## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# **Detonability of THDCPD-exo–air mixtures**

**Rémy Sorin · Pascal Bauer · Daniel Desbordes**

Received: 15 June 2006 / Revised: 28 August 2007 / Accepted: 15 November 2007 / Published online: 15 December 2007 © Springer-Verlag 2007

**Abstract** In the frame of industrial risk and propulsive application, the detonability study of JP10–air mixtures was performed. The simulation and measurements of detonation parameters were performed for THDCPD-exo/air mixtures at various initial pressure (1 bar  $P_0$  < 3 bar) and equivalence ratio (0.8 <  $\Phi$  < 1.6) in a heated tube ( $T_0 \sim 375$  K). Numerical simulations of the detonation were performed with the STANJAN code and a detailed kinetic scheme of the combustion of THDCPD. The experimental study deals with the measurements of detonation velocity and cell size  $\lambda$ . The measured velocity is in a good agreement with the calculated theoretical values. The cell size measurements show a minimum value for  $\Phi \sim 1.2$  at every level of initial pressure studied and the calculated induction length *L*<sup>i</sup> corresponds to cell size value with a coefficient  $k = \lambda/L_i = 24$ at  $P_0 = 1$  bar. Based on the comparison between the results obtained during this study and those available in the literature on the critical initiation energy *E*c, critical tube diameter *d*<sub>c</sub> and deflagration to detonation transition length  $L_{\text{DDT}}$ , we can conclude that the detonability of THDCPD–air mixtures corresponds to that of hydrocarbon–air mixtures.

**Keywords** Detonation · Cellular structure · THDCPD-exo · Detonability · Critical energy

**PACS** 47.40-x

Communicated by F. Lu.

This paper is based on the work presented at the 33rd International Pyrotechnics Seminar, IPS 2006, Fort Collins, July 16–21, 2006.

R. Sorin (B) · P. Bauer · D. Desbordes

Laboratoire de Combustion et de Détonique, ENSMA,

CNRS UPR 9028, BP 40109, 86961 Futuroscope Cedex, France e-mail: sorin@lcd.ensma.fr

#### **List of symbols**



Greek symbol

0 initial state



# **1 Introduction**

The purpose of this work is to study the detonability of gaseous kerosene mixed in various proportions with air in order to evaluate the risk of explosion during transportation in a confined environment. The kerosene investigated



<span id="page-1-0"></span>**Fig. 1** Structure of THDCPD-exo  $(C_{10}H_{16})$ 

is tetrahydrodicyclopentadiene (THDCPD; i.e.,  $C_{10}H_{16}$  also known as JP10) with an exo structure as indicated in Fig. [1.](#page-1-0) The corresponding *C*/*H* ratio and calorific value are 0.625 and 44.5MJ/kg respectively.Moreover the high energy caracteristics of this kerosene are of interest for propulsive application particularly for pulsed detonation engines (PDE). Thus, knowledge of the fuel's detonation caracteristics such as the CJ velocity, the CJ pressure and the cell size is extremely valuable.

The detonation properties of THDCPD–air are available in the literature [\[2](#page-6-0),[6,](#page-6-1)[26\]](#page-6-2). Austin and Shepherd [\[2\]](#page-6-0) reported the evolution law of vapor pressure with temperature of THDCPD-exo. They also provided data on detonation wave velocity for stoichiometric conditions and cell size variation as a function of the equivalence ratio, ranging from 0.7 to 1.4, at  $P_0 = 1$  bar, as well as a function of pressure, ranging from 0.635 to 1.3 bar at  $\Phi = 1$  for THDCPD-exo/air mixtures at  $T_0 = 373$  K. Their results exhibited a minimum value of  $\lambda \sim 50$  mm at  $\Phi = 1.1$ . They concluded that the THDCPD–air mixture has the same behavior in terms of cell size measurements as propane–air. Zhang et al. [\[26\]](#page-6-2) reported cell size measurements for JP-10 at different pressures and temperatures. They showed that  $T_0$  has a minor influence on cell size. A regression law  $\lambda = A \cdot P_0^n$  curve was provided for stoichiometric THDCPD–air mixtures based on the values of Ref. [\[2](#page-6-0),[6](#page-6-1),[26\]](#page-6-2). The law shows that  $n \sim 1.26$ , which corresponds to classical values found for hydrocarbon–air mixtures. Card et al. [\[6\]](#page-6-1) provided values of the deflagration to detonation transition (DDT) length for lean and rich limits as well as the flame acceleration in a THDCPD–air mixture at 473 K and 2 atm for different equivalence ratios. This allows to measure the length of DDT ( $L_{\text{DDT}}$ ) for  $\Phi = 1, 0.8$  and 0.74, these data are reported in Table [1.](#page-1-1)

