Published in final edited form as:

Fire Saf J. 2017 ; 91: . doi:10.1016/j.firesaf.2017.04.010.

A Computational Study of Extinguishment and Enhancement of Propane Cup-Burner Flames by Halon and Alternative Agents

FUMIAKI TAKAHASHI*,

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, 10900 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44106, USA

VISWANATH KATTA,

Innovative Scientific Solutions, Inc., 7610 McEwen Road, Dayton, Ohio, 45459, USA

GREGORY LINTERIS, and

National Institute of Standard and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive Gaithersburg, MD 20899, USA

VALERI BABUSHOK

National Institute of Standard and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive Gaithersburg, MD 20899, USA

Abstract

Computations of cup-burner flames in normal gravity have been performed using propane as the fuel to reveal the combustion inhibition and enhancement by the CF_3Br (halon 1301) and potential alternative fire-extinguishing agents (C_2HF_5 , $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$, and $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$). The time-dependent, two-dimensional numerical code used includes a detailed kinetic model (up to 241 species and 3918 reactions), diffusive transport, and a gray-gas radiation model. The peak reactivity spot (i.e., reaction kernel) at the flame base stabilizes a trailing flame, which is inclined inwardly by a buoyancy-induced entrainment flow. As the volume fraction of agent in the coflow increases gradually, the *premixed*-like reaction kernel weakens, thus inducing the flame base detachment from the burner rim and blowoff-type extinguishment eventually. The *two-zone* flame structure (with two heat-release-rate peaks) is formed in the trailing *diffusion* flame. The H_2O formed in the inner zone is converted further, primarily in the outer zone, to HF and CF_2O through exothermic reactions most significantly with the C_2HF_5 addition. The total heat release of the entire flame decreases (inhibiting) for CF_3Br but increases (enhancing) for the halon alternative agents, particularly C_2HF_5 and $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$. Addition of C_2HF_5 results in unusual (non-chain branching) reactions.

Keywords

aircraft cargo-bay fire suppression; halon 1301 replacement; numerical simulation; diffusion flame stabilization; reaction kernel

*Corresponding author. fxt13@case.edu.

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the Montreal Protocol to protect the stratospheric ozone layer, the use of the effective fire suppressant CF_3Br (bromotrifluoromethane, Halon 1301) has been discontinued except for certain critical applications such as the suppression of cargo-bay fires in aircraft. Halon alternative agents must pass a mandated Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) test [1,2], in which a simulated explosion of an aerosol can, caused by a fire, must be suppressed by the agent. Unlike CF_3Br , some replacement agents, including C_2HF_5 (pentafluoroethane, HFC-125) and $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$ (2-bromo-3,3,3-trifluoropropene, 2-BTP), when added at any concentration less than that required for inerting, created a higher over-pressure in the test chamber and thus failed the test.

Recent work [3–6] employing thermodynamic equilibrium and perfectly stirred-reactor calculations (for premixed systems) revealed that higher overpressures in the FAA aerosol can tests might be due to higher heat release from reaction of the inhibitor itself. Nonetheless, the agents should still reduce the overall reaction rate and inhibit the reaction. For diffusion flames, however, the flame structure, combustion inhibition, and enhancement processes are not yet fully understood. In previous papers [7,8], the authors reported the results of comprehensive numerical simulations for zero- and normal Earth-gravity cup-burner flames using the FAA aerosol can test [ACT] fuel mixture with CF_3Br , C_2HF_5 , $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$ (2,2-dichloro-1,1,1-trifluoroethane, HCFC-123), and $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$ added to the coflowing air. In the halon-replacement-agent molecules as compared to CF_3Br , additional numbers of carbon and fluorine atoms, as well as a double bond ($\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$), represent potential energy contributions at a fixed concentration if they burn to COF_2 and HF . The ACT fuel mixture is somewhat unusual, however, in that it contains a large portion of water (which is an important reactant with the halogenated species). The objectives of this study are to investigate the effects of fire-extinguishing agents (with different numbers of carbon atoms and types of halogen) on the diffusion flame and to determine if the enhanced heat release found for the previous simulations with the ACT fuel occur with a more typical hydrocarbon fuel (propane).

