

# Joint PDF Closure of Turbulent Premixed Flames

Mathias L. Hack\*, Patrick Jenny\*

hack@ifd.mavt.ethz.ch

\*Institut of Fluid Dynamics, ETH Zurich, Sonneggstr. 3, 8092 Zurich

## Abstract

In this paper, a novel model for turbulent premixed combustion in the corrugated flamelet regime is presented, which is based on transporting a joint probability density function (PDF) of velocity, turbulence frequency and a scalar vector. Due to the high dimensionality of the corresponding sample space, the PDF equation is solved with a Monte-Carlo method, where individual fluid elements are represented by computational particles. Unlike in most other PDF methods, the source term not only describes reaction rates, but accounts for "ignition" of reactive unburnt fluid elements due to propagating embedded quasi laminar flames within a turbulent flame brush. If one assumes unperturbed embedded flame structures and a constant laminar flame speed (as expected in the corrugated flamelet regime), then the mean flame surface density and thus the probability for an individual particle to "ignite" during a time step can rigorously be calculated within the proposed modeling framework. This is achieved by introducing the following particle properties: a flag indicating whether a particle represents the unburnt mixture; a flame residence time, which allows to resolve the embedded quasi laminar flame structure; and a flag indicating whether the flame residence time lies within a specified range. Latter, together with precomputed one dimensional laminar flames, allows to accurately estimate the flame surface density and thus the "ignition" probability. In addition to the turbulent flame brush, molecular mixing of the products with a co-flow has to be modeled. Therefore a modified interaction by exchange with the mean (IEM) mixing model is employed, but it has to be emphasized that this is not critical for the propagation of the turbulent premixed flame. For example, no mixing model is required, if the co-flow consists of the hot product composition. To validate the proposed PDF model, simulation results of three piloted methane-air Bunsen flames are compared with experimental data and very good agreement is observed.

## Introduction

Most combustion applications operate at highly turbulent flow conditions, such that accurate descriptions of turbulence, chemistry and their interaction are crucial for reliable predictions. Whereas for non-premixed combustion various models depend on the mixture fraction, for premixed turbulent combustion no such general approach exists. One existing approach is the model by Bray, Moss and Libby [1]. In their original version it is assumed that the gas is either unburnt or fully burnt. In the transport equation for an averaged progress variable, turbulent convection and mean source term are unclosed. Although progress has been made in modeling the mean source term, this still is an issue in that context; as well as a general closure for turbulent convection capable of properly accounting for counter-gradient diffusion. Another approach are flamelet models [2] based on the level-set formulation [3]. An iso-surface of a non-reacting scalar  $G$  describes the position of the flame front, for which a transport equation is solved. Issues due to counter-gradient diffusion are avoided with this approach and it allows to study instantaneous flame dynamics. It is not straightforward however, to achieve closure for turbulent premixed flames.

Here a new modeling approach for premixed turbulent flames in the corrugated flamelet regime is presented. It is based on solving a transport equation for the joint PDF of velocity,

turbulence frequency and a scalar vector with a hybrid particle/finite volume method [4, 5]. Like in other joint velocity composition PDF methods turbulent convection appears in closed form. The source term describes the rate at which unburnt particles get "ignited" by the embedded propagating quasi laminar flame, i.e. it reflects the coupled fine-scale convection-diffusion-reaction dynamics in the flame. For closure, the particle properties  $c^* \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\tau^* \geq 0$  are introduced. Similar as in the BML model, the progress variable  $c^*$  is zero, if a particle represents the unburnt gas mixture; otherwise  $c^* = 1$ . The flame residence time  $\tau$  is zero if  $c^* = 0$ ; else it represents the elapsed time since  $c^*$  switched from zero to one. This allows to resolve the embedded quasi laminar flame structure by mapping  $\tau^*$  onto the space coordinate of a precomputed one dimensional laminar flame profile. To estimate the mean flame surface density  $\langle \Sigma \rangle$  and thus the particle "ignition" probability  $P$ , the binary indicator function  $d(\tau^*) \in \{0, 1\}$  is introduced; it is zero except if  $0 \leq \tau_a < \tau^* \leq \tau_a + \tau_d$  and  $c^* = 1$ , where  $\tau_d$  is a specified small time constant and  $\tau_a$  is the corresponding time of the flame surface in the one-dimensional laminar flame table. As a direct consequence, under the assumptions made for the corrugated flamelet regime, turbulent premixed combustion can be described without further modeling, i.e. besides numerical inaccuracies the only uncertainty which arises is due to the stochastic model for the velocity components (turbulence model). Note that this is a unique property of this combined PDF-flamelet-progress variable approach. Numerical results of three piloted premixed jet flames and comparisons with corresponding experimental data demonstrate the generality and accuracy of this new approach, where a mixing model is needed only to account for the molecular mixing of the products with the co-flow.

