Effects of Ambient Oxygen and Density on Primary Soot Size under Diesel-Like Conditions Using a Lagrangian Soot Tracking Model

Ong, Jiun Cai; Pang, Kar Mun; Walther, Jens Honore; Ho, Jee-Hou; Ng, Hoon Kiat

Published in:
S A E International Journal of Engines

Link to article, DOI:
[10.4271/03-14-02-0018](https://doi.org/10.4271/03-14-02-0018)

Publication date:
2021

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Ong, J. C., Pang, K. M., Walther, J. H., Ho, J-H., & Ng, H. K. (2021). Effects of Ambient Oxygen and Density on Primary Soot Size under Diesel-Like Conditions Using a Lagrangian Soot Tracking Model. *S A E International Journal of Engines*, 14(2), 301-315. <https://doi.org/10.4271/03-14-02-0018>

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.

Effects of Ambient Oxygen and Density on Primary Soot Size under Diesel-like Conditions using a Lagrangian Soot Tracking Model

Abstract

This paper investigates the effect of ambient oxygen levels and ambient density on the primary soot size under diesel engine-like conditions via a Lagrangian soot tracking (LST) method. The numerical studies and soot analysis are carried out for an *n*-heptane spray flame in the Sandia constant volume combustion chamber. Numerical studies are carried out at two oxygen levels of 15% and 12%, as well as two ambient densities of 14.8 kg/m³ and 30 kg/m³. The LST model involves treating the soot particles formed in the spray flame as Lagrangian particles and their individual soot information are stored. Based on the primary soot size distribution for soot particles in the core of the spray jet, an increase in ambient density from 14.8 kg/m³ to 30 kg/m³ is shown to increase the peak and mean soot size by a factor of 1.5. Furthermore, the peak and mean primary soot size decreases with decreasing oxygen levels from 15% to 12%. The larger primary soot at higher oxygen levels and ambient densities can be attributed to the higher net growth rate experienced by the soot particles. At low density, the span of soot cloud is shorter at low oxygen level. In contrast, the high density cases show comparable soot cloud span for both oxygen levels before steady-state is reached. Soot age is introduced to predict the soot residence time in the spray flame. The results show that soot residence time is dependent on both the span of the soot cloud and the initial onset location of the soot formed.

Keywords: Lagrangian soot tracking; primary soot; soot age; soot size; diesel spray

1. Introduction

Soot is one of the most distinctive and problematic emissions of diesel engines due to its complex formation and oxidation processes. Soot particles are normally formed as fractal open structured agglomerates with large quantities of nano-sized primary particles via incomplete combustion of hydrocarbon fuels [1,2]. The morphological characteristics and nanostructural properties of combustion-generated soot particles are of paramount importance because they are closely linked to the formation of primary soot particles and soot oxidative reactivity [3]. Furthermore, ultrafine particle emissions from incomplete combustion are harmful to human health [4,5]. This concern has led to the legislation of Euro 5/6 which aims to reduce soot mass and particle number emissions [6,7]. Driven by the stringent legislations for pollutant emissions, detailed analysis of soot morphology and its evolution could provide useful insights into mitigating the detrimental impact of particle emissions.

Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) analysis of soot particles directly sampled from a diesel spray flame has emerged to be a powerful and quantitative technique for studying soot particle size. This direct soot sampling technique has been successfully applied in reacting diesel jets, under high-pressure and high-temperature ambient conditions for soot study in a constant volume vessel [8–14], as well as in diesel engines [15–17]. Kook and Pickett [8] studied the morphology of soot particles extracted from diesel spray flames at ambient temperature and density of 1000 K and 6.7 MPa, respectively in a constant volume vessel by using a thermophoretic probe. The TEM analysis of the soot samples along different in-flame axial locations revealed that the diameters of primary soot increase at first, reach a peak and then decrease [8], in which the decrease in primary soot size is due to soot oxidation. Several studies [9,18] showed similar trend. Similar sampling technique and TEM analysis were used by Kuribayashi et al. [14] to study the effects of oxygen (O₂) level (15% and 21%) on soot concentration, size, number density and morphology in a diesel spray

flame. They found that lowering the ambient oxygen concentration resulted in a delayed and downstream-shifted soot processes, as well as an increase in the aggregate size in the downstream region. However, the primary soot size remained relatively stable when the oxygen concentration decreased from 21% to 15%. Besides this work, the same approach (direct sampling and TEM analysis) has also been applied in other studies, such as fuel comparison among conventional diesel, biodiesel and Fischer-Tropsch Diesel [11,12], effect of injected fuel amount [17], and nanostructure analysis of primary particles [19,20]. Despite successful implementation in various studies, a major limitation of the direct soot sampling and TEM analysis is the time resolution. Since the thermophoretic probe is constantly exposed to the diesel flame, the sampled soot is a time-integrated mixture of soot particles throughout the injection and combustion duration. Therefore, the use of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) is expected to overcome the limitations of TEM analysis of sampled soot by giving instantaneous spatial or temporal information of the soot formation process.

There are a few methods available for CFD analysis that can model soot size distribution. One approach is the Method of Moments (MOM) [21], in which the evolution equations for moments of the population distribution are solved instead of explicitly solving the population distribution [22]. MOM was used by Ito et al. [23] who compared the predicted primary soot size from MOM against the measurement data from a laser-induced incandescence experiment of *n*-heptane spray combustion in a constant volume chamber. Recently, Naik et al. [24] utilized MOM in their simulation study of high-pressure lifted flames in a constant-volume chamber. In addition to *n*-heptane fuel, a two-component surrogate fuel, conventional U.S. No. 2 diesel (D2), and world-averaged jet fuel (Jet-A) were considered in their simulation study [24]. Another approach is the discrete sectional method (DSM) [25–27] which discretizes the population of soot particles into discrete sections or “bins” and the evolution equations are solved for each of these bins. This method has been

applied to model primary soot size distribution in optical engine [28,29]. It is important to note that MOM only predicts ensemble averaged quantities where the exact shape of the particle size distribution is unknown. As for DSM, in order to achieve good accuracy, a higher number of sections is needed to represent the particle size distribution, thus making it computationally expensive. It is also noteworthy that both MOM and DSM can only provide the mean primary particle soot size, and do not provide information about the history of the soot particles which may contain vital information to understand the soot processes.