In order to compare the relative detonation sensitivity of THDCPD–air mixtures with other compounds, one can consider various detonation dynamic parameters such as: (i) the critical energy  $E_c$  to initiate a spherical detonation, (ii) critical diameter  $d_c$  of detonation transmission from a tube

<span id="page-1-1"></span>**Table 1** Length of DDT measured on flame acceleration in obstacle laden tube (results derived from [\[6\]](#page-6-1)), detonation cell size and normalized parameters

$\Phi$	$L_{\rm DDT}$ (mm)	$\lambda = 19 \cdot L_i$ (mm)	$L_{\rm DDT}/\lambda$	$d/\lambda$
1.00	1755	27.4	64	2.7
0.80	1936	60.7	31.9	1.2
0.74	2313	91.3	25.4	0.8

to open space, (iii) the detonation propagation limit in a tube and (iv) the deflagration to detonation transition length  $L_{\text{DDT}}$ . These values can be calculated from a knowledge of the cellular structure width λ. Zel'dovich et al. [\[25](#page-6-3)] found that *E*<sup>c</sup> was proportional to the Chapman–Jouguet pressure  $P_{\text{CI}}$  and to the induction length *L*i. From Desbordes et al. [\[8](#page-6-4)], one can express  $E_c$  in the form (with  $B \sim 425$  for hydrocarbon–air mixtures):

<span id="page-1-3"></span>
$$
E_{\rm c} \cong A \cdot P_{\rm CJ} \cdot L_{\rm i}^3 \approx B \cdot \rho_0 \cdot D_{\rm CJ}^2 \cdot \lambda^3. \tag{1}
$$

The criterion for successful transmission of a selfsustained detonation from a tube of inner diameter  $d_c$  to an open space was first expressed by Zel'dovich et al. [\[25](#page-6-3)]. It is proportional to the chemical thickness  $\Delta$  for 5 different reactive mixtures ( $d_c \approx 15\Delta$ ). The above criterion can be formulated as:

<span id="page-1-2"></span>
$$
d_{\rm c} = 13\,\lambda.\tag{2}
$$

Equation [\(2\)](#page-1-2) applies to most common hydrocarbons/ $O_2$ /  $N_2$  mixtures in cylindrical tubes [\[15](#page-6-5)[,16](#page-6-6)]. This relationship was further used by Bauer et al. [\[3](#page-6-7)] for compositions of hydrocarbons/ $O_2/N_2$  at elevated pressures, namely up to 5MPa.

The detonation propagation limit depends on the roughness of the tube wall. In smooth bore, cylindrical tubes, the limit propagation proceeds through a spinning detonation [\[14](#page-6-8)]. This propagation mode corresponds to the coupling between the pulsation of a simple detonation triple point and the acoustic resonance of the tube. The propagation limit can be expressed as:

<span id="page-1-4"></span>
$$
\pi \, d = \lambda. \tag{3}
$$

For obstacle-laden tube (e.g., perforated plate), the detonation propagation limit depends on the comparison between the cell size and the obstacle inside diameter:  $d \approx \lambda$  [\[17](#page-6-9)].

The DDT length can be used as a criterion for the detonability of the mixture. For  $C_3H_8/O_2/N_2$  mixtures the results provided by Pinard et al. [\[18\]](#page-6-10) obtained in an obstacle-laden tube clearly indicate that  $L_{\text{DDT}}/\lambda$  increases with  $d/\lambda$  (cf. Fig. [8\)](#page-5-0). Sorin [\[20](#page-6-11)[,21](#page-6-12)] showed that, given  $d/\lambda$ , the ratio  $L_{\text{DDT}}/\lambda$  is roughly constant depending weakly on the reduced activation energy of the mixture. The above results yielded an estimation of the length necessary for the onset of detonation from flame self-acceleration of the mixture:

$$
L_{\text{DDT}} \approx 40 \,\lambda \quad \text{for } d/\lambda \sim 2. \tag{4}
$$