In the following section, a general outline of the joint PDF method is presented. Then the closure for combustion is explained, the tabulation procedure is discussed and it is shown how molecular mixing between products co-flow can be modeled. Finally, numerical validation studies are presented and conclusions are given.

### Joint PDF Method

In this section, a brief outline of the PDF modeling framework used here is presented. Let  $\tilde{g}$  be the one-point one-time Eulerian mass-weighted joint PDF of (Favre) fluctuating velocity  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)^T$ , turbulence frequency  $\omega$  and the scalar vector  $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_{N_s})$  ( $N_s$  is the number of scalars). The corresponding sample space variables are  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3)^T$  for the fluctuating velocities,  $\theta$  for the turbulence frequency and  $\Psi = (\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_{N_s})$  for the scalars. Then, the mass density function (MDF)  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{v}, \theta, \Psi, \mathbf{x}, t) = \langle \rho \rangle (\Psi, \mathbf{x}, t) \tilde{g}(\mathbf{v}, \theta, \Psi; \mathbf{x}, t), \quad (1)$$

where  $\langle \rho \rangle$  is the mean density. Here, the first scalar represents the (inert) mixture fraction  $Z$ , i.e.  $\Phi_1 = Z$ , the second scalar the progress variable  $c$  and the third one the flame residence time  $\tau$ . From the Navier-Stokes and scalar conservation equations the transport equation for  $\mathcal{G}$  can be derived exactly [5]; it reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{G} (\tilde{U}_j + v_j)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \tilde{U}_i}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \mathcal{G} v_j}{\partial v_i} + \frac{1}{\langle \rho \rangle} \frac{\partial \langle \rho \rangle \tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial v_i} \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial v_i} \left( \mathcal{G} \left\langle \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} - \frac{1}{\langle \rho \rangle} \frac{\partial \langle p \rangle}{\partial x_i} - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \tau_{ij}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{1}{\langle \rho \rangle} \frac{\partial \langle \tau_{ij} \rangle}{\partial x_j} \right|_{\mathbf{v}, \theta, \Psi} \right) \\ &- \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left( \mathcal{G} \left\langle \frac{D\omega}{Dt} \right|_{\mathbf{v}, \theta, \Psi} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \Psi_\beta} \left( \mathcal{G} \left\langle \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial J_i^\beta}{\partial x_i} \right|_{\mathbf{v}, \theta, \Psi} \right) - \frac{\partial \mathcal{G} S_\beta}{\partial \Psi_\beta} + S^c(\mathcal{G}) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Favre-averaged quantities are denoted as  $\widetilde{\cdot}$ , Reynolds-averaged quantities as  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  and volume weighted conditional expectations as  $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ . The variable  $p$  means pressure,  $\rho$  density,  $\tau_{ij}$  is the viscous stress tensor,  $\mathbf{J}^\beta$  is the molecular diffusion flux of scalar  $\beta$  and  $S_\beta$  is the source term of scalar  $\beta$ . Moreover, the source  $\mathcal{S}^c$  describes discontinuous evolutions; here in particular transitions (jumps) of  $\Phi_2 = c$  from zero to one. In the case of a continuously evolving progress variable  $\mathcal{S}^c$  would vanish. Note that the left-hand side of eq. (2) is closed (below it is explained how  $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}$  is provided); the conditional expectations on the right-hand side (rhs) on the other hand require modeling. Here, the simplified Langevin model (SLM) [6] is used to close the first rhs-term and another stochastic model is employed for the turbulence frequency [7] in the second rhs-term. It will become clear later that the molecular diffusion flux in the third rhs-term is non-zero only for the scalars  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_3$ , for which a modified IEM mixing model [8] is devised (see section "Molecular Mixing"). The fourth rhs-term is non-zero only for scalar  $\Phi_3 = \tau$ , i.e.  $S_\beta = \delta_{3\beta}\Psi_2$ , where  $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$  is the Kronecker delta. Therefore  $\tau$  (which by definition is zero for  $c = 0$ ) represents the time, which elapsed since  $c$  switched from zero to one. The probability for this transition from  $c = 0$  to  $c = 1$  is the topic of the following two sections.


