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A B S T R A C T
Here, a finite-rate chemistry large-eddy simulation (LES) solver is utilized to investigate dual-fuel (DF) ignition process of n-dodecane spray injection into a methane–air mixture at engine-relevant ambient temperatures. The investigated configurations correspond to single-fuel (SF) \( \phi_{CH_4} = 0 \) and DF \( \phi_{CH_4} = 0.5 \) conditions for a range of temperatures. The simulation setup is a continuation of the work by Kahila et al. (2019, Combustion and Flame) with the baseline SF spray setup corresponding to the Engine Combustion Network (ECN) Spray A configuration. First, ignition is investigated at different ambient temperatures in 0D and 1D studies in order to isolate the effect of chemistry and chemical mechanism selection to ignition delay time (IDT). Second, 3D LES of SF and DF sprays at three different ambient temperatures is carried out. Third, a reaction sensitivity analysis is performed to investigate the effect of ambient temperature on the most sensitive reactions. The main findings of the paper are as follows: (1) DF ignition characteristics depend on the choice of chemical mechanism, particularly at lower temperatures. (2) Addition of methane to the ambient mixture delays ignition, and this effect is the strongest at lower temperatures. (3) While the inhibiting effect of methane on low- and high-temperature IDT's is evident, the time difference between these two stages is shown to be only slightly dependent on temperature. (4) Reaction sensitivity analysis indicates that reactions related to methane oxidation are more pronounced at lower temperatures. The provided quantitative results indicate the strong ambient temperature sensitivity of the DF ignition process.

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of The Combustion Institute. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license. (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Engine combustion research is primarily focused on increasing the engine efficiency and reducing the emission products such as soot and nitrogen oxides (NOx) [1]. One way to achieve low-emissions is to target at low-temperature and fuel-lean combustion conditions [2]. Combining the advantages of compression ignition (CI) and spark ignition (SI) engine systems, dual-fuel (DF) engines offer a promising solution to reduce particulate matter (PM) and NOx emissions by providing low-temperature and fuel-lean combustion [3–5].

In DF engines, a high-reactivity fuel spray (e.g. diesel) is injected into a low-reactivity primary fuel (e.g. methane–air mixture) to release sufficient heat and chemically active reactants to ignite the ambient mixture under compression. Depending on various aspects, including the engine size, operation range and relative ratio of the two fuels, such a fuel spray ignition scenario may differ substantially between different applications. For example, in reactivity controlled compression ignition (RCCI) engines, the two fuels are present commonly in energy-wise similar quantities, up to 70–90% low-reactivity fuel (LRF) ratio [6]. In the RCCI mode, the high-reactivity fuel is typically injected quite early before the top dead center (TDC), targeting towards a volumetric and staged ignition with substantial mixing time. In contrast, high-reactivity pilot spray may also be injected close to the TDC in rather small amounts (e.g. LRF ratio higher than 90%) [7], acting as a robust spark and eventually leading to combustion of the low-reactivity primary fuel. This paper focuses on continuous spray injection with high LRF ratio and close to TDC, which is common in industrial applications.

Due to the complexity of spray combustion, there is a need for comprehensive experimental data in order to better understand the associated fundamental physical and chemical phenomena. A number of datasets relevant to spray ignition at engine-relevant conditions exist for diesel and gasoline fuels in the Engine Combustion Network (ECN) database [8]. The main goal of the ECN
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is to create well documented datasets suitable for numerical and experimental validation. Among different target conditions, the ECN Spray A is a suitable candidate for this study. It corresponds to a constant volume diesel spray combustion experimental setup, details of which are discussed in Section 2.4.

Previously, many experimental [9–13] and numerical [14–20] studies have been conducted investigating the Spray A configuration, all agreeing on the increase in IDT at lower ambient temperature conditions. In particular, Pei et al. [21–23] and Ameen et al. [24] concluded that lower ambient temperature levels lead to substantially higher IDT and leaner combustion characteristics due to longer mixing timescales. Moreover, Kundu et al. [25] reported the increase in influence of turbulent strain on chemistry in reacting flows at lower ambient temperatures. Following our previous work, here the ECN Spray A target condition is considered as a baseline case, enabling validation of the spray-LES framework [26,27].

Although there has been a growing interest in DF combustion research, so far results have mostly focused on the performance and emission characteristics of engine scale applications [28–33]. However, an agreement is reached on the retarding effect of ambient CH₄ on diesel spray ignition process through different studies. Rapid compression-expansion machine (RCEM) experiments conducted by Schlatter et al. [34] with n-heptane and ambient oxidizer containing CH₄ showed a linear relation between increase in IDT and the methane concentration of the ambient mixture. Following their work, Srna et al. [35,36] observed a similar behavior with n-dodecane and concluded that the retarding effect increases at lower temperatures and higher methane–air equivalence ratios. Almost all previous studies noted that there is an increase in the inhibiting effect of methane on IDT at lower temperatures for DF configurations. A large amount of numerical studies investigating DF combustion with diesel pilot ignition is also available in literature [3,4,37–44]. These studies range from 0D models [45] to full scale 3D RANS simulations with finite-rate chemistry combustion modeling [3,4,37,39]. A summary of recent key studies investigating DF ignition is provided in Table 1.

While chemical oxidation process of diesel has been investigated from the chemistry point of view before, direct effect of CH₄ on this phenomenon is still ambiguous. Recently, Manias et al. [49] investigated the influence of CH₂O and H₂O₂ additives on CH₄ autoignition chemistry. Such species are known to be produced during the long hydrocarbon decomposition process and their presence is known to reduce the autoignition timescales considerably [26].

