

# **Experimental and Numerical Investigation of a Parallel Jet MILD Combustion Burner System in a Laboratory-scale Furnace**

by

**George Gabriel Szegő**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

SCHOOL OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING  
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCE



March 2010 (Approved in July 2010)

© George G. Szegő 2010

# Declarations

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I hereby give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, throughout the world, subject to the Australian Copyright Act of 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed in Appendix H) resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

*George G. Szegö*

# Acknowledgments

I would like to begin thanking all my office mates Dr. David Harvey, Mr. Mark Symes, Mr. Pierre Dumuid, Mr. Tommie Liddy, Mr. Shahrooz Afsharvahid, Ms. Kristy Hansen and Mr. Timothy Lau for their company and friendship during my PhD project.

Particular thanks go to Dr. Peter Kalt and Dr. Paul Medwell from the combustion research group for the many fruitful discussions on various topics. The interaction with such amicable and nice people made this long and lonely endeavour enjoyable.

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Australian Research Council (ARC) and the efforts of the technicians at the School of Mechanical Engineering of The University of Adelaide. In particular, Bob Dyer from the workshop for his manufacturing solutions and Graham Kelly from the Thebarton Laboratories for his willingness to help in difficult times. The assistance of Dr. Erwin Gamboa and Mr. Grant Nelson with the microscope and ceramic cutting machine in the materials lab is much appreciated.

This thesis is a culmination of many years of study away from my home country, and I must thank my family and friends for their endless support and encouragement during this time. I am greatly indebted to my wife Fabiana, who supported me in every possible way throughout the darkest days and nights of my research student life.

Finally, and most importantly, I am eternally grateful to the support of my principal supervisor Assoc. Prof. Bassam Dally and associate supervisors Prof. Graham Nathan and Assoc. Prof. Farid Christo. Their generous advice and outstanding technical support has been invaluable. I felt privileged to have worked with such competent combustion scientists.

# Abstract

In a world increasingly concerned with fuel prices, sustainability and the environment, energy efficiency improvements are indispensable. In this framework, Moderate or Intense Low-oxygen Dilution (MILD) combustion technology can play a significant role in the mitigation of combustion-generated pollutants and greenhouse gases, whilst meeting thermal efficiency needs. Under MILD conditions, reactants are highly diluted with combustion products causing reactions to occur in a distributed reaction zone with a reduced peak temperature. As a consequence, the temperature distribution is nearly uniform, and pollutant emissions, nitrogen oxides ( $\text{NO}_x$ ) in particular, are lower than from conventional flames.

Over the past few decades, MILD combustion technology has been implemented at full scale in various industrial sectors and tested at pilot scale in other applications. Nevertheless, despite considerable industrial success, many important issues of MILD combustion remain unresolved. The current research seeks to characterise the MILD regime in a furnace environment burning gaseous fuels through a combined experimental and numerical modelling approach.

This study describes the performance and stability characteristics of a parallel jet MILD combustion burner system in a laboratory-scale furnace, in which the reactants and exhaust ports are all mounted on the same wall. In-furnace temperatures and global emissions are measured, respectively with fine-wire thermocouples and a gas analyser, for a wide range of operating conditions. In addition, velocities for selected cases are measured using laser Doppler anemometry (LDA). The detailed experimental data set is then used to validate a computational fluid dynamics (CFD) model. In combination, the experimental and numerical data reveal details of the passive and reactive scalar fields, and enable not only the investigation of the parameters that influence their structure and pollutant for-

mation, but also insight into the contribution of flue gas recirculation to flame stability under MILD conditions.

The present furnace/burner configuration proved to operate without the need for external air preheating, and achieved a high degree of temperature uniformity. The analysis of the furnace aerodynamics and qualitative observations of the burner exit region revealed that effective mixing is essential in order to increase dilution before reaction to ensure stability of this multiple jet system. Unlike in previous investigations, the fuel jet momentum is found to control the stability of this multiple jet system. The CO formation is found to be related to the mixing patterns and furnace temperature rather than reaction quenching by the heat exchanger.