We studied the detonation of gaseous THDCPD-exo/air mixture as a function of equivalence ratio (0.8  $\lt \Phi \lt 1.6$ ) and initial pressure (1 bar  $\langle P_0 \rangle$  < 3 bar) at an initial temperature  $T_0 \sim 373$  K. In the first place, the detonation properties were calculated using a thermochemical code, STANJAN. The detonation velocity and the cell width  $\lambda$  were then measured. Based on the comparison of the calculated critical initiation energy  $E_c$  or DDT length with the literature data concerning common hydrocarbons-air mixtures, the detonability of the THDCPD–air mixture is discussed.

### **2 Experimental details**

We studied the detonation of THDCPD-exo and air mixtures for various equivalence ratios and initial pressures. The THDCPD-exo used contains a mass fraction of 99% of  $C_{10}H_{16}$ . Since THDCPD-exo is liquid at ambient pressure and temperature, the experiments must be performed at elevated temperature. We checked the evolution of THDCPD-exo vapor pressure as a function of temperature and confirmed the data given by Austin and Shepherd [\[2\]](#page-6-0) for 323 K  $\lt$  $T_0$  < 373 K. In order to detonate a gaseous mixture at  $0.8 \leq \Phi \leq 1.6$  and 1 bar  $\leq P_0 \leq 3$  bar we need a partial pressure in the range of 15 to 80 mbar; i.e., maintain a temperature of 335 to 375 K. Therefore, we studied the detonation of gaseous mixtures for 365 K  $\lt$   $T_0$   $\lt$ 385 K (cf. Table [2\)](#page-2-0) in order to make sure that there is no cold point in the tube and that all the THDCPD-exo is vaporized.

The experiments were conducted in a heated 5 m steel tube with an inner diameter  $d = 52$  mm. The reactants is injected in the heated tube on the basis of its partial pressure. A recirculation line is installed and allows the mixing of the reactants. This mixing procedure arbitrarily takes place for at least 15 min in order to ensure the homogeneity of the mixture. The detonation tube is immersed in an oil bath which is externally heated and conveyed into a recirculation line (see Fig. [2\)](#page-2-1). The temperature is measured by means of two thermocouples positioned in the oil bath along the tube. The value of  $T_0$  indicated in Table [2](#page-2-0) is an average. The detonation is ignited by means of a pyrotechnic device (i.e. a mercury fulminate inflammator coupled with a detonator HERICA *n*◦8) at one end of the tube.

The detonation velocity and pressure were recorded by means of two pressure transducers (spaced by 760 mm) which



<span id="page-2-1"></span>**Fig. 2** Scheme of the experimental device; 1 injection point, 2 pyrotechnic initiation, 3 smoked foil, 4 pressure transducers, 5 electrical heating, 6 recirculation pump

<span id="page-2-0"></span>**Table 2** Summary of experimental results

$P_0$ (mbar)	$T_0(K)$	Φ	$\lambda$ (mm)	$\sigma$ (mm)	D(m/s)	$D_{\text{CI}}(\text{m/s})$
2997	375	0.81	35.8	9.4	1691	1726
3018	379	0.92	21.8	5.1	1746	1771
1974	379	0.91	$33.5^{\rm a}$	7.1 <sup>a</sup>	1814	1764
3013	368	0.99	17.2	3.0	1746	1803
2015	372	1.01	27.4	4.4	1777	1796
1501	377	0.99	39.5	8.6	1767	1791
2971	377	1.21	13.0	2.3	1823	1839
2023	375	1.18	21.0	3.5	1826	1832
1512	371	1.17	30.2	8.9	1788	1827
1015	384	1.21	48.4	8.5	1737	1821
2907	379	1.40	15.1	1.8	1831	1840
1991	381	1.38	23.8	4.2	1830	1836
1520	365	1.44	32.4	5.3	1811	1833
2956	386	1.58	21.1	4.5	1823	1820
2023	375	1.62	32.7	5.3	1826	1818