The Lagrangian tracking method is an alternative to DSM and MOM for computing particle dynamics. It allows the possibility to track an individual particle continuously along its trajectory, and to monitor its individual interaction with both the gas phase and the other particles. No classes or sections of particles are required, thus making the calculation of the particle size distribution relatively straightforward. Gallen et al. [30] introduced a semi-deterministic Lagrangian particle tracking methodology that tracks the Lagrangian soot particles as well as consider their collision process. A hybrid Eulerian-Lagrangian method for soot modelling, which was developed by Dellinger et al. [31], combined a reduced gas-phase chemistry, a sectional model for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and a Lagrangian description of soot particles dynamics. The Lagrangian soot particles were nucleated from polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons molecules and radicals. Meanwhile, two-way coupling of the gaseous and solid phases was assumed. It is important to note that the aforementioned studies were both related to gas turbine applications. A Lagrangian soot tracking (LST) model based on a semi-empirical formulation was recently developed by Ong et al. [32] and was successfully implemented for diesel spray applications. The LST model was validated using the experimental data of *n*-dodecane and *n*-heptane spray flame from the Engine Combustion Network. Despite omitting the coagulation process, the LST model was

demonstrated to be able to predict primary soot size, track individual soot particles, and access their history as they evolve in the diesel spray flame.

Setting against this background, the present study is carried out by integrating the previously developed LST model [32] with a reduced *n*-heptane chemical mechanism to investigate the effect of ambient oxygen and density on primary soot size in a Sandia *n*-heptane reacting spray. The paper is structured such that numerical formulation and setup are first provided. This is followed by the validation of CFD models using non-reacting and reacting spray experimental data. The validation of the LST method is carried out by comparing the distribution of the steady-state soot volume fraction (SVF). Following this is the study of soot size distribution for soot particles formed at the core of the jet during the transient and the steady-state phase.

2. Numerical formulation and setup

2.1 Mesh and numerical models

The computational study was performed using the spray combustion solver in an open-source code, OpenFOAM version 2.0.x [33]. Experimental data from the Sandia combustion vessel [34] was used for the model validation of the *n*-heptane spray and its combustion characteristics. Detailed descriptions of the experimental setup are available in [34]. The constant volume combustion vessels were represented by a cylinder during simulation studies. For computational expediency, the cylindrical chamber was simplified to a 4-degree axisymmetric wedge with a single layer of cells in the tangential direction. Details of the mesh and geometry can be found herein [32]. The time step size was fixed at $0.2 \mu\text{s}$. The non-reacting spray case was studied at an ambient temperature of 1000 K and ambient density of 14.8 kg/m^3 with the absence of oxygen (0% O_2 in ambient gas composition). As for the reacting spray case, there were a total of four cases with two oxygen concentrations (15% and

12% and two ambient densities (14.8 kg/m^3 and 30 kg/m^3), while having the same initial ambient temperature of 1000 K. Cases with ambient density of 14.8 kg/m^3 and 30 kg/m^3 were henceforth addressed as low density and high density cases, respectively for brevity. Injection specifications and profiles in the current simulations were set to correspond to those used in the experimental setup. Details of the experimental conditions and the injection parameters are shown in Table 1.

The spray breakup was described using the Reitz-Diwakar model [35]. The model constant that governs the time factor for stripping, C_s was set to 11.5. The turbulent flow was modelled using the Unsteady Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes (URANS) method with the standard $k - \varepsilon$ model [36]. The model constant $C_{1\varepsilon}$ was calibrated according to its approximation of round jets [37, 38] and set to a value of 1.53. The initial turbulence kinetic energy, k was set to $0.735 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2$, which was estimated based on the measured RMS velocity in the experiment [34]. The initial turbulence dissipation rate, ε was set to $5.67 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^3$ based on the turbulence integral length scale of 0.01 mm. The choice of the initial k and ε are similarly used in Ref. [38, 39, 40]. The average velocity in the combustion chamber prior to spray injection is approximately 0.7 m/s as provided in ECN [34]. This gas velocity is too low to cause significant effect on the spray development as the spray velocity is 400 – 600 m/s. Therefore, the initial velocity field for all cases was set to be zero. Similar treatment of the initial velocity field can be seen in Ref. [39]. Soot radiation modelling was neglected in all test cases [41]. Collision and coalescence with the fuel spray region were omitted in all studies as these processes have negligible influence on the liquid and vapour fuel penetration of evaporating spray [42]. In addition, the Ranz-Marshall correlation [43] was implemented to calculate the droplet heat transfer with the surrounding gas phase while the Frossling correlation [44] was used to model the evaporation of droplet fuel. The skeletal *n*-heptane mechanism developed by Pang et al. [45] was implemented to describe the chemical kinetics

of *n*-heptane spray combustion. Details about the mechanism can be referred to in [45]. In this current study, the spray combustion solver was incorporated with a LST model [32]. The LST model is explained in detail in our previous study [32] but for completeness the essential features are outlined here.

2.2 LST model for soot particles

The LST model treats soot particles as Lagrangian particles and they are tracked via the Lagrangian method, in which the motion of the soot particles are computed using Newton's second law of motion. The dispersion of Lagrangian particles due to turbulence is influenced by the instantaneous fluctuating velocity $\vec{u}'$ [46, 47], which is modelled by the discrete random walk model (DRW) [46, 47]. It correlates with the flow turbulent kinetic energy k , predicted by the standard $k - \varepsilon$ model, and is expressed by

$$\vec{u}' = \zeta \sqrt{2k/3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where ζ is a Gaussian random number [45,46] with zero mean and unit variance.

The LST model also considers the inception, surface growth and oxidation processes of the soot particles. It is important to note that the coagulation process is omitted in the LST model as the surface growth is the relatively dominant process in affecting primary soot particle size [48, 49]. The inception, surface growth and oxidation rates in the LST model are adapted from the semi-empirical, multi-step Moss-Brookes (MB) soot model [50]. The MB soot model is chosen due to its flexibility in implementing different surface ageing model, as shown in Ref. [51].