2. COMPUTATIONAL METHOD

A time-dependent, axisymmetric numerical code (UNICORN) [9,10] is used for the simulation of coflow diffusion flames stabilized on the cup burner. The code solves the axial and radial (z and r) full Navier-Stokes momentum equations, continuity equation, and enthalpy- and species-conservation equations on a staggered-grid system. A clustered mesh system is employed to trace the gradients in flow variables near the flame surface. The thermo-physical properties such as enthalpy, viscosity, thermal conductivity, and binary molecular diffusion of all of the species are calculated from the polynomial curve fits developed for the temperature range 300 K to 5000 K. Mixture viscosity and thermal conductivity are then estimated using the Wilke and Kee expressions [11], respectively. Molecular diffusion is assumed to be of the binary-diffusion type, and the diffusion velocity of a species is calculated using Fick's law and the effective-diffusion coefficient of that species in the mixture. A simple radiation model [12] based on the optically thin-media and gray-gas assumptions was incorporated into the energy equation. Radiation from CH_4 , CO ,

CO₂, H₂O, HF, COF₂ and soot was considered in the present study. The Plank-mean absorption coefficients are obtained from the literature for the first four species [12] and HF [13]; or calculated for COF₂ [13] and soot [14]. The finite-difference forms of the momentum equations are obtained using an implicit QUICKEST scheme [9], and those of the species and energy equations are obtained using a hybrid scheme of upwind and central differencing.

A comprehensive reaction mechanism was assembled for the simulation of propane or ACT fuel flames with CF₃Br, C₂HF₅, C₂HF₃Cl₂, or C₃H₂F₃Br added to air from four mechanisms: the four-carbon hydrocarbon mechanism of Wang and co-workers [15,16] (111 species and 1566 one-way elementary reactions), detailed reactions of ethanol (5 species and 72 reactions) of Dryer and co-workers [17,18], the bromine and chlorine parts of the mechanism of Babushok et al. [19–22] (10 additional species and 148 reactions), and a subset (51 species and 1200 reactions) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) HFC starting mechanism [23, 24]. The final chemical kinetics model (187 species, 3198 reactions for CF₃Br, C₂HF₅, and C₃H₂F₃Br; or 241 species and 3918 reactions for C₂HF₃Cl₂) and a soot model [14] are integrated into the UNICORN code. Transport data for 139 species are available in the literature; for the remaining 38 species, data are constructed by matching these species with the nearest species (based on molecular weight) with known transport data.

The ACT fuel is a propane-ethanol-water mixture [1,2] with the volume fractions of the components: $X_{C_3H_8} = 0.159$, $X_{C_2H_5OH} = 0.454$, and $X_{H_2O} = 0.387$. Table 1 shows the minimum extinguishing concentrations (MECs) of fire-extinguishing agents for n-heptane and propane fuels in the literature [25–34] using the cup-burner method [25,26]. The calculated MECs obtained for the ACT fuel and propane in our previous and present studies are also listed and discussed in the results section. There are neither experimental data for the ACT fuel nor calculated results for n-heptane available.

The boundary conditions are treated in the same way as reported in earlier papers [7,8]. The computational domain is bounded by the axis of symmetry, a chimney wall, and the inflow and outflow boundaries. Calculations are made on a physical domain of 200 mm by 47.5 mm using a 251×101 non-uniform grid system that yielded 0.2 mm by 0.2 mm minimum grid spacing in both the z and r directions in the flame zone. The burner outer diameter is 28 mm and the chimney inner diameter is 95 mm. The burner wall (4-mm long and 1-mm thick tube) temperature is set at 600 K and the wall surface is under the no-slip velocity condition.

The mean fuel velocities for the ACT fuel and propane are 0.853 cm/s and 0.307 cm/s, respectively, and the mean velocity of the oxidizer (“air” [21 % O₂ in nitrogen] with added agent) is 10.7 cm/s at 294 K.

