High-pressure pyrolysis and oxidation of ethanol

Hashemi, Hamid; Christensen, Jakob M.; Glarborg, Peter

Published in:
Fuel

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1016/j.fuel.2017.12.085](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.12.085)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Hashemi, H., Christensen, J. M., & Glarborg, P. (2018). High-pressure pyrolysis and oxidation of ethanol. *Fuel*, 218, 247-257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.12.085>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

High-pressure pyrolysis and oxidation of ethanol

Hamid Hashemi^{*a}, Jakob M. Christensen^a, Peter Glarborg^a

^a*DTU Chemical Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, DK-2800 Lyngby, Denmark*

Abstract

The pyrolysis and oxidation of ethanol has been investigated at temperatures of 600–900 K, a pressure of 50 bar and residence times of 4.3–6.8 s in a laminar flow reactor. The experiments, conducted with mixtures highly diluted in nitrogen, covered fuel-air equivalence ratios (Φ) of 0.1, 1.0, 43, and ∞ . Ethanol pyrolysis was observed at temperatures above 850 K. The onset temperature of ethanol oxidation occurred at 700–725 K over a wide range of stoichiometries. A considerable yield of aldehydes was detected at intermediate temperatures. A detailed chemical kinetic model was developed and evaluated against the present data as well as ignition delay times and flame speed measurements from literature. The model predicted the onset of fuel conversion and the composition of products from the flow reactor experiments fairly well. It also predicted well ignition delays above 900 K whereas it overpredicted reported flame speeds slightly. The results of sensitivity analyses revealed the importance of the reaction between ethanol and the hydroperoxyl radical for ignition at high pressure and intermediate temperatures. An accurate determination of the rate coefficients for this reaction is important to improve the reliability of modeling predictions.

Keywords:

Ethanol, Ignition, High pressure, Reaction mechanism

1. Introduction

In recent years, ethanol has attracted both scientific and commercial attention as an additive to conventional liquid fuels or even as a alternative neat fuel. Gasoline doped with ethanol is widely used in spark-ignited (SI) engines [1]. Ethanol addition to gasoline

^{*}Corresponding author. Fax: +45 4588 2258, URL: <http://www.kt.dtu.dk>, e-mail: hah@kt.dtu.dk
Preprint submitted to Fuel *December 15, 2017*

promotes the overall octane number of the fuel while it potentially reduces the emission of particulate matter [2, 3] and CO [4]. Ethanol addition to diesel fuels has also been studied [5, 6] and a positive effect on fuel economy was found [5].

The relatively high energy density of ethanol makes it attractive also as a neat fuel. Using ethanol-based fuels produced from bio-sources can reduce the pressure on fossil fuels resources and reduce CO₂ release to the atmosphere. However, a widespread usage of ethanol as a fuel may increase the emission of aldehydes [1, 4, 7], which can cause health risks.

Compared to studies of hydrocarbon oxidation, research in the oxidation chemistry of oxygenated fuels is more recent, motivated by their importance in engines. In addition to the interest due to its role as a fuel or fuel additive, the reaction mechanism of ethanol is a crucial part in models for heavier alcohols often found in complicated biofuels [1]. Due to its relevance, e.g., for homogeneous-charge compression-ignition (HCCI) engines [8], ethanol ignition has been studied at high pressure and intermediate temperatures in flow reactors, rapid compression machines (RCM), and, to some extent, in shock tubes.

Data from high-pressure turbulent flow reactors are available for ethanol pyrolysis (950 K, 3–12 atm) [9] and ethanol oxidation (523–903 K, 12.5 atm) [10]. Ignition delay times at intermediate temperatures are mostly obtained in rapid compression machines (RCM), but the relatively short ignition delays of ethanol make it possible to conduct such experiments also in shock tubes. Ignition delay data from RCM have been reported by Lee et al. [11] (750–1000 K, 20–40 atm), Mittal et al. [12] (825–985 K, 10–50 bar), Lee et al. [13] (700–1300 K, 67–80 bar), and Barraza-Botet et al. [14] (880–1150 K, 3–10 atm), while shock tube ignition delays are available from Noorani et al. [15] (1070–1760 K, 2–12 atm), Heufer and Olivier [16] (800–1400 K, ≤ 40 bar), and Cancino et al. [17] (650–1220 K, 10–50 bar). Some of these studies cover partly the pressure and temperatures of the current study, but ignition delay times provide only an overall characteristic of combustion. Additional insight into the combustion chemistry can be obtained by measuring more detailed characteristics such as species profiles.

A number of chemical kinetic models for ethanol oxidation has been published over the years [10, 12, 13, 18–25], but only some of them have been applied at elevated pressure. Marinov [21] conducted the first comprehensive modeling study of ethanol oxidation, estimating a number of rate constants by analogy to known reactions. Whereas most of the data used for validation were obtained at low pressures and high temperatures, his model has been adopted also for high-pressure studies [15]. Dryer and co-workers [10, 22] developed a kinetic model and validated it against flow-reactor data at 12.5 bar as well as against ignition delays up to 50 bar. This model was largely adopted by Lee et al. [13] who extended the validation range to 77 bar. Cancino et al. [17] modified earlier kinetic models to address ethanol oxidation chemistry at high pressures and intermediate temperatures. However, their model was solely validated against shock tube data. Mittal et al. [12] optimized a model for ethanol oxidation at intermediate temperatures.

By the advent of more reliable data for the key reactions in ethanol oxidation, a careful reevaluation of reactions focusing on medium temperatures and high pressure seems desirable. In this paper we present species concentration profiles from ethanol pyrolysis and oxidation in a flow reactor at high pressure and intermediate temperatures. A detailed chemical kinetic model based on earlier high-pressure studies from our laboratory [26–33] is extended with a subset for ethanol oxidation and evaluated against the data from the present work as well as from literature.

2. Experimental approach

The experiments were conducted in a laboratory-scale high-pressure laminar-flow reactor designed to approximate plug flow [26]. The setup was described in detail elsewhere [26] and only a brief description is provided here. The system was used here for the investigation of ethanol oxidation chemistry at a pressure of 50 bar, temperatures up to 900 K, and a flow rate of 4.78 Nliter/min (4.42 Nliter/min for the pyrolysis experiments, STP: 1 atm and 273.15 K).

The reactions took place in a tubular quartz reactor (inner diameter of 8 mm), enclosed

in a stainless steel tube that acted as a pressure shell. The system was pressurized from the feed gas cylinders and the reactor pressure was monitored upstream of the reactor by a differential pressure transducer and controlled by a pneumatically operated pressure control valve positioned after the reactor. The pressure fluctuations of the reactor were limited to $\pm 0.2\%$. The pressure in the shell-side of the reactor was retained close to that inside the reactor in order to prevent breaking the quartz tube.

The steel tube was placed in a tube oven with three individually controlled electrical heating elements that produced an isothermal reaction zone (± 6 K) of 42–48 cm in the middle of the reactor. A moving thermocouple was used to measure the temperature profile inside the pressure shell at the external surface of the quartz tube after stabilizing the system.