Note that equation (2) is not complete, since  $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}$  cannot be extracted from the MDF  $\mathcal{G}$ . Therefore, simultaneously to the modeled version of eq. (2), the Reynolds averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) equations are solved to provide the mean velocity. Vice versa, the unclosed terms in the RANS equations are obtained from  $\mathcal{G}$ . For the RANS equations a finite volume solver is employed and due to the high dimensionality of the sample space a Monte Carlo method is used to solve eq. (2). In the Monte Carlo method Lagrangian particles consistently evolve in the  $\mathbf{v}$ - $\theta$ - $\Psi$ -space according to stochastic differential equations (SDE), such that the MDF is represented by the particle ensemble density. Such internally consistent hybrid particle/finite volume PDF solution algorithms proved to be much more efficient than stand-alone particle methods; more details are provided in [4].

## Combustion Modeling Approach

In this section, the general framework of the new combustion model for turbulent premixed combustion in the corrugated flamelet regime is presented. To simplify the explanations, we consider the computational particles in the PDF solution algorithm, which can also be viewed as representative fluid elements. Essential for the proposed modeling approach are the individual particle properties  $Z^*$ ,  $c^* \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\tau^* \geq 0$  representing the mixture fraction, a progress variable and a flame residence time. Moreover, we introduce the function  $d(\tau^*)$  (from now on denoted as  $d^*$ ), which is one for  $0 \leq \tau_a < \tau^* \leq \tau_a + \tau_d$  and  $c^* = 1$  and zero otherwise. The scalars  $c^*$  and  $\tau^*$  are crucial to model the turbulent flame brush; the mixture fraction on the other hand quantifies the level of molecular mixing between the reaction products and a potential co-flow stream. Next, the roles of these particle properties are further detailed.

The scalar  $c^*$  is a flag indicating whether a particle represents the unburnt reactive mixture. In that case  $c^* = 0$ , else  $c^* = 1$ . In the case of infinitely thin embedded flames  $c^*$  can be interpreted as a normalized temperature; similar as in the BML model [1]. Here, however, the embedded flame structure is not infinitely thin and to account for that, the flame residence time  $\tau^*$  is useful. As already mentioned, it is non-zero only if  $c^* = 1$  and reflects the time which elapsed since  $c^*$  switched from zero to one, i.e. since the particle was "reached" by the embedded flame surface (marking the very front of the embedded flame). Since at this point the corrugated flamelet regime is considered, the embedded flame structure and the laminar flame speed  $s_L$  are assumed to remain unaffected by the turbulent eddies and can be obtained from precomputed steady laminar 1D flames. Note that for these calculations complex mechanisms can be considered. Now it is straightforward to consistently map  $\tau^*$  onto the spatial coordinate of that 1D flame

and to retrieve mass fractions and temperature via cheap table lookup. More about tabulation and lookup follows in section "Tabulation". A sketch of such a steady laminar premixed flame



**Figure 1:** Sketch of a steady laminar 1D flame profile showing  $T$  (solid line),  $c$  (dashed line) and  $\tau$ .

profile is depicted in figure 1, where the temperature varies from  $T_u$  in the unburnt mixture to the adiabatic equilibrium temperature  $T_b$  on the burnt side. Shown is also the variation of  $c$  along the flame and the arrow at the bottom indicates the increasing flame residence time  $\tau$  from left to right where  $c = 1$ .

The crucial remaining question is: when does the  $c^*$  value of a particle switch from zero to one? During a given time step, this occurs with the probability  $P$  and it will be shown in the following section how it can be calculated without further modeling assumptions.