Validation of the code with the kinetic model was performed through the simulation of opposing-jet diffusion flames. The predicted extinction strain rates for propane-air flames (no agent) were within 7.5% of the measured values (with an error margin of 9 %) by Zegers et al. [35]. The predicted extinction agent concentrations for CF₃Br and C₂HF₅ are within 4 % of the measured concentrations in weakly stretched flames and within 25 % in highly

stretched flames. Although cup-burner data using the ACT fuel are unavailable for a direct comparison, computation with the assembled reaction mechanism should provide insights into the detailed flame structure.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Internal flame structure

The flame base supports a trailing flame and controls the flame attachment, detachment, and oscillation processes [36,37]. Small variations in the agent volume fraction in the coflowing oxidizing stream (X_a) results in profound changes near the extinguishment limit. Figure 1 shows the calculated structure of nearlimit propane flames in air with added agent: (a) CF_3Br , $X_a=0.0258$; (b) C_2HF_5 , $X_a=0.0765$; (c) $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$, $X_a=0.0455$; and (d) $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$, $X_a=0.0246$. The variables include the velocity vectors ($\mathbf{v}$), isotherms (T), and heat-release rate ($\dot{q}$). The base of the agent-added flames are detached and drift inward a few mm away from the burner rim by the nearly horizontal entrainment flow. In contrast to zero-gravity ($0g_n$) flames [7], which are formed vertically, the normal gravity ($1g_n$) flame inclines inwardly due to the streamline shrinkage in the accelerating buoyancy-induced flow. The contours of the heat-release rate show a peak reactivity spot (i.e., the *reaction kernel* [36]) at a height from the burner rim, $z_k = 0.8$ mm to 1.8 mm. The chain propagating radical species (H, O, and OH) as well as heat diffuse back against the oxygen-rich flow at the flame base (edge), thus promoting vigorous reactions to form the reaction kernel.

Unlike the flame with CF_3Br (Fig. 1a), the other near-limit flames, particularly with C_2HF_5 (Fig. 1b) and $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$ (Fig. 1d), show distinct “two-zone” flame structure as evident from nearly parallel zones of the high heat-release rate contours.

Figure 2 shows the radial variations of the calculated temperature and heat-release rate in propane flames in air with agent: (a) across a trailing flame ($z_k + 5$ mm); (b) across the reaction kernel: $z_k = 1.8$ mm (CF_3Br), 1.2 mm (C_2HF_5), 0.8 mm ($\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$), and 1.4 mm ($\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$). The trailing flames (Fig. 2a) are characterized by the two-zone flame structure (inner and outer) as evident from two heat-release rate peaks most prominently for C_2HF_5 and least significantly for CF_3Br . Although the temperature peak is closer to the inner reaction zone, formed by the hydrocarbon- O_2 combustion, the larger heat-release rate peak for C_2HF_5 is in the outer zone by highly exothermic reactions. The temperature and heat-release-rate profiles in the propane flame with C_2HF_5 (Fig. 2a) are similar to those obtained previously [8] for the ACT fuel with C_2HF_5 .

The outer heat-release-rate peak in the trailing flame in $1g_n$ (Fig. 2a) is more evident, compared to the $0g_n$ case [7], due to increased convective fluxes of reactants (i.e., the blowing effect [36]) by the buoyancy-induced incoming flow.

At the reaction kernel in the flame base region (Fig. 2b), the peak heat-release-rate for each agent slightly on the airside of each temperature peak is several times larger than that in the trailing flame. The peak temperature for $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$ is much higher than other agents, suggesting that additional number of carbon in the agent molecule, compared to CF_3Br , represent potential energy contributions at a fixed concentration.