<sup>a</sup> Corrected value due to measured overdriven velocity

are located at 4 m from the ignition end. We used KISTLER 603B pressure transducers which have a frequency response of 1  $\mu$ s and pressure signals are recorded using a TEKTRO-NIX oscilloscope. Since the transducer is 5 mm diameter and the detonation remains below 2,000 m/s, the sampling rate was chosen at  $10<sup>6</sup>$  samples per second to accurately capture the CJ peak. This system induces an error of the order of 2% on the velocity measurement, indicated by the error bars on Fig. [3.](#page-3-0) A 1.5 m long 55 mm wide smoked foil was inserted in the tube in order to record the detonation structure. The detonation cell size  $\lambda$  is the average of at least 20 measured structures along the foil (the standard error on the calculation is reported in the Table [2](#page-2-0) and by error bars shown on Figs. [5](#page-4-0) and [6\)](#page-4-1).



<span id="page-3-0"></span>**Fig. 3** Comparison between experimental and theoretical detonation velocity; *error bars* correspond to the characteristic error of velocity measurement

#### **3 Results**

#### 3.1 Numerical results

We performed the calculation of detonation thermochemical parameters using the STANJAN code [\[19](#page-6-13)]. This code allows the three characteristic parameters of the CJ detonation to be calculated, namely, the CJ velocity  $D_{\text{CI}}$ , the normalized pressure  $P_{\text{CI}}/P_0$  and the induction time and length,  $\tau_i$  and *L*i. The STANJAN code uses the CHEMKIN-II chemical kinetics package [\[12](#page-6-14)] to calculate the chemical composition variation and thermodynamic parameters  $(\rho, T)$  in the reaction zone behind the precursor shock (the ZND state). STANJAN also provides the time that corresponds to the maximum of temperature variation  $\left[\frac{dT}{dt}\right]_{\text{max}}$ , i.e. the induction time  $\tau_i$ .

The detailed reaction mechanism was provided by Williams [\[13](#page-6-15)[,24\]](#page-6-16). It involves 55 chemical species and 251 reactions, and is appropriate for the ignition mechanism of THDCPD and heptane mixtures as well as for NO*x* formations in addition to the classical reaction mechanism  $C_1 - C_3$ [\[22](#page-6-17)]. This reaction mechanism is validated for  $0.6 < \Phi <$ 2.0 and 1 bar  $P_0$  < 9 bar.

Calculated theoretical and experimental velocities,  $D_{\text{CJ}}$ and *D* respectively, are shown in Fig. [3.](#page-3-0) The theoretical calculations exhibit a maximum for  $\Phi \sim 1.35$  with *D*<sub>CJ</sub> ∼ 1840 m/s and  $P_{\text{CJ}}/P_0 \sim 19.4$ . These values are consistent with classical hydrocarbon–air mixtures measurements. Theoretical and experimental values show a good agreement with respect to the inherent experimental error (less than 2%). We then checked that the observed detonation was close to the self-sustained propagation and that the detonation was established in the tube.

Since the experimental device did not allow us to perform measurements at  $\phi \ge 1.4$  for  $P_0 = 1.5$  bar, the experimental velocity curve seems to increase monotically. We clearly see that for different initial pressures (2 and 3 bar), the detonation



<span id="page-3-1"></span>**Fig. 4** Evolution of induction time  $\tau_i$  as a function of equivalence ratio Φ

velocity tends to decrease for  $\phi \geq 1.4$  as predicted by the theoretical calculations, which indicates that the trend for  $P_0 = 1.5$  bar is due to a lack of measurements. Moreover, we notice that the discrepancy between theoretical and measured value is larger when  $P_0 \le 1.5$  bar, i.e., for mixtures with larger detonation cell sizes (see Figs. [5](#page-4-0) and [6\)](#page-4-1). This observation can be explained as follows. For mixtures with λ near *d*, the heat loss at the tube wall modifies the detonation propagation and slowes it down.

The computed induction time  $\tau_i$  is shown in Fig. [4](#page-3-1) as a function of equivalence ratio  $\Phi$  for initial pressures  $P_0 =$ 1, 1.5, 2 and 3 bar at  $T_0 = 373$  K. The curves show a minimum value of  $\tau$ <sub>i</sub> at  $\Phi \sim 1.2$  regardless of the initial pressure. Since the detonation cell size is proportional to the induction length [\[23](#page-6-18)] one should observe a minimum  $\lambda$  for equivalence ratio around 1.2, as confirmed in [\[2\]](#page-6-0) at  $\Phi \sim 1.1$ . We checked the variation of  $\tau_i$  as a function of initial pressure  $P_0$  and found that the evolution is consistent with  $\tau_i = A \cdot P_0^{-n}$  keeping a global reaction order  $n = 0.89$ . This reaction order is lower than the one exhibited by experimental measurements (from the  $\lambda = k \cdot P_0^{-n}$  law) of hydrocarbon–air mixtures  $(n \sim 1.2)$ .