It is found that, although heat extraction, air preheat, excess air, firing rate, dilution, and fuel type all affect  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions, they do not control  $\text{NO}_x$  scaling. The combined effects of these global parameters can be ultimately characterized by a furnace temperature and a global residence time. The quantitative analysis of  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions demonstrated the nondominant role of the thermal-NO pathway in the present MILD combustion conditions. It has been revealed that the  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ -intermediate pathway is the dominant  $\text{NO}_x$  formation mechanism, while the prompt-NO mechanism is negligible. There is potential for NO reburning for this parallel jet burner configuration.

Despite the complexity of the recirculating flow inside the furnace, the CFD model agrees reasonably well with the experimental data. It is noted from the CFD analysis that finite-rate chemistry must be included for accurate predictions of MILD combustion conditions.

The fundamental aspects revealed by this study provide unique advancements in the understanding of MILD combustion that will assist in the effort to extend this technology to other heat and power systems.

# Contents

<b>Declarations</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xxiii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Combustion and the Environment . . . . .	1
1.2 Energy Efficiency and MILD Combustion . . . . .	2
1.3 Thesis Outline . . . . .	4
<b>2 Background</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Pollutant Emissions . . . . .	6
2.1.1 Nitrogen oxides ( $\text{NO}_x$ ) . . . . .	6
2.1.2 Carbon monoxide (CO) . . . . .	12
2.1.3 Unburned hydrocarbon (UHC) . . . . .	14
2.2 MILD Combustion . . . . .	14
2.2.1 Definition / Terminology . . . . .	14
2.2.2 Fundamentals and characteristics . . . . .	16
2.2.3 Regimes of operation . . . . .	18
2.2.4 Burner and furnace technology . . . . .	22
2.2.5 Mathematical modelling . . . . .	27

---

2.3	Laser Doppler Anemometry . . . . .	30
<b>3</b>	<b>Experimental Setup and Methodology</b>	<b>36</b>
3.1	MILD Combustion Furnace and Burner . . . . .	36
3.2	Instrumentation and Control . . . . .	38
3.2.1	Input-output measurements . . . . .	38
3.2.2	In-furnace temperature measurements . . . . .	40
3.2.3	Exhaust gas measurements . . . . .	42
3.2.4	Control system . . . . .	43
3.3	LDA System . . . . .	46
3.3.1	Laser and optical arrangement . . . . .	46
3.3.2	Particle seeding . . . . .	49
3.3.3	Measurement locations . . . . .	49
3.3.4	Data acquisition and processing . . . . .	51
3.4	Error Analysis . . . . .	53
3.4.1	General sources of error . . . . .	53
3.4.2	Temperature . . . . .	54
3.4.3	Global emissions . . . . .	55
3.4.4	LDA measurements . . . . .	55
<b>4</b>	<b>Numerical Modelling</b>	<b>59</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	59
4.2	CFD Model Description . . . . .	59
4.2.1	Computational domain . . . . .	60
4.2.2	Turbulence models . . . . .	61
4.2.3	Combustion models . . . . .	62
4.2.4	Radiation model . . . . .	65
4.2.5	NO <sub>x</sub> post-processor . . . . .	65
4.2.6	Boundary and initial conditions . . . . .	68
4.3	Reactor Model and Equilibrium Calculations . . . . .	72
<b>5</b>	<b>Temperature and Emission Measurements</b>	<b>74</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	74
5.2	Operating Conditions . . . . .	74

---

5.3	Transition from Conventional to MILD Combustion . . . . .	77
5.4	Furnace Performance Characteristics . . . . .	77
5.4.1	Parametric Study . . . . .	77
5.4.2	Effect of thermal input . . . . .	80
5.4.3	Effect of heat extraction . . . . .	82
5.4.4	Effect of air preheat . . . . .	83
5.4.5	Effect of fuel dilution . . . . .	85
5.4.6	Effect of equivalence ratio . . . . .	88
5.4.7	Optimisation tests . . . . .	91
5.5	Burner Stability Characteristics . . . . .	94
5.5.1	Visual observations . . . . .	94
5.5.2	Stability limits . . . . .	94
5.6	Summary . . . . .	99
<b>6</b>	<b>Scaling of <math>\text{NO}_x</math></b>	<b>101</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	101
6.2	Global Nitrogen Oxides Emission Correlations . . . . .	101
6.3	Froude Number Scaling . . . . .	105
6.4	Temperature-time Scaling . . . . .	107
6.5	Summary . . . . .	114
<b>7</b>	<b>Thermal, Flow and Scalar Fields</b>	<b>115</b>
7.1	Introduction . . . . .	115
7.2	Validation Results . . . . .	115
7.2.1	Velocity . . . . .	115
7.2.2	Temperature . . . . .	127
7.2.3	Energy balance . . . . .	130
7.2.4	Exhaust emissions . . . . .	130
7.3	Mixing Patterns and Thermal Field . . . . .	133
7.4	Investigation of Key Species . . . . .	146
7.5	$\text{NO}_x$ Formation . . . . .	150
7.6	Summary . . . . .	151