With relevance to the present paper, Kahila et al. [26,27] carried out high-resolution (62.5 µm) LES of DF spray ignition where n-dodecane was injected into a lean methane–air mixture in engine-relevant conditions at 900 K. The spray configuration corresponded to the ECN Spray A case, allowing extensive validation of the utilized numerical models against the available experimental data in SF configuration. The authors reported that the DF ignition is a volumetric process with three main stages: first-stage ignition and early heat release, second stage ignition at spray tip and activation of high-temperature chemistry and full oxidation of available premixed low-reactivity fuel. It was observed that the DF IDT values are increased by a factor of 1.6–2.4 compared to SF at 900 K, depending on the applied chemical mechanism. In addition, it was reported that the ambient methane influences the n-dodecane ignition throughout the chemical oxidation process and inhibits both first and second-stage ignition, compared to the SF. In particular, the early decomposition of n-dodecane was reported to be inhibited by methane related reactions, hence supporting the findings of the longer first-stage IDT values observed by Srna et al. [50] in RCEM experiments. Finally, it was observed that the high-temperature ignition in LES appears in rich mixture, around $Z \approx 2Z_{IDT}$.

Based on the literature, several research gaps were identified to be addressed in this paper. First, suitability of the spray-LES framework for lower ambient oxidizer temperatures in spray combustion context has not been investigated. Second, in depth analysis of DF ignition characteristics with varying ambient temperature is yet to be analyzed in detail. Third, although the retarding effect of CH₄ to diesel spray ignition is known from engine and RCEM experiments, the trend as a function of ambient temperature is not fully quantified. Based on the noted research gaps, the following objectives are set for the paper:

1. Carry out simulations in 0D, 1D and 3D to extend the work by Kahila et al. [26,27] on DF ignition for a range of temperatures.
2. Compare the effect of chemical mechanism in 0D and 1D for an engine-relevant temperature range.
3. Perform 3D LES of SF and DF spray ignition at different temperatures (850, 900 and 1000 K).
4. Explain the inhibiting influence of methane on ignition at different ambient temperatures from mixing and chemical kinetics points of view.

The present paper is organized as follows: the numerical methods and utilized tools, such as governing equations, numerical discretization, turbulence and combustion models are presented in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, followed by a description of the different chemical mechanisms used and the simulation setup in Sections 2.3 and 2.4. Results obtained from 0D, 1D and 3D simulations are presented in Section 3. In Section 4, an overall summary of the findings and the conclusion are presented.

### 2. Methodology

#### 2.1. Governing equations and discretization

Gas phase fluid flow is governed by the compressible Navier–Stokes equations. In reactive flows, governing equations consist of continuity, momentum, species concentration and enthalpy. LES formulation of these equations with Favre-filtering is given as:

$$
\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \hat{\rho} \hat{u}_i}{\partial x_i} = \hat{S}_\rho.
$$

### Table 1

Summary of recent key studies related to DF spray combustion and ignition characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Added value</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahila et al.</td>
<td>n-dodecane DF spray</td>
<td>LES</td>
<td>Ignition characteristics and t_{IDT} effect</td>
<td>[26,27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad et al.</td>
<td>Diesel DF spray</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>Pilot ratio and $\phi_{CH}_4$</td>
<td>[46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srna et al.</td>
<td>n-dodecane DF spray</td>
<td>RCEM Exp. + OD</td>
<td>$T_{SOY}$, $\phi_{CH}_4$, EGR effects and optical imaging</td>
<td>[35,36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grochowina et al.</td>
<td>Diesel DF combustion cell</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>DF spray characteristics</td>
<td>[47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghaderi et al.</td>
<td>n-dodecane DF mixture</td>
<td>OD + 1D</td>
<td>Mechanism performance analysis</td>
<td>[48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenichinos et al.</td>
<td>n-heptane DF spray</td>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>TCI + kinetics</td>
<td>[42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlatter et al.</td>
<td>n-heptane DF spray</td>
<td>RCEM Exp. + OD</td>
<td>First detailed optical imaging</td>
<td>[34]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The table lists various studies that investigated DF spray combustion and ignition characteristics. For each study, the configuration (e.g., n-dodecane DF spray, Diesel DF spray), model (LES, Experiment), and added value (Ignition characteristics and t_{IDT} effect, Pilot ratio and $\phi_{CH}_4$) are specified, along with the relevant reference. This summary highlights the diverse approaches and findings in the field, setting the stage for the analysis presented in the paper.
\[
\frac{\partial (\rho \hat{u}_i)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j)}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( -\rho \hat{u}_i \hat{v}_j + \rho \hat{u}_j \hat{u}_i + \tau_{ij} \right) + \mathbf{S}_i,
\]
(2)

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho \hat{u}_i \hat{y}_k)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho \hat{u}_i \hat{y}_k \hat{y}_l)}{\partial x_l} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} \left( \rho \hat{u}_i \hat{v}_k - \rho \hat{u}_k \hat{v}_i + \rho \hat{D} \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k}{\partial x_l} \right) + \mathbf{S}_k + \hat{\omega}_k,
\]
(3)

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho \hat{h}_i)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho \hat{u}_i \hat{h}_k)}{\partial x_k} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \rho \hat{u}_i \hat{v}_k - \rho \hat{u}_k \hat{v}_i + \frac{\bar{S}}{\tau_p} \frac{\partial \hat{h}_k}{\partial x_l} \right) + \bar{S}_h + \hat{\omega}_h,
\]
(4)

where \( \rho, \hat{u}_i, \hat{v}_k, \hat{h}_k, \tau_{ij} \) represents filtered density, velocity, pressure, mass fraction of \( k \)-th species, sensible enthalpy and viscous stress tensor, respectively. In this notation, overbar (\( ~ \)) denotes unweighted ensemble average and tilde (\( \tilde{\cdot} \)) denotes density-weighted ensemble average. In energy equation (i.e. Eq. (4)), variables \( \tau_p \) and \( \bar{S} \) represent heat capacity and thermal conductivity of the mixture.

