Development and Validation of a Mechanism for Flame Propagation in R-32/Air Mixtures

Donald R. Burgess, Jr., Jeffrey A. Manion, Robert R. Burrell, Valeri I. Babushok, Michael J. Hegetschweiler, Gregory T. Linteris

Abstract

A mechanism for the combustion of the refrigerant R-32 (CH2F2) in air mixtures was developed and validated through comparisons with measured flame speeds for a range of equivalence ratios (0.9 to 1.4) and pressures (1 to 3 bar) using a constant-volume spherical flame method. Premixed flame calculations were performed and analyzed to identify primary species and reactions contributing to flame speeds and combustion. We found that there were only three HFC reactions that contributed significantly to flame speeds. Their rate constants were optimized within uncertainty limits and the model showed excellent agreement (<3 %) with measured flames speeds.

Keywords: Chemical kinetics, Refrigerant flammability, Burning velocity, Hydrofluorocarbons

1. Introduction

The overall purpose of this work is to characterize the flammability of a set of fluoromethanes, fluoroethanes, and fluoropropenes, and their mixtures for use as refrigerant working fluids. Although it is possible to make measurements of the flammability of a single refrigerant under a limited set of conditions, it is not realistic to measure flammabilities of all possible formulations under a wide range of refrigerant-to-air ratios for different diluents, ambient temperatures, and humidity levels. The driving force for this work is the development of new refrigerant blends that simultaneously minimizes their global warming potentials (GWP) and flammabilities, while maximizing their refrigerant performance which is a function of thermodynamic and physical properties (e.g., critical temperature, vaporization enthalpy, thermal conductivity, saturation vapor pressure). The ability to have robust and accurate predictive tools that are benchmarked to high quality measurements of the flammability of these refrigerants for a set of specific mixtures under a range of conditions will allow industry to screen, optimize, and rank different blends to enable rapid development of new refrigerant formulations.

1

In the work reported here, the flammability of the refrigerant R-32 (CH₂F₂, difluoromethane) is studied using burning velocities (flame speeds). R-32 is a widely used refrigerant that is nonozone depleting and has a moderate GWP. It, however, is mildly flammable, and is used with less flammable refrigerants in blends. This current work on R-32, a standard refrigerant, will provide a benchmark for extending flammability models based on elementary reaction kinetics to other refrigerants (both pure and blends) such as the HFC's R-125 (pentafluoroethane), R-134a (1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane), R-152a (1,1,-difluoroethane), and the hydrofluoroolefins HFO-1234yf (2,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene) and HFO-1234ze (1,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene).

2. Methods

In this work, we developed and validated a chemical kinetic mechanism/model to predict the flammability of the refrigerant R-32 (CH_2F_2). This requires understanding the chemistry on a microscopic level from the analysis of reaction pathways and comparison of the model predictions to measured flame speeds.

The full details of the measurements in this work are reported elsewhere [1] and are only summarized here. The flame speeds of R-32/air mixtures were measured using a constant-volume spherical-flame method. A spherical chamber about 15 cm diameter (~1.8 liters) was filled with R-32/air mixtures with equivalence ratios ranging from 0.9 to 1.4, and using different initial pressures on the order of (0.87 to 1.13) bar. The mixtures were then ignited by a spark at the center of the chamber, and the pressure rise (final pressures of about 7 to 11 bar) as a function of time was monitored. The final pressures were about 7 to 11 bar, but instabilities, interaction with the chamber wall, and other effects limited the reliable data to final pressures of about 1 to 3 bar. The pressure traces were then used to calculate flame radius, and thus flame speeds $S_u(T,P)$, using a thermodynamic spherical flame propagation model. In the data reduction procedures, corrections were made to account for thermal radiation of the burned gas [3] and flame stretch [4]. Buoyancy is unimportant for the present conditions [5] and was not considered.