The inception rate, ω_{inc} is given by

$$\omega_{inc} = C_{inc} M_P \left(\frac{X_{prec} P}{RT} \right) \exp \left\{ -\frac{T_{inc}}{T} \right\} \quad (2)$$

165 where X_{prec} denotes the mole fraction of soot precursor, whereas C_{inc} is the model constant
 166 for soot incipient rate and is given as 54 s^{-1} . T , P and R denote the gas temperature, pressure
 167 and universal gas constant, respectively. The activation temperature of soot inception, T_{inc} is
 168 given as 21,000 K. The constant M_p represents the mass of an incipient soot particle which is
 169 set to 1200 kg/kmol. In the LST model, Lagrangian particles are formed when a formation
 170 criterion in a computational cell is met. The formation criterion at cell j is given as

$$m_{inc,j} > m_{inc,min} \quad (3)$$

171 where $m_{inc,j}$ denotes the total incipient soot mass at cell j and $m_{inc,min}$ denotes the minimum
 172 mass of incipient soot. $m_{inc,j}$ is calculated by taking the product of $\omega_{inc,j}$ and the time-step
 173 Δt . Meanwhile, $m_{inc,min}$ is calculated to be $2.0 \times 10^{-24} \text{ kg}$, based on the assumption that the
 174 minimum diameter of an incipient soot is 1.24 nm [52], with the soot density of 2000 kg/m^3
 175 [52, 53]. The single formed Lagrangian particle is assumed to represent the total number of
 176 incipient soot particles in that particular computational cell at that time instance. It is also
 177 assumed that all particles formed in that cell, at that instant, follow the same pathway [54]
 178 and size change as the existing Lagrangian particle. The initial velocity of the new particle
 179 formed follows the mean velocity of the cell it is formed in.

180 The newly formed Lagrangian particles then undergo mass addition and increase in
 181 size through the surface growth process and decrease in size due to oxidation processes via
 182 hydroxyl radicals (OH) and O_2 . The rate of change of soot diameter due to surface growth is
 183 governed by Equation (4), whereas the diameter change due to oxidation is by Equation (5)
 184 and (6).

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt}(d_i) \right|_{SG} = \alpha \left[2C_{sg} \left(\frac{X_{sg}P}{RT} \right) \frac{1}{\rho_{soot}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{T_y}{T} \right\} \right] \quad (4)$$

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt}(d_i) \right|_{ox \text{ via } OH} = 2C_{OH} \eta_{coll} \left(\frac{X_{OH}P}{RT} \right) \frac{\sqrt{T}}{\rho_{soot}} \quad (5)$$

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt}(d_i) \right|_{ox \text{ via } O_2} = 2C_{O_2} \left(\frac{X_{O_2}P}{RT} \right) \frac{\sqrt{T}}{\rho_{soot}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{T_{O_2}}{T} \right\} \quad (6)$$

The mole fraction surface growth species is denoted as X_{sg} . The mole fractions for soot oxidants, OH and O₂ are represented by X_{OH} and X_{O_2} , respectively. It is important to note that acetylene (C₂H₂) is chosen here as the surface growth species and soot precursor species. Although polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon is also an important soot precursor. To accurately predict the formation of PAH, a larger chemical mechanism that includes PAH formation pathways is required, which will incur higher computational cost. Furthermore, numerous numerical studies of soot formation in diesel spray flame consider only acetylene as soot precursor, e.g. Ref. [38, 55-57]. Therefore, only acetylene is chosen as the soot precursor to achieve a balance of accuracy and computational efficiency. Furthermore, one-way coupling is assumed between the Lagrangian soot particles and the gaseous species. This implies that the gaseous species affects the Lagrangian soot particles but not the other way around. The soot model constants, their descriptions and values are shown in Table 2. The α in Equation (4) denotes the surface ageing factor, which is assumed to be a function of temperature and is expressed as

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tanh \left(\frac{8168}{T} - 4.57 \right) + 1 \right) \quad (7)$$

Once a Lagrangian soot particle is reduced below a threshold diameter, it is assumed to be fully oxidised and is removed from the computational cell. The threshold value is set to 1.24 nm which is the same as the initial incipient soot particle size.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Validation of numerical models

The first part of this section compares the simulation results of non-reacting fuel spray against experimental measurements, in terms of liquid and vapour penetration lengths as well as the mixture fraction. It is followed by the validation of the computed ignition delay times (IDT) and lift-off lengths (LOL) of reacting sprays using the experimental data [34]. The non-reacting and reacting spray validation cases are carried out to ensure that the fuel-air distribution and combustion characteristics are reasonably simulated, and the uncertainties induced by these elements can be minimised prior to studying soot formation events. The validation of LST model is carried out by comparing the predicted SVF profiles with measured data during steady-state combustion for different ambient conditions.

In the current work, the liquid penetration length (LPL) is taken as the axial location from the injector to the location where 99% of the total liquid mass is found, while the vapour penetration length (VPL) is taken as the maximum distance from the nozzle outlet to where the fuel mass fraction (or mixture fraction) is 0.1%. As for the LOL, it is defined as the first axial location of Favre-averaged OH mass fraction which reaches 2% of its maximum value in the domain. The time averaging of the simulated LOL is carried out from 3.0 to 6.0 ms. This corresponds to the experimental definition. The IDT is defined as the time when the greatest rise of maximum temperature is observed, $\left(\frac{dT_{max}}{dt}\right)_{max}$, and this definition remains consistent throughout the study. Although there are other definitions for the IDT, it is shown that there is no significant discrepancy in the IDT between different IDT definitions [39]. Moreover, this definition is in accordance with the recommendation by the Engine Combustion Network [34].

3.1.1 Non-reacting spray simulations

Comparisons between the computed and measured penetration lengths are provided in Figure 1(a) using the default and calibrated model constant. In general, the tuned model shows an improved VPL and LPL prediction as compared to the measurement. Computed and measured mean radial mixture fraction profiles are next compared in Figure 1(b). The overall trend of the mixture fraction profiles agrees with the experimental data which implies that the air-fuel distributions are reasonably predicted by the model.

3.1.2 Reacting spray simulations

Figure 2 shows the comparison of experimental and predicted IDT/LOL for the reacting *n*-heptane spray cases at different oxygen levels and ambient densities. At low density, the predicted IDTs correspond well with the measured IDT for 15% and 12% oxygen levels with a maximum relative difference of 7.3%. A maximum relative difference of 17.5% is obtained for the predicted IDT at a higher ambient density of 30.0 kg/m³. At high density (30.0 kg/m³), the predicted LOLs at both oxygen levels are within a relative difference of 7% as compared to the experimental LOL. At low density (14.8 kg/m³), the predicted LOL at 12% O₂ and 15% O₂ are underpredicted by 6% and 20%, respectively. Nevertheless, the simulated LOLs are shown to correspond well with the measured data for all the reacting spray cases by capturing the LOL trend, where the LOL increases with increasing ambient density and decreasing oxygen levels.