To summarize, during each time step the position  $\mathbf{X}^*$  of a computational particle evolves according to its individual velocity  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{X}^*) + \mathbf{u}^*$ , whereas the fluctuating velocity  $\mathbf{u}^*$  is updated according to the simplified Langevin model (SLM) [6] and the turbulent frequency  $\omega^*$  by solving another stochastic model equation [7]. Then, if the value of  $c^*$  is zero, it is set to one with probability  $P$  and if  $c^* = 1$ , the flame residence time is incremented by the time step size. Now mass fractions and temperature are retrieved from the precomputed tables and a modified IEM model is employed to account for micro-mixing of the products with a potential co-flow stream; details are provided in section "Molecular Mixing".

### Ignition Probability

In the corrugated flamelet regime, the probability  $P$  that a particle is "reached" by the embedded flame during a time step of size  $\Delta t$  is a function of the mean flame surface density  $\langle \Sigma \rangle$  and the laminar flame speed  $s_L$  (which is assumed constant here). For infinitesimal small time steps one can write  $P = F\Delta t$ , but to always ensure that  $P \in [0, 1]$  the formulation

$$P = 1 - e^{-F\Delta t} \quad (3)$$

is employed; note that  $F$  is the ignition probability density. To derive an expression for  $P$ , an ergodic statistical fine scale picture of turbulent premixed flames is considered. A sketch of an instantaneous snapshot is depicted in figure 2, where the solid line represents the embedded flame front at time  $t$  within a volume  $\Omega$ . The shaded area  $\Omega_d$  represents the fluid volume, which was "consumed" by this flame front since the time  $t - \tau_d$ . Note that  $\Omega_d$  is approximately equal to  $A_F l_d$ , where  $A_F$  is the flame surface area and  $l_d$  the separation distance between the flame front and a fluid element, which was located on the flame front at time  $t - \tau_d$ . Taking the ensemble average of many such realizations leads to

$$\langle \Omega_d \rangle \approx \langle A_F l_d \rangle = \langle A_F \rangle l_d \quad (4)$$

and since  $l_d$  is approximately constant in the context of the corrugated flamelet regime (for fix  $\tau_d$ ) one can write

$$\langle A_F \rangle = \lim_{\tau_d \rightarrow 0} \langle \Omega_d \rangle / l_d. \quad (5)$$

With these definitions, the mean flame surface density is

$$\langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{\langle A_F \rangle}{\Omega} = \lim_{\tau_d \rightarrow 0} \frac{\langle \Omega_d \rangle}{l_d \Omega}, \quad (6)$$

i.e. it can be calculated, if  $\langle \Omega_d \rangle$  can be estimated for small  $\tau_d$ . It turns out that the proposed PDF modeling framework offers the unique opportunity to close this modeling problem without any further assumptions, since for a small  $\tau_d$  the volume  $\langle \Omega_d \rangle = \langle d \rangle \Omega$ , which can easily be estimated (see section "Combustion Modeling Approach", where the binary function  $d(\tau)$  was introduced). Thus, from eq. (6) one obtains the closed expression

$$\langle \Sigma \rangle \approx \frac{\langle d \rangle}{l_d}. \quad (7)$$

Since the probability for an unburnt fluid element to be "reached" by the propagating embedded flame sheet during the next infinitesimal time interval is

$$F dt = \frac{\langle \Sigma \rangle s_L \Omega}{\Omega_u} dt \approx \frac{\langle d \rangle}{1 - \langle c \rangle} \frac{s_L}{l_d} dt, \quad (8)$$


where  $\Omega_u = (1 - \langle c \rangle) \Omega$  is the volume of unburnt gas. Note that the laminar flame speed  $s_L$  is assumed to be a function of the unburnt gas composition and temperature only and that expression (8) is only correct, if all particles with  $c^* = 0$  have the same density  $\rho = \rho_u$ , i.e. if the flame sheet marks the very front of the embedded flame where  $T \approx T_u$ . With this result, for small time steps of length  $\Delta t$ , one obtains the closed expression

$$P \approx 1 - e^{-\frac{\langle d \rangle}{1 - \langle c \rangle} \frac{s_L}{l_d} \Delta t} \quad (9)$$


for the ignition probability, which becomes exact for  $(\tau_d, \Delta t) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ .

### Tabulation

To generalize the combustion model for scenarios where  $Z$  of the unburnt reactive mixture varies, multiple laminar 1D flames have to be precomputed and tabulated; i.e. for an adequate number of mixture fraction values in the flammable range. Between these selected  $Z$  values, linear interpolation is applied. Outside the flammable range, i.e. where the mixture fraction is smaller than an appropriately specified  $Z_f$ , diffusion dominates and therefore the species mass fractions and temperature are linearly interpolated between the values corresponding to  $Z_f$  and the ones in the co-flow stream where  $Z = 0$ . A sketch of the resulting temperature manifold, i.e. of  $T_m(Z, \tau)$ , is depicted in figure 3. This temperature, and similarly also species mass fractions, can be tabulated as functions of mixture fraction and flame residence time and thus can be retrieved during PDF simulations by simple and cheap lookup operations. These precomputed



**Figure 2:** Sketch of an instantaneous flame surface with the volumes  $\Omega_u$  (left) and  $\Omega_d$  (shaded).



**Figure 3:** Sketch of the normalized temperature  $\hat{T}$  as a function of  $Z$  and  $\tau$ .

tables have some similarities with the ones used in the flamelet generated manifolds (FGM) method [9] or in the flame prolongation of the ILDM method (FPI) [10]. There however, different "control variables" are employed.

### Molecular Mixing

For the closure of the third rhs-term in equation (2), which here affects the  $Z^*$  and  $\tau^*$  values of the computational particles, a variety of micro-mixing models have been proposed in the past [8, 11, 12, 13]. In the context of the proposed PDF method, the interaction by exchange with the mean (IEM) model is employed to account for molecular mixing of mixture fraction and temperature. Then, under the assumption that the temperature must lie on the manifold  $T_m(Z, \tau)$  and since it is a monotonous function of both  $Z$  and  $\tau$ , it is straight forward to determine the new pair  $(Z^*, \tau^*)$  from the new values of  $Z^*$  and  $T^*$ , i.e. after the mixing model has been applied for  $Z^*$  and  $T^*$ , the mapping  $(Z^*, T^*) \rightarrow (Z^*, \tau^*)$  is applied. While it is clear that the "effective" flame residence time of a particle changes due to molecular mixing, it is questionable whether a mixing model designed for inert scalars like mixture fractions can directly be employed to describe the effect on  $\tau^*$ . Therefore it is not surprising that the mechanical-to-scalar time scale ratio  $C_\Phi$  had to be increased from from 2 (standard value for inert scalars) to 8. Note that the situation here is different than in other combustion modeling approaches, where the mechanical-to-scalar time scale ratio had to be adjusted for reactive flows, since some scalar gradients are affected by chemistry. Lindstedt and Vaos [14] investigated the influence of varying  $C_\Phi$  in the range [2.0, 8.0] for a turbulent premixed combustion model based on a transported joint composition

PDF method with a reduced chemical reaction scheme. Stöllinger and Heinz [15] showed good agreement of a piloted premixed burner with a value of  $C_\phi = 12.0$ ; also within a joint composition PDF framework combined with a skeletal mechanism. More recently, Rowinski and Pope [16] presented a detailed study of  $C_\phi$  and concluded that increasing  $C_\phi$  improves the prediction of the flame temperature, whereas a value of approximately 2.0 is most appropriate for inert scalars like the mixture fraction. In conclusion of this section it is re-emphasized that in the PDF method devised in this paper the mixing model is only required to account for molecular mixing between the products and the air co-flow stream, but not to predict the dynamics of the turbulent flame brush.