#### 3.2 Experimental results

The detonation cell width of THDCPD-exo/air mixtures was measured at  $T_0 \sim 375$  K as a function of the equivalence ratio and initial pressure. The data are presented in Table [2.](#page-2-0) The discrepancy on the initial temperature is less than 3%. A simple result at  $\Phi = 0.91$  exhibits a velocity that is higher than the error on the measurement. This discrepancy is certainly due to a late onset of the detonation which remains overdriven. The detonation cell size depends on the local velocity of the detonation through the following relationship [\[7](#page-6-19)]:

$$
\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_{\text{CI}}} \cong \frac{D}{D_{\text{CI}}} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{E_{\text{a}}}{R \cdot T_{ZND}} \cdot \left[\left(\frac{D_{\text{CI}}}{D}\right)^2 - 1\right]\right). \tag{5}
$$



<span id="page-4-0"></span>**Fig. 5** Variation of detonation cell size  $\lambda$  as a function of initial pressure  $P_0$  for different equivalence ratios  $\Phi$  in THDCPD-exo/air mixtures at *T*<sup>0</sup> ∼ 373 K; *dark symbols*: measured values, *hollow symbols*: estimated values; *dot lines*: estimated regression  $\lambda = A \cdot P_0^{-1,2}$ ; *vertical bars*: standard errors σ from Table [2](#page-2-0)



<span id="page-4-1"></span>**Fig. 6** Variation of detonation cell size λ as a function of equivalence ratio  $\Phi$  for different initial pressures  $P_0$  in THDCPD-exo/air mixtures at *T*<sup>0</sup> ∼ 373 K; *dark symbols*: measured values, *hollow symbols*: estimated values; *dot lines*: estimated values with numerical simulation based on  $\lambda = k \cdot L_i$ ; *vertical bars*: standard errors  $\sigma$  from Table [2](#page-2-0)

The activation energy for THDCPD-exo mixtures was set equal to 180 kJ/mol [\[9\]](#page-6-20), and for the data at  $\Phi = 0.91$  and  $P_0 \sim 2$  bar the ZND temperature (temperature behind the shock front) is  $T_{\text{ZND}} = 1621 \text{ K}$  which yields  $\lambda/\lambda_{\text{CJ}} = 0.86$ . Although the measured value of  $\lambda$  is 29 $\pm$ 6.1 mm, we estimate that the actual value is  $\lambda_{CI} = 33.5 \pm 7.1$  mm.

Figure [5](#page-4-0) exhibits the evolution of the detonation cell size  $\lambda$  as a function of initial pressure (1 bar  $\langle P_0 \rangle$  < 3 bar) of THDCPD-exo/air mixtures for various equivalence ratios Φ. In the Figs. [5](#page-4-0) and [6,](#page-4-1) the vertical error bars correspond to the standard deviation of the cell size measurement made on the smoked foil. The detonation cell size follows the  $\lambda =$  $A \cdot P_0^{-n}$  law within the range of equivalence ratio that was investigated with  $n \approx 1.19$ . Moreover the data collected in the detonation database seem to indicate that the variation of equivalence ratio has little influence on the parameter *n*. The data at  $P_0 = 1$  bar were estimated so that the regression law

matches the requirement  $n = 1.2$ . This evolution is common to most hydrocarbon-air mixtures where  $1.08 < n < 1.22$ .