---

<b>8</b>	<b>General Discussion</b>	<b>154</b>
8.1	Cooling Effects and CO Conversion . . . . .	154
8.2	Furnace Aerodynamics and Stability Criterion . . . . .	156
8.3	NO <sub>x</sub> Formation / Destruction and Scaling . . . . .	160
8.4	Application / Implementation . . . . .	162
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>165</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>MILD Modelling Summary</b>	<b>191</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Temperature Correction</b>	<b>200</b>
B.1	Methodology . . . . .	200
B.2	Error Propagation . . . . .	202
<b>C</b>	<b>Control Logic</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Particle Size Distribution</b>	<b>209</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Velocity for Nonreacting Isothermal Conditions</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>Compositional Struture Contours</b>	<b>215</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub> Contours</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>Publications</b>	<b>241</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	World commercial energy consumption by source [56]. . . . .	2
2.1	NO <sub>x</sub> control technologies for gas-fired industrial combustion equipment (adapted from Ref. [17]). . . . .	9
2.2	Definition of MILD combustion based on the theory of well-stirred reactor (WSR) [23]. . . . .	16
2.3	MILD combustion operating principles (adapted from Ref. [198]).	17
2.4	Stability diagram for conventional and MILD combustion [199]. .	19
2.5	Schematic layout of an industrial MILD combustion furnace operated with alternating flow regenerators [98]. . . . .	23
2.6	Different burner configurations used in MILD combustion. . . . .	26
2.7	Typical optical arrangement for dual-beam LDA operating in backscatter (adapted from Refs. [7, 40]). . . . .	31
2.8	LDA measurement volume and fringe model parameters [40]. . . .	32
3.1	Schematic diagram of MILD combustion furnace and parallel jet burner system. . . . .	37
3.2	Schematic diagram of heat exchanger insertion length at one of the five possible window openings (positions A1–A5). . . . .	39
3.3	Flow and instrumentation diagram of the MCF system. . . . .	41
3.4	Bluff-body burner arrangement. . . . .	44
3.5	Photograph of the burner management system (BMS). . . . .	45
3.6	Photographs of the window frame arrangement. . . . .	48
3.7	Photograph of the LDA probe cooling apparatus. . . . .	48
3.8	Photograph of the particle seeding system. . . . .	50

3.9	Photograph of the MILD combustion furnace installations and the 3-axis traverse system. . . . .	50
3.10	Photograph of the target used for alignment. . . . .	51
4.1	Meshed computational domain for the MCF. . . . .	61
4.2	Air inlet axial velocity, $V_z$ , profile normalised by the bulk velocity, $U_o$ , at $z = 9$ mm. . . . .	70
5.1	Temperature and emissions recorded during the transition from conventional to MILD combustion for the baseline operating conditions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$ mm, $\dot{Q}_{fuel} = 15$ kW NG, $\phi = 0.80$ , $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , 25% insertion at position A3). . . . .	78
5.2	Sequence of photographs of the burner exit region from the heat up stage until the MILD combustion mode is activated. . . . .	79
5.3	Effect of fuel input on temperature and $\text{NO}_x$ emissions for the baseline operating conditions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$ mm, $\phi = 0.80$ , $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , 25% insertion at position A3). . . . .	81
5.4	Effect of heat extraction on temperature and $\text{NO}_x$ emissions for different thermal input conditions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$ mm, $\phi = 0.80$ , $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , heat exchanger at position A3). . . . .	82
5.5	Effect of heat extraction on temperature and $\text{NO}_x$ emissions for various heat exchanger positions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$ mm, $\dot{Q}_{fuel} = 15$ kW NG, $\phi = 0.80$ , $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ ) . . . . .	83
5.6	Effect of air preheating on temperature and $\text{NO}_x$ emissions for different thermal input conditions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$ mm, $\phi = 0.80$ , 25% insertion at position A3). . . . .	84
5.7	Effect of heat extraction on temperature and $\text{NO}_x$ emissions for the baseline operating conditions with (squares) and without (triangles) air preheating ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$ mm, $\dot{Q}_{fuel} = 15$ kW NG, $\phi = 0.80$ , heat exchanger at position A3). . . . .	85