In reacting cases, production rate of each species is denoted by \( \hat{\omega}_k \) and heat release rate (HRR) is calculated as \( \hat{\omega}_h = \sum_k \Delta h_f^k \hat{\omega}_k \), where \( \Delta h_f^k \) is the enthalpy of formation of a unity Lewis number is assumed for all the species, making the diffusion coefficient \( \hat{D} = \lambda/(\rho \hat{c}_p) \). The system of equations is completed by the ideal gas law and thermal equation of state.

Finite volume method is utilized to solve Eqs. (1)–(4) with a 2nd order implicit time integration method within OpenFOAM-2.4.x framework [51]. The reacting PISO (Pressure-Implicit with Splitting of Operators) algorithm is utilized to achieve pressure-velocity coupling. While diffusion terms are discretized by 2nd order central differencing schemes, convection related terms required a different discretization strategy due to their non-linearity and subgrid scale modeling. The LES subgrid parameters present in the Eqs. (1)–(4) can be explicitly modeled through a subgrid scale turbulence model. Alternatively, with a suitable grid size, they can also be implicitly modeled by choosing a dissipative numerical discretization scheme for convection terms. In this work, the latter path is taken with utilizing a non-linear, dissipative interpolation scheme called Gamma scheme [52] for scalar and convective term discretizations, which is similar to our previous studies involving non-reactive and reactive spray simulations [19,26,27,53].

### 2.2. Spray and combustion modeling

For modeling the injected liquid diesel surrogate spray, Lagrangian Particle Tracking (LPT) method is used, similar to our previous spray simulation studies [19,26,27,53]. The initial particles are sampled as computational parcels using Rosin-Rammler distribution with an initial Sauter mean diameter of 6 \( \mu \)m. The secondary breakup of the droplets is modeled using the KHRT model [54,55], Frössling correlation [56] and Ranz and Marshall correlation [57,58] are used to model the evaporation between the two phases.

The reactivity is introduced to the governing equations through source terms in Eqs. (3) and (4): filtered species reaction rates (\( \bar{\omega}_k \)) and heat release rate (HRR) (\( \bar{\omega}_h \)). Due to the large timescale difference between the flow and the chemistry, an operator-splitting technique is used to split the calculation of gas phase flow equations from chemical source term calculation step.

In our OpenFOAM implementation, calculation of the Jacobian matrix for solving the chemical source term ODE system is carried out with the open-source library pyljac [59]. The stiff ODE system is solved independently for each computational cell, using a linearly implicit Euler extrapolation method (Seulex) [60] with high-order (up to 12th) accuracy. Finally, the computational load of the chemistry calculation is optimized through MPI routines and uniformly distributed to the available processors during simulation.

The turbulence-chemistry interaction (TCI) is taken into account through a first order closure hypothesis and no subgrid scale model is applied for the chemical source terms in Eqs. (3) and (4). Similar to our previous study, it is assumed that the turbulence levels in the high velocity spray leads to such an intense mixing, that with the present mesh resolution finite-rate chemistry is able to predict the ignition characteristics sufficiently [26]. Previously, Pei et al. [21] utilized a similar first order approach in Spray A using a similar grid spacing to the present study and reported reasonable results. In addition, LES studies in configurations including non-premixed and premixed combustion modes have shown promising results with such a simplified no-model approach [61–63]. In general, adequate performance of this simple approach is attributed to the comparatively fine grid resolutions used in the prescribed studies. However, it has been shown earlier that the influence of strain effects and mixing on reactive sprays (e.g. modeling uncertainties) increase at lower ambient temperature conditions [25]. In general, it should be noted that the current TCI approach introduces a modeling error to the simulation. However, according to our previous investigations [26,27] and compiled results in the recent ECN proceedings [64], the TCI model has less influence on IDT compared to dynamics of e.g. transient spray flame stabilization phenomenon.

Finally, the chemistry computation is further optimized by computing the full detailed chemistry solution only within the spray region (\( Z > 1 \epsilon – 4 \)). Elsewhere, where homogeneous premixed methane mixture is present (\( Z < 1 \epsilon – 4 \)), chemistry solution is integrated for a single cell and mapped to other cells. This provides significant computational speedup especially at the beginning of the simulation, where the fuel spray is spatially confined.

### 2.3. Chemical mechanisms

Choosing a suitable chemical mechanism plays a crucial role in reactive simulations. There are various mechanisms governing the \( n \)-dodecane oxidation reaction. However, the chosen mechanism should also properly predict CH\(_4\) oxidation and the effect of CH\(_4\) on \( n \)-dodecane oxidation.

At lower ambient temperature conditions, contribution of the low-temperature combustion (LTC) and related reactions to overall oxidation path increases. The ECN workshops reported that the chemical mechanisms carry much significance for modeling LTC accurately [64]. Wehrfritz et al. [65] showed that for low temperature conditions around 750–800K, differences in ignition delay can be as high as 2 ms for different chemical mechanisms at the Spray A (SF) conditions. In a different study by Ghaderi Masouleh et al. [48], various \( n \)-dodecane mechanisms by Sarathy et al. [66], Ranzi et al. [67,68], Narayanaswamy et al. [69] and Luo et al. [70] were investigated in 0D and 1D DF modeling context and their performance on ignition modeling was explored. However, most of these mechanisms are considered too large to be used in 3D LES simulations.