In this work, the development and validation of a chemical kinetic mechanism (model) to predict the flammability of R-32 (CH₂F₂) was iterative. An initial chemical kinetic mechanism was

2

developed based on compilations from the literature, updates to reflect more recent work, and an evaluation of reactions and their rate constants. Simulations were performed using the Sandia Premix code [6] and Cantera [7] and the results examined using reaction path analysis employing the graphics post-processor XSenkplot [8] to identify important species and reactions. The refined mechanism was used to simulate the flame speeds. Rough agreement between the computed and measured flames speeds was initially found, and the rate constants were then adjusted/optimized within their uncertainty limits (factors of about 1.3 to 2.0) to achieve best agreement.

3. Rate Constant Evaluation

We provide here a short discussion of the rate constants evaluated and utilized in this work. Key rate expressions are provided in Table 1. The rate expressions for hydrogen-oxygen chemistry and hydrocarbon/oxidized hydrocarbon chemistry were taken from GRI-Mech 3.0 [9], while those for H/O/F chemistry were based on our fits to rate constants reported in the literature [10-12].

The rate expression for $CH_2F_2 \rightarrow CHF + HF$ was derived from the shock tube measurements for the analogous reaction $CHF_3 \rightarrow CF_2 + HF$ by Schug and Wagner [13] and employing the very rough relative decomposition rates for CH_2F_2 and CHF_3 from the pyrolysis study of Politanskii and Shevchuk [14]. This scaled rate expression was then refined during our optimizations. It was found that the flame speeds could not be modeled with a pressure independent rate constant for this unimolecular reaction. It was necessary to use a pressure-dependent rate constant of the form $Rate = k_0[M] + k_1$, where the pressure dependent term $k_0[M]$ dominated – suggesting that the reaction was approaching the low pressure limit under (P, T) conditions in the flame.

The rate expressions for H abstractions from CH_2F_2 by the flame radicals H, O, OH, and F were evaluated in this work. In our evaluation, we utilized rate constants from the literature [15-21] and then fit them to extended Arrhenius rate expressions to provide rate constants over a wide range of temperatures. Depending upon the reaction, available data, and fitting procedures, we estimate uncertainty factors on the order of about (1.3 to 1.6) for these reactions.

The rate constants for $CHF_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + OH$ and $CHF + O_2 \rightarrow CHFO + O$ were estimated by analogy to those for $CH_3 + O_2 \rightarrow CH_2O + OH$ and $CF_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + O$, respectively [22-23]. Both of the former reactions are significantly more exothermic (~100 kJ mol⁻¹) than the reference reactions, and consequently should have much smaller barriers. For the $CHF_2 + O_2$ and $CHF + O_2$ reactions, we initially estimated activation energies on the order of (15 to 20) kJ mol⁻¹ and (20 to 25) kJ mol⁻¹, but our optimizations compared to our measured flame speeds suggest somewhat smaller activation energies – on the order of (5 to 15) kJ mol⁻¹ and (15 to 25) kJ mol⁻¹, respectively.

The rate expression for $CHF_2 + CHF_2 \rightarrow CHF=CF_2 + H$ used in this work is from the earlier ab initio transition state and RRKM calculations by Burgess et al [24]. Although this is a primary pathway, this reaction has a small impact on flames speeds (< 3 %) and combustion – it simply provides a pathway to products. We utilized the rate expression for $CHF + H_2O \rightarrow CH_2O + HF$ from the ab initio transition state and RRKM calculations of Zachariah et al [25]. This reaction is a major destruction pathway for CHF and the primary pathway leading to the formation of HO_2 ($CH_2O + OH \rightarrow CHO + H_2O$, followed by $CHO + O_2 \rightarrow CO + HO_2$). This reaction, however, contributes a negligible amount (<0.1 %) to changes in flame speeds – it is largely a conduit for establishing steady state concentrations during the pre-ignition process.

For the reactions R^{\bullet} (CHF₂, CF₂, CHF) + X (H, O, OH, F), we utilized rate constants from the literature. These reactions are generally very fast and contribute negligible amounts to flame speeds and little to the combustion chemistry other than to provide pathways to complete combustion. Similarly, reactions involving CHFO, CF₂O, and CFO, contribute negligible amounts to changes in flame speeds, and provide pathways to combustion products.