Figure [6](#page-4-1) exhibits the evolution of the detonation cell size  $\lambda$  as a function of the equivalence ratio (0.8  $\lt \Phi \lt 1.6$ ) for different initial pressures *P*0. For each initial pressure the detonation cell size shows a minimum at  $\Phi = 1.2$  as predicted by the numerical calculation. The numerical simulations allow to calculate the induction length *L*<sup>i</sup> derived from the relation:

$$
L_{\rm i} = \tau_{\rm i} \cdot (D_{\rm CJ} - u_{\rm ZND}).\tag{6}
$$

As commonly observed, the detonation cell size of hydrocarbon-air mixtures varies proportionally to the induction length  $L_i$  [\[23](#page-6-18)]. The coefficient of proportionality is  $k =$  $\lambda/L_i = 29$  for a large number of mixtures. If we compare the evolution of  $k \cdot L_i$  with the equivalence ratio ( $\Phi$ ), we see that for each initial pressure these results are in good agreement with experimental values. The parameter *k* is merely evaluated in order that the  $k \cdot L_i$  curve fit the experimental data. We estimate then that for  $P_0 = 1$  bar, *k* is closed to 24. Since the calculated induction time  $\tau_i$  varies according to  $P_0^{-0.89}$  and the cell size  $\lambda$  as  $P_0^{-1.2}$ , we observe that *k* varies with the initial pressure:  $k = 24, 21, 18, 16$  respectively for  $P_0 = 1, 1.5, 2$  and 3 bar.

## **4 Discussion**

We aim at providing the appropriate data to assess whether a THDCPD-exo/air mixture may raise a concern for industrial application. We can estimate detonation hazards of such mixture by comparing values of the critical initiation energy  $E_c$ , critical tube diameter  $d_c$  and DDT length  $L_{\text{DDT}}$  with data available in the literature for such parameters. In order to estimate  $E_c$  and  $d_c$  we first calculated the theoretical values of  $\lambda$  using the approximation 24  $\times$  *L*<sub>i</sub> based on the knowledge of  $\tau_i$  derived from numerical simulation at  $P_0 = 1$  bar. Then  $E_c$  and  $d_c$  were calculated from Eqs. [\(1\)](#page-1-3) and [\(2\)](#page-1-2).

The evolution of critical energy  $E_c$  as a function of the equivalence ratio  $\Phi$  for THDCPD-exo/air mixtures is shown in Fig. [7.](#page-5-1) Like the cell size evolution, *E*<sup>c</sup> exhibits a minimum value around  $\Phi = 1.2$ . If we compare  $E_c$  values with those of propane and ethane–air mixtures we conclude that the detonability of THDCPD–air mixtures is equivalent to hydrocarbon-air mixtures in terms of equivalence ratio variation. Moreover in order to study the application to propulsion we compared THDCPD–air mixtures with JP4 and *n*-hexane–air mixtures for stoichiometric conditions. The comparison shows that the detonability of these mixtures is similar.

An assessment of detonability of THDCPD–air mixtures based on the definition of the detonation propagation limit



<span id="page-5-1"></span>**Fig. 7** Variation of critical initiation energy  $E_c$  as a function of equivalence ratio  $\Phi$  for different hydrocarbon mixtures; C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>–air: [\[10](#page-6-21)], C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub>–air: [\[5\]](#page-6-22), *n*-hexane and JP4: [\[4\]](#page-6-23)

(Eq. [\(3\)](#page-1-4)) or critical tube diameter (Eq. [\(2\)](#page-1-2)) yields two conclusions:

- a self-sustained detonation will not exist in a cylindrical tube of inner diameter lower than 0.014 m
- the self-sustained detonation transmission to open space will not be possible from a cylindrical tube with a diameter less than 0.6 m.

The evolution of  $L_{\text{DDT}}/\lambda$  with  $d/\lambda$  for  $C_3H_8/O_2/N_2$  mix-tures [\[18](#page-6-10)] and for THDCPD-exo mixtures at  $P_0 = 2$  bar [\[6](#page-6-1)], see Table [1,](#page-1-1) is shown in Fig. [8](#page-5-0) (with  $\lambda$  estimated from [\[11](#page-6-24)]). The knowledge of the length required for a flame to transit into a detonation is a good way to estimate the relative detonation sensitivity of a mixture [\[20](#page-6-11),[21\]](#page-6-12), even if the detonation is not directly initiated but proceeds through a long flame propagation which can be ignited by a low energy deposit. The DDT investigated by Pinard et al. [\[18\]](#page-6-10) and Card et al. [\[6](#page-6-1)] were observed in the same geometrical conditions; i.e., a cylindrical tube of  $d = 100$  mm with equidistant perforated plates (blockage ratio of 0.43) located along the tube. The



