

**DEVELOPMENT OF LOW EMISSION OIL BURNER**

**KIRAN BABU A/L APPALANIDU**

**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA**

DEVELOPMENT OF LOW EMISSION OIL BURNER

KIRAN BABU A/L APPALANIDU

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
Requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Engineering (Mechanical)

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

FEBRUARY, 2005

*To*

*My inspirational father*

*My beloved mum*

*My brothers and sisters*

*My nephews and nieces*

*Your support gave me the strength*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my supervisors, Associate Professor Dr. Mohammad Nazri Mohd. Jaafar and Professor Ir. Dr. Farid Nasir bin Haji Ani of Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, UTM for their constant guidance, inspiration, support and precious suggestions and supervisions in performing and completing this research study.

I would like also to thank the staff of the Thermodynamic and Combustion Laboratory for their cooperation and assistance during the experimental testing. Special thank to the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, Malaysia for the financial support through IRPA research grants.

The understanding, patience and moral support of my parents, Appalanidu Akiah and Jayalechumy Apparoo and family members are deeply acknowledged. Special thank to Khandoker Abul Hossain, Mohd Ridzuan Mansor, Lukeman Yusoff, Ekhwan Hakim Sukadarin and Abd. Razak Abd. Hamid for helping in discussions during the research was conducted. My sincere appreciations also extend to all my colleagues, friends and others who have provided assistance at various occasions. Their views and tips are useful indeed. Unfortunately, it is not possible to list all of them in this limited space.

## ABSTRACT

Recently, most of the gas turbine combustion research and development involves in lowering the emissions emitted from the combustor. Emission causes adverse affect to the world and mankind especially. Main concern of the present work is to reduce the NO<sub>x</sub> emission since the CO emission could be reduced through homogeneous mixing of fuel and air. Homogeneous mixing of fuel and air is also needed in order to reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emission. A liquid fuel burner system with radial air swirler vane angle of 30°, 40°, 50° and 60° has been investigated using 163mm inside diameter combustor. Orifice plates with three different sizes of 20mm, 25mm and 30mm were inserted at the back plate of swirler outlet. All tests were conducted using diesel as fuel. Fuel was injected at two different positions, i.e. at upstream and downstream of the swirler outlet using central fuel injector with single fuel nozzle pointing axially outwards. Experiment has been carried out to compare between three emissions NO<sub>x</sub>, CO and SO<sub>2</sub>. NO<sub>x</sub> reduction of about 53 percent was achieved for orifice plate of 20mm with downstream injection compared to orifice plate of 20mm with upstream injection. CO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> was reduced about 26 percent and 56 percent respectively for the same configuration. This comparison was taken using swirler vane angle of 60°. The overall study shows that bigger swirler vane angle produce lower emission results compared to the smaller ones. Smaller orifice plates generate better emission reduction. Meanwhile, downstream injection position significantly decreases the emission results compared to upstream injection position. Combination of smallest orifice plate and biggest swirler vane angle with downstream injection produce widest and shortest flame length. Lowest emission results were found in the smallest orifice plate using biggest swirler vane angle with downstream injection. The temperature of the flame increases along the combustion chamber and decreases back towards the combustor exit once it reaches the peak.