Figure 3 shows the radial variations of the species volume fractions (X_i) crossing the trailing flame with C_2HF_5 (added at $X_a=0.0765$) at $z=6.2$ mm. Oxygen penetrates through the outer zone and a pool of chain carrier radicals (H, O, and OH) is formed in the middle of the two zones at relatively high concentrations ($X_a \approx 10^{-3}$), thus contributing to both reaction zones. The initial hydrocarbon fuel (C_3H_8) diffuses from the fuel side, decomposes to fragments (CH_4 , C_2H_4 , and C_2H_2) and reacts with the chain carrier radicals in the inner zone. In the outer zone, the agent (C_2HF_5) from the air side decomposes to many fluorinated species (C_2F_6 , CF_2 , CHF_3 , etc.), which react with the radicals. The H_2O (formed by hydrocarbon- O_2 reaction) diffuses to the outer zone, where it is converted to HF through highly exothermic reactions. The H_2O nearly vanishes in the outer zone in the propane flame, whereas that in the ACT fuel flame with C_2HF_5 , reported previously [8], remains at a $X_a \approx 10^{-3}$ level even outside the outer zone due to its high content ($X_{H_2O} = 0.387$) in the fuel. The CF_2O peak ($X_{CF_2O} = 0.031$) in the outer zone in the propane flame is lower than that ($X_{CF_2O} = 0.048$) in the ACT fuel flame. The final products (CO_2 , HF, and CF_2O) are distributed radially in a wide range. Low levels of C_2HF_5 on the fuel side and H_2 on the air side in Fig. 3 are due to leakage in the opposite directions through the quenched zone below the flame base. These species' contributions to overall reactions in the opposite zones must be insignificant.

Figure 4 shows the radial variations of the calculated production (+) or consumption (–) rates (Fig. 4a) and heat-release rates (Fig. 4b) of species i crossing the trailing flame at $z=5.8$ mm in a propane flame in air with C_2HF_5 at $X_a=0.076$. In the inner zone, H_2 , CO, and the chain carrier radicals (H, O, and OH) are formed and consumed, O_2 , and CF_2O are consumed, and H_2O , HF and CO_2 are formed. In the outer zone, C_2HF_5 and O_2 are consumed and HF, CF_2O , and CO are formed. The major contributors to the overall heat-release rate (Fig. 4b) are the formation of H_2O , CO, CO_2 HF in the inner zone, with HF, CF_2O and CO in the outer zone. Although the production rates and heat-release rates of HF and CF_2O in the propane flame are significantly less than those in the ACT fuel flame [7], the resultant heat-release rate profiles are very similar for the two flames. The highly exothermic reactions with the heats of reactions (H) include:

The reactions to form CF_2O are particularly exothermic because of its exceptionally low (negative) heat of formation (-640 kJ/mol).

3.2 Flame characteristics

Figure 5 shows the effects of the agent volume fraction in the coflowing oxidizer on the calculated axial (z_k) and radial (r_k) positions of the reaction kernel from the burner exit on the axis in propane flames. In the present unsteady calculations, as X_a was increased incrementally, the flame-stabilizing reaction kernel in the flame base detached from the burner rim and moved downstream (i.e., the inward and upward direction) gradually and then more steeply as the extinguishment limit approached. For each X_a , a stable stationary flame was obtained.

For CF_3Br (and, to a lesser extent, C_2HF_5), the flame base oscillated, until finally, blowoff-type extinguishment occurred, whereas for $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$ and $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$, the calculation abruptly diverged at $X_a=0.046$ and $X_a=0.025$, respectively. The radial location of the reaction kernel decreased (inward) with X_a , thereby more premixing occurred over the standoff distance. For propane, the MECs of CF_3Br and C_2HF_5 (see Table 1) are: $X_a \approx 0.04$ and ≈ 0.1 , respectively (measured); and $X_a=0.0264$ and 0.0765 , respectively (calculated). By considering technical difficulties, including the stiffness in the computation, complex combustion and inhibition chemistries, and transient blowoff phenomena with occasional flame-base oscillations, the calculated MECs are in fair agreement ($\approx 30\%$) with the measurements.

The incoming flow velocity around the flame base is important in diffusion flame stability as it represents the reciprocal of the residence time through the reaction kernel. Figure 6 shows the effects of the agent volume fraction in the oxidizer on the calculated total ($|\mathbf{v}_k|$), axial (U_k), and radial velocity (V_k) at the reaction kernel. For all agents, as X_a was increased, the absolute values of $|\mathbf{v}_k|$ increased and decreased moderately, and then it increased steeply (for CF_3Br and $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$) as the flame lifted off. Figure 7 shows the temperature, heat-release rate, and a ratio of the heat-release rate and the total velocity at the reaction kernel. For all agents, as X_a was increased, the reaction kernel weakened (lower heat-release rate), but the flame stabilized at higher temperature and velocity ($|\mathbf{v}_k|$). Nevertheless, the quantity $\dot{q}_k/|\mathbf{v}_k|$ (which relates to a ratio of the residence time and the reaction time, i.e., local Damkhöler number, at the reaction kernel [36]) decreased mildly to a minimum level (≈ 3), which was comparable to the chemically passive agents [38, 39]. This result suggests that the reaction kernel shifted gradually downstream (inward) to seek a location where a subtle balance between the residence time and the reaction time can be achieved. As the flame lifted higher, it became more difficult to obtain the balance, thus leading to blowoff eventually.