## Results

For validation, numerical calculations for three axisymmetric premixed piloted bunsen flames [17] were performed. Each of these flames has three inflow streams, i.e. an unburnt reactive jet encircled by a hot pilot, both surrounded by a slow ambient air co-flow. The jet bulk velocities are  $U_0 = 30m/s$  (flame F3),  $U_0 = 50m/s$  (flame F2) and  $U_0 = 65m/s$  (flame F1), and the reference turbulent kinetic energies are  $k_0 = 3.82m^2/s^2$ ,  $k_0 = 10.8m^2/s^2$  and  $k_0 = 12.7m^2/s^2$ , respectively. The adiabatic temperature of the fully burnt mixture is  $T_b = 2248K$  and that of the unburnt jet stream and the co-flow is  $T_u = 298K$ . Profiles at the jet inflow of mean and root mean square (rms) velocities  $\bar{U}_1$  and  $u_1^{rms}$ , respectively, are directly adopted from [17] and the estimation  $\overline{u_1 u_2} \approx 0.5u_1^{rms}u_2^{rms}$  is used for the velocity covariance (subscripts 1 and 2 indicate axial and radial components, respectively). The turbulence frequency  $\omega$  at the jet inflow is set proportional to  $(\overline{u_i u_i}/3)^{0.5}/D$ , where  $D = 0.012m$  is the jet diameter. Pilot and co-flow have uniform mean velocities, i.e.  $1.3m/s$  in the hot pilot,  $1.0m/s$  in the cold pilot and  $0.5m/s$  in the co-flow. The rms-velocities are  $u_1 = u_2 = 0.1m/s$  for the pilot and  $u_1 = u_2 = 0.05m/s$  for the co-flow. The turbulence frequency for the pilot is  $10^3s^{-1}$  and  $10^2s^{-1}$  for the co-flow. From now on it is convenient to consider the following normalized quantities: the normalized mean axial velocity  $\hat{U} = \bar{U}/U_0$ , the normalized turbulent kinetic energy  $\hat{k} = \bar{k}/k_0$  and the normalized temperature  $\hat{T} = (T - T_u)/(T_b - T_u)$ . Normalized temperature and mixture fraction are  $\hat{T} = 0$  and  $Z = 1$  in the jet,  $\hat{T} = 0$  and  $Z = 0$  in the co-flow, and  $\hat{T} = 0.8$  and  $Z = Z_p$  such that  $\hat{T}_m(Z_p, \tau \rightarrow \infty) = 0.8$ .


For the simulations presented in this paper, the simplified manifold  $\hat{T}_m(Z, \tau) = \hat{T}_{st}(\tau)Z$  was employed, whereas  $\hat{T}_{st}(\tau)$  is the normalized temperature along the profile of a premixed 1D flame with stoichiometric mixture ( $Z = 1$ ). In the manifold, by construction  $c$  is one where  $0.05 \leq \hat{T}$  and zero otherwise and the function  $d(\tau)$  is chosen such that it is one for  $0.2 \leq \hat{T} \leq 0.8$  and zero otherwise; note that this defines  $\tau_d = 0.227 \cdot 10^{-3}s$  and  $l_d = 0.386 \cdot 10^{-3}m$ . For molecular mixing with the co-flow,  $C_\phi$  values in the range between 2 and 10 were considered. The best agreement for flame F3 was obtained for  $C_\phi = 8$ ; the same value was then also employed for the simulations of flames F2 and F1.

For the computations a rectangular plane of  $0.6m$  in axial direction (starting at the nozzle exit) and  $0.1m$  in radial direction (starting at the symmetry-axis) was considered and a  $50 \times 50$  non-equidistant grid with an average of 20 computational particles per cell was used. To investigate the numerical convergence with respect to grid refinement and particle number, an additional simulation of flame F3 on a  $80 \times 80$  grid and 30 particles per cell in average was performed; comparison with the result obtained with the  $50 \times 50$  grid and 20 particles per cell shows very little difference.

In figure 4 and 5, the normalized mean downstream velocity  $\hat{U}_1$  and the normalized turbulent kinetic energy  $\hat{k}$  of the non-reactive flow cases are presented. The solid lines represent the simulation results and the circles the experimental data. In general good agreement can be



**Figure 4:** Radial profiles of the normalized mean downstream velocity  $\hat{U}_1$  for the three cold cases at several downstream locations (circles: experiment; solid lines: numerical simulation).