Table 1: Rate parameters for elementary reactions employed in the model. The rate constants have the Arrhenius form $k = Ae^{-E/RT}$ where A, E, and R are the pre-exponential, activation energy, and the gas constant, respectively. Units are mol, cm³, s, kJ. Note: these are only rate expressions developed as part of this work. Rate expressions for other reactions used in the model were taken from the literature (see text).

Reaction		Α	Ε
$CH_2F_2 + M$	\rightarrow CHF + HF + M	5.9E+17	295.0
CH ₂ F ₂	\rightarrow CHF + HF	4.9E+11	272.0
$CH_2F_2 + H$	\rightarrow CHF ₂ + H ₂	2.5E+14	62.5
$CH_2F_2 + O$	\rightarrow CHF ₂ + OH	1.9E+14	56.3
$CH_2F_2 + OH$	\rightarrow CHF ₂ + H ₂ O	1.7E+13	30.0
$CH_2F_2 + F$	\rightarrow CHF ₂ + HF	3.1E+14	19.4
$CHF_2 \ + O_2$	\rightarrow CF ₂ O + OH	4.9E+10	14.6
$CHF + O_2$	\rightarrow CHFO + O	2.2E+13	20.9

4. **Results and Discussion**

Figure 1 shows the experimentally-derived flames speeds (points) and the modeled flame speeds (curves). The solid symbols show the flame speeds corrected using an optically thin radiation model, while the open symbols show the uncorrected flames for 1 bar (2 and 3 bar data not shown for clarity). The deviations between the experimental flame speeds and the model predictions are on the order of (1 to 3) %. This is excellent agreement given that the uncertainties in the flames speeds are on the order of (10 to 20) % due to uncertainties in the rate constants which are multiplicative factors of about 1.5 to 2.0. As seen in Figure 1, the flame speeds are roughly linear with pressure suggesting the rate constant *Rate* = $k_0[M] + k_1$ is approaching the low pressure limit.

The optically thin (limit) radiation model correction increases flames speeds by about (19 ± 2) % relative to those computed using adiabatic flame temperatures (shown for 1 bar) and is independent (<1 %) of equivalence ratio. When estimated radiation absorption corrections are used for each major species, flame speeds decrease by about (8±3) % relative to those using the optically thin radiation model (not shown). Given the insensitivity of the corrections to equivalence ratio, the rate constants for the primary reactions contributing to flame speeds can be easily adjusted to correct for absorption of radiation. The correction using the optically thin radiation model translates into changes in the rate constants of about 40% (this is shown for 1 bar). This is lower than the uncertainties in the rate constants which have uncertainty factors of about 1.4 to 2.0.

We note that under lean conditions (where flame stretch is most important) the measured flame speeds $S_u(T,P)$ appear to be slightly higher (3 to 6) % than the modeled flame speeds. Recently, we have reprocessed the data better fitting the burning velocity / temperature-pressure curves $S_u(T,P)$ and find lower burning velocities under lean conditions at 1 atm in good agreement (<3 %) with the model (these data are not shown, because we have not re-optimized model yet). In addition, we are currently in the process of optimizing the temperature and pressure dependencies of the rate constants by considering measurements that we have made using argon/O₂ mixtures (instead of air mixtures). The lower heat capacity of argon increases flame temperatures and thus increases flame speeds (by about a factor of 2). The refined experimental data and re-optimized rate constants are likely to provide better agreement between measured and model flame speeds.

Figure 2 shows the dependence of flame speeds for the three most important reactions as a function of equivalence ratio. The dependencies are on the order of (5 to 20) %, while all other reactions are less than 3 % and relatively independent of equivalence ratios. The quantity shown here is the percent change in flame speed relative to a change in rate constant. That is, a value of 20 % would mean increasing a rate constant by 10 % would result in an increase of 2 % in flame speed. The two most important reactions are the unimolecular decomposition of the refrigerant $CH_2F_2 \rightarrow CHF$ + HF and the subsequent reaction of its decomposition product CHF with oxygen in the mixture $CHF + O_2 \rightarrow CHFO + O$. Both of these reactions contribute to increases in flame speeds. In contrast, H abstraction from the refrigerant $CH_2F_2 + H \rightarrow CHF_2 + H_2$ causes a decrease in flame speeds – it inhibits the flame by consuming the radical H atom during pre-ignition that otherwise would be involved in radical chain branching leading to ignition.