3.1.3 Steady-state SVF distribution

In this section, the predicted SVF results using the LST model are compared against the measured SVF for different oxygen concentrations and ambient densities. The experimental SVF are obtained from the time-averaged line-of-sight extinction (KL) data [34]. Predicted SVF using the LST model is calculated based on the total number of Lagrangian soot particles in the domain. Figure 3 shows the temporal evolution of the number of

250 computational particles for soot under different ambient densities and oxygen levels. It is
251 depicted in the figure that the number of soot particles reaches a quasi-steady state at $t \geq 4$
252 ms. Therefore, the predicted steady-state SVF using the LST model is obtained by time-
253 averaging the computed SVF from 4 – 6 ms. In addition, normalization is carried out by
254 normalizing the simulated and measured SVF with their respective peak SVF at 15% O₂, 30.0
255 kg/m³ density. The normalized SVF profiles for different oxygen levels and ambient densities
256 along the spray axis are shown in Figure 4. The simulated SVF for the 12% O₂, 30.0 kg/m³
257 density case is underpredicted by approximately 30% relative to the measured data. At low
258 density, the predicted SVF at 15% O₂ is overpredicted by a factor of two as compared to the
259 measured result. The larger discrepancy at 15% O₂ is likely due to the underpredicted LOL
260 which leads to less air entrainment into the spray and subsequently higher soot formation (cf.
261 Figure 2). Despite these discrepancies, the predicted SVF using the LST model is shown to
262 increase with increasing oxygen level and ambient density, which corresponds with the
263 experimental observation as depicted in Figure 4. The spatial location of the predicted SVF is
264 further downstream than the measured SVF. This can be attributed to the use of the Moss-
265 Brookes soot model in the formulation of the LST model which is discussed in [32]. It is
266 shown in Ref. [39] that considering surface ageing effect in the surface growth model can
267 cause the spatial location of the soot cloud to be more upstream. Therefore, it is expected that
268 implementing a more advanced surface ageing model than the one implemented in the
269 present study will likely improve the spatial prediction of the LST model. Despite the
270 overprediction, the LST model is able to capture the variation of spatial location of SVF
271 towards the upstream location of the spray as oxygen level increases and ambient density
272 increases, which coincides with experimental observation (cf. Figure 4). It is important to
273 note that a single simulation case using the LST model requires approximately 170 hours to

reach 6.0 ms after start of fuel injection when running in serial on a HP Z200 Workstation with Quad-Core Intel Xeon Processor 3400 at 2.40 GHz.

3.2. In the spray core jet

3.2.1 Sampling of individual lagrangian soot particles

The soot sampling experiment was conducted by Aizawa and colleagues, in which full details of the experimental methodology can be seen in Ref. [11–13]. For completeness of the present paper, only the essential steps are highlighted here. The soot sampling experiment involves placing a probe in-parallel to the spray axis to skim the gas containing soot from the spray flame while minimizing the flow disturbance to the other half of the spray flame. As the reacting flow passes the probe, soot particles are deposited onto the carbon-coated copper grid inside the probe via thermophoresis. The sampled soot particles correspond to the soot present at that position. Sampled soot particles at different locations along the spray axis can be obtained by repeating the experiment with the probe being at different locations along the spray axis. The sampled soot particles are then observed under a High-Resolution Transmission Electron Microscope (HR-TEM). The diameter of each primary soot particles is finally obtained by manually processing the TEM images.

In order to simulate the same sampling technique along the spray axis, Lagrangian particles which are $\pm 1.5\text{mm}$ axially and $\pm 0.5\text{mm}$ radially about the sampling locations are assumed to be deposited onto the sampler and thus, their information is recorded. Similar analysis was carried out in our previous work [32]. Information of the deposited Lagrangian particles, such as size, position, velocity, etc, are gathered from the start of ignition (SOI) to 6.0ms after start of ignition (ASOI). The analysis of the information gathered on the individual Lagrangian particles is later carried out in subsequent sections to obtain the primary soot size distribution and study its relation to soot processes.

3.2.2 Primary soot size distribution

The effect of ambient oxygen and density on primary soot size distribution at the core of the spray jet for the *n*-heptane spray cases are investigated here. The probability density function (PDF) of primary soot size for various ambient oxygen level and density cases are shown in Figure 5. It is observed that the onset location of soot moves downstream as oxygen level decreases. Soot is present at $x = 50$ mm for the 15% O₂, low density case, while soot is only present further downstream at $x = 60$ mm for the 12% O₂, low density case. This phenomenon is similarly captured for the high density case (not shown in the figure). The variation of soot onset location with oxygen level coincides with the experimental observation in [58–60] and in Section 3.1.3. Furthermore, Figure 5 also shows that in all the cases the primary soot diameters increase as soot particles migrate downstream. This is caused by the soot undergoing surface growth process and is consistent with experimental observations [8,9,18]

The mean primary soot diameter is computed from the collected Lagrangian particles along the core of the spray jet from the SOI to 6.0 ms ASOI and is shown in Figure 6. The mean primary soot size predicted at the oxygen level of 15% and ambient density of 30 kg/m³ is in reasonable agreement with the measured mean primary soot size using *n*-dodecane fuel [61]. For the low density case, the mean primary soot size reaches a peak value of approximately 4.5 nm and 3.2 nm for oxygen levels of 15% and 12%, respectively. As ambient density increases to 30.0 kg/m³, the peak value of the predicted mean primary soot size also increases to 6.2 nm and 4.5 nm for oxygen levels of 15% and 12%, respectively. This implies that the increase in density resulted in the primary soot size to increase by a factor of 1.5. Furthermore, it is also evidently shown in Figure 6 that the mean primary soot size decreases with decreasing oxygen levels. There have been no experimental studies on the effects of ambient oxygen and density on primary soot size in diesel spray flame for *n*-

heptane fuel. However, experimental studies on SVF have shown that decreasing ambient oxygen [58] and increasing ambient density [62] can increase SVF in diesel spray flame. In addition, measurement of primary soot size in canonical flame setups also showed similar findings regarding the effect of oxygen [63] and ambient density [64–66] on primary soot sizes.