The liquid feeding system is described in detail elsewhere [34]. The liquid was pressurized by an HPLC pump and its flow to the reactor was controlled by a liquid mass flow controller. The liquid was mixed with the incoming gas and heated to temperatures around 520 K in evaporator before entering the reactor. A tube of more than 4 m in the evaporator ensured sufficient time for evaporation and mixing. A long stabilization period prior to each test served to limit the fluctuations of the liquid feeding system to $\pm 5\%$.

Downstream of the reactor, the system pressure was reduced to atmospheric level prior to product analysis, which was conducted by an on-line *6890N Agilent Gas Chromatograph* (GC-TCD/FID) calibrated according to the procedure in [32]. The GC allowed detection of O_2 , CO , CO_2 , C_2H_4 and C_2H_6 with estimated uncertainties around 10%. The uncertainty for ethanol was higher due to its calibration procedure. Methane could not be quantified accurately due to signal overlapping with CO . Distinguishing methanol from acetaldehyde was not possible due to signal overlapping for the GC configuration used. However, it was possible to measure the signal areas corresponding to sum of these components. Using the response factor of acetaldehyde, the sum of acetaldehyde and methanol was estimated but a relatively large uncertainty must be acknowledged.

Moreover, due to the small signal to noise ratio of formaldehyde, a larger uncertainty especially in measuring low quantities of formaldehyde was expected.

All gases used in the present experiments were high purity gases or mixtures with certified concentrations ($\pm 2\%$ uncertainty) and the ethanol purity was above 99.8 %. The total flow rate was measured by a bubble flow meter downstream of the reactor.

For each set of experiments, the concentrations of reactants as well as the pressure of the system were maintained while the temperature of the isothermal zone was increased in small steps. Figure 1 shows the measured temperature profiles for different isotherms in pure nitrogen. The residence time of the gases in the isothermal zone of the reactor can be estimated as $\tau[\text{s}] = 3840/T [\text{K}]$ ($\pm 8\%$) for all the oxidizing experiments and $\tau[\text{s}] = 4098/T [\text{K}]$ ($\pm 8\%$) for the pyrolysis tests.

The temperature rise due to exothermic reactions was limited by strongly diluting the reactants in nitrogen. The adiabatic temperature increase was estimated to a maximum of 107 K. However, measurements of the temperature profile under oxidizing conditions indicated only a marginal difference compared to the flow of pure nitrogen. This is attributed to a fast heat transfer between the quartz reactor and its surrounding, facilitated by the small diameter of the quartz tube.

The possible impact of surface reactions is a concern in flow reactor studies. In this work, surface reactions were minimized, partly by the use of quartz as reactor material and partly by the high pressure, inhibiting diffusion to the wall. Previous work in the reactor, covering a range of fuels [26, 29–33, 35, 36], have shown no indications of wall reactions. In a recent study of oxidation of ammonia [36], known to be sensitive to surfaces, we found that replacing the quartz reactor by an alumina reactor did not affect the oxidation behavior. Hence, it seems safe to assume a negligible contribution from surface reactivity on the gathered data.

Figure 1: Measured temperature profiles across the reaction zone. The nitrogen flow rate was 4.78 NL/min at a pressure of 50 bar. The flow rate and temperature profiles were slightly different for the ethanol pyrolysis experiments.

3. Chemical kinetic model

The reaction mechanism and the corresponding thermodynamic and transport data were based on previous work by the authors on high-pressure oxidation of hydrogen [31], methane [32], acetylene [35], ethylene [29], ethane [33], and methanol [30]. The acetaldehyde subset is reviewed in a companion paper [37]. Here, the reactions important for ethanol oxidation at high pressure and moderate temperatures are discussed. Selected reactions are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Reactions from ethanol reaction mechanism. The rate constants are in the form of $k = AT^n \exp(-E/(RT))$. Units are *mol*, *cm*, *K*, *s*, and *cal*.

	Reaction	A	n	E	Note/Ref.
R1a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}=\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	3.8E20	-2.060	69426	[38], ^a
R1b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}=\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_2\text{OH}$	1.8E47	-8.960	101002	[38], ^a
R1c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}=\text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{OH}$	6.2E51	-10.340	109879	[38], ^a
R2a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}_2$	8.8E03	2.680	2913	[38]
R2b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}_2$	5.3E03	2.810	7491	[38]
R2c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2$	9.5E02	3.140	8696	[38]
R3a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{OH}=\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	6.9E16	-0.733	13799	[39], see text
	duplicate rate constant	4.6E05	2.147	-1779	
R3b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{OH}=\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	2.4E10	0.881	5350	[39], see text
	duplicate rate constant	9.6E05	1.927	-831	
R3c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{OH}=\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	7.9E06	1.609	-461	[39], see text
	duplicate rate constant	1.6E03	2.870	53	
R4a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2=\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$	8.2E03	2.550	10750	[21]
R4b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2=\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$	1.2E04	2.550	15750	[21]
R4c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2=\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$	2.5E12	0.000	24000	[21]
R5a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3=\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{CH}_4$	2.0E01	3.370	7630	[40]
R5b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3=\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{CH}_4$	2.0E00	3.570	7717	[40]
R5c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3=\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{CH}_4$	3.3E02	3.300	12283	[40]
R6a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH}(+ \text{M})=\text{CH}_3\text{CHO} + \text{H}(+ \text{M})$	6.2E09	1.310	33778	[41]
	Low-pressure limit:	1.8E16	0.000	20782	
	Troe parameters: 0.187 65.2 2568 41226				
R6b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH}(+ \text{M})=\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{H}(+ \text{M})$	6.4E09	1.330	35974	[41]
	Low-pressure limit:	8.2E14	0.000	21517	
	Troe parameters: 0.473 10 2218 2615				
R6c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH}(+ \text{M})=\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_2\text{O}(+ \text{M})$	2.2E09	1.180	33987	[41]
	Low-pressure limit:	5.9E15	0.000	21333	
	Troe parameters: 0.124 1 1729 50000				
R7a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{H}_2$	3.1E12	0.270	-334	[42]
R7b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}=\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	1.7E20	-1.810	9448	[42], ^a