3.3 Combustion enhancement

Figure 8 shows the maximum temperature in the trailing diffusion flame and the total heat-release rate (total) integrated over the entire flame and over the flame base region ($\dot{q}_{< z_k+3 \text{ mm}}$). Thus, both the heat-release rate per unit volume along the flame and the flame size affect $\dot{q}_{\text{total}}$. Unlike chemically passive agents [38,39], which work thermally to reduce the flame temperature by dilution, the maximum flame temperatures in the present work are

nearly constant (≈ 1800 K) for C_2HF_5 or mildly increased for CF_3Br , $C_3H_2F_3Br$ and $C_2HF_3Cl_2$ as X_a increased until extinguishment. There is a striking difference in $\dot{q}_{total}$ over the entire flame between CF_3Br and the other agents: $\dot{q}_{total}$ decreased (i.e., inhibition) with added CF_3Br , whereas it increased (i.e., combustion enhancement) with C_2HF_5 or $C_2HF_3Cl_2$. It is neutral for $C_3H_2F_3Br$. In contrast, for all agents, $\dot{q}_{<zzk+3\text{ mm}}$ was nearly constant as X_a increased. Thus, the combustion enhancement occurred only in the trailing flame. In fact, the heat release in the *trailing flame* ($\dot{q}_{total} - \dot{q}_{<zzk+3\text{ mm}}$) tripled with added C_2HF_5 (at $X_a \approx 0.08$). This enhancement is ≈ 1.5 x larger than the zero-gravity flames studied previously [7], because of much higher incoming flow velocity in normal gravity, resulting in higher reactants (agent and oxygen) influx into the flame zone. Although the volumetric heat-release rate in the trailing flame was an order-of-magnitude smaller than the peak $\dot{q}_k$, integration over the entire trailing flame zone made the total value much larger. This result suggests the significant implication that even if the reaction kernel, with *premixed*-like flame structure, is weakened by halogenated agent addition toward the flame stability limit, the trailing *diffusion* flame can burn more reactants (including the agent itself) because of the additional heat release to form HF and CF_2O in the aforementioned “two-zone” flame structure.

4. CONCLUSIONS

By using propane as the fuel, in addition to the ACT fuel studies previously, the physical and chemical effects of Halon 1301 (CF_3Br) and halon-replacement fire-extinguishing agents (C_2HF_5 , $C_2HF_3Cl_2$, and $C_3H_2F_3Br$) are studied numerically to gain better understanding of the flame structure, combustion inhibition/enhancement, and blowoff extinguishment of cup-burner flames. Addition of agent to the coflowing air weakens the flame attachment point (reaction kernel) at the flame base, thereby inducing the detachment, lifting, and blowout extinguishment. With added agent, the calculated maximum flame temperature remains nearly constant (≈ 1800 K) for C_2HF_5 or mildly increases for CF_3Br , $C_3H_2F_3Br$, and $C_2HF_3Cl_2$, while the reaction kernel temperature increased for all agents. Moreover, the total heat release of the *entire flame* increases with agent addition for C_2HF_5 and $C_2HF_3Cl_2$ (by up to a factor of 2.5). In the trailing flame, H_2 and H_2O (from hydrocarbon combustion) are converted to HF and CF_2O by exothermic reactions, enhancing an inner flame zone, while reactions of the inhibitor, also forming of HF and CF_2O , created a large outer heat-release zone. In contrast, CF_3Br reduced the total heat release.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by The Boeing Company.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Reinhardt JW, Behavior of bromotrifluoropropene and pentafluoroethane when subjected to a simulated aerosol can explosion, Federal Aviation Administration, DOT/FAA/AR-TN04/4, 2004.
- [2]. Reinhardt JW, Minimum performance standard for aircraft cargo compartment halon replacement fire suppression systems (2nd update), FAA, DOT/FAA/AR-TN05/20, 2005.
- [3]. Linteris GT, Takahashi F, Katta VR, Chelliah HK, Meier O, Thermodynamic analysis of suppressant-enhanced overpressure in the FAA aerosol can simulator, Fire Safety Science –

Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium, International Association for Fire Safety Science, 2011, pp. 307–320. 10.3801/iafss.fss.10-307.