The results presented in Figures 5 and 6 are time-integrated results of all the collected Lagrangian particles along the core of the spray jet from the SOI to 6.0 ms ASOI. In order to gain a better insight on the effect of ambient oxygen and density on the primary soot size, the instantaneous primary soot size and the corresponding net growth rates experienced by the soot particles are analysed next. The temporal evolution of the net growth rates for all the cases are presented in Figure 7. Moreover, their corresponding evolution of the primary soot size distribution with respect to axial distance is presented in Figure 8.

At low density (14.8 kg/m^3), the maximum net growth rates for the 15% O_2 and 12% O_2 cases are $1 \times 10^5 \text{ kg/m}^3/\text{s}$ and $0.25 \times 10^5 \text{ kg/m}^3/\text{s}$, respectively. The span of soot cloud for the 12% O_2 case is shorter than the 15% O_2 case from 1.0 ms ASOI to the steady-state period, as depicted in Figures 7(a) – (d). The evolution of the primary soot size is shown in Figure 8 to correspond to the net growth rates for the 15% O_2 and 12% O_2 cases, where a larger soot size is achieved in the former case due to having higher net growth rates.

At high density, the net growth rates for the 15% O_2 case is higher than the 12% O_2 case (cf. Figure 7). Contrary to the low density case, the span of soot cloud at both oxygen levels are comparable to one another during the early ignition stage ($t \leq 2 \text{ ms ASOI}$). However, the span of soot cloud for 12% O_2 case becomes longer than the 15% O_2 case at later times ($t \geq 3 \text{ ms ASOI}$). During steady-state period, the span of soot cloud for the 12% O_2 is 10 mm longer than the 15% O_2 case. The evolution of primary soot size at high density

shows similar trend to the ones at low density, where the primary soot size is larger for the 15% O₂ (cf. Figure 8). In addition, increasing ambient density while keeping the ambient oxygen constant leads to an increase in primary soot sizes. This is likely due to the higher net growth rate achieved at higher ambient density, as depicted in Figure 7.

3.2.3 Soot age distribution

As the previous section has clearly demonstrated that the soot cloud span varies with different ambient conditions, it is expected that the longer span of the soot cloud would imply longer soot residence time in the spray flame. The use of the LST model allows the ability to analyse the residence time of soot in the spray flame by tracking the soot particles from the time of formation to the time of oxidation. The time duration of the soot particle from formation till oxidation is henceforth known as soot age [67]. It is important to note that the transient analysis of soot age is carried out after soot onset (ASO), where the soot onset time and onset location are tabulated in Table 3. The soot onset time is defined here as the earliest time after SOI when the total number of Lagrangian soot particles present in the domain are more than 100 particles. The soot onset location is taken as the axial distance from the nozzle to the point where the maximal SVF is present, at the soot onset time. From Table 3, it is shown that the soot onset time and location increase as oxygen level decreases at both ambient densities. Shorter soot onset time and a more upstream soot onset location are obtained when the ambient density increases. These results agree qualitatively with the experimental and numerical findings in [59] which uses *n*-dodecane as fuel.

Figure 9 shows the predicted temporal evolution of soot age distribution of the primary soot particles at the core of spray jet with different ambient oxygen levels and densities. From 1.0 ms to 3.0 ms ASO, the soot age distributions at different oxygen levels and ambient densities are similar to one another. A narrower distribution is obtained for the 15% O₂ case at high density as compared to the other cases at 4.0 ms ASO, which implies

that the soot particles in the 15% O₂, high density case have a relatively shorter soot age than the other cases.

It is mentioned in Section 3.2.2 that the cloud span for the 12% O₂, low density case is shorter than the 15% O₂, low density case before reaching the steady-state period. Despite having a shorter soot cloud span, the soot age distribution in Figure 9 shows no significant difference between both oxygen level cases. This can be explained by the difference in the soot onset location in both cases. As mentioned earlier, the soot onset location for 15% O₂, low density case is more upstream than the 12% O₂ case (as shown in Table 3). As the soot particles are formed nearer to the nozzle, the flow velocity experienced by the soot particles is higher than the ones further downstream. Therefore, the time taken to travel along the spray flame is shorter. Meanwhile, the soot onset location for the 12% O₂ case is further downstream. The lower flow velocity experienced by the soot particles consequently lead to particles travelling more slowly through the spray flame.

As for the high density case, the 15% O₂ case has a much narrower soot age distribution at 4.0 ms ASO cf. Figure 9(d) and a shorter soot cloud span than the 12% O₂ case at the steady-state period cf. Figure 8(h). This observation can also be attributed to the soot onset location. The soot onset location for both oxygen levels are close to one another, as shown in Table 3. This implies that the flow velocities experience by the soot particles at both oxygen levels are not significantly different. Therefore, the shorter soot cloud span in the 15% O₂ case would yield shorter soot age as what is predicted in Figure 9(d). The results above also show that longer soot cloud span does not necessary equate to longer soot residence time. The residence time of the soot particles in a spray flame is dependent on both the soot cloud span and the soot onset location.

4. Conclusion

The effect of ambient oxygen level and density on the prediction of soot volume fraction and soot size distribution are carried out using a Lagrangian soot tracking method on Sandia *n*-heptane spray cases. The simulated SVF for the 12% O₂, 30.0 kg/m³ density case is underpredicted by approximately 30% relative to the measured data. At low density, the predicted SVF at 15% O₂ is overpredicted by a factor of two. Despite these discrepancies, the qualitative trend of the measured SVF where the SVF increases with increasing oxygen level and ambient density is captured by the simulated SVF.

The peak primary soot size achieved in the core of the spray jet at an ambient density of 14.8 kg/m³ and oxygen level of 15% and 12% are 14 nm and 10 nm, respectively. Based on the primary soot size distribution in the core of the spray jet, an increase in ambient density from 14.8 kg/m³ to 30 kg/m³ is shown to increase the peak and mean primary soot size by a factor of 1.5. Furthermore, the peak and mean primary soot size decrease with decreasing oxygen levels from 15% to 12%. Higher oxygen level and ambient density lead to higher net growth rate experience by the soot particles, resulting in larger primary soot sizes. At low density, the soot cloud span is shorter for the 12% O₂ case as compared to the 15% O₂ case. On the contrary, the high density cases show comparable soot cloud span for both oxygen levels before steady-state period. With the introduction of soot age, the present study shows that longer span of the soot cloud does not equate to longer soot residence time in the spray flame.