- 
- 5.8 Effect of fuel dilution on temperature and  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions with fuel type and burner size as parameters for the baseline operating conditions ( $\dot{Q}_{fuel} = 15 \text{ kW}$ ,  $\phi = 0.80$ ,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , 25% insertion at position A3). Solid symbols:  $\text{N}_2$  dilution, open symbols:  $\text{CO}_2$  dilution, solid lines with small symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0 \text{ mm}$ , and dashed lines with large symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 3.0 \text{ mm}$ . Red colored lines and symbols represent PSR calculations for methane (GRI 3.0). . . . . 87
- 5.9 Effect of equivalence ratio ( $\phi$ ) on temperature,  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{CO}$  and  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions with heat exchanger position as the parameter, for the baseline operating conditions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0 \text{ mm}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{fuel} = 15 \text{ kW NG}$ ,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , 25% insertion at position A3). . . . . 90
- 5.10 Effect of air preheating on  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions and furnace temperature for two different equivalence ratios for the baseline operating conditions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0 \text{ mm}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{fuel} = 15 \text{ kW NG}$ , 25% insertion at position A3). . . . . 92
- 5.11 Effect of heat extraction on  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions and furnace temperature for two different equivalence ratios for the baseline operating conditions ( $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0 \text{ mm}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{fuel} = 15 \text{ kW NG}$ ,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , heat exchanger at position A3). . . . . 93
- 5.12 Sequence of instantaneous images of NG combustion with increasing  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  dilution ( $\varnothing_{id} = 3.0 \text{ mm}$ ). The dashed circles represent regions of visible flame. . . . . 95
- 5.13 Sequence of instantaneous images of LPG combustion with increasing  $\text{N}_2$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  dilution ( $\varnothing_{id} = 3.0 \text{ mm}$ ). The dashed circles represent regions of visible flame. . . . . 96
- 5.14 Global measurements of (a) temperature, and (b)  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions for the fuel dilution data; and (c) the axial distance to the junction point calculated from the SJWJ model [79]. Square: baseline case with air preheat, and triangle: baseline case without air preheat, as in Figure 5.7. . . . . 98

- 6.1 Relationship between  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions and furnace temperature,  $T_{furnace}$ , for all tested operating conditions. The solid line represents a linear curve fit for all data. The experimental data points are sorted according to fuel type, diluent and burner size. Diamonds: NG, circles: LPG, thin line symbols: no fuel dilution, solid symbols:  $\text{N}_2$  dilution, thick line symbols:  $\text{CO}_2$  dilution, small symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$  mm, and large symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 3.0$  mm. . . . . 102
- 6.2 Relationship between  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions and exhaust temperature,  $T_{exhaust}$ , for all tested operating conditions. The experimental data points are grouped according to fuel input power and fuel type. No distinction is made with respect to fuel dilution and burner size. The thick solid black line represents a linear curve fit for all data. The other thin coloured lines are linear curve fits for each fuel input power bin. Open symbols: all cases burning NG, and solid symbols: all cases burning LPG. . . . . 103
- 6.3 Relationship between  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions and heat extracted,  $\dot{Q}_{hx}$ , for all tested operating conditions. The solid line represents a linear curve fit for all data. The experimental data points are sorted according to fuel type, diluent and burner size. Diamonds: NG, circles: LPG, thin line symbols: no fuel dilution, solid symbols:  $\text{N}_2$  dilution, thick line symbols:  $\text{CO}_2$  dilution, small symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$  mm, and large symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 3.0$  mm. . . . . 104
- 6.4 Leading-order  $\text{NO}_x$  scaling correlation,  $EINO_x(\rho_{fuel}u/d)$ , versus fuel jet exit Froude number,  $Fr_e$ , for (a) all data points, (b) all cases burning NG, and (c) all cases burning LPG. The experimental data points are sorted according to fuel type, diluent and burner size. Diamonds: NG, circles: LPG, thin line symbols: no fuel dilution, solid symbols:  $\text{N}_2$  dilution, thick line symbols:  $\text{CO}_2$  dilution, small symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$  mm, and large symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 3.0$  mm. Blue coloured line and symbols on part (b) represent data for a reference condition ( $17\% < \dot{Q}_{hx} < 30\%$ ,  $12\text{kW} < \dot{Q}_{fuel} < 16\text{kW}$ ,  $0.78 < \phi < 0.82$ ,  $400^\circ\text{C} < T_{air} < 500^\circ\text{C}$ ). . . . . 106