- [4]. Linteris GT, Burgess DR, Katta VR, Takahashi F, Chelliah HK, Meier O, Stirred reactor calculations to understand unwanted combustion enhancement by potential halon replacements, *Combust. Flame* 159 (2012) 1016–1025. 10.1016/j.combustflame.2011.09.011.
- [5]. Linteris GT, Babushok VI, Sunderland PB, Takahashi F, Katta VR, Meier O, Unwanted combustion enhancement by $C_6F_{12}O$ fire suppressant, *Proc. Combust. Inst* 34 (2012) 2683–2690. 10.1016/j.proci.2012.06.050.
- [6]. Linteris GT, Babushok VI, Pagliaro JL, Burgess DR, Manion JA, Takahashi F, Katta VR, Baker PT, Understanding overpressure in the FAA aerosol can test by $C_3H_2F_3Br$ (2-BTP), *Combust. Flame* 167 (2016) 452–462. 10.1016/j.combustflame.2015.10.022. [PubMed: 29628525]
- [7]. Takahashi F, Katta VR, Linteris GT, Meier O, Cup-burner flame structure and extinguishment by C_2HF_5 in microgravity, *Proc. Combust. Inst* 34 (2012) 2707–2717. 10.1016/j.proci.2012.06.091.
- [8]. Takahashi F, Katta VR, Linteris GT, Babushok VI, Combustion inhibition and enhancement of cup-burner flames by CF_3Br , C_2HF_5 , $C_2HF_3Cl_2$, and $C_3H_2F_3Br$, *Proc. Combust. Inst* 35 (2014) 2741–2748. 10.1016/j.proci.2014.05.114.
- [9]. Katta VR, Goss LP, Roquemore WM, Numerical investigations of transitional H_2/N_2 jet diffusion flames, *AIAA J.* 32 (1994) 84–94. 10.2514/3.11954.
- [10]. Roquemore WM, Katta VR, Role of flow visualization in the development of UNICORN, *J. Visualization* 2, 3/4, (2000) 257–272. 10.1007/bf03181442.
- [11]. Hirschfelder JO, Curtis CF, Bird RB, *The Molecular Theory of Gases and Liquids*, Wiley, New York, 1954.
- [12]. Barlow RS, Karpets AN, Frank JH, Chen J-Y, Scalar profiles and NO formation in laminar opposed-flow partially premixed methane/air flames, *Combust. Flame* 127 (2001) 2102–2118. 10.1016/S0010-2180(01)00313-3.
- [13]. Fuss SP, Hamins A, Determination of Planck mean absorption coefficient for HBr, HCl and HF, *J. Heat Transfer, Trans ASME* 124 (2002) 26–29. 10.1115/1.1416689.
- [14]. Katta VR, Forlines RA, Roquemore WM, Anderson WS, Zelina J, Goad JR, Stouffer SD, Roy S, Experimental and computational study on partially premixed flames in a centerbody burner, *Combust. Flame* 158 (2011) 511–524. 10.1016/j.combustflame.2010.09.022.
- [15]. Wang H, You X, Jucks KW, Davis SG, Laskin A, Egolfopoulos F, Law CK, USC Mech Version II High-Temperature Combustion Reaction Model of $H_2/CO/C_1-C_4$ Compounds, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, 2007 http://ignis.usc.edu/USC_Mech_II.htm, (accessed 24.3.17).
- [16]. Sheen DA, You X, Wang H, Lovas T, Spectral uncertainty quantification, propagation and optimization of a detailed kinetic model for ethylene combustion, *Proc. Combust. Inst* 32 (2009) 535–542. 10.1016/j.proci.2008.05.042.
- [17]. Li J, Kazakov A, Chaos M, Dryer FL, Chemical kinetics of ethanol oxidation, US Sections/The Combustion Institute Meeting, 2007.
- [18]. Li J, Kazakov A, Dryer FL, Ethanol pyrolysis experiments in a variable pressure flow reactor, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet* 33 (2001) 859–867. 10.1002/kin.10009.
- [19]. Babushok VI, Burgess DRF, Tsang W, Miziolek AW, Simulation studies on the effects of flame retardants on combustion processes in a plug reactor, in *Halon Replacements*, 1995, pp. 275–288. 10.1021/bk-1995-0611.ch022.
- [20]. Babushok VI, Noto T, Burgess DRF, Hamins A, Tsang W, Influence of CF_3I , CF_3Br , and CF_3H on the high-temperature combustion of methane, *Combust. Flame* 107 (1996) 351–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-2180\(96\)00052-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-2180(96)00052-1).
- [21]. Babushok VI, Linteris GT, Meier OC, Pagliaro JL, Flame inhibition by CF_3CHCl_2 (HCFC-123), *Combust. Sci. Technol* 186 (2014) 792–814. 10.1080/00102202.2013.878709.
- [22]. Pagliaro JL, Linteris GT, Babushok VI, Premixed flame inhibition by $C_2HF_3Cl_2$ and C_2HF_5 , *Combust. Flame* 163 (2016) 54–65. 10.1016/j.combustflame.2015.08.015.
- [23]. Burgess DR, Zachariah MR, Tsang W, Westmoreland PR, Thermochemical and chemical kinetic data for fluorinated hydrocarbons, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci* 21 (1995) 453–529.