Despite having different soot cloud span, the soot age distributions at different oxygen levels and ambient densities are similar to one another from 1.0 ms to 4.0 ms after soot onset time. The reason for this is likely due to the soot onset location. Soot particles that form upstream of the spray will experience higher flow velocity, thus leading to a shorter soot age when the span of the soot cloud is short.

References

- [1] Chen L, Liang Z, Zhang X, Shuai S. Characterizing particulate matter emissions from GDI and PFI vehicles under transient and cold start conditions. *Fuel* 2017;189:131–40.
- [2] Liu H, Ma X, Li B, Chen L, Wang Z, Wang J. Combustion and emission characteristics of a direct injection diesel engine fueled with biodiesel and PODE/biodiesel fuel blends. *Fuel* 2017;209:62–8.
- [3] Kazemimanesh M, Moallemi A, Olfert JS, Kostiuk LW. Probe sampling to map and characterize nanoparticles along the axis of a laminar methane jet diffusion flame. *Proc Combust Inst* 2017;36:881–8.
- [4] Bockhorn H. Combustion Generated Fine Carbonaceous Particles: Proceedings of an International Workshop Held in Villa Orlandi, Anacapri, May 13-16, 2007. KIT Scientific Publishing; 2009.
- [5] Schwartz J. Air pollution and daily mortality: a review and meta analysis. *Environ Res* 1994;64:36–52.
- [6] European Parliament, Council of the European Union. REGULATION (EC) No 715/2007 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 20 June 2007 on type approval of motor vehicles with respect to emissions from light passenger and commercial vehicles (Euro 5 and Euro 6) and on access to vehicle repair and mai. *Off J Eur Union* 2007;L171:1–16. doi:OJEU 29.6.2007 L171.
- [7] Le Coq L. Élimination Des Particules. *Tech l'Ingénieur* 2006;33:20.
- [8] Kook S, Pickett LM. Soot volume fraction and morphology of conventional and surrogate jet fuel sprays at 1000-K and 6.7-MPa ambient conditions. *Proc Combust Inst* 2011;33:2911–8.
- [9] Yamaguchi T, Kondo K, Nishigai H, Takano S, Aizawa T. Direct Sampling, TEM

analysis and optical measurement of soot particles at different axial locations in a transient spray flame. SAE Int J Fuels Lubr 2011;5:316–28.

[10] Kondo K, Yamaguchi T, Nishigai H, Takano S, Aizawa T. High-Resolution Transmission Electron Microscopy of soot directly sampled at different axial locations in diesel spray Flame, No. 2011-24-0068, SAE Technical Paper, 2011.

[11] Aizawa T, Nishigai H, Kondo K, Yamaguchi T, Nerva JG, Genzale C, Kook S, Pickett L. Transmission electron microscopy of soot particles directly sampled in diesel spray flame - a comparison between US#2 and biodiesel soot. SAE Int J Fuels Lubr 2012;5:665–73. doi:10.4271/2012-01-0695.

[12] Aizawa T, Takahata N, Okabe K, Mizutani Y. Effect of fuel aromatics on in-flame diesel soot nanostructure via HRTEM. No. 2015-01-1829. SAE Technical Paper; 2015.

[13] Kuribayashi M, Ishizuka Y, Aizawa T. Sizing of soot particles in diesel spray flame-a qualitative comparison between TEM analysis and LII/scattering laser measurements. SAE Int J Fuels Lubr 2013; 6(3):641-50.

[14] Kuribayashi M, Mizutani Y, Ishizuka Y, Taki N, Aizawa T. Effects of ambient oxygen concentration on soot processes in diesel spray flame-A qualitative comparison between TEM analysis and LII/Scattering laser measurements. SAE Int J Fuels Lubr 2014;7:693–703.

[15] Kook S, Zhang R, Szeto K, Pickett LM, Aizawa T. In-flame soot sampling and particle analysis in a diesel engine. SAE Int J Fuels Lubr 2013;6:80–97. doi:10.4271/2013-01-0912.

[16] Zhang R, Kook S. Structural evolution of soot particles during diesel combustion in a single-cylinder light-duty engine. Combust Flame 2015;162:2720–8.

[17] Wang Y, Liu H, Li T, Jiang H, He P, Liu D, Zhang J, Xiong Q, Liu L. Characterization of the morphology and nanostructure of the soot particles produced within transient

470 diesel reacting jet flame by using thermophoretic sampling technique. *Energy & Fuels*
471 2019;33:9124–37.

472 [18] Nerva JG, Yamaguchi T, Iguma H, Nishigai H, Kondo K, Takano S, Aizawa T,
473 Genzale CL, Pickett LM. Transmission electron microscopy of soot particles sampled
474 directly from a biodiesel spray flame. *SAE Int J Fuels Lubr* 2011;5:2011-01–2046.
475 doi:10.4271/2011-01-2046.

476 [19] Sakai M, Iguma H, Kondo K, Aizawa T. Nanostructure analysis of primary soot
477 particles directly sampled in diesel spray flame via HRTEM. No. 2012-01-1722. *SAE*
478 *Technical Paper*; 2012.

479 [20] Jiang H, Li T, Wang Y, He P, Wang B. The evolution of soot morphology and
480 nanostructure along axial direction in diesel spray jet flames. *Combust Flame*
481 2019;199:204–12.

482 [21] Frenklach M. Method of moments with interpolative closure. *Chem Eng Sci*
483 2002;57:2229–39.

484 [22] Mueller ME, Blanquart G, Pitsch H. A joint volume-surface model of soot aggregation
485 with the method of moments. *Proc Combust Inst* 2009;32:785–92.

486 [23] Ito T, Hosaka T, Ueda M, Senda J, Fujimoto H. Detailed kinetic modeling and laser
487 diagnostics of soot formation process in diesel jet flame. *SAE Transactions*.
488 2004;1:602-13.

489 [24] Naik CV, Puduppakkam KV, Meeks E. Simulation of soot volume fraction and size in
490 high-pressure lifted flames using detailed reaction mechanisms. *ASME Turbo Expo*
491 2014 Turbine Tech Conf Expo 2014:V04BT04A025.

492 [25] Gelbard F, Seinfeld JH. Simulation of multicomponent aerosol dynamics. *J Colloid*
493 *Interface Sci* 1980;78:485–501.