In our previous study, Kahila et al. [26] have shown that the compact skeletal mechanism developed by Yao et al. [71] (hereby referred to as Yao) and another reduced mechanism developed by Frassoldati et al. [hereby referred to as POLIMI reduced] [72] were able to reproduce similar features during the DF oxidation process, including the interactions between CH\(_3\), OH and long hydrocarbon radicals, relevant to CH\(_4\) and \( n \)-dodecane oxidation. Consistent with that study, the main chemical mechanism utilized in this study is the compact Yao mechanism. For completeness, we
provide a mechanism comparison in 0D and 1D simulations with two additional mechanisms from Lu et al. [73] (referred as LLNL reduced) and Narayanaswamy et al. [69] (referred to as Narayanaswamy). From these mechanisms, POLIMI reduced was analyzed in a comparative study investigating \( n \)-dodecane/\( \text{CH}_4 \) blends with homogeneous reactor simulations [48], while Yao and LLNL reduced were validated against experimental RCEM data [74]. Narayanaswamy was included in both of these studies. These results combined with our previous spray modeling studies using flamelet models [19,53] and finite-rate chemistry [26,27] show that all the selected mechanisms are able to describe \( n \)-dodecane oxidation kinetics consistently. It is also important to note that all the mechanisms except POLIMI reduced were reduced from the same detailed mechanism developed by Sarathy et al. [66]. A brief summary of the chemical mechanisms considered is provided in Table 2.

### 2.4. Simulation configuration and case setup

The numerical SF spray analysis conducted in this study corresponds to the ECN Spray A conditions [8]. Diesel fuel surrogate \( n \)-dodecane is injected from a 90 \( \mu \)m nozzle orifice into a constant volume combustion vessel, where the thermophysical properties are similar to engine conditions. There is an extensive additional data for different ambient temperature conditions, ranging from 750 to 1200 K. The corresponding DF setup derived from the baseline Spray A condition has additional \( \text{CH}_4 \) in the ambient mixture, which is achieved by keeping the molar concentration of \( \text{O}_2 \) constant and adding \( \text{CH}_4 \) to the ambient mixture until \( \phi_{\text{CH}_4} = 0.5 \) condition is satisfied. Based on these conditions, stoichiometric mixture fraction (Z_0) corresponds to \( Z_0^{\text{SF}} = 0.0435 \) and \( Z_0^{\text{DF}} = 0.0234 \) for SF and DF cases. Details of this experimental setup and the DF condition derived from it is given in Table 3.

For 3D LES analysis, the computational domain is constructed to have the same volume with the experimental combustion vessel [8]. The simulation setup is depicted in Fig. 1. A refinement region of 62.5 \( \mu \)m is applied around the region where \( n \)-dodecane spray penetrates. This grid resolution has been shown to be fine enough to capture important spray features in previous numerical studies [16,18,19,21,24–27,53]. For all cases, spray penetration is included within the prescribed uniform resolution. In zone (I), strong momentum exchange, mixing, and liquid evaporation take place. In the present LES-LPT model, the spatial dimensions of zone (I) depend mostly on droplet size (via the Stokes number), fuel thermophysical properties (e.g. latent heat) and injection conditions (e.g. injection pressure, duration, and nozzle diameter). Towards the end of zone (I) and in the LTC zone (II), low-temperature reactions occur. The LTC zone (II) terminates at the point where high temperature reactions start at the border of high-temperature combustion (HTC) zone (III). Finally, the HTC zone expands towards the ambient \( \text{CH}_4 \)-air mixture. Based on previous studies, the inhibiting effect of ambient \( \text{CH}_4 \) to diesel spray ignition mostly occurs between the zones (I) and (II), affecting the early stage LTC [26,35,36].

### 3. Results

In order to understand the different physical and chemical phenomena affecting ignition in reactive dual-fuel sprays, nu-
adiabatic mixing line has particular relevance in spray-originated non-premixed combustion.

The IDT values for both SF and DF conditions are obtained and presented in Fig. 2(a). First stage IDT ($\tau_1$) is the characteristic time of LTC onset and here it is defined as the time instance when 20% of maximum $C_{10}H_{20}O_2(RO_2)$ concentration ($Y_{RO_2}\max$) is reached. Second stage IDT ($\tau_2$), or the high temperature ignition, represents the full ignition of the mixture and initiation of high-temperature chemistry (HTC). The definition of $\tau_2$ is based on the maximum value of the maximum temperature gradient ($\frac{dT}{dz}\max$). While Fig. 2(a) and (b) show $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ of the SF and DF mixtures, Fig. 2(c) presents the chemical induction time ($\tau_{ind} = \tau_2 - \tau_1$) for all cases.

From Fig. 2, the following observations can be made: (1) Lower ambient temperature indicates higher $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ values for both SF and DF configurations. (2) The inhibiting effect of methane on $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ is observed for all four mechanisms and the effect increases with decreasing temperature. (3) For $T \geq 950$ K, $\tau_{ind}$ values are found to be independent of temperature and methane addition (SF vs. DF). However, at $T < 950$ K, $\tau_{ind}$ becomes substantially more dependent on temperature and methane addition. (4) While the $\tau_2^{DF}/\tau_2^{SF}$ ratio (not shown in figure) is between 1.2 to 1.4 for three of the selected mechanisms at different ambient temperatures, the Yao mechanism yields a higher ratio in the range of 1.4 to 3.4. Qualitatively, these findings are consistent with the results by Srna et al. [35,36], where the inhibiting effect of methane was

**3.1. Homogeneous reactor simulations (0D)**

Constant pressure HR simulations are carried out using the Cantera software [75]. In particular, we compare four different n-dodecane reaction mechanisms and investigate SF and DF IDT’s along the adiabatic mixing line. We note that the concept of the numerical simulations are presented in this section in an order based on their level of complexity: 0D homogeneous reactor (HR) simulations, 1D counter-flow diffusion flamelet (CDF) simulations and 3D LES spray simulations.