Continued on next page

Table 1 – continued from previous page

		Arrhenius data			
R7c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_2\text{OH}$	4.0E23	-2.530	13637	[42], ^a
R7d	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}=\text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{OH}$	6.3E21	-2.110	15269	[42], ^a
R7e	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$	1.6E40	-7.820	12916	[42, 43], ^a
R8a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{O}_2=\text{CH}_3\text{CHO} + \text{HO}_2$	3.8E20	-2.430	3090	[44], ^a
R8b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{O}_2=\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{HO}_2$	4.4E05	1.700	2330	[44], ^a
R9a-rev	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{OH}=\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$	6.0E37	-7.440	14269	[45], ^a
	duplicate rate constant	2.8E19	-2.410	1011	^a
R9b	$\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}=\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{H}$	2.7E27	-4.440	37205	[46], ^a
R10a	$\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}=\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	3.6E16	-0.720	8767	[42], ^a
R10b	$\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3$	7.5E20	-1.690	13429	[42], ^a
R10c	$\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}=\text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{OH}$	8.1E19	-1.510	15534	[42], ^{a,b}
R11a	$\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{O}_2=\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{HO}_2$	1.9E30	-5.510	16616.0	[47], ^a
	duplicate rate constant	6.0E03	-10.000	199.0	[47], ^a
R11b	$\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{O}_2=\text{HOCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OO}$	4.2E26	-4.460	3940	[47], ^a
R11c	$\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{O}_2=\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{OH}$	1.2E29	-5.440	11323	[47], ^a
R12	$\text{HOCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OO}=\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{OH}$	3.8E18	-2.600	19972	[47], ^a
R13	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O}(+ \text{M})=\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_2\text{O}(+ \text{M})$	6.3E10	0.930	17098	[41]
	Low-pressure limit:	4.7E25	-3.000	16532	
	Troe parameters: 0.426 0.3 2278 100000				
R14a	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}(+ \text{M})=\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}(+ \text{M})$	3.1E11	0.890	13	[48]
	Low-pressure limit:	3.8E51	-15.550	11101	
R14b	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}(+ \text{M})=\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3(+ \text{M})$	2.6E18	-1.050	5128	[48]
	Low-pressure limit:	3.0E11	0.890	17	
R14c	$\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}=\text{CH}_3\text{CHO} + \text{H}_2$	7.5E09	1.150	673	[48]

^a : at 100 atm pressure, for other pressures see the mechanism file in the supplementary materials.

^b : for reactions between $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ and other radicals (estimated by analogy to C_2H_5 reactions), see the mechanism file in the supplementary materials.

141

142 The thermal decomposition of ethanol (R1), a key reaction at high temperatures [10],
 143 is believed to proceed through three channels [38]:

144 We have adopted the rate coefficients from Sivaramakrishnan et al. [38], who combined
 145 measurements of ethanol dissociation over 1392–1663 K with a theoretical treatment.
 146 The results of Wu et al. [49], obtained at 1450–1760 K in shock-tube tests with very
 147 low ethanol concentrations of 1–3 ppm, indicate that the branching ratios for R1 may be
 148 less sensitive to pressure than predicted by Sivaramakrishnan et al. [38], but more work
 149 is needed to confirm this. More recently, Kiecherer et al. [50] extracted the rate of the
 150 $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ channel (R1a) at 1300–1510 K and atmospheric pressure; their measurements
 151 support those of Sivaramakrishnan et al. [38] and Wu et al. [49].

152 Ethanol oxidation is controlled by H-abstraction reactions forming isomers of $\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{O}$
 153 radicals, i.e., α -hydroxyethyl (CH_3CHOH), β -hydroxyethyl ($\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$), and ethoxy
 154 ($\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O}$). The abstraction by H from ethanol (R2),

155 is challenging to measure, as the H-decay may be affected by thermal dissociation of
 156 ethanol at high temperatures. To overcome this problem, Sivaramakrishnan et al. [38]
 157 measured the D atom concentration in the reaction $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{D}$ over 1054–1359 K and
 158 then eliminated the isotope effect via theoretical calculations. Their results, adopted in
 159 this work, show that the dominant channels form CH_3CHOH (R2a) and $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ (R2b).

The reaction between ethanol and the hydroxyl radical (R3), which is the dominant H-abstraction reaction of ethanol at intermediate temperatures [10, 51], has been investigated by several research groups recently [38, 39, 51–53]. Figure 2 shows an Arrhenius plot for the overall reaction, as well as for each of the three product channels. Determinations of the overall rate constant [38, 51, 53], covering a wide range of temperature, are in fairly good agreement, but reported values for the product branching fraction vary significantly.

The $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ radical produced from R3b is expected to dissociate to $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{OH}$ at temperatures above 550 K [38]. Above 650 K, the dissociation further accelerates, so it is considered instantaneous compared to other chemical time scales. Sivaramakrishnan et al. [38] measured the OH-decay rate, which represents an overall rate for $\text{R3a} + \text{R3c}$, over 857–1297 K. Their calculated rate for $\text{R3a} + \text{R3c}$ was larger than the measured values, so they adjusted the barrier heights of all the branches in their calculations to compensate for it. Their proposed rate constants indicate negligible contributions from R3b and R3c in the overall rate of $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{OH}$ at combustion temperatures.

Carr et al. [51] investigated reaction R3 at lower temperatures (298–865 K) using isotopic labelling to distinguish between different channels. Below 523 K, $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ decomposition is small and channel R3b could be quantified, albeit with an increased uncertainty at elevated temperatures. Their results indicate that R3c is the dominant path, with minor contributions of the α and β channels.

More recently, Stranic et al. [53] measured the overall rate as well as the rate of the β branch of the title reaction over 900–1270 K. Isotopic labeling of OH radicals enabled Stranic et al. to account for interference from $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ dissociation on the measured rate. The branching ratio of the β channel was reported to be 0.2–0.25 over 900–1200 K whereas distinction between R3a and R3c was not possible.

The theoretical study by Zheng and Truhlar [39] explains most of the reported observations over a wide range of temperature (figure 2) and we have adopted their recommended rate constants. Their calculated β branching ratio is close to the only reliable

188 measurement at higher temperature from Stranic et al. [53] and also in good agreement
189 with the data from Carr et al. [51]. To implement the calculated rate in CHEMKIN [54],
190 a modified Arrhenius equation was fitted to the data over 300–3000 K with a maximum
191 reproduction error of 3%.

192 For the reactions of HO_2 (R4) and CH_3 (R5) with ethanol, no experimental data have
193 been reported. For $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2$ (R4), which would be expected to be important for
194 ignition at intermediate temperatures, we have adopted the rate constants from Marinov
195 [21], estimated by analogy to similar reactions of methanol and propane. Recent studies
196 of ignition delay times of ethanol [12, 13, 17] generally employ values of the overall rate
197 constant and branching ratio for reaction R4 in fair agreement with the estimates from
198 Marinov [21]; only the data from Cancino et al. [17] show significant differences (see Fig.
199 3) and should probably be used with caution. However, a more reliable determination of
200 the rate coefficients for this reaction is desirable. For the reaction between ethanol and
201 methyl (R5), we rely on data from the theoretical study by Xu et al. [40].

Figure 2: The rate constant for R3 ($\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{products}$). Literature data are taken from Sivaramakrishnan et al. [38], Carr et al. [51], Xu and Lin [52], Stranic et al. [53], and Zheng and Truhlar [39]. Symbols mark measured data and lines denote the results of theoretical calculation or evaluation.

Figure 3: The rate constant for R4 ($\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{products}$). Literature data are taken from Lee et al. [13], Cancino et al. [17], Marinov [21], and Mittal et al. [12]. Symbols mark measured data and lines denote the results of theoretical calculation or evaluation.

The α -hydroxyethyl radical (CH_3CHOH) is presumably the major product of H-abstraction from ethanol. For the decomposition of CH_3CHOH (R6), the rate constants are taken from an RRKM study by Dames [41] who predicted the major branch, $\text{CH}_3\text{CHOH} + \text{M} = \text{CH}_3\text{CHO} + \text{H} + \text{M}$ (R6a) to be faster by up to one order of magnitude compared to an earlier calculation by Xu et al. [46].