- 
- 6.5 Relationship between the  $\text{NO}_x$  emission index,  $\text{EINO}_x$ , and the momentum flux ratio of air-to-fuel,  $\rho$ , for all tested operating conditions. The experimental data points are sorted according to fuel type, diluent and burner size. Diamonds: NG, circles: LPG, thin line symbols: no fuel dilution, solid symbols:  $\text{N}_2$  dilution, thick line symbols:  $\text{CO}_2$  dilution, small symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 2.0$  mm, and large symbols:  $\varnothing_{id} = 3.0$  mm. . . . . 108
- 6.6  $\text{NO}_x$  production rates calculated with the global residence time,  $\tau_G$ , as a function of the reciprocal of the furnace temperature. The experimental data points are grouped according to global residence time. +,  $\text{CH}_4$  [199]; \*, NG [98];  $\blacktriangledown$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  [154];  $\oplus$ , NG [171];  $\times$ , NG [194];  $\otimes$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  [32, 147];  $\emptyset$ , LPG [105];  $\bullet$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  &  $\text{C}_3\text{H}_8$  [37]. . . . . 111
- 6.7 Percentage difference between the regression predictions (cf. Table 6.1) of  $\text{NO}_x$  production rates and the experiments for all 191 data points. . . . . 113
- 7.1 Comparison of measured and predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles along the  $y$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at  $x = 0$  (left) and  $x = -10$  (right) for different turbulence models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, blue lines: realizable, red lines:  $k - \epsilon$ , green lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 2} = 1.8$ , purple lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 1} = 1.6$ , orange lines: RNG, and gray lines: RSM. . . 118
- 7.2 Comparison of measured and predicted mean radial velocity ( $V_x$ ) profiles along the  $y$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at  $x = 0$  (left) and  $x = -10$  (right) for different turbulence models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, blue lines: realizable, red lines:  $k - \epsilon$ , green lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 2} = 1.8$ , purple lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 1} = 1.6$ , orange lines: RNG, and gray lines: RSM. . . 119

- 7.3 Comparison of measured and predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles along the  $x$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at  $y = -10$  (left) and  $y = 30$  (right) with the exception of  $y = 5$  (lower right) for different turbulence models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, blue lines: realizable, red lines:  $k - \epsilon$ , green lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 2} = 1.8$ , purple lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 1} = 1.6$ , orange lines: RNG, and gray lines: RSM. . . . . 120
- 7.4 Comparison of measured and predicted mean radial velocity ( $V_x$ ) profiles along the  $x$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at  $y = -10$  (left) and  $y = 30$  (right) with the exception of  $y = 5$  (lower right) for different turbulence models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, blue lines: realizable, red lines:  $k - \epsilon$ , green lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 2} = 1.8$ , purple lines:  $k - \epsilon$  with  $C_{\epsilon 1} = 1.6$ , orange lines: RNG, and gray lines: RSM. . . . . 121
- 7.5 Comparison of measured and predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles along the  $y$ -axis for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , at  $x = 0$  (left) and  $x = -10$  (right) for different combustion models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, solid lines: FRED with a two-step global chemistry, and dashed lines: EDC with the Smooke mechanism. . . . . 123
- 7.6 Comparison of measured and predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles along the  $x$ -axis for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , at  $y = -10$  (left) and  $y = 5$  (right) for different combustion models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, solid lines: FRED with a two-step global chemistry, and dashed lines: EDC with the Smooke mechanism. . . . . 124
- 7.7 Comparison of measured and predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles along the  $y$ -axis for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , at  $x = 0$  (left) and  $x = -10$  (right) for different combustion models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, solid lines: FRED with a two-step global chemistry, and dashed lines: EDC with the Smooke mechanism. . . . . 125