**Figure 5:** Radial profiles of the normalized turbulent kinetic energy  $\hat{k}$  for the three cold cases at several downstream locations (circles: experiment; solid lines: numerical simulation).


observed, except for the slight under-prediction of  $\hat{k}$  far downstream. For the reactive flow simulations the same boundary conditions are applied. The normalized mean downstream velocity  $\hat{U}_1$  (figure 6) and the normalized turbulent kinetic energy  $\hat{k}$  (figure 7) are predicted very accurately for all three flames. Compared to the cold cases, the shear layer is shifted outwards due to gas expansion; this effect is captured very well by the presented simulations. In figure 8, the normalized mean temperatures are presented. At the axial location  $x_1/D = 2.5$  the gradients of  $\tilde{T}$  in the radial profiles are over-predicted; similar over-predictions are also reported in [14, 18, 19]. Further downstream, at  $x_1/D = 10.5$ , the mean temperature of flames F2 and F1 is under-predicted; otherwise good agreement between simulation and experimental data is observed. Figure 9 shows the normalized rms-temperature  $\hat{T}^{rms}$ . For flame F3, the predictions are in good agreement with the experiment; for flames F2 and F1, the predictions are good upstream of  $x_1/D = 6.5$ ; further downstream the model tends to under-predict  $\hat{T}^{rms}$ .

In figure 10, simulation results for flame F3 are presented, where the influence of the mechanical-





**Figure 6:** Radial profiles of the normalized mean downstream velocity  $\hat{U}$  for all three flames at several downstream locations (circles: experiments; solid lines: numerical simulation).




**Figure 7:** Radial profiles of the normalized turbulent kinetic energy  $\hat{k}$  for all three flames at several downstream locations (circles: experiments; solid lines: numerical simulation).

to-scalar time scale ratio was investigated, i.e. simulations with  $C_\phi = 2.0$ ,  $C_\phi = 4.0$ ,  $C_\phi = 6.0$  and  $C_\phi = 8.0$  were performed. For  $C_\phi = 2.0$ , the mean temperature at  $x_1/D = 8.5$  is under-predicted. On the other hand, the rms-temperature is over-predicted for positions upstream of  $x_1/D = 8.5$ . The best general agreement was found for  $C_\phi = 8$ .


Before this section is concluded it has to be emphasized that only flame F3 is operated in the corrugated flamelet regime, for which the modeling assumptions are rigorous. Flames F2 and F1 are subject to the thin reaction zone regime and to a small extent even to the broken flamelet regime, which is most likely the reason for most of the observed discrepancies with measurements.

## Conclusion

A novel model for turbulent premixed combustion is presented. The modeled transport equation for the joint PDF of velocity, turbulence frequency, mixture fraction, a binary progress




**Figure 8:** Radial profiles of the normalized mean temperature  $\tilde{T}$  for all three flames at several downstream locations (circles: experiment; solid lines: numerical simulation).



**Figure 9:** Radial profiles of the normalized rms-temperature  $\hat{T}^{rms}$  for all three flames at several downstream locations (circles: experiment; solid lines: numerical simulation).

variable and a flame residence time is solved with a hybrid particle/finite volume solution algorithm. Besides other advantages, such joint velocity-scalar PDF methods are not subject to counter gradient diffusion, since turbulent convection appears in closed form.

During a time step, a computational particle representing reactive unburnt mixture is "reached" by the embedded propagating flame surface with the "ignition" probability  $P$ , which is a function of the flame surface density. In the proposed joint PDF framework it is possible to calculate the flame surface density without further assumptions, which allows to close  $P$  and thus the progress in the turbulent flame brush. Once "reached" by the embedded flame surface, mass fractions and temperature of a particle are governed by the mixture fraction and the flame residence time and can be retrieved by lookup from precomputed premixed laminar flame tables. To account for molecular mixing between the hot products and the co-flow, the IEM mixing model is employed for mixture fraction and temperature; the flame residence time is then obtained via unique mapping. The best results have been achieved with a mechanical-to-scalar time scale



**Figure 10:** Radial profiles of the normalized quantities  $\hat{U}$ ,  $\hat{k}$ ,  $\hat{T}$  and  $\hat{T}^{rms}$  for the flame F3 at several downstream locations (experiment: circles; numerical simulation: solid lines ( $C_\phi = 2.0$ ), dashed lines ( $C_\phi = 4.0$ ), dashed-dotted lines ( $C_\phi = 6.0$ ) and dotted lines ( $C_\phi = 8.0$ )).

ratio of  $C_\phi = 8$ , but in this modeling context the choice of  $C_\phi$  is not of prime importance for the dynamics of the flame brush.