## ABSTRAK

Masa kini, kebanyakan kajian dan pembangunan ke atas pembakaran turbin gas melibatkan pengurangan emisi dari pembakar. Pencemaran memberi kesan negatif kepada dunia dan manusia khususnya. Dalam projek ini, perhatian diberikan kepada pengurangan emisi  $\text{NO}_x$  kerana emisi CO dapat dikurangkan melalui percampuran yang baik di antara bahan api dan udara. Percampuran yang baik juga diperlukan untuk mengurangkan emisi  $\text{NO}_x$ . Pembakar berbahan api cecair menggunakan pemusar udara aliran jejarian bersudut  $30^\circ$ ,  $40^\circ$ ,  $50^\circ$  dan  $60^\circ$  dikaji menggunakan pembakar berdiameter dalam 163mm. Tiga plat orifis bersaiz 20mm, 25mm dan 30mm dipasang di bahagian keluar pemusar udara. Ujikaji dijalankan menggunakan bahan api diesel. Bahan api dibekalkan pada dua kedudukan pancitan, yakni di belakang dan di hadapan pemusar udara menggunakan pemancit bahan api berlubang tunggal menghala arah paksi. Ujikaji dijalankan keatas tiga jenis pencemar iaitu  $\text{NO}_x$ , CO dan  $\text{SO}_2$ . Emisi  $\text{NO}_x$  dapat dikurangkan sebanyak 53 peratus bagi plat orifis 20mm menggunakan pancitan di hadapan pemusar udara berbanding plat orifis 20mm menggunakan pancitan di belakang pemusar udara. CO dan  $\text{SO}_2$  pula dapat dikurangkan sebanyak 26 dan 56 peratus masing-masing untuk konfigurasi yang sama. Ujikaji menunjukkan emisi yang rendah bagi pemusar udara bersudut besar berbanding pemusar udara bersudut kecil. Plat orifis bersaiz kecil memperoleh nilai emisi yang rendah. Pancitan di hadapan pemusar udara menunjukkan pengurangan emisi yang lebih baik berbanding pancitan di belakang pemusar udara. Saiz api yang pendek dengan bukaan yang besar diperoleh apabila pemusar udara bersudut besar, plat orifis yang kecil dan pancitan di hadapan pemusar udara digunakan. Kombinasi pemusar udara bersudut paling besar, plat orifis bersaiz paling kecil dengan pancitan di hadapan pemusar udara menghasilkan emisi paling rendah. Suhu pembakaran meningkat sepanjang kebuk pembakaran dan seterusnya berkurangan menghala mendekati hujung keluar kebuk pembakar apabila suhu maksima tercapai.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	<b>DECLARATION</b>	ii
	<b>DEDICATION</b>	iii
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b>	iv
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	v
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	vi
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	vii
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	xiv
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	xv
	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	xxi
	<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	xxiv
<b>I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 Review of Previous Works	2
	1.3 Problem Statement	6
	1.4 Objective of Research	6
	1.5 Scopes of Research	7
	1.6 Limitations of the Study	7
<b>II</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	10
	2.1 Introduction	10
	2.2 Environmental Problems	10
	2.2.1 Acid Rain	11

2.2.2	Ozone Depletion	11
2.2.3	Global Warming	12
2.2.4	Photochemical Smog	12
2.3	Combustor Exhaust Emissions	13
2.3.1	Oxides of Nitrogen	14
2.3.1.1	Nitric Oxide	14
2.3.1.2	Nitrogen Dioxide	16
2.3.1.3	Nitrous Oxide	16
2.3.2	Carbon Monoxide	17
2.3.3	Unburned Hydrocarbon	18
2.3.4	Oxides of Sulphur	19
2.3.5	Carbon Dioxide	19
2.4	Gas Turbine Combustor	20
2.4.1	Operation of a Gas Turbine Combustor	20
2.4.2	Combustor Arrangement	21
2.4.2.1	Tubular Combustor	21
2.4.2.2	Annular Combustor	23
2.4.2.3	Tuboannular Combustor	24
2.4.3	Combustor Design Requirement	25
2.5	Flame Stabilizer	25
2.5.1	Bluff Body	26
2.5.2	Opposed Jet	26
2.5.3	Sudden Expansion	27
2.5.4	Grid Mix and Jet Mix	27
2.5.5	Axial and Radial Swirler	27
2.6	Injection System	28
2.6.1	Injectors Requirement	29
2.6.2	Atomization Process	30
2.6.2.1	Jet Break Up	30
2.6.2.2	Sheet Break Up	31
2.6.3	Spray Characteristic	32
2.6.3.1	Mean Drop Size	32
2.6.3.2	Drop Size Distribution	33
2.6.3.3	Spray Pattern and Cone Angle	34