494 [26] Gelbard F, Tambour Y, Seinfeld JH. Sectional representations for simulating aerosol

495 dynamics. J Colloid Interface Sci 1980;76:541–56.

496 [27] Pope CJ, Howard JB. Simultaneous particle and molecule modeling (SPAMM): An
 497 approach for combining sectional aerosol equations and elementary gas-phase
 498 reactions. Aerosol Sci Technol 1997;27:73–94.

499 [28] Aubagnac-Karkar D, Michel J-B, Colin O, Noël L, Darabiha N. A Sectional Soot
 500 Model for RANS Simulation of Diesel Engines. SAE Technical Paper; 2014.

501 [29] Aubagnac-Karkar D, Michel J-B, Colin O, Vervisch-Kljakic PE, Darabiha N.
 502 Sectional soot model coupled to tabulated chemistry for Diesel RANS simulations.
 503 Combust Flame 2015;162:3081–99.

504 [30] Gallen L, Felden A, Riber E, Cuenot B. Lagrangian tracking of soot particles in LES
 505 of gas turbines. Proceedings of the Combustion Institute. 2019 Jan 1;37(4):5429-36.

506 [31] Dellinger N, Bertier N, Dupoirieux F, Legros G. Hybrid Eulerian-Lagrangian method
 507 for soot modelling applied to ethylene-air premixed flames. Energy. 2020 Mar
 508 1;194:116858.

509 [32] Ong JC, Pang KM, Walther JH, Ho J-H, Ng HK. Evaluation of a Lagrangian soot
 510 tracking method for the prediction of primary soot particle size under engine-like
 511 conditions. J Aerosol Sci 2018;115:70–95.

512 [33] Weller HG, Tabor G, Jasak H, Fureby C. A tensorial approach to computational
 513 continuum mechanics using object-oriented techniques. Comput Phys 1998;12:620–
 514 31.

515 [34] ECN. Engine Combustion Network 2020. www.sandia.gov/ecn/.

516 [35] Reitz RD, Diwakar R. Effect of drop breakup on fuel sprays. SAE Transactions.
 517 1986;1:218-27.

518 [36] Launder BE, Spalding DB. The numerical computation of turbulent flows. Comput
 519 Methods Appl Mech Eng 1974;3:269–89. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/0045->

520 7825(74)90029-2.

521 [37] Novella R, García A, Pastor JM, Domenech V. The role of detailed chemical kinetics
522 on CFD diesel spray ignition and combustion modelling. *Math Comput Model*
523 2011;54:1706–19.

524 [38] Pang KM, Jangi M, Bai X-S, Schramm J. Investigation of chemical kinetics on soot
525 formation event of n-heptane spray combustion. No. 2014-01-1254. SAE Technical
526 Paper; 2014.

527 [39] Pang KM, Jangi M, Bai X-S, Schramm J. Evaluation and optimisation of
528 phenomenological multi-step soot model for spray combustion under diesel engine-
529 like operating conditions. *Combust Theory Model* 2015;19:279–308.

530 [40] Varna A, Wehrfritz A, Hawkes ER, Cleary MJ, Lucchini T, D’Errico G, Kook S, Chan
531 QN. Application of a multiple mapping conditioning mixing model to ECN Spray A.
532 *Proceedings of the Combustion Institute*. 2019 Jan 1;37(3):3263-70.

533 [41] Skeen S, Manin J, Pickett L, Dalen K, Ivarsson A. Quantitative spatially resolved
534 measurements of total radiation in high-pressure spray flames. No. 2014-01-1252.
535 SAE Technical Paper; 2014.

536 [42] Jangi M, D’Errico G, Bai X-S, Lucchini T. Numerical simulation of the ECN Spray A
537 using multidimensional chemistry coordinate mapping: n-dodecane diesel combustion.
538 No. 2012-01-1660. SAE Technical Paper; 2012.

539 [43] Ranz WE, Marshall WR. Evaporation from drops. *Chem Eng Prog* 1952;48:141446.

540 [44] Frossling N. Evaporation, heat transfer, and velocity distribution in two-dimensional
541 and rotationally symmetrical laminar boundary-layer flow. DTIC Document; 1956.

542 [45] Pang KM, Ng HK, Gan S. Development of an integrated reduced fuel oxidation and
543 soot precursor formation mechanism for CFD simulations of diesel combustion. *Fuel*
544 2011;90:2902–14.

545 [46] Kitanidis PK. Particle-tracking equations for the solution of the advection-dispersion
546 equation with variable coefficients. *Water Resour Res* 1994;30:3225–7.

547 [47] Zhang Z, Chen Q. Comparison of the Eulerian and Lagrangian methods for predicting
548 particle transport in enclosed spaces. *Atmos Environ* 2007;41:5236–48.

549 [48] Bolla M, Wright YM, Boulouchos K, Borghesi G, Mastorakos E. Soot formation
550 modeling of n-heptane sprays under diesel engine conditions using the conditional
551 moment closure approach. *Combustion Science and Technology*. 2013 May
552 4;185(5):766-93.

553 [49] Haynes BS, Wagner HG. The surface growth phenomenon in soot formation.
554 *Zeitschrift für Physikalische Chemie*. 1982 Feb 1;133(2):201-13.

555 [50] Brookes SJ, Moss JB. Predictions of soot and thermal radiation properties in confined
556 turbulent jet diffusion flames. *Combust Flame* 1999;116:486–503.

557 [51] Ong, JC, Development of Lagrangian soot tracking method for the study of soot
558 morphology in diesel spray combustion. PhD Thesis. University of Nottingham, 2017.

559 [52] Leung KM, Lindstedt RP, Jones WP. A simplified reaction mechanism for soot
560 formation in nonpremixed flames. *Combust Flame* 1991;87:289–305.

561 [53] Vishwanathan G, Reitz RD. Development of a practical soot modeling approach and
562 its application to low-temperature diesel combustion. *Combust Sci Technol*
563 2010;182:1050–82.

564 [54] Katta VR, Blevins LG, Roquemore WM. Dynamics of an inverse diffusion flame and
565 its role in polycyclic-aromatic-hydrocarbon and soot formation. *Combust Flame*
566 2005;142:33–5

567 [55] Pei Y, Som S, Pomraning E, Senecal PK, Skeen SA, Manin J, Pickett LM. Large eddy
568 simulation of a reacting spray flame with multiple realizations under compression
569 ignition engine conditions. *Combustion and Flame*. 2015 Dec 1;162(12):4442-55.

