



# Some Characteristics of Particulate Matter Exhaust Emissions of Bio-fuels

Professor Hongming Xu School of Mechanical Engineering

18 May 2012 Cambridge Particle Meeting



## • Work carried out

<u>PhD Research Students</u> R. Daniel, C. Wang, D. Liu and other contributors

Future Power System Group, Future Engines and Fuels Lab, University of Birmingham

- Financial support TSB, EPSRC and AWM
- Technical support Cambustion, Jaguar Land Rover, Shell and TSI



- 1. Background
- 2. Research on bio-fuels
  - DMF, Ethanol
  - RME
- 3. Some results and discussion
- 4. Summary

## **PM studies for automotive engines**











#### Upgraded laboratory New investment £4m





Birmingham Science City







# DMF, Ethanol – alternatives to gasoline

![](_page_5_Picture_1.jpeg)

Name(s) <sup>i,ii</sup>	2,5 Dimethylfuran	Ethanol	Gasoline
Linear Structure Formula <sup>i</sup>	(CH2)2C4H20	CH <sub>2</sub> OCH <sub>2</sub>	Variable
Molecular <mark>Formula<sup>i</sup></mark>	C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>2</sub> O	C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>6</sub> O	C2 to C14
Molecule 3D <u>View<sup>iv</sup></u>			Variable
Molecule <u>Schematic<sup>iv</sup></u>	ң <sub>а</sub> с <mark>о</mark> сң	Но∕сн₃	Variable
Molecule <u>Schematic<sup>iv</sup></u> BP, Boiling Point (1atm) <sup>i</sup>	H <sub>3</sub> C CH <sub>3</sub> 93.0°С	HO CH <sub>3</sub>	Variable
Molecule <u>Schematiciv</u> BP, Boiling Point (1atm) <sup>i</sup> Enthalpy of <u>Vaporization<sup>iv</sup></u> ( <sup>20°C</sup> )	H <sub>3</sub> C CH <sub>3</sub> 93.0°C 31.91kJmol <sup>-1</sup>	HO CH <sub>3</sub> 77.3°C 43.2496kJmol <sup>-1</sup>	Variable
Molecule <u>Schematic<sup>iv</sup></u> BP, Boiling Point (1atm) <sup>i</sup> Enthalpy of <u>Vaporization<sup>iv</sup></u> ( <sup>20°C</sup> ) Enthalpy of Combustion <sup>iii</sup>	H <sub>3</sub> C CH <sub>3</sub> 93.0°C 31.91kjmol <sup>-1</sup> 42.0kjmol <sup>-1</sup>	HO CH <sub>3</sub> 77.3°C 43.2496kJmol <sup>-1</sup> 26.9kJmol <sup>-1</sup>	Variable 43.4kJmol <sup>-1</sup>
Molecule <u>Schematiciv</u> BP, Boiling Point (1atm) <sup>i</sup> Enthalpy of <u>Vaporization<sup>iv</sup></u> (20°C) Enthalpy of Combustion <sup>iii</sup> $\rho$ Density of Liquid <sup>i</sup>	H <sub>3</sub> C CH <sub>3</sub> 93.0°C 31.91kjmol <sup>-1</sup> 42.0kjmol <sup>-1</sup> 0.8954kgm <sup>-2</sup> @20°C	HO CH <sub>3</sub> 77.3°C 43.2496kjmol <sup>-1</sup> 26.9kjmol <sup>-1</sup> 0.79363kgm <sup>-3</sup> @15°C	Variable 43.4kJmol <sup>-1</sup>
Molecule Schematic <sup>iv</sup> BP, Boiling Point (1atm) <sup>i</sup> Enthalpy of Vaporization <sup>iv</sup> (20°C) Enthalpy of Combustion <sup>iii</sup> P. Density of Liquid <sup>i</sup> Research Octane Number (RON) <sup>v</sup>	H <sub>3</sub> C CH <sub>3</sub> 93.0°C 31.91kJmol <sup>-1</sup> 42.0kJmol <sup>-1</sup> 0.8954kgm <sup>-3</sup> @20°C 119	HO CH <sub>3</sub> 77.3°C 43.2496kJmol <sup>-1</sup> 26.9kJmol <sup>-1</sup> 0.79363kgm <sup>-3</sup> @15°C 110 <sup>vii</sup>	Variable 43.4kJmol <sup>-1</sup> 95 <sup>iv</sup>

![](_page_6_Picture_1.jpeg)

- DMF has physical properties very close to gasoline, but it has a very high octane number (RON=119) and relatively low volatility.
- Compared to ethanol, it has an energy density higher by 60 per cent in volume and by 40% in mass.
- DMF is stable in storage and not soluble in water and therefore it cannot become contaminated by absorbing water from the atmosphere.
- It consumes only one-third of the energy in the evaporation stage of its production, compared with that required to evaporate a solution of ethanol produced by fermentation for biofuel applications.

The most attractive advantage is that making DMF will not compete with land and food, and therefore it can be an ideal candidate for a new generation of sustainable bio-fuel!

![](_page_6_Picture_7.jpeg)

### Gasoline type of fuel spray characterisation

![](_page_7_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Single cylinder GDI Engine and SMPS

![](_page_8_Picture_1.jpeg)

SMPS Settings		
Sample Flow Rate (L/min)	1	
Sheath Flow Rate (L/min)	10	
Scan Time (s)	120	
Minimum Particle Diameter (nm)	7.23	
Maximum Particle Diameter (nm)	294.3	

![](_page_8_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### DMF, Ethanol and gasoline – gaseous emissions

![](_page_9_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Effect of Load

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

## PM size distribution at lower load

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

More accumulation mode particles than nucleation ones with the nucleation mode dominating the distribution.

# PM size distributions at higher load

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

The separation between the nucleation and accumulation modes becomes clear at higher load.

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Effect of Spark Sensitivity

## Gasoline at SR10

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

Spark retard largely affects the nucleation mode and not the accumulation mode distribution

### Ethanol at SR10

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

PM @SR10 is 359,614 #/cm<sup>3</sup> @ 38.5nm, 46% higher than at MBT

DMF at SR10

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

Increase in particle concentration and diameter is less than half compared with gasoline

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

Total PM concentration with DMF increases by 1,429 particles/cm<sup>3</sup> (2.1%), whereas with ethanol this is 12,620 particles/cm<sup>3</sup> (26.6%).

## Mean diameter

![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

Both of the biofuels have larger total number concentrations compared to gasoline due to the dominant nucleation mode.

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Comparison of PM emissions between RME blends and diesel fuels

### Jaguar V6 diesel engine (Ford Lion)

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

# DMS 500 sampling system layout

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

B30 are much higher relatively in PM mainly for smaller diameters (nuclei mode) compared to ULSD

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

Size distributions re often mono-module with the nucleation mode dominating the distribution

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

Variation in nucleation mode is small with RME blends With little difference for higher RME blends

# Particle numbers in cold start

![](_page_25_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

Variation in PM with RME blends is mainly with accumulation mode, which drop clearly with increasing RME blend ratio

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### With Ethanol an DMF

- The separation between the nucleation and accumulation modes becomes clear at higher load with the nucleation mode dominate the distribution.
- More accumulation mode particles than nucleation ones
- Spark retard largely affects the nucleation mode and not the accumulation mode distribution
- Ethanol has higher spark-sensitivity whereas DMF is the minimum

#### With RME

- Much relatively higher portion of PM in smaller diameters (nuclei mode) compared to ULSD
- Variation in PM with RME blends is mainly with accumulation mode, which drop clearly with increasing RME blend ratio

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Thanks very much for your attention