Fig. 2. IDT results obtained from most reactive mixture fraction ($Z_{frac}$) value of homogeneous reactors set along the adiabatic mixing line at 800–1200 K ambient temperature range (SF – open, DF – filled symbols).

Fig. 3. IDT values of 0D homogeneous reactors set along the adiabatic mixing line for a range of ambient temperatures using Yao mechanism.
found to increase at lower temperatures, and the retarding effect of methane was reported to diminish after the initiation of LTC.

Overall, Fig. 2 shows an increasing discrepancy in IDT with decreasing temperature. In particular, the Yao mechanism seems to produce longer IDT values at $Z_{MR}$ compared to the other mechanisms. Due to high complexity of chemical kinetics at low temperatures and within the negative temperature coefficient (NTC) region, such deviations are expected [76]. For example, Yao et al. [71] show high sensitivity to low-temperature reactions on Spray A IDT at 800 K. Therefore, compared to other mechanisms, a certain over-prediction of the ignition events by the Yao mechanism at lower temperatures is anticipated for both SF and DF.

The IDT calculated along the adiabatic mixing line with the Yao mechanism are presented in Fig. 3. It can be seen that at low temperatures, the igniting mixtures are more confined in the mixture fraction domain in DF cases. Such a confining behavior is due to the effect of added methane: in DF conditions the retarding effect creates a narrower band of mixture fraction values active enough to ignite within a relevant time frame, which in turn delays the IDT. Increasing the ambient temperature diminishes this effect and the SF and DF cases show similar behavior for the higher temperature conditions.

3.2. Counter-flow diffusion flamelets (1D)

Next, 1D igniting counter-diffusion flamelet (CDF) simulation results are presented to investigate the joint effect of laminar mixing and diffusion on ignition chemistry characteristics. The governing equations for the transient CDF [77,78] are solved using the Chem1D software [79]. The initial and boundary conditions of the flamelets are set according to Table 3 with a unity Lewis number assumption. Here, a constant strain rate of 500 s$^{-1}$ is used, a value shown previously to capture the moderately strained conditions [19,26,53].

Figure 4 provides a quantitative comparison of the mechanisms for the 1D simulations. Narayanaswamy is selected as the baseline reference since it is the most detailed among the investigated mechanisms. It can be seen that for the baseline SF condition, Yao tends to underpredict both $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$. In the DF configuration, Yao overpredicts both $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ compared to the reference at higher IDT values, corresponding to lower temperature conditions. However, the overall performance of the selected mechanisms seem to be following the same trend. Considering the compactness and overall performance above the desired lower temperature limit (850K), the Yao mechanism is chosen to be used for 3D simulations. Therefore, the following 1D flamelet analysis is limited to the results obtained with the Yao mechanism.

We have already investigated the ignition characteristics of 1D SF and DF laminar flamelets at 900 K in our previous work [26]. Utilizing a similar analysis, three characteristic time instances associated with ignition process are computed for each case in mixture fraction-time $(Z, t)$ space and the results are presented in Fig. 5. For brevity, two conditions corresponding to the lower and higher limits of our focus ambient temperature range (850 and 1000 K) are given. Numerical results for all investigated cases are presented in Table 4. The obtained results follow the same trends as the 0D homogeneous reactor simulations at different temperatures which are provided in the supplementary materials of the paper.

The timescale $\tau_4$ (○) is defined similar to before as the time instance when 20% of $(\phi_{CH_4})_{max}$ is reached. It is associated with LTC and its position in $(Z, t)$ space corresponds to the onset of early heat release at low mixture fraction conditions. It can be seen from Fig. 5 that CH$_4$ addition shifts the LTC initiation to richer mixture fraction conditions, which is consistent with the 0D results. From Table 5 it can also be observed that $\tau_4$ increases with CH$_4$ addition and the effect is the strongest at lower ambient temperatures (increase around 0.9 ms for 850 K).

After a sufficient time, the HTC is activated and the mixture progresses to higher burning temperatures. Second timescale, the $\tau_{HTC}$ (□) is defined as the time instance when 1% of maximum H$_2$O$_2$ consumption rate is reached [80] and similar to LTC, a shift to the richer mixtures due to CH$_4$ addition can be observed. It is noted that the addition of CH$_4$ not only delays $\tau_1$, but also $\tau_{HTC}$. However, the induction time between these two time instances $(\tau_{HTC} - \tau_1)$ seems to be unaffected by CH$_4$, further supporting the view that the timescales after $\tau_1$ seem to be only weakly dependent on $\phi_{CH_4}$ (SF vs. DF).

After the HTC onset, there is another characteristic timescale until high-temperature oxidation progresses. This stage is defined similar to the second-stage ignition introduced previously and denoted as $\tau_2$ (▲). It is defined as the time instance when maximum value of temperature gradient $(\varphi_{Tmax})_{max}$ is obtained. Typical to diesel ignition process, after HTC onset, HTC drifts towards leaner mixtures. From Table 5 it can be seen that the induction time between $\tau_2$ and $\tau_{HTC}$ increases with lower ambient temperature for both SF and DF conditions. It is also evident that CH$_4$ addition increases this time interval by around 0.1 ms, with weak ambient temperature dependency. A similar observation can be made for the overall induction time between the two main ignition events $(\tau_2 - \tau_1)$. Although the independent inhibiting effect of CH$_4$ and
Based on the 1D analysis, we conclude that: (1) The addition of CH₄ shifts the whole ignition process to richer mixture fraction conditions. (2) The time difference between τ₁ and HTC onset (τ-HTC) is unaffected by CH₄ addition, supporting the observation that CH₄ mainly inhibits the early oxidation process. (3) At any given temperature, the time difference between τ₂ and τ₁ seems to increase with methane addition (by 0.1–0.12 ms). Overall, the flamelet simulations support the previous observations that the inhibiting effect of CH₄ on long hydrocarbon oxidation occurs mainly at the early stages of oxidation.