Reaction pathway analysis and flame speed dependencies of rate constants show that burning of R-32 can be described by two quasi-separate reaction pathways. The first stage is pre-ignition driven by unimolecular decomposition of CH_2F_2 forming CHF. The subsequent second stage is a combustion pathway driven by H abstraction by flame radicals H, O, OH, and F forming CHF₂. Both CHF and CHF₂ then react quickly with the reactant O₂ to form the fluorocarbonyls CHFO and CF₂O, respectively. The pre-ignition pathway is primarily responsible for generation of initial flame radicals and hence drives flame propagation, while the combustion pathway occurs after ignition, mediated by flame radicals, and drives the process to products. Interestingly, reactions in the combustion pathway actually inhibit ignition by consuming radicals needed for chain branching – tying up the chemistry in relatively stable intermediates that are slow to decompose.



Figure 1: Comparison between measured and model flame speeds for CH₂F₂/air mixtures.

Figure 2: Dependence of flame speeds on the three most important rate constants.

5. Conclusions

In this work, a mechanism for the combustion of the refrigerant R-32 (CH₂F₂) in air mixtures was developed and validated through comparisons with measured flame speeds for a range of equivalence ratios (0.9 to 1.5) and pressures (1 to 3 bar) using a constant-volume spherical flame method. Premixed flame calculations were performed and analyzed to identify primary species and reactions contributing to flame speeds and combustion. We found that there were just three HFC reactions that contributed significantly to flame speeds. Their rate constants were optimized (within their uncertainty limits) and the model showed excellent agreement (<3 %) with measured flame speeds. Ongoing experiments and modeling will refine this model using other conditions such using Ar/O_2 mixtures (instead of air) to change flame temperatures and the addition of H₂O and H₂ to change the concentration of flame radicals. The radiation parameters will also be improved. This work will be also extended to other refrigerants: the fluoroethanes R-125, R-134a, and R-152a and the hydrofluoroolefins HFO-1234yf (2,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene) and HFO-1234ze (1,3,3,3-tetrafluoropropene).

6. Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Buildings Technologies Office of the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy under contract no. DE-EE0007615 with Antonio Bouza serving as Project Manager.