- 7.8 Comparison of measured and predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles along the  $x$ -axis for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , at  $y = -10$  (left) and  $y = 5$  (right) for different combustion models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, solid lines: FRED with a two-step global chemistry, and dashed lines: EDC with the Smooke mechanism. . . . . 126
- 7.9 Comparison of measured and predicted temperature profiles along the  $y$ -axis for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , at  $x = -100$  (left),  $x = 0$  (centre) and  $x = 100$  (right) for different combustion models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, solid lines: FRED with a two-step global chemistry, and dashed lines: EDC with the Smooke mechanism. . . . . 128
- 7.10 Comparison of measured and predicted temperature profiles along the  $y$ -axis for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , at  $x = -100$  (left),  $x = 0$  (centre) and  $x = 100$  (right) for different combustion models at various axial locations. Open symbols: experimental data, solid lines: FRED with a two-step global chemistry, and dashed lines: EDC with the Smooke mechanism. . . . . 129
- 7.11 Pathlines inside the furnace with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism. Blue lines: air jet, purple lines: fuel jet A, green lines: fuel jet B, orange lines: fuel jet C, and red lines: fuel jet D. . . . . 134
- 7.12 Pathlines inside the furnace with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism. Blue lines: air jet, purple lines: fuel jet A, green lines: fuel jet B, orange lines: fuel jet C, and red lines: fuel jet D. . . . . 135
- 7.13 Predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) isosurface plots for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism. The threshold value that defines the isosurface for  $V_z$  is represented in the lower right corner of each plot. 137



- 7.14 Predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) isosurface plots for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism. The threshold value that defines the isosurface for  $V_z$  is represented in the lower right corner of each plot. . . . . 138
- 7.15 Computed mixture fraction ( $\xi$ ) contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 139
- 7.16 Computed mixture fraction ( $\xi$ ) contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 140
- 7.17 Predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) contours for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. The lines represent the points in the flow field where  $V_z = 0$ . . . . . 141
- 7.18 Predicted mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) contours for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. The lines represent the points in the flow field where  $V_z = 0$ . . . . . 142
- 7.19 Predicted temperature contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 144
- 7.20 Predicted temperature contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 145

---

7.21	Predicted temperature contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat, $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat, $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the FRED model with the two-step global reaction mechanism at the $x - z$ and $y - z$ centreline planes. . . . .	147
7.22	Predicted temperature contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat, $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat, $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the FRED model with the two-step global reaction mechanism at different $x - y$ planes. . . . .	148
8.1	Simplified axisymmetric representation of the aerodynamics inside the combustion chamber with the velocity contours from Figure 7.17 overlaid, derived from §7.3, beside the measured temperature distribution from Figure 7.10. . . . .	157
B.1	Images used to determine the thermocouple bead diameter. The red circle represents the average circumference of the bead. . . . .	202
C.1	Flowdiagram of the control logic integrated in the burner management system (BMS). . . . .	208
D.1	$\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ particle size distribution. ( <i>Source</i> : Pulver Technology Ltd.)	209
E.1	Comparison of measured (open symbols) and predicted (blue lines) mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles across the $y$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at $x = 0$ (left) and $x = -10$ (right) for the realizable $k - \epsilon$ turbulence model at various axial locations. . . . .	211
E.2	Comparison of measured (open symbols) and predicted (blue lines) mean radial velocity ( $V_x$ ) profiles across the $y$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at $x = 0$ (left) and $x = -10$ (right) for the realizable $k - \epsilon$ turbulence model at various axial locations. . . . .	212