<span id="page-5-0"></span>**Fig. 8**  $L_{\text{DDT}}/\lambda$  versus  $d/\lambda$ ;  $C_3H_8/O_2/N_2$ : results from [\[18](#page-6-10)], THDCPD–air: results from [\[6\]](#page-6-1), the *dot line* corresponds to power regression fit for [\[18\]](#page-6-10) values

geometrical influence was equivalent and had the same effect on the flow. The results may thus be comparable. The data obtained for the THDCPD–air mixture are in agreement with those of propane. Thus in the same geometrical conditions, the DDT behavior of a THDCPD–air or propane/ $O_2/N_2$ mixture will be similar with respect to the detonation cell size to diameter ratio.

### **5 Summary and conclusion**

The calculation of detonation parameters (i.e., velocity, pressure and induction length) and related measurements were performed for THDCPD-exo/air mixtures at various initial pressures (1 bar  $\langle P_0 \rangle$  < 3 bar) and equivalence ratios  $(0.8 < \Phi < 1.6)$ . In order to have sufficient partial vapor pressure of THDCPD in the mixture, the detonation tube was heated up to an initial temperature  $T_0 = 375 \pm 10$  K.

The numerical simulations of the detonation were performed by means of the STANJAN code and a detailed kinetics of Williams for THDCPD combustion. It shows that the detonation velocity *D*<sub>CJ</sub> exhibits a maximum (∼1840 m/s) for  $\Phi = 1.35$ . Moreover the variation of the induction time  $(\tau_i)$  as a function of equivalence ratio shows a minimum at  $\Phi = 1.2$  regardless of the initial pressure.

The experimental study deals with measurements of the detonation velocity and cell size. The measured velocity is in agreement with the calculated values. The cell size measurements show a minimum value for  $\Phi \sim 1.2$  and the calculated induction length  $L_i$  is proportional to the value of the cell size with a coefficient  $k = 24$  at  $P_0 = 1$  bar.

Comparison of the present results with available data in the literature on the detonation critical initiation energy  $E_c$ , critical tube diameter  $d_c$  and length of deflagration to detonation transition *L*<sub>DDT</sub>, allows to conclude that THDCPD–air mixtures have the same level of detonability as propane-air mixtures, which can be regarded as appropriate representative of hydrocarbon–air mixtures.