- [24]. Burgess DR, Zachariah MR, Tsang W, Westmoreland PR, Thermochemical and Chemical Kinetic Data for Fluorinated Hydrocarbons, NIST Technical Note 1412, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, 1995.
- [25]. Anon., Standard on Clean Agent Fire Extinguishing Systems, National Fire Protection Association, NFPA 2001, Quincy, MA, 2000.
- [26]. Anon., Gaseous Fire-Extinguishing Systems Physical Properties and System Design, ISO 14520-Part I, International Organization for Standardization, 2000.
- [27]. Sheinson RS, Penner-Hahn JE, Indritz D, The physical and chemical action of fire suppressants, *Fire Safety J.* 15 (1989) 437–450. 10.1016/0379-7112(89)90015-5.
- [28]. Hamins A, Gmurczyk G, Grosshandler W, Rehwoldt RG, Vazquez I, Cleary T, Presser C, Seshadri K, Flame suppression effectiveness, in: Grosshandler W, Gann RG, Pitts WM (Eds.), *Evaluation of Alternative In-Flight Fire Suppression for Full Scale Testing in Simulated Aircraft Engine Nacelles and Dry Bays*, NIST SP 861, 1994, pp. 345–465.
- [29]. Linteris GT, Flame suppression chemistry, in: Gann RG (Ed.), *Advanced Technology for Fire Suppression in Aircraft*, NIST Special Publication 1069, 2007, pp. 119–338.
- [30]. Linteris GT, Acid gas production in inhibited propane-air diffusion flames, in: Miziolek AW, Tsang W (Eds.), *Halon Replacements: Technology and Science*, American Chemical Society, Washington, DC, Chap. 19, 1995, pp. 225–242. 10.1021/bk-1995-0611.ch019.
- [31]. Linteris GT, Takahashi F, Katta VR, Fuel effects in cup-burner flame extinguishment, 5th US Combustion Meeting, San Diego, March 25–28, 2007.
- [32]. Kim A, Overview of Recent Progress in Fire Suppression Technology, National Research Council of Canada, NRCC-45690, 2002.
- [33]. Riches J, Knutsen L, Morrey E, Grant K, A modified flame ionization detector as a screening tool for halon alternatives, *Halon Alternatives Technical Working Conference*, Albuquerque, NM, 2000, pp. 115–125.
- [34]. Grigg J, Chattaway A, Ural EA, Evaluation of advanced agent working group agents by kidde, *Halon Options Technical working Conference*, Albuquerque, NM, 2001.
- [35]. Zegers EJP, Williams BA, Fisher EM, Fleming JW, Sheinson RS, Suppression of nonpremixed flames by fluorinated ethanes and propanes, *Combust. Flame* 121 (2000) 471–487. 10.1016/S0010-2180(99)00162-5.
- [36]. Takahashi F, Katta VR, A Reaction kernel hypothesis for the stability limit of methane jet diffusion flames, *Proc. Combust. Inst* 28 (2000) 2071–2078. 10.1016/S0082-0784(00)80615-3.
- [37]. Takahashi F, Linteris GT, Katta VR, Vortex-coupled oscillations of edge diffusion flames in coflowing air with dilution, *Proc. Combust. Inst* 31 (2007) 1575–1582. 10.1016/j.proci.2006.07.227.
- [38]. Takahashi F, Linteris GT, Katta VR, Extinguishment of methane diffusion flames by carbon dioxide in coflow air and oxygen-enriched microgravity environments, *Combust. Flame* 155 (2008) 37–53. 10.1016/j.combustflame.2008.03.005.
- [39]. Takahashi F, Linteris GT, Katta VR Extinguishment of methane diffusion flames by inert gases in coflow air and oxygen-enriched microgravity environments, *Proc. Combust. Inst* 33 (2010) 2531–2538. 10.1016/j.proci.2010.06.086.