- E.3 Comparison of measured (open symbols) and predicted (blue lines) mean axial velocity ( $V_z$ ) profiles across the  $x$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at  $y = -10$  (left) and  $y = 30$  (right) with the exception of  $y = 5$  (lower right) for the realizable  $k - \epsilon$  turbulence model at various axial locations. . . . . 213
- E.4 Comparison of measured (open symbols) and predicted (blue lines) mean radial velocity ( $V_x$ ) profiles across the  $x$ -axis for nonreacting conditions at  $y = -10$  (left) and  $y = 30$  (right) with the exception of  $y = 5$  (lower right) for the realizable  $k - \epsilon$  turbulence model at various axial locations. . . . . 214
- F.1 Predicted  $\text{CH}_4$  mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 216
- F.2 Predicted  $\text{CH}_4$  mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 217
- F.3 Predicted  $\text{CH}_3$  mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 218
- F.4 Predicted  $\text{CH}_3$  mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 219

- 
- F.5 Predicted O<sub>2</sub> mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 220
- F.6 Predicted O<sub>2</sub> mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 221
- F.7 Predicted CO mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 222
- F.8 Predicted CO mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 223
- F.9 Predicted CH<sub>2</sub>O mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 224
- F.10 Predicted CH<sub>2</sub>O mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 225

- F.11 Predicted OH mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 226
- F.12 Predicted OH mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 227
- F.13 Predicted O mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 228
- F.14 Predicted O mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 229
- F.15 Predicted H mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 230
- F.16 Predicted H mole fraction contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 231

- G.1 Predicted NO mole fraction contours on a wet basis with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  and  $y - z$  centreline planes. . . . . 233
- G.2 Predicted NO mole fraction contours on a wet basis with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case, (a) and (b) without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , and (c) and (d) with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. . . . . 234
- G.3 Predicted NO reaction rate contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  centreline plane. The thermal, prompt and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ -intermediate  $\text{NO}_x$  models were considered (Full NO case shown in Table 7.2). . . . . 235
- G.4 Predicted NO reaction rate contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $y - z$  centreline plane. The thermal, prompt and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ -intermediate  $\text{NO}_x$  models were considered (Full NO case shown in Table 7.2). . . . . 236
- G.5 Predicted NO reaction rate contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case without air preheat,  $T_{air} = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x - y$  planes. The thermal, prompt and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ -intermediate  $\text{NO}_x$  models were considered (Full NO case shown in Table 7.2). 237
- G.6 Predicted NO reaction rate contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $x - z$  centreline plane. The thermal, prompt and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ -intermediate  $\text{NO}_x$  models were considered (Full NO case shown in Table 7.2). . . . 238

- 
- G.7 Predicted NO reaction rate contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at the  $y-z$  centreline plane. The thermal, prompt and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ -intermediate  $\text{NO}_x$  models were considered (Full NO case shown in Table 7.2). . . . 239
- G.8 Predicted NO reaction rate contours with stoichiometric surface ( $\xi_{st} = 0.0552$ ) overlaid for the baseline case with air preheat,  $T_{air} = 450^\circ\text{C}$ , for the EDC model with the Smooke mechanism at different  $x-y$  planes. The thermal, prompt and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ -intermediate  $\text{NO}_x$  models were considered (Full NO case shown in Table 7.2). . . . 240

# List of Tables

3.1	Specifications of the laser and LDA system . . . . .	46
3.2	Characteristics of the LDA measurement volume and optics . . . . .	47
3.3	LDA measurement locations with coordinates in mm . . . . .	52
3.4	Nominal accuracies for the gas analysis equipment . . . . .	55
4.1	Boundary and initial conditions for the CFD model . . . . .	69
4.2	Measured average outer wall temperatures . . . . .	72
4.3	Inlet conditions for PSR calculations . . . . .	73
5.1	Typical fuel properties and composition . . . . .	76
5.2	Summary of all test conditions . . . . .	76
6.1	Regression coefficients for equation 6.3 . . . . .	110
7.1	Overall energy balance for the baseline case with and without air preheat for different combustion models . . . . .	132
7.2	Exhaust emissions for the baseline case with and without air preheat for different combustion models . . . . .	132
A.1	MILD combustion modelling summary . . . . .	192
B.1	Estimated uncertainty of the parameters used to calculate the temperature correction . . . . .	203
B.2	Error estimates for in-furnace temperature data for the baseline operating conditions . . . . .	203