### 3.3. Large-eddy simulation of spray ignition (3D)

Next, SF and DF sprays are simulated at T = 850, 900 and 1000 K. On one hand, the chosen temperature range is justified based on the obtained 0D and 1D results which indicated temper-
ature sensitivity for the Yao mechanism below 850 K. On the other hand, above 1000 K, the retarding effect of CH$_4$ is observed to diminish, making the higher temperature values of less interest. We note that the current baseline ECN Spray A simulation setup has been thoroughly validated in non-reacting ($Y_{O_2}$=0) conditions by comparing the vapor and liquid penetration and mixture profiles with the experimental results [16,19,53]. Additionally, the utilized solver has been benchmarked for various reacting configurations [26,27].

3.3.1. IDT definition and spatio-temporal DF ignition analysis

Figure 6 shows the temporal evolution of the maximum temperature in the 3D domain, along with concentrations of key species related to ignition for different ambient temperatures. The first and second stage IDT values ($\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$) are marked as vertical dashed lines in the figure. The temporal shift in $T_{\text{max}}$ from SF (-----) to DF (----) is evident for all temperature levels. In addition, the two-stage ignition structure associated with long hydrocarbon fuels can be clearly observed from the $T_{\text{max}}$ curves.

In order to compare the ignition characteristics at different conditions in detail, IDT values are presented in Fig. 7 along with experimental Spray A IDT results for $\tau_2$. The SF Spray A IDT values obtained from LES (blue bar) show good agreement with the experimental data with a slight underprediction, which is expected for the Yao mechanism [74]. Furthermore, the retarded ignition for DF case is also clearly visible in the figure for both $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$. For lower ambient temperatures, the retarding effect of CH$_4$ increases. In addition, $\tau_2^{SF}/\tau_2^{DF}$ is found to be 3.1 (850 K), 2.33 (900 K) and 1.71 (1000 K). Finally, relative insensitivity of $\tau_{\text{ind}}$ to ambient temperature can also be observed from Fig. 7. Such a characteristic behavior also supports the view that the CH$_4$ mostly

Fig. 6. Evolution of RO$_{\text{max}}$ (-----), $T_{\text{max}}$ (----) and OH$_{\text{max}}$ (_____ ) with respect to time. Dashed line represent SF while solid line shows DF. Note the change in horizontal axis scale for each case.

Fig. 7. IDT’s of SF and DF cases obtained from 3D LES analysis. Patterned portion of the bar represents $\tau_1$ while the total bar represents $\tau_2$. Inhibiting effect of CH$_4$ to both ignition stages is clearly observed. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
retards the low-temperature reactions and causes a primary delay in the early oxidation products [26].

In order to understand the effect of ambient temperature on DF ignition, spatio-temporal species distribution is investigated and linked with the timescales $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$. Cutplane data from the DF spray simulations from different time instances is presented in Fig. 8 for 850 K and 900 K, while the 1000 K case is not shown for brevity. The chosen time instances are: (1) first stage ignition ($\tau_1$) when LTC is initiated, (2) slightly before the second stage ignition ($0.9 \tau_2$) when low and high temperature regions can be observed, (3) second stage ignition ($\tau_2$) when first ignition kernels can be spotted, (4) slightly after the second stage ignition ($1.2 \tau_2$) at the onset of ambient CH₄ consumption.

At $\tau = \tau_1$, first row of Fig. 8 shows the distribution of LTC (red) across the spray. The boundary of the LTC region is marked by the isoline of 1% of maximum of early oxidation products (1% $\left(Y_{OH}\right)_{min}$). At 850 K, $\tau_1$ is higher, enabling longer mixing time and consequently a more diluted diesel spray. Such enhanced mixing can be observed in the LTC region, which is more confined towards richer regions at 900 K, whereas at 850 K LTC region leans out and follows more closely the stoichiometric mixture fraction $Z_{st}$ (black) isoline. Additionally, the retarding effect of CH₄ on ignition can be seen from the onset of the LTC region from the nozzle. While at 850 K LTC initiates around 25 mm, at 900 K it shifts to 15 mm.

Following the second row ($\tau = 0.9 \tau_2$), growth of the LTC throughout the spray can be observed. It is worth noting that the wider distribution of the LTC at lower temperatures is still visible. In addition, onset of HTC (green) is also visible during this phase. The border of this region is marked by the isoline representing 1% of maximum H₂O consumption rate (1% $\left(Y_{H_2O}\right)_{min}$), denoting the consumption of LTC phase products and eventually leading to HTC.

The third row ($\tau = \tau_2$) shows the second stage ignition for both cases. LTC and HTC structures can be easily identified and the formation of the first high temperature ignition kernels (red) is visible (I). This region is defined by the $T=1500$ K isoline and will eventually ignite the ambient CH₄ in the spray vicinity. It is clear that the ratio of LTC/HTC is much higher at 850 K, showing that LTC contribution to the heat release is higher than at 900 K. Finally, the last row ($\tau = 1.2 \tau_2$) shows the growing HTC region (II), reacting with the ambient methane. This region follows the stoichiometric isoline covering the periphery of the spray tip for both temperatures. In addition to the reported results here, a spatial distribution analysis of formaldehyde (CH₂O) is provided as supplementary material to this paper to give more insight on the LTC characteristics in the investigated configurations.