570 [56] Fernandez SF, Paul C, Sircar A, Imren A, Haworth DC, Roy S, Modest MF. Soot and
571 spectral radiation modeling for high-pressure turbulent spray flames. *Combustion and*
572 *Flame*. 2018 Apr 1;190:402-15.

573 [57] Chishty MA, Bolla M, Hawkes ER, Pei Y, Kook S. Soot formation modelling for n-
574 dodecane sprays using the transported PDF model. *Combustion and Flame*. 2018 Jun
575 1;192:101-19.

576 [58] Idicheria CA, Pickett LM. Soot formation in diesel combustion under high-EGR
577 conditions. *SAE Transactions*. 2005;1:1559-74.

578 [59] Cenker E. Imaging measurements of soot particle size and soot volume fraction with
579 laser-induced incandescence at Diesel engine conditions. Ph.D. Thesis., Ecole Centrale
580 Paris, 2014.

581 [60] Pandurangi SS, Bolla M, Wright YM, Boulouchos K, Skeen SA, Manin J, Pickett LM.
582 Onset and Progression of Soot in high-pressure n-Dodecane Sprays under Diesel-
583 Engine Conditions. *Int J Engine Re*. 2017;18(5-6):436-52.

584 [61] Kook S, Zhang R, Chan QN, Aizawa T, Kondo K, Pickett LM, Cenker E, Bruneaux G,
585 Andersson O, Pagels J, Nordin EZ. Automated detection of primary particles from
586 transmission electron microscope (TEM) images of soot aggregates in diesel engine
587 environments. *SAE Int J Engines* 2016;9:279–96.

588 [62] Pickett LM, Siebers DL. Soot in diesel fuel jets: effects of ambient temperature,
589 ambient density, and injection pressure. *Combust Flame* 2004;138:114–35.

590 [63] Oh KC, Shin HD. The effect of oxygen and carbon dioxide concentration on soot
591 formation in non-premixed flames. *Fuel* 2006;85:615–24.

592 [64] Vargas AM, Gülder ÖL. Pressure dependence of primary soot particle size determined
593 using thermophoretic sampling in laminar methane-air diffusion flames. *Proc Combust*
594 *Inst* 2017;36:975–84.

595 [65] Amin HMF, Roberts WL. An experimental apparatus to measure soot morphology at
596 high pressures using multi-angle light scattering. Meas Sci Technol 2019;30:75902.

597 [66] Amin HMF, Roberts WL. Investigating soot parameters in an ethane/air counterflow
598 diffusion flame at elevated pressures. Combust Sci Technol 2020:1–16.

599 [67] Singh J, Balthasar M, Kraft M, Wagner W. Stochastic modeling of soot particle size
600 and age distributions in laminar premixed flames. Proc Combust Inst 2005;30:1457–
601 65.

602

List of Figures

Figure 1: (a) Comparison of liquid and vapour penetration length for the non-reacting *n*-heptane spray case. (b) Comparison of simulated and experimental radial mixture fraction of the non-reacting *n*-heptane spray case at different axial locations and time after injection.

Figure 2: Comparison of simulated ignition delay time (IDT) and lift-off length (LOL) for the reacting *n*-heptane spray cases with experimental results at different ambient oxygen levels and ambient densities. [Hollow symbols represent measured data; Filled symbols represent simulation data]

Figure 3: Temporal evolution of the number of computational particles for soot under different ambient densities and oxygen levels.

Figure 4: Normalized SVF as a function of the axial distance from injector for 15% and 12% oxygen levels at ambient density of 14.8 kg/m^3 (low density) and 30.0 kg/m^3 (high density).

Figure 5: Probability density function (PDF) of primary soot size predicted along various axial locations from injector location for different ambient oxygen level and density cases.

Figure 6: Mean primary soot size as a function of axial distance from injector for different ambient oxygen level and density cases. The filled symbols refer to low density cases; hollow symbols refer to high density cases.

Figure 7: Temporal evolution of the net growth rates at core of spray jet for different ambient oxygen level and density cases at different timings. The filled symbols refer to low density cases; hollow symbols refer to high density cases.

Figure 8: Primary soot size distribution at the core of the spray jet for different ambient oxygen level and density cases. (a) – (d) refer to low density cases and (e) – (f) refer to high density cases.

Figure 9: Soot age distribution of soot particles at the core of spray jet for different ambient oxygens and densities at different timing ASO. Solid lines refer to low density cases; dashed lines refer to high density cases.

List of Tables

Table 1: Experimental conditions for Sandia *n*-heptane test cases. Data taken from Ref. [34].

Spray configuration	T_{am} [K]	ρ_{am} [kg/m ³]	O ₂ % [-]	Injection duration [ms]	Nozzle orifice diameter [mm]	Injection pressure drop [MPa]	Total fuel mass [mg]
Non-reacting	1000	14.8	0	6.8	0.1	150	17.8
Reacting	1000	14.8	15	6.8	0.1	150	17.8
			12	6.8	0.1	150	17.8
	1000	30.0	15	6.8	0.1	150	18.0
			12	6.8	0.1	150	17.8

T_{am} : Ambient temperature ; ρ_{am} : Ambient density ; O₂ %: Ambient oxygen concentration (in mole fraction)

Table 2: The soot model constants. Data taken from Ref. [50,52]

Soot Model Constants	Descriptions	Value [Unit]
C_{sg}	Surface growth rate scaling factor	11,700 [kg m kmol ⁻¹ s ⁻¹]
C_{OH}	Model constant for soot oxidation due to OH	105.81 [kg m kmol ⁻¹ K ^{-0.5} s ⁻¹]
C_{O_2}	Model constant for soot oxidation due to O ₂	8903.51 [kg m kmol ⁻¹ K ^{-0.5} s ⁻¹]
T_{sg}	Activation temperature of surface growth	12,100 [K]
T_{O_2}	Activation temperature of soot oxidation due to O ₂	19,778 [K]
η_{coll}	Collision efficiency parameter	0.13 [-]

Table 3: Soot onset time and onset location for different ambient oxygen level and density *n*-heptane spray cases.

Ambient density [kg/m ³]	Ambient oxygen [%]	Soot onset time [ms]	Soot onset location [mm]
14.8	15	0.94	48
	12	1.38	58
30.0	15	0.41	27
	12	0.57	30