The reaction between CH_3CHOH and atomic hydrogen (R7) is expected to be important only at low pressures [42]. The rate constants for the different branches of this reaction (see Table 1) are taken from a theoretical study by Labbe et al. [42].

For the reaction between CH_3CHOH and molecular oxygen, we rely on a theoretical study by da Silva et al. [44] who found the major products to be $\text{CH}_3\text{CHO} + \text{HO}_2$ under combustion conditions. The other possible products, $\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{HO}_2$, were formed in small amounts and only at high temperatures. The high pressure limit of this reaction was also studied by Zador et al. [47] who predicted an overall rate larger within a factor of two. However, the pressure dependence of the reaction was not explored in [47].

The dissociation of the β -hydroxyethyl radical ($\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$) is expected to yield $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{OH}$ (R9a) or $\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{H}$ (R9b) [46]. The branch to C_2H_4 was studied theoretically [45, 46, 55] and experimentally [56]. The theoretical derivations by Xu et al. [46] and Senosiain et al. [45] differed within a factor of six at atmospheric pressure over 700–1000 K. The larger sensitivity to temperature predicted by Senosiain et al. [45] was confirmed experimentally by Srinivasan et al. [56]. Therefore, the $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{OH}$ (R9a) branch is taken from Senosiain et al. [45] who fitted pressure-dependent rate constants for the reverse direction of this reaction. The rate constant of the minor branch to $\text{CH}_2\text{CHOH} + \text{H}$ (R9b) is adopted from the calculations of Xu et al. [46].

Gimenez-Lopez et al. [29] proposed that the major consumption path of $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ under conditions similar to the present study was its reaction with molecular oxygen. They estimated the rate constant of this reaction by analogy to C_2H_5 reactions. Here, we adopt the results of a more recent theoretical study by Zador et al. [47] who investigated the title reaction by using high-level ab initio calculations. Zador et al. calculated an

overall high-pressure rate around five times larger than that estimated by Gimenez-Lopez et al. [29].

The ethoxy radical ($\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O}$) is mainly consumed by thermal dissociation to $\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_2\text{O}$ (R13) under combustion conditions. Caralp et al. [57] measured the ethoxy radical decomposition at 391–471 K. We have adopted the rate coefficients from the RRKM study by Dames [41], covering temperatures of 400–1200 K and pressures of 0.001–100 atm. It should be noted that the earlier theoretical study of Xu et al. [46] resulted in substantially different pressure and temperature dependencies, and measurements at medium temperatures are desirable.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Ethanol oxidation in the flow reactor

The aim of this work was to characterize the pyrolysis and oxidation of ethanol at high pressure and intermediate temperatures. Here, results from the flow reactor experiments are presented and compared to predictions by the developed model. For the calculations using CHEMKIN [54], a model with constrained temperature and pressure was used.

Figure 4 shows the results of the pyrolysis experiments. The ethanol conversion starts around 825 K and increases with temperature to 18% at 900 K. The major detected products are CH_4 , CO , and C_2H_4 . The ethanol mole fraction fluctuates below the onset temperature of reaction, but these fluctuations are within the $\pm 5\%$ uncertainty of the liquid feeding system discussed earlier. Carbon is balanced within $\pm 9\%$, with the difference attributed partly to fluctuations in the liquid feeding system and partly to uncertainties

251 in measuring aldehydes and ethanol.

252 The model predicts the onset temperature of ethanol decomposition well, but it
 253 slightly overestimates the reactivity of ethanol at higher temperatures. The acetaldehyde
 254 yield from the model agrees well with the measurements at temperature below 875 K. As
 255 discussed earlier, the GC configuration does not allow quantification of acetaldehyde and
 256 methanol separately. We expect the measured quantity to represent acetaldehyde, as the
 257 methanol yield predicted by the model is negligible.

Figure 4: Results of pyrolysis experiments (0.689% ethanol in N₂) at 50 bar. Gas residence time is given by $\tau[\text{s}] = 4098/T[\text{K}]$ ($\pm 8\%$).

The ethanol conversion starts around 700 K for the fuel-rich mixture ($\Phi=43$, see figure 5). Acetaldehyde and CO are the major detected products of ethanol partial oxidation. The methane concentration is not quantified due to peaks overlapping in GC signals. Similar to the pyrolysis test, the sum of methanol and acetaldehyde measured by GC is interpreted as acetaldehyde. The maximum conversion of ethanol is 36% while oxygen is fully consumed at high temperatures.

The model predicts well the onset temperature of reaction but it marginally underestimates the fuel conversion at high temperatures. Although the model overpredicts the concentrations of ethane and ethanol, it reproduces well the fractions of O_2 , C_2H_4 , and CH_3CHO . By adopting the methane concentration from the model, the carbon loss in the experiments is at most 18%.

Under stoichiometric conditions, ethanol oxidation starts around 725 K. The major detected products are CO and CO_2 , as shown in figure 6. The CO concentration peaks around 750 K and decreases gradually at higher temperatures. Aldehydes are detected around 725 K, but disappear at higher temperatures. Ethene, detected in a few ppm, shows a non-monotonic behaviour toward temperature.

The model reproduces fairly well the onset of fuel conversion as well as the concentration of major products. Even though CO is overestimated at high temperatures, the non-linear changes in aldehydes and ethene profiles are well predicted by the model. Balancing carbon reveals a maximum loss of 26%.

For the fuel-lean mixture ($\Phi=0.10$), the fuel oxidation is observed at temperatures above 725 K, similar to the onset temperature for stoichiometric and reducing mixtures. Again, aldehydes peak at 725 K, but they are soon depleted at higher temperatures. The model agrees well with the measurements and the carbon is balanced within a maximum loss of 21% which occurs at 725 K.

The data presented here are in line with the results by Haas et al. [10] who studied ethanol ignition at a lower pressure of 12.5 atm. They reported ignition temperatures of 750–775 K under stoichiometric ($\Phi = 0.91$, 0.27% ethanol) and fuel-lean ($\Phi = 0.43$,

Figure 5: Results of experiments under reducing conditions (0.525% ethanol and 0.0363% O_2 in N_2 , $\Phi=43$) at 50 bar. Gas residence time is given by $\tau[s]=3840/T[K]$ ($\pm 8\%$).

286 0.28% ethanol) conditions. No sign of negative temperature coefficient (NTC) behavior
 287 was observed neither in their work nor in the present study.

Figure 6: Results of experiments under stoichiometric conditions (0.3467% ethanol and 1.01% O_2 in N_2 , $\Phi=1.0$) at 50 bar. Gas residence time is given by $\tau[\text{s}]=3840/T[\text{K}]$ ($\pm 8\%$).

Figure 7: Results of experiments under oxidizing conditions (0.312% ethanol and 9.830% O_2 in N_2 , $\Phi=0.10$) at 50 bar. Gas residence time is given by $\tau[s]=3840/T[K]$ ($\pm 8\%$).