A summary of the quantitative results for the 3D SF and DF sprays is provided in Table 5. The observed trends can be also understood in light of certain previous studies. First, Dahm et al. [81] have shown that the early conversion rate of n-dodecane is highly dependent on temperature, leading to slow increase in temperature and radical/intermediate species concentrations, prolonging $\tau_1$. Second, as discussed earlier by Kahila et al. [26], the early CH₄ related kinetics consumes important radicals such as OH, subsequently enhancing the inhibiting effect on the early
and investigated 3.3.2.

mean 60 SF 850 0.37 0.5 0.13 27.0 ± 3.2 10.7 ± 2.13
900 K 0.19 0.34 0.15 21.3 ± 2.1 9.01 ± 1.65
1000 K 0.08 0.2 0.12 18.1 ± 2.0 8.92 ± 1.99
DF 850 K 1.21 1.5 0.29 56.2 ± 2.1 11.69 ± 1.25
900 K 0.51 0.76 0.25 32.9 ± 2.5 10.22 ± 1.76
1000 K 0.16 0.35 0.20 22.5 ± 2.2 8.94 ± 2.04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>τ1 [ms]</th>
<th>τ2 [ms]</th>
<th>τind [ms]</th>
<th>XHTC [mm]</th>
<th>Xliq [mm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>850 K</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>27.0 ± 3.2</td>
<td>10.7 ± 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 K</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>21.3 ± 2.1</td>
<td>9.01 ± 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 K</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>18.1 ± 2.0</td>
<td>8.92 ± 1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>850 K</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>56.2 ± 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 K</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>32.9 ± 2.5</td>
<td>10.22 ± 1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 K</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>22.5 ± 2.2</td>
<td>8.94 ± 2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9. Contribution of LTC and HTC stages to the heat release rate for SF 900 K (top) and DF 1000 K (bottom) conditions. Similar temporal evolution of LTC and HTC is observed for both cases.

3.3.2. Comparison of SF-DF ignition at similar IDT timescales

From Table 5, it can be seen that SF 900 K and DF 1000 K cases have τ1 and τ2 values close to one another. Figure 9 shows the heat release rate up to ignition for a SF 900 K and DF 1000 K cases. At first look, the HRR characteristics are rather similar.

Initially, LTC activates around τ1 and it is the primary source of heat release for a certain period of time. When approaching τ2, high-temperature chemistry in the rich region inside the spray starts to contribute more to the heat release. HTC contribution exceeding LTC around the time of τ2. Hence, the figure shows that controlling the global characteristics of the ignition process is possible by changing the ambient temperature.

For SF 900 K and DF 1000 K cases, the conditional means and the standard deviations of the key species and quantities related to ignition are provided in Fig. 10. Complementing Fig. 9, heat release is noted to initiate with LTC at lean conditions, and to progress towards richer mixtures. On the contrary, HTC heat release initiates around Z = 0.1 and then moves towards leaner mixtures, stabilizing around stoichiometry. The peak at the Zff denotes the initial high temperature ignition kernels. Composition of CH3 and CH4 on the other hand indicates the differences between the two cases. For SF 900 K, there is net production of CH4 in richer conditions originating from oxidation of n-dodecane. In contrast, for DF 1000K, there is net consumption of ambient CH4 originating from the rich spray regions in LTC, which then evolve to leaner conditions in the HTC regime. In general, CH3 is a direct product of CH4 oxidation. For the SF case, CH3 production is initiated and maintained in rich conditions (i.e. spray region), indicating the source of CH3 to be diesel surrogate oxidation process. For the DF case, the initiation is still at rich conditions, but it spreads to both lean and rich mixture fraction values in time. Thus, for DF, the CH3 formation is originated both from diesel surrogate oxidation and ambient CH4 near the spray periphery.

3.4. Reaction sensitivity analysis of DF mixtures

Recent studies by Kahila et al. [26] and Srna et al. [35,36] show the inhibiting influence of methane on the ignition chemistry originating from chemical kinetics. Changes in thermodynamical properties caused by methane addition in a DF mixture (e.g. specific heat) were reported to account for only ~ 1% of the observed IDT variations [26]. Therefore, to extend the analysis by Kahila et al. and to further explain the observed sensitivity of IDT to temperature, a brute-force sensitivity analysis was conducted.

The following analysis reveals the influence of ambient temperature on the chemical pathways of n-dodecane/CH4 chemistry and particularly production/consumption rates of intermediate species such as OH, CH3, HO2 and early decomposition products of n-dodecane such as RO2. In addition, the analysis suggests that inhibiting reactions related to CH4 oxidation generally become more dominant at low temperatures, compared to reactions including long hydrocarbons originating from n-dodecane decomposition.

The sensitivity analysis includes OD HR computations in three different mixture compositions, corresponding to the overall equivalence ratio of φ = 0.5, φ = 1.0 and Zair, which are sampled from the adiabatic mixing line. The sensitivity coefficients Sj are defined as the relative change in the corresponding second-stage IDT when a specific reaction rate is multiplied by a factor of two [26,69,71]. While negative sensitivity coefficients stand for enhancing influence (i.e. decreasing IDT), the positive coefficients mean inhibiting effect (i.e. increasing IDT).