7. References

- [1] R. Burrell, J. L. Pagliaro, G. T. Linteris, Effects of stretch and thermal radiation on difluoromethane-air burning velocity measurements in constant volume spherically expanding flames, Proc. Combust. Inst. 37 (2018) submitted.
- [2] C. Xiouris, T.L. Ye, J. Jayachandran, F. N. Egolfopoulos, Laminar flame speeds under engine-relevant conditions: Uncertainty quantification and minimization in spherically expanding flame experiments, Combust. Flame 163 (2016) 270-283.
- [3] Z. Chen, Effects of radiation absorption on spherical flame propagation and radiationinduced uncertainty in laminar flame speed measurement, Proc. Combust. Inst. 36 (2017) 1129-1136.
- [4] F.J. Wu, W.K. Liang, Z. Chen, Y.G. Ju, C.K. Law, Uncertainty in Stretch Extrapolation of Laminar Flame Speed from Expanding Spherical Flames, Proc. Combustion Inst. 35 (2015) 663-670.
- [5] K. Takizawa, S. Takagi, K. Tokuhashi, S. Kondo, M. Mamiya, H. Nagai, Assessment of. Burning Velocity Test Methods for Mildly Flammable Refrigerants, Part 1: Closed-Vessel Method, ASHRAE Trans. 119 (2013) 243-254.
- [6] R. J. Kee, J. F. Grcar, M. D. Smooke, J. A. Miller, PREMIX: A Fortran Program for Modeling Steady Laminar One-Dimensional Premixed Flames (Version 2.5b), Report No. SAND85-8240, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California, 1992.
- [7] D. G. Goodwin, H. K. Moffat, R. L. Speth, Cantera, Ver. 2.3.0, 2017. http://www.cantera.org
- [8] D. Burgess, J. Racek, XSenkplot: An Interactive, Graphics Postprocesser for Numerical Simulations of Chemical Kinetics, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, 1996.
- [9] G. P. Smith, D. M. Golden, M. Frenklach, N. W. Moriarty, B. Eiteneer, M. Goldenberg, C. T. Bowman, R. K. Hanson, S. Song, W. C. Gardiner, Jr., V. V. Lissianski, Z. Qin, GRI-Mech 3.0, 1999.
- [10] A. Persky, H. Kornweitz, The kinetics of the reaction $F+H_2 \rightarrow HF+H$, Inter. J. Chem. Kinet. 29 (1997) 67-71.
- [11] PS Stevens, WH Brune, JG Anderson, Kinetic and mechanistic investigations of F atom + water and F atom + hydrogen over the temperature range 240-373 K, J. Phys. Chem. 93 (1989) 4068.
- [12] C. D. Walther, H. G. Wagner, Uber die Reaktionen von F-atomen mit H₂O, H₂O₂ und NH₃, Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem. 87 (1983) 403.
- [13] Schug, K. P.; Wagner, H. Gg., Zum thermischen zerfall von CH₃F, Z. Phys. Chem. 86 (1973) 59.
- [14] S. F. Politanski, U. V. Shevchuk, Thermal conversions of fluoromethanes. II. Pyrolysis of difluoromethane and trifluoromethane, Kinet. Catal. 9 (1968) 411.
- [15] G. O. Pritchard, M. J. Perona, Some hydrogen atom abstraction reactions of CF₂H and CFH₂ radicals, and the C-H bond dissociation energy in CF₂H₂, Inter. J. Chem. Kinet. 1 (1969) 509-525.

- [16] A. A. Westenberg, N. DeHaas, Rates of H + CH₃X reactions, J. Chem. Phys. 62 (1975) 3321.
- [17] A. Miyoshi, K. Ohmori, K. Tsuchiya, H. Matsui, Reaction rates of atomic oxygen with straight chain alkanes and fluoromethanes at high temperatures, Chem. Phys. Lett. 204 (1993) 241-247.
- [18] A. Matsugi, H. Shiina, Kinetics of hydrogen abstraction reactions from fluoromethanes and fluoroethanes, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn. 87 (2014) 890-901.
- [19] A. Persky, The temperature dependence of the rate constants for the reactions F+CH₃F and F+CH₂F₂, Chem. Phys. Lett. 376 (2003) 181-187.
- [20] L. Wang, J. Y. Liu, Z. S. Li, Ab initio direct dynamics studies on the hydrogen abstraction reactions of CF₂H₂ and CF₃H with F atom, Chem. Phys. 351 (2008) 154-158.
- [21] J. B. Burkholder, J. Sander, J. R. Abbat, R. E. Huie, C. E. Kolb, M. J. Kurylo, V. L. Orkin, D. M. Wilmouth, P. H. Wine, Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Atmospheric Studies, JPL Publication 15-10, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, 2015. http://jpldataeval.jpl.nasa.gov
- [22] N. K. Srinivasan, M. C. Su, J. W. Sutherland, J. V. Michael, Reflected shock tube studies of high-temperature rate constants for CH₃+O₂, H₂CO+O₂, OH+O₂. J. Phys. Chem. A 109 (2005) 7902-7914.
- [23] EL Keating, RA Matula, The high temperature oxidation of tetrafluoroethylene, J. Chem. Phys. 66 (1977) 1237.
- [24] D. Burgess Jr., M.R. Zachariah, W. Tsang and P.R. Westmoreland, Thermochemical and Chemical Kinetic Data for Fluorinated Hydrocarbons, Prog. Energ. Comb. Sci., 21 (1996) 453-529.
- [25] M. R. Zachariah, P. R. Westmoreland, D. Burgess, Jr., Theoretical Prediction of Thermochemistry and Kinetics of Halocarbons, in ACS Volume 611 on Halon Replacements, 1995, pp. 358-373.