288 The consumption paths of ethanol according to the model is shown in figure 8 for con-
 289 ditions representing the current experiments. Under all investigated conditions, ethanol
 290 is mainly converted to the α -hydroxyethyl radical (CH_3CHOH). In the absence of oxy-
 291 gen, ethanol is mainly consumed by reaction with H (R2a) and CH_3 (R5a). Under
 292 oxidizing conditiond, reactions with OH (R3a) and HO_2 (R4a) become dominant. The
 293 α -hydroxyethyl radical either reacts with an oxygen molecule (R8a) or dissociates (R6a),
 294 depending on the oxygen availability. Both paths yield acetaldehyde which is then dehy-
 295 drogenated to form the acetyl radical (CH_3CO).

296 The acetyl radical then dissociates to form CO and CH_3 (R19).

297 Hydrogen abstraction from ethanol may also yield minor quantitites of $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{O}$ or
 298 $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$. The ethoxy radical dissociates to formaldehyde which finally gives CO.

299 The β -hydroxyethyl radical ($\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$) either adds to molecular oxygen (R11b)
 300 or dissociates (R9a). The $\text{HOCH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OO}$ radical dissociates to give two formaldehyde
 301 molecules (R12). The reaction pathways presented here agree with those suggested for
 302 ethanol oxidation by Frassoldati et al. [24], except that under the lower temperatures

and elevated pressures of the current study, oxygen association to $\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ (R11b) becomes competitive with its dissociation (R9a).

Figure 8: Consumption path for ethanol at 50 bar and 725–900 K under the flow reactor conditions (in presence of oxygen).

The sensitivities of selected reactions are analyzed via a brute-force method in which the sensitivity coefficient (S_i) is defined as

$$S_i = \frac{(\Delta X_{\text{EtOH}}/X_{\text{EtOH}})}{(\Delta k_i/k_i)} \quad (1)$$

Figure 9 shows the results of the analysis under the flow reactor conditions. Ethanol pyrolysis is mainly sensitive to H-abstraction from ethanol by the hydrogen and methyl radicals (R2, R5), but also ethanol dissociation to CH_2OH (R1b) is important.

Under reducing conditions, in addition to R2 and R5, H-abstraction by OH (R3b) and HO_2 (R4a) becomes important. Dissociation of H_2O_2 promotes the oxidation at 723 K, but surprisingly it has an inhibiting effect at 873 K, even though it proceeds in the forward direction.

314 For both stoichiometric and oxidizing conditions, the H-abstraction by HO_2 (R4) gov-
 315 erns the main fuel oxidation at 723 K. Abstraction by HO_2 and CH_3OO from acetaldehyde
 316 is also important for ethanol oxidation.

Figure 9: Sensitivity of ethanol prediction by the model at 50 bar and under the flow reactor conditions for ethanol pyrolysis (PYR), fuel-rich (RD), stoichiometric (ST), and fuel-lean (OX) conditions. The coefficients are calculated at the time corresponding to 20% conversion of ethanol.

4.2. Comparison with literature data

4.2.1. Ignition at higher temperatures

Figure 10 compares ethanol ignition delays calculated here with those reported in literature [12–17]. The ignition delay decreases monotonically with increasing temperature and the model can predict the ignition delays fairly well for most of the cases above 900 K. However, it systematically overpredicts ignition delays measured in shock tube (top figure) at $T < 900$ K. However, the calculations agree better with measurements from RCM (bottom figure) at $T < 900$ K.

Figure 11 compares the measurements from RCM and shock tubes at $T < 1000$ K. The slope of ignition delays from RCM is sharper compared to those observed in shock tubes, i.e., RCM ignition delays are more sensitive to temperature. The fraction of inert gas is different between experiments in shock tubes and RCM. Most of the shock-tube data were measured for ethanol/air mixtures, while in the RCM experiments more-diluted mixtures were tested. However, the difference in initial fraction cannot be the source of the observed considerable scatter among the data. According to the model (not shown here) we expect $\tau \sim 1/X_{EtOH}$, where τ and X_{EtOH} are ignition delay time and molar fraction of ethanol, respectively.

The difference between RCM and shock tube data might be due to the pre-ignition pressure rise in shock tube experiments, as noted earlier [12, 13]. Over long residence times, pressure and temperature increase gradually behind the shock wave [13], even in non-reactive mixtures [58, 59]. These pre-ignition effects are believed to be fuel-dependent and increase at lower temperatures [13]. Lee et al. [13] found that the ignition of ethanol in shock tubes is non-homogeneous due to local hot-spots and is highly affected by pre-ignition effects. In RCM, on the other hand, it is common to observe decreasing pressure (and temperature) due to heat transfer. In general, it is required to include those pre-ignition pressure variation in interpreting and simulating data for long residence time for both shock tubes and RCM. In the RCM data simulated here, the pre-ignition pressure-drop was reported to be fairly small and therefore is not included in the simulation. For

the shock tube data from Cancino et al. [17], simulations are repeated by considering a pressure rise of 2% (per ms) behind the shock wave. The results (not shown here) improve but still deviate considerably from the measurements at $T < 900$ K. We attribute the differences at least partly to device-dependent non-idealities in conducting experiments. More-controlled experiments in RCM and shock tubes might help to find the source of the data discrepancy at low temperature and high pressure.

Figure 10: Ignition delay time of stoichiometric ethanol/air from Cancino et al. [17], Lee et al. [13], and Heufer and Olivier [16]; and ethanol/ O_2 /diluent ($\Phi=0.3$ –1) from Noorani et al. [15] (1–2.9% ethanol), Mittal et al. [12] (2.1–6.5% ethanol), and Barraza-Botet et al. [14] (3.6% ethanol). Top fig: measurements from shock tubes. Bottom fig: measurements from RCM. The lines mark the present model prediction.

The sensitivity of the predicted ignition delay to reaction rates are calculated with a brute-force method in which the coefficients are calculated as

Figure 11: Comparing experimental results at low temperature. The sources of data are given in the caption of figure 10.

$$S_i = \frac{(\Delta\tau/\tau)}{(\Delta k_i/k_i)} \quad (2)$$

where τ is the ignition delay time and k_i is the rate constant of i^{th} reaction. The results of the analysis are shown in figure 12. Among the reactions, the H-abstraction by HO_2 from ethanol (R4) is sensitive for temperatures of both 800 and 1100 K.

The importance of $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2$ (R4) for ethanol ignition at medium temperature has been noted earlier [12–14, 17, 60]. As discussed above, the rate of this reaction is estimated by analogy to methanol reactions by Marinov [21] and has a significant uncertainty. To improve model predictions at temperatures below 1000 K, the rate constant of this reaction was modified in [12, 13, 17], e.g. the overall rate of $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2$ increased considerably in [17] to improve the predictions for shock-tube conditions. Here, we refrain from optimizing the rate constant of $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2$, but a reliable deter-

Figure 12: Sensitivity of ignition delay time prediction to reaction rate constant. The coefficients were calculated as $S_i = (\Delta\tau/\tau)/(\Delta k_i/k_i)$ for a stoichiometric ethanol/air mixtures at 50 bar.

mination of the rate constant of this reaction is important to improve our understanding of the ethanol oxidation chemistry at intermediate temperature.