**Acknowledgments** The authors thank EADS-CCR for supporting this work.

#### **References**

- 1. Auffret, Y.: Etude de la détonation de mèlanges gazeux température initiale élevée. PhD Dissertation University of Poitiers (1998)
- <span id="page-6-0"></span>2. Austin, J.M., Shepherd, J.E.: Detonations in hydrocarbon fuel blends. Combust. Flame **132**, 73–90 (2003)
- <span id="page-6-7"></span>3. Bauer, P., Brochet, C., Presles, H.N.: The influence of initial pressure on critical diameters of gaseous explosives mixtures. Prog. Astronaut. Aeronaut. **94**, 118–128 (1984)
- <span id="page-6-23"></span>4. Beeson, H.D., McClenagan, R.D., Bishop, C.V., Benz, F.J., Pitz, W.J., Westbrook, C.K., Lee, J.H.: Detonability of hydrocarbon fuels in air. Prog. Astronaut. Aeronaut. **133**, 19–36 (1991)
- <span id="page-6-22"></span>5. Bull, D.C., Elsworth, J.E., Shuff, P.J., Metcalfe, E.: Detonation cell structures in fuel/air mixtures. Combust. Flame **45**, 7–22 (1982)
- <span id="page-6-1"></span>6. Card, J., Rival, D., Ciccarelli, G.: DDT in fuel–air mixtures at elevated temperatures and pressures. Shock Waves **14**, 167– 173 (2005)
- <span id="page-6-19"></span>7. Desbordes, D.: Transmission of overdriven plane detonations: critical diameter as a function od cell regularity and size. Prog. Astronaut. Aeronaut. **114**, 170–185 (1988)
- <span id="page-6-4"></span>8. Desbordes, D., Guerraud, H.L., Presles, H.N.: Failure of the classical dynamic parameters relationships in highly regular cellular detonation systems. Prog. Astronaut. Aeronaut. **153**, 347–359 (1993)
- <span id="page-6-20"></span>9. Dubois, C., Ringuette, S., Stowe, R.: Evaluation of modified JP-10 fuels for pulsed detonation engine. AIAA Paper A02-26684 (2002)
- <span id="page-6-21"></span>10. Elsworth, J.E., Eyre, J.A.: The susceptibility of propenepropane/air mixtures to detonation. Combust. Flame **55**, 237– 243 (1984)
- <span id="page-6-24"></span>11. Kaneshige, M., Shepherd, J.: Detonation database, Technical Report FM97–8, GALCIT, July 1997. [http://www.galcit.caltech.](http://www.galcit.caltech.edu/detn_db/html/) [edu/detn\\_db/html/](http://www.galcit.caltech.edu/detn_db/html/)
- <span id="page-6-14"></span>12. Kee, R.J., Rupley, F.M., Miller, J.A.: Chemkin II: a fortran kinetics package for the analysis of gas-phase chemical kinetics, Sandia National Laboratory Technical Report SAND89-8009. Reprinted August 1993
- <span id="page-6-15"></span>13. Li, S.C., Varatharajan, B., Williams, F.A.: The chemistry of JP-10 ignition. AIAA J. **39**, 2351–2356 (2001)
- <span id="page-6-8"></span>14. Manson, N.: Contribution l'étude de la propagation des détonations et des déflagrations dans les mélanges gazeux. PhD Dissertation, University of Paris (1946)
- <span id="page-6-5"></span>15. Matsui, H., Lee, J.H.: On the measure of the relative detonations hazards of gaseous fuel–oxygen and air mixtures. Proc. Comb. Inst. **17**, 1269–1279 (1978)
- <span id="page-6-6"></span>16. Mitrofanov, V.V., Soloukhin, R.I.: The diffraction of multi-front detonation waves. Sov. Phys. Dokl. **9**, 1055–1058 (1965)
- <span id="page-6-9"></span>17. Peraldi, O., Knystautas, R., Lee, J.H.S.: Criteria for transition to detonation in tubes. Proc. Comb. Inst. **21**, 1629–1637 (1986)
- <span id="page-6-10"></span>18. Pinard, P.F., Higgins, A.J., Lee J.H.S.: The effects of NO<sub>2</sub> addition on deflagration-to-detonation transition. Combust. Flame **136**, 146–154 (2004)
- <span id="page-6-13"></span>19. Reynolds, W.C.: The element potential method for chemical equilibrium analysis: implementation in the interactive program STANJAN, Version 3, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California (1986)
- <span id="page-6-11"></span>20. Sorin, R.: Etude et optimisation de la transition déflagration détonation en tube des mélanges stoechiométriques  $H_2/O_2/N_2$  et  $(CH_4, C_2H_2, C_2H_4, C_3H_8)/O_2/N_2$  et de sa transmission à un espace de plus grande dimension, PhD Dissertation, University of Poitiers (2005)
- <span id="page-6-12"></span>21. Sorin, R., Zitoun, R., Desbordes, D.: Optimization of the deflagration to detonation transition: reduction of length and time of transition. Shock Waves **15**, 137–145 (2006)
- <span id="page-6-17"></span>22. Hewson, J.C., Bollig, M.: Reduced mechanisms for NOx emissions from hydrocarbon diffusion flames. Proc. Combust. Inst. **26**, 2171–2179 (1996)
- <span id="page-6-18"></span>23. Westbrook, C.K., Urtiew, P.A.: Chemical kinetic prediction of critical parameters in gaseous detonations. Proc. Comb. Inst. **19t**, 583–590 (1982)
- <span id="page-6-16"></span>24. Williams, F.A.: [http://maemail.ucsd.edu/combustion/cermech/](http://maemail.ucsd.edu/combustion/cermech/JP10-Reactions/) [JP10-Reactions/](http://maemail.ucsd.edu/combustion/cermech/JP10-Reactions/)
- <span id="page-6-3"></span>25. Zel'dovich, Y.B., Kogarko, S.M., Simonov, N.H.: Etude expérimentale de la détonation sphérique dans les gaz. Z.E.P.T. **26**, 1744– 1772 (1956)
- <span id="page-6-2"></span>26. Zhang, F., Murray, S.B., Gerrard, K.: JP-10 vapor detonations at elevated pressures and temperatures. In: Proceedings of 18th ICDERS, Seattle (2001)