Figure 11 shows the sensitivity analysis for the DF mixtures at temperatures 1000, 900 and 850 K. Figure 11(a) and (b) follows the previously reported results [26], showing the appearance of the inhibiting reaction CH4 + OH ⇒ CH3 + H2O which produces methyl radicals and water from methane via H abstraction. Such an increased methyl radical production subsequently leads to the recombination reaction 2 CH3(+M) ⇒ C2H4(+M) and to the chain terminating reaction CH3 + HO2 ⇒ CH4 + O2. Both reactions are strongly inhibiting [49,80]. In addition, the prescribed reactions consume OH and HO2 radicals which are frequently

n-dodecane decomposition. Therefore, inhibition of τ1 at lower temperatures and in the presence of ambient CH4 is expected. As shown earlier, τind is less sensitive to temperature. After τ1, the accumulation of heat and radicals in the system reduces the inhibiting effect of CH4 on the oxidation process, relative to conditions prior to τ1. In general, the LTC related reactions are expected to be more sensitive to temperature than the ones in LTC [80], which is also depicted in the Yao mechanism by high/low-temperature exponents for LTC/HTC reactions [71].

In addition to the above, according to Table 5, conditional mean of the LTC location (XHTC) away from the nozzle tends to increase with lower temperature and CH4 addition, consistent with the the inhibiting effect of low ambient temperature and CH4 to ignition. Finally, the average liquid penetration (Xliq) calculated for n-dodecane shows that while the liquid penetration increases with lower temperatures and CH4 addition, the increasing effect of CH4 on XHTC diminishes between SF and DF cases at 1000 K. In contrast, at 850 K the DF spray ignites approximately by a factor of 2 longer distance than the SF spray.
Fig. 10. Conditional mean (solid line) and standard deviation (filled area) of (a) HRR, (b) CH$_4$ and (c) CH$_3$ with respect to Z for SF 900 K (top) and DF 1000 K (bottom). While orange color (■) denotes LTC region, HTC region is represented with green color (■). Note: only 1% of the LES data is used for background scatter by uniform sampling. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
products decreases as a function of mixture temperature, see Fig. 11(c). In particular, the inhibiting reactions \( \text{C}_{12}\text{OOH} \rightarrow \text{C}_{12}\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{C}_{12}\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O}_2 + \text{S}_3\text{X}_2\text{C}_{12}\text{H}_{25} \) are not present for \( 850 \text{ K} \). In addition, the number of IDT promoting reactions (neg. \( S_i \)) where \( n\)-dodecane is present increases at \( T = 850 \text{ K} \).

Such observations on DF oxidation indicate the importance of early decomposition process of both fuels and subsequent interaction between produced intermediate species. It is worth noting that the presented analysis shows only for the Yao mechanism. We note that, as shown by Kahila et al. [26], the influence of \( \text{CH}_4 \) on \( n\)-dodecane oxidation depends on the chosen chemical mechanism.

### 4. Conclusions

In this paper, we investigated the ignition characteristics of \( n\)-dodecane sprays in a lean methane–air mixture for different ambient temperature conditions using 0D, 1D and 3D simulations. The Engine Combustion Network Spray A case is employed as a single-fuel diesel ignition baseline. The case is then extended to dual-fuel configurations. Comprehensive information on ignition characteristics of dual-fuel sprays was obtained at different ambient temperatures. An overall summary of the main IDT results is presented in Fig. 12. Clearly, by accounting for mixing in higher dimensional studies, IDT is consistently prolonged. Based on the simulation
results, such a trend is noted to be the strongest at 850 K, due to the increased ratio between IDT and mixing timescales.

The main results of the paper are:

1. 0D and 1D simulations indicate that the choice of the chemical mechanism is crucial for estimating ignition characteristics, particularly at temperatures below 900 K for the present setups. In DF context, the choice of the mechanism was shown to become even more important than in SF. In particular, the effect of chemical mechanism on the IDT in 1D flamelet simulations is observed to be less than 0.05 ms for temperatures above 900 K, while this discrepancy increases up to 0.25 ms for lower temperatures (e.g., 850 K).

2. 0D, 1D and 3D simulations all support and bring further insight to the works by Srna et al. [35,36] and Kahila et al. [26,27]. The results indicate that methane propagates both the low and high temperature ignition delay times (τ₁ and τ₂) for a range of temperatures. It is also observed that this retarding effect increases for lower temperatures. For LES simulations, the inhibiting effect of methane increases from 2 to 3.2 times for τ₁ and 1.7 to 3.1 times for τ₂ for 1000 K ≥ T ≥ 850 K. In addition, within DF context, the τ₁ increases by a factor of 7.5 (0.16 to 1.21 ms), while τ₂ changes much less (0.20 to 0.29 ms) for 1000 K ≥ T ≥ 850 K.

3. The chemical induction time τind (τ₂ − τ₁) is shown to be less dependent on the temperature and methane addition effects compared to e.g. τ₁. For 3D simulations, τind changes slightly (0.02 to 0.09 ms) with ambient temperature, and increases around 0.1 to 0.15 ms in DF configurations, compared to SF.

4. The chemical sensitivity analysis indicates that reactions involving methane or methane decomposition products become more pronounced at lower temperatures, while the number of dominating reactions involving long hydrocarbons decreases. Such observation explains on its part why IDT_DF is strongly increasing for lower temperatures.

In practice, engine in-cylinder temperature is a function of the piston position (crank angle) and the intake air temperature. Hence, depending on the operating conditions, the ambient conditions into which the spray is injected can vary to a great extent. As seen from the sensitivity analysis, the share of inhibiting long hydrocarbon reactions decreases at lower temperatures, indicating a change in not only IDT, but also overall ignition chemistry at these conditions. Hence, in any dual-fuel application, the role of low-temperature reactions should be carefully considered when modeling ignition. This aspect may become particularly important for modern low-temperature combustion strategies (e.g. RCCI) involving early fuel injection. For such applications, the dynamic change in temperature and other thermodynamic properties during compression should be taken into account to accurately model the ignition process.
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