Another source of uncertainty in the present model is the reaction $\text{CH}_3\text{CHO} + \text{CH}_3\text{OO}$ (R25), which is important at low temperature (800 K). The rate of this reaction is estimated by analogy with R18 ($\text{CH}_3\text{CHO} + \text{HO}_2$); hence a more accurate determination of this reaction might enhance the accuracy of the model.

4.2.2. Laminar burning velocity

Figure 13 compares the laminar burning velocity of ethanol/air mixtures calculated by the model with measured data [61–68]. At atmospheric pressure, the model slightly overpredicts the burning velocity but its prediction improves for fuel-rich mixtures. The trend of changes as well as the fuel-air equivalence ratio corresponding to the maximum flame speed are predicted well.

The model is further tested against data obtained at higher pressures of 5–12 bar by Gulder [61] and Bradley et al. [63]. To avoid ethanol condensation at high pressures, the initial temperature had to be increased. While the maximum flame speed at 5 and 7 bar occurred at $\Phi=1.1$ according to Gulder [61], it was reported at $\Phi=1.2$ by Bradley et al. [63]. This difference shifts the profiles and causes noticeable scattering between the data in the fuel-rich side. The model overestimates the flame speed at high pressures but its trend is similar to data from Gulder [61].

The sensitivity of the gas flow-rate (in mass unit) to the reaction rate constants is analyzed with CHEMKIN [54] and the results are shown in figure 14. Since the initial temperature and pressure are fixed, the sensitivity coefficients necessarily correlates to the sensitivity of flame speed. Remarkably, no reactions in the ethanol subset of the reaction mechanism exhibits significant sensitivity coefficients. The reactions that are most sensitive in determining the burning velocity are the chain-branching reaction $\text{H} + \text{O}_2 = \text{O} + \text{OH}$ R26 and the very exothermic reaction $\text{CO} + \text{OH} = \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}$ R27. The decomposition of HCO promotes the burning rate noticeably, whereas its reactions with any of H, OH, or O_2 slow down the burning rate. The C_2 subset is relatively less important in determining the burning velocity. Its most important reactions are

Figure 13: Laminar burning velocity of ethanol/air mixture. Top: atmospheric pressure and initial temperature of 300 K; Bottom: 5–12 bar pressure and initial temperature of 358 K (350 K for data from Gulder [61]). Experimental results are from Gulder [61], Konnov et al. [64], Bradley et al. [63], van Lipzig et al. [65], Egolfopoulos et al. [62], Eisazadeh-Far et al. [66], Sileghem et al. [67], and Dirrenberger et al. [68].

The competition between R30 and R31 in consumption of the methyl radicals control the burning velocity of fuel-rich mixtures to a large extent.

As can be seen in figure 14, almost the same reactions control the flame speed at atmospheric pressure and at higher pressure of 10 bar.

The difference between flame speed measurements and predictions have been reported

earlier for ethanol/air mixtures [64, 69, 70]. Konnov et al. [64] showed that both the models by Konnov [71] and by Saxena and Williams [23] significantly overpredict ethanol laminar burning velocities in lean and near-stoichiometric mixtures. The model by Leplat et al. [25] generally underestimated burning velocities under fuel-rich conditions. Beeckmann et al. [70] tested four chemical kinetic models (Marinov [21], Saxena and Williams [23], Rohl and Peters [72], Leplat et al. [25]) to reproduce ethanol flame speed and found that the model of Leplat et al. [25] compared better with the measurements at atmospheric pressure, but all the models underpredicted the data at high pressure. In another study by Christensen et al. [69], the overprediction problem for both ethanol and acetaldehyde flame speed was reported for the models of [23, 71]. Christensen et al. [69] analysed the sensitivity of the mechanism by Leplat et al. [25] and found R28 and R29 to be controlling for both ethanol and acetaldehyde flames, similar to the finding here for ethanol flames.

Figure 14: Sensitivity of flame speed of ethanol/air mixture at 1 atm and 10 bar pressures and the initial temperatures of 300 and 358 K, respectively.

Conclusion

Ethanol pyrolysis and oxidation were investigated in a laminar flow reactor at 50 bar pressure and temperatures of 600–900 K. The onset temperature of ethanol oxidation was found to be 700–725 K for a wide range of stoichiometries ($\Phi=0.1\text{--}43$). In pyrolysis experiments, the decomposition of ethanol was detected above 850 K. A detailed chemical kinetic model was developed for ethanol oxidation and pyrolysis. The modelling results agreed well with the measured onset temperature of reaction as well as the concentration of most components after ignition. The model was also used to predict the ignition delay time and flame speed of ethanol. Modelling results agreed well with the literature ignition delays above 900 K. Below 900 K, the model overpredicted ignition delays from shock tubes, possibly due to device-dependent non-idealities encountered in operating shock tubes for long residence times. The flame speeds were slightly overpredicted by the model, most pronounced for fuel-lean mixtures. The present flow reactor data can be used to validate kinetic models at intermediate temperature and elevated pressures. More accurate determination of the key reactions identified here will be helpful in extending the model validity for further applications.

Acknowledgement

Funding from the European Graduate School as well as MAN Diesel & Turbo is gratefully acknowledged. This project has received funding from the European Unions Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 634135.

Supplementary data

Tabulated data from flow-reactor experiments are provided. The detailed mechanism is also attached.

References

- [1] K. Kohse-Höinghaus, P. Oßwald, T. A. Cool, T. Kasper, N. Hansen, F. Qi, C. K. Westbrook, P. R. Westmoreland, Biofuel combustion chemistry: from ethanol to biodiesel, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* 49 (2010) 3572–3597.