<b>IV</b>	<b>BURNER DESIGN COMCEPT</b>	<b>58</b>
4.1	Introduction	58
4.2	Combustion Chamber Design	59
	4.2.1 Length and Diameter	59
	4.2.2 Pressure Loss Parameter	60
4.3	Swirler Design	61
	4.3.1 Rapid Mixing System	62
	4.3.2 Swirl Flow	62
	4.3.3 Effect of Swirl	63
	4.3.4 Swirl Stabilized Flame	65
	4.3.5 Swirler Pressure Drop	66
	4.3.6 Swirl Number	67
4.4	Fuel Injector Design	69
<b>V</b>	<b>EXPERIMENTAL SET UP</b>	<b>70</b>
5.1	Introduction	70
5.2	Experimental Set Up	70
	5.2.1 Liquid Fuel Burner	71
	5.2.1.1 Combustion Chamber	72
	5.2.1.2 Swirler and Orifice Plate	72
	5.2.1.3 Injector Design	73
	5.2.2 Fuel System	73
	5.2.2.1 Fuel Tank	74
	5.2.2.2 Air Compressor	74
	5.2.3 Air Supply System	74
	5.2.3.1 Air Compressor	75
	5.2.3.2 Blower	75
	5.2.4 Instrumentation	75
	5.2.4.1 Filter, Lubricator and Regulator	
	Gauge	76
	5.2.4.2 Flow Meters	76

	5.2.4.3 Pressure Gauge	76
	5.2.4.4 Gas Sampling Probe	76
	5.2.4.5 Gas Analyzer	77
5.3	General Test Procedure	78
5.4	Experimental Testing Parameters	79
5.5	Temperature Measurement	81

## VI

### **EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS ON COMBUSTION PERFORMANCE**

		82
6.1	Introduction	82
6.2	Upstream Injection	83
6.3.1	Temperature Profile in Accordance to Equivalence Ratio along the Combustion Chamber Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	83
6.3.2	Emission Investigation Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	87
6.3.3	Temperature Profile in Accordance to Equivalence Ratio along the Combustion Chamber Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	90
6.3.4	Emission Investigation Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	94
6.3.5	Temperature Profile in Accordance to Equivalence Ratio along the Combustion Chamber Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	97
6.3.6	Emission Investigation Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	101
6.4	Downstream Injection	103

6.4.1	Temperature Profile in Accordance to Equivalence Ratio along the Combustion Chamber Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	104
6.4.2	Emission Investigation Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	108
6.4.3	Temperature Profile in Accordance to Equivalence Ratio along the Combustion Chamber Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	111
6.4.4	Emission Investigation Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	116
6.4.5	Temperature Profile in Accordance to Equivalence Ratio along the Combustion Chamber Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	119
6.4.6	Emission Investigation Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	123
6.4.7	Temperature Profile for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	126
6.4.8	Temperature Profile for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	127
6.4.9	Temperature Profile for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	128
6.4.10	Temperature Profile for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	130

6.4.11	Temperature Profile for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	131
6.4.12	Temperature Profile for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	133
6.5	Discussion on Combustion Temperature Profile	134
6.6	Comparison on Varying Orifice Plate Diameter and Injection Position	136
<b>VII</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORKS</b>	139
7.1	General Conclusions	139
7.2	Conclusion on Combustion Performance	141
7.3	Conclusions on Emission Results	143
7.4	Conclusions on Temperature Profiles	144
7.4	Recommendations for Future Work	145
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	146
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	149 – 174

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>TABLE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2.1	Source of Atmospheric emissions	13
2.2	Advantages and Disadvantages of Tubular Combustor	22
2.3	Advantages and Disadvantages of Annular Combustor	23
2.4	Advantages and Disadvantages of Tuboannular Combustor	24
2.5	Some Mathematical Definitions of Mean Drop Size	33
2.6	Air Fuel Ratio for Various Fuels	43
2.7	Influence of Various Primary Zone Mixture Strengths	44
4.1	Researcher's suggestion on Length to Diameter Ratio	59
4.2	Pressure Losses in Combustion Chambers	60
5.1	Experimental Testing Constant Parameters	80
5.2	Experimental Testing Manipulated Parameters	80
5.3	Experimental Testing Measured Parameters	80
5.4	Combustor Wall Thermocouple Position	81

**LIST OF FIGURES**

<b>FIGURE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2.1	Typical Combustor Cross Section	20
2.2	Tubular Combustor	22
2.3	Annular Combustor	23
2.4	Tuboannular Combustor	24
2.5	Bluff Body Flame Stabilizers	26
2.6	Opposed Jet Flame Stabilizers	26
2.7	Sudden Expansion Flame Stabilization	27
2.8	Grid Mix Flame Stabilizer	27
2.9	Axial or Radial Swirler	28
2.10	Injector	28
2.11	Typical drop-size histogram	34
2.12	Spray Pattern	35
2.13	Cone Angle	35
2.14	Plain Orifice Atomizer	37
2.15	Simplex Atomizer	38
2.16	Duplex Atomizer	39
2.17	Dual Orifice Atomizer	39
2.18	Spill Return Atomizer	40
2.19	Fan Spray Atomizer	40