Numerical validation studies of piloted premixed Bunsen flames reveal that the proposed model not only delivers excellent results for the corrugated flamelet regime, but seems also applicable in the thin reaction zone regime and to a small extent also in the broken flamelet regime. However, for the latter two regimes more research is required, since the current modeling assumptions are not valid there.

## References

- [1] Bray, K. and Moss, J., A unified statistical model of the premixed turbulent flame, *Acta Astronautica* 4 (3-4): 291–319 (1977).
- [2] Peters, N., Laminar flamelet concepts in turbulent combustion, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 21 (1): 1231–1250 (1986).
- [3] Kerstein, A. R., Ashurst, W. T., and Williams, F. A., Field equation for interface propagation in an unsteady homogeneous flow field, *Phys. Rev. A* 37 (7): 2728–2731 (1988).
- [4] Jenny, P., Pope, S. B., Muradoglu, M., and Caughey, D. A., A hybrid algorithm for the joint PDF equation of turbulent reactive flows, *Journal of Computational Physics* 166: 218–252 (2001).

- [5] Pope, S. B., Pdf methods for turbulent reactive flows, *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science* 11 (2): 119–192 (1985).
- [6] Haworth, D. C. and Pope, S. B., A generalized langevin model for turbulent flows, *Physics of Fluids* 29 (2): 387–405 (1986).
- [7] Sooten, P. R. V., Jayesh, and Pope, S. B., Advances in pdf modeling for inhomogeneous turbulent flows, *Physics of Fluids* 10 (1): 246–265 (1998).
- [8] Villermaux, J. and Devillon, J., Représentation de la coalescence et de la redispersion des domaines de ségrégation dans un fluide par un modèle d’interaction phénoménologique, *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Chemical Reaction Engineering, Elsevier, New York* : 1–13 (1972).
- [9] Van Oijen, J. and De Goey, L., Modelling of premixed laminar flames using flamelet-generated manifolds, *Combustion Science and Technology* 161 (1): 113–137 (2000).
- [10] Gicquel, O., Darabiha, N., and Thévenin, D., Liminar premixed hydrogen/air counterflow flame simulations using flame prolongation of ildm with differential diffusion, *Symposium (International) on Combustion* 28 (2): 1901–1908 (2000).
- [11] Janicka, J., Kolbe, W., and Kollmann, W., Closure of the transport-equation for the probability density-function of turbulent scalar fields, *Journal of Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* 4: 47–66 (1979).
- [12] Subramaniam, S. and Pope, S. B., A mixing model for turbulent reactive flows based on euclidean minimum spanning trees, *Combustion and Flame* 115 (4): 487–514 (1998).
- [13] Meyer, D. W. and Jenny, P., A mixing model for turbulent flows based on parameterized scalar profiles, *Physics of Fluids* 18 (3): 035105 (2006).
- [14] Lindstedt, R. and Vaos, E., Transported pdf modeling of high-reynolds-number premixed turbulent flames, *Combustion and Flame* 145 (1-2): 495–511 (2006).
- [15] Stoellinger, M. and Heinz, S., Evaluation of scalar mixing and time scale models in pdf simulations of a turbulent premixed flame, *Combustion and Flame* 157 (9): 1671–1685 (2010).
- [16] Rowinski, D. H. and Pope, S. B., Pdf calculations of piloted premixed jet flames, *Combustion Theory and Modelling* 15 (2): 245–266 (2011).
- [17] Chen, Y.-C. et al., The detailed flame structure of highly stretched turbulent premixed methane-air flames, *Combustion and Flame* 107 (3): 223–226 (1996).
- [18] Stoellinger, M. and Heinz, S., Pdf modeling and simulation of premixed turbulent combustion, *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications* 14 (4): 343–377 (2008).
- [19] Herrmann, M., Numerical simulation of turbulent bunsen flames with a level set flamelet model, *Combustion and Flame* 145 (1-2): 357–375 (2006).