- [2] H. Chen, S. Shi-Jin, W. Jian-Xin, Study on combustion characteristics and PM emission of diesel engines using ester-ethanol-diesel blended fuels, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 31 (2007) 2981–2989.
- [3] S. Sakai, D. Rothamer, Effect of ethanol blending on particulate formation from premixed combustion in spark-ignition engines, *Fuel* 196 (2017) 154–168.
- [4] A. K. Agarwal, Biofuels (alcohols and biodiesel) applications as fuels for internal combustion engines, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* 33 (2007) 233–271.
- [5] Z. Bo, F. Weibiao, G. Jingsong, Study of fuel consumption when introducing DME or ethanol into diesel engine, *Fuel* 85 (2006) 778–782.
- [6] E. W. de Menezes, R. da Silva, R. Cataluna, R. J. Ortega, Effect of ethers and ether/ethanol additives on the physicochemical properties of diesel fuel and on engine tests, *Fuel* 85 (2006) 815–822.
- [7] C. Yao, X. Yang, R. Roy Raine, C. Cheng, Z. Tian, Y. Li, The effects of MTBE/ethanol additives on toxic species concentration in gasoline flame, *Energy Fuels* 23 (2009) 3543–3548.
- [8] M. Yao, Z. Zheng, H. Liu, Progress and recent trends in homogeneous charge compression ignition (HCCI) engines, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* 35 (2009) 398–437.
- [9] J. Li, A. Kazakov, F. L. Dryer, Ethanol pyrolysis experiments in a variable pressure flow reactor, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 33 (2001) 859–867.
- [10] F. M. Haas, M. Chaos, F. L. Dryer, Low and intermediate temperature oxidation of ethanol and ethanol - PRF blends: An experimental and modeling study, *Combust. Flame* 156 (2009) 2346–2350.
- [11] D. Lee, S. Hochgreb, J. C. Keck, Autoignition of alcohols and ethers in a rapid compression machine, *SAE Tech. Pap.* 932755 (1993).
- [12] G. Mittal, S. M. Burke, V. A. Davies, B. Parajuli, W. K. Metcalfe, H. J. Curran, Autoignition of ethanol in a rapid compression machine, *Combust. Flame* 161 (2014) 1164–1171.
- [13] C. Lee, S. Vranckx, K. A. Heufer, S. V. Khomik, Y. Uygun, H. Olivier, R. X. Fernandez, On the Chemical Kinetics of Ethanol Oxidation: Shock Tube, Rapid Compression Machine and Detailed Modeling Study, *Z. Phys. Chem.* 226 (2012) 1–28.
- [14] C. L. Barraza-Botet, S. W. Wagnon, M. S. Wooldridge, Combustion chemistry of ethanol: Ignition and speciation studies in a rapid compression facility, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 120 (2016) 7408–7418.
- [15] K. E. Noorani, B. Akih-Kumgeh, J. M. Bergthorson, Comparative high temperature shock tube ignition of C₁–C₄ primary alcohols, *Energy Fuels* 24 (2010) 5834–5843.

- [16] K. A. Heufer, H. Olivier, Determination of ignition delay times of different hydrocarbons in a new high pressure shock tube, *Shock Waves* 20 (2010) 307–316.
- [17] L. R. Cancino, M. Fikri, A. A. M. Oliveira, C. Schulz, Measurement and Chemical Kinetics Modeling of Shock-Induced Ignition of Ethanol-Air Mixtures, *Energy Fuels* 24 (2010) 2830–2840.
- [18] M. P. Dunphy, P. M. Patterson, J. M. Simmie, High-temperature oxidation of ethanol. Part 2.-Kinetic modelling, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.* 87 (1991) 2549–2559.
- [19] T. S. Norton, F. L. Dryer, The flow reactor oxidation of C1-C4 alcohols and MTBE, *Symp. Combust.* 23 (1991) 179–185.
- [20] T. S. Norton, F. L. Dryer, An experimental and modeling study of ethanol oxidation-kinetics in an atmospheric-pressure flow reactor, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 24 (1992) 319–344.
- [21] N. M. Marinov, A detailed chemical kinetic model for high temperature ethanol oxidation, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 31 (1999) 183–220.
- [22] J. Li, A. Kazakov, F. L. Dryer, Experimental and numerical studies of ethanol decomposition reactions, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 108 (2004) 7671–7680.
- [23] P. Saxena, F. A. Williams, Numerical and experimental studies of ethanol flames, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 31 (2007) 1149–1156.
- [24] A. Frassoldati, A. Cuoci, T. Faravelli, E. Ranzi, Kinetic Modeling of the Oxidation of Ethanol and Gasoline Surrogate Mixtures, *Combust. Sci. Technol.* 182 (2010) 653–667.
- [25] N. Leplat, P. Dagaut, C. Togbé, J. Vandooren, Numerical and experimental study of ethanol combustion and oxidation in laminar premixed flames and in jet-stirred reactor, *Combust. Flame* 158 (2011) 705–725.
- [26] C. L. Rasmussen, J. Hansen, P. Marshall, P. Glarborg, Experimental measurements and kinetic modeling of CO/H₂/O₂/NO, conversion at high pressure, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 40 (2008) 454–480.
- [27] C. L. Rasmussen, J. G. Jakobsen, P. Glarborg, Experimental measurements and kinetic modeling of CH₄/O₂ and CH₄/C₂H₆/O₂ conversion at high pressure, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 40 (2008) 778–807.
- [28] C. L. Rasmussen, K. H. Wassard, K. Dam-Johansen, P. Glarborg, Methanol oxidation in a flow reactor: Implications for the branching ratio of the CH₃OH+OH reaction, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 40 (2008) 423–441.
- [29] J. Gimenez-Lopez, C. L. Rasmussen, M. U. Alzueta, Y. Gao, P. Marshall, P. Glarborg, Experimental and kinetic modeling study of C₂H₄ oxidation at high pressure, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 32 (2009) 367–375.

- [30] V. Aranda, J. M. Christensen, M. U. Alzueta, P. Glarborg, S. Gersen, Y. Gao, P. Marshall, Experimental and kinetic modeling study of methanol ignition and oxidation at high pressure, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 45 (2013) 283–294.
- [31] H. Hashemi, J. M. Christensen, S. Gersen, P. Glarborg, Hydrogen oxidation at high pressure and intermediate temperatures: Experiments and kinetic modeling, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 35 (2015) 553–560.
- [32] H. Hashemi, J. M. Christensen, S. Gersen, H. Levinsky, S. J. Klippenstein, P. Glarborg, High-pressure oxidation of methane, *Combust. Flame* 172 (2016) 349–364.
- [33] H. Hashemi, J. G. Jacobsen, C. T. Rasmussen, J. M. Christensen, P. Glarborg, S. Gersen, M. van Essen, H. B. Levinsky, S. J. Klippenstein, High-pressure oxidation of ethane, *Combust. Flame* 182 (2017) 150–166.
- [34] J. M. Christensen, P. A. Jensen, A. D. Jensen, Effects of Feed Composition and Feed Impurities in the Catalytic Conversion of Syngas to Higher Alcohols over Alkali-Promoted Cobalt-Molybdenum Sulfide, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 50 (2011) 7949–7963.
- [35] J. Gimenez-Lopez, C. Rasmussen, H. Hashemi, M. Alzueta, Y. Gao, P. Marshall, C. Goldsmith, P. Glarborg, Experimental and kinetic modeling study of C_2H_2 oxidation at high pressure, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 48 (2016) 724–738.
- [36] Y. Song, H. Hashemi, J. M. Christensen, C. Zou, P. Marshall, P. Glarborg, Ammonia oxidation at high pressure and intermediate temperatures, *Fuel* 181 (2016) 358–365.
- [37] H. Hashemi, P. Glarborg, P. Marshall, Development and validation of a kinetic model for acetaldehyde oxidation over a wide pressure and temperature range, 2017.
- [38] R. Sivaramakrishnan, M.-C. Su, J. V. Michael, S. J. Klippenstein, L. B. Harding, B. Ruscic, Rate constants for the thermal decomposition of ethanol and its bimolecular reactions with OH and D: Reflected shock tube and theoretical studies, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 114 (2010) 9425–9439.
- [39] J. Zheng, D. G. Truhlar, Multi-path variational transition state theory for chemical reaction rates of complex polyatomic species: Ethanol + OH reactions, *Faraday Discuss.* 157 (2012) 59–88.
- [40] Z. F. Xu, J. Park, M. C. Lin, Thermal decomposition of ethanol. III. A computational study of the kinetics and mechanism for the $CH_3 + C_2H_5OH$ reaction, *J. Chem. Phys.* 120 (2004) 6593–6599.
- [41] E. E. Dames, Master equation modeling of the unimolecular decompositions of alpha-hydroxyethyl (CH_3CHOH) and ethoxy (CH_3CH_2O) radicals, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 46 (2014) 176–188.
- [42] N. J. Labbe, R. Sivaramakrishnan, S. J. Klippenstein, The role of radical + fuel-radical well-skipping reactions in ethanol and methylformate low-pressure flames, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 35 (2015) 447–455.