Fig. 1.

Calculated structure of near-limit propane flames in air with added agent: (a) CF_3Br , $X_a=0.0258$; (b) C_2HF_5 , $X_a=0.0765$; (c) $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$, $X_a=0.0455$; and (d) $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$, $X_a=0.0246$.

Fig. 2.

Calculated radial variations of the temperature and heat-release rate in propane flames in air with agent: (a) across a trailing flame (at $z_k + 5$ mm); (b) across the reaction kernel (at z_k).

CF_3Br , $X_a = 0.0258$, $z_k = 1.8$ mm; C_2HF_5 , $X_a = 0.0765$, $z_k = 1.2$ mm; $\text{C}_2\text{HF}_3\text{Cl}_2$, $X_a = 0.0455$, $z_k = 0.8$ mm; and $\text{C}_3\text{H}_2\text{F}_3\text{Br}$, $X_a = 0.0246$, $z_k = 1.4$ mm.

Fig. 3.
Calculated structure of a propane flame in air with added C_2HF_5 at $X_a = 0.076$ and $z = 5.8$ mm.

Fig. 4. Calculated radial variations of the (a) species production rates, and (b) species specific and total heat-release rates in a propane flame in air with C₂HF₅ at $X_a=0.076$ and $z=5.8$ mm.

Fig. 5.
Calculated reaction kernel coordinates of propane flames in air with agent.

Fig. 6.
Calculated axial (U_k) and radial (V_k) velocity components and total velocity ($|v_k|$) in propane flames in air with agent.

Fig. 7. Calculated reaction kernel temperature and heat-release rate, and its ratio to total velocity in propane flames in air with agent.

Fig. 8. Calculated maximum temperature and total heat release rate (integrated over the entire flame and the base region) in propane flames in air with agent.

Table 1.

Measured and calculated minimum extinguishing concentrations.

Agent	Chemical	Formula	Measured n-Heptane MEC (%)	Measured Propane MEC (%)	Calculated ACT Fuel MEC (%)	Calculated Propane MEC (%)
Halon 1301	Bromotrifluoromethane	CF ₃ Br	3.0 to 3.2 [26–27]	3.8 to 4.3 [27,29,30]	2.26	2.64
HFC-125	Pentafluoroethane	C ₂ HF ₅	8.7 to 9.3 [24–28]	10.2 to 10.4 [27,29]	8.40	7.65
HCFC-123	2,2-dichloro-1,1,1-Trifluoroethane	C ₂ HF ₃ Cl ₂	7.1 to 7.4 [31]	N/A	(4.90 ^b)	(4.60 ^b)
2-BTP	2-bromo-3,3,3-Trifluoropropene	C ₃ H ₂ F ₃ Br	2.6 [32] 4.7 [33] ^a	N/A	(1.87 ^b)	(2.50 ^b)

^aThe fuel temperature: 50 °C^bA concentration above which the calculation was unable to obtain the solution