- [43] R. Sivaramakrishnan, Personal Communication, 2014.
- [44] G. da Silva, J. W. Bozzelli, L. Liang, J. T. Farrell, Ethanol Oxidation: Kinetics of the alpha-Hydroxyethyl Radical + O₂ Reaction, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 113 (2009) 8923–8933.
- [45] J. P. Senosiain, S. J. Klippenstein, J. A. Miller, Reaction of ethylene with hydroxyl radicals: A theoretical study, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 110 (2006) 6960–6970.
- [46] Z. F. Xu, K. Xu, M. C. Lin, Ab initio kinetics for decomposition/isomerization reactions of C₂H₅O radicals, *ChemPhysChem* 10 (2009) 972–982.
- [47] J. Zador, R. X. Fernandes, Y. Georgievskii, G. Meloni, C. A. Taatjes, J. A. Miller, The reaction of hydroxyethyl radicals with O₂: A theoretical analysis and experimental product study, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 32 (2009) 271–277.
- [48] Z. F. Xu, K. Xu, M. C. Lin, Thermal decomposition of ethanol. 4. Ab initio chemical kinetics for reactions of H atoms with CH₃CH₂O and CH₃CHOH radicals, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 115 (2011) 3509–3522.
- [49] C.-W. Wu, H. Matsui, N.-S. Wang, M. C. Lin, Shock tube study on the thermal decomposition of ethanol, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 115 (2011) 8086–8092.
- [50] J. Kiecherer, C. Bansch, T. Bentz, M. Olzmann, Pyrolysis of ethanol: A shock-tube/TOF-MS and modeling study, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 35 (2015) 465–472.
- [51] S. A. Carr, M. A. Blitz, P. W. Seakins, Site-Specific Rate Coefficients for Reaction of OH with Ethanol from 298 to 900 K, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 115 (2011) 3335–3345.
- [52] S. Xu, M. Lin, Theoretical study on the kinetics for OH reactions with CH₃OH and C₂H₅OH, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 31 (2007) 159–166.
- [53] I. Stranic, G. A. Pang, R. K. Hanson, D. M. Golden, C. T. Bowman, Shock Tube Measurements of the Rate Constant for the Reaction Ethanol plus OH, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 118 (2014) 822–828.
- [54] Ansys 17.2 Chemkin-Pro, 2017.
- [55] T. Yamada, J. W. Bozzelli, T. Lay, Kinetic and thermodynamic analysis on OH addition to ethylene: Adduct formation, isomerization, and isomer dissociations, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 103 (1999) 7646–7655.
- [56] N. K. Srinivasan, M.-C. Su, J. V. Michael, Reflected shock tube studies of high-temperature rate constants for OH + C₂H₂ and OH + C₂H₄, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 9 (2007) 4155–4163.
- [57] F. Caralp, P. Devolder, C. Fittschen, N. Gomez, H. Hippler, R. Mereau, M. T. Rayez, F. Striebel, B. Viskolcz, The thermal unimolecular decomposition rate constants of ethoxy radicals, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 1 (1999) 2935–2944.

- [58] F. L. Dryer, M. Chaos, Ignition of syngas/air and hydrogen/air mixtures at low temperatures and high pressures: Experimental data interpretation and kinetic modeling implications, *Combust. Flame* 152 (2008) 293–299.
- [59] M. Chaos, F. L. Dryer, Chemical-kinetic modeling of ignition delay: Considerations in interpreting shock tube data, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 42 (2010) 143–150.
- [60] F. Herrmann, B. Jochim, P. Oßwald, L. Cai, H. Pitsch, K. Kohse-Höinghaus, Experimental and numerical low-temperature oxidation study of ethanol and dimethyl ether, *Combust. Flame* 161 (2014) 384–397.
- [61] O. L. Gulder, Laminar burning velocities of methanol, ethanol and isooctane-air mixtures, *Symp. (Int.) Combust., [Proc.]* 19 (1982) 275–281.
- [62] F. N. Egolfopoulos, D. X. Du, C. K. Law, A study on ethanol oxidation kinetics in laminar premixed flames, flow reactors, and shock tubes, *Symp. Combust.* 24 (1992) 833–841.
- [63] D. Bradley, M. Lawes, M. S. Mansour, Explosion bomb measurements of ethanol-air laminar gaseous flame characteristics at pressures up to 1.4 MPa, *Combust. Flame* 156 (2009) 1462–1470.
- [64] A. Konnov, R. Meuwissen, L. De Goey, The temperature dependence of the laminar burning velocity of ethanol flames, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 33 (2011) 1011–1019.
- [65] J. P. J. van Lipzig, E. J. K. Nilsson, L. P. H. de Goey, A. A. Konnov, Laminar burning velocities of n-heptane, iso-octane, ethanol and their binary and tertiary mixtures, *Fuel* 90 (2011) 2773–2781.
- [66] K. Eisazadeh-Far, A. Moghaddas, J. Al-Mulki, H. Metghalchi, Laminar burning speeds of ethanol/air/diluent mixtures, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 33 (2011) 1021–1027.
- [67] L. Sileghem, V. Alekseev, J. Vancoillie, E. Nilsson, S. Verhelst, A. Konnov, Laminar burning velocities of primary reference fuels and simple alcohols, *Fuel* 115 (2014) 32–40.
- [68] P. Dirrenberger, P.-A. Glaude, R. Bounaceur, H. Le Gall, A. P. da Cruz, A. Konnov, F. Battin-Leclerc, Laminar burning velocity of gasolines with addition of ethanol, *Fuel* 115 (2014) 162–169.
- [69] M. Christensen, M. T. Abebe, E. J. K. Nilsson, A. A. Konnov, Kinetics of premixed acetaldehyde + air flames, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 35 (2015) 499–506.
- [70] J. Beeckmann, L. Cai, H. Pitsch, Experimental investigation of the laminar burning velocities of methanol, ethanol, n-propanol, and n-butanol at high pressure, *Fuel* 117 (2014) 340–350.
- [71] A. Konnov, Implementation of the NCN pathway of prompt-NO formation in the detailed reaction mechanism, *Combust. Flame* 156 (2009) 2093–2105.
- [72] O. Rohl, N. Peters, A reduced mechanism for ethanol oxidation, in: *Eur. Combust. Meet. Vienna*, 2009.