2.20	Air Assist Atomizer	41
3.1	Emission Characteristic of a Gas Turbine	45
3.2	Premixed Combustor	47
3.3	Rapid Mixing Combustor	48
3.4	Variable Geometry Combustor	49
3.5	Lean Premixed Prevapourized Combustor	50
3.6	Fuel Staging Combustor	51
3.7	Air Staging Combustor	51
3.8	Schemes of flue gas recirculation	52
3.9	Rich-Burn Quench Lean-Burn Staged Combustor	53
3.10	Selective Catalytic Reduction Combustor	54
3.11	Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction Combustor	55
3.12	Effect of Reaction Zone Equivalence Ratio on NO <sub>x</sub> Emission	56
4.1	Recirculation Zone	64
5.1	Gas Sampling Probe	77
5.2	Experimental Set up for Upstream Injection	79
5.3	Experimental Set up for Downstream Injection	79
6.1	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 30° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	83
6.2	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 40° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	84
6.3	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 50° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	85
6.4	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 60° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	86



6.5	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	87
6.6	CO Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	88
6.7	SO <sub>2</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection	89
6.8	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 30° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	90
6.9	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 40° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	91
6.10	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 50° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	92
6.11	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 60° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	93
6.12	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	94
6.13	CO Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	95
6.14	SO <sub>2</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection	96
6.15	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 30° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	97
6.16	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 40° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	98
6.17	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 50° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	99
6.18	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 60° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	100

6.19	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	101
6.20	CO Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	102
6.21	SO <sub>2</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Upstream Injection	103
6.22	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 30° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	104
6.23	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 40° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	105
6.24	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 50° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	106
6.25	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 60° and Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	107
6.26	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	108
6.27	CO Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	109
6.28	SO <sub>2</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection	110
6.29	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 30° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	111
6.30	Upstream Flame Profile	112
6.31	Downstream Flame Profile	112
6.32	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 40° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	113
6.33	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 50° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	114

6.34	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 60° and Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	115
6.35	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	116
6.36	Temperature Profile for Various Equivalence Ratios	117
6.37	CO Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	117
6.38	SO <sub>2</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection	118
6.39	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 30° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	119
6.40	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 40° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	120
6.41	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 50° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	121
6.42	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for flames at Different Equivalence Ratios Using Swirler Vane Angle of 60° and Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	122
6.43	NO <sub>x</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	123
6.44	CO Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	124
6.45	SO <sub>2</sub> Emission vs. Equivalence Ratio for Various Swirlers Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection	125
6.46	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for Various Swirler Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Upstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	126
6.47	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for Various Swirler Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Upstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	127
6.48	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for Various Swirler Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with	

	Upstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	128
6.49	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for Various Swirler Using Orifice Plate of 30mm with Downstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	130
6.50	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for Various Swirler Using Orifice Plate of 25mm with Downstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	131
6.51	Combustion Temperature vs. Axial Distance from Swirler Exit for Various Swirler Using Orifice Plate of 20mm with Downstream Injection at Equivalence Ratio of 0.803	133

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

$A$	-	cross sectional area
$C_c$	-	contraction coefficient
$C_D$	-	discharge coefficient
$d_o$	-	Initial jet diameter
$d$	-	hub diameter
$D$	-	diameter
et al.	-	and others
$g$	-	acceleration due to gravity (9.81 m/s <sup>2</sup> )
$G_\theta$	-	axial flux of angular momentum
$G_x$	-	axial flux of axial momentum
$h$	-	height
HP	-	horse power
i.e.	-	id est (that is)
$I_e$	-	intensity of rotation
$L$	-	length
$\dot{m}$	-	mass flow rate
$m$	-	mass
$M$	-	Airflow Mach number
$n$	-	quantity
$P$	-	pressure
$q$	-	volumetric flow rate
$r$	-	radius
$R$	-	gas constant (8.31 J/ mol K)
Re	-	Reynolds number
$s$	-	vane thickness

$S$	-	swirl number
$T$	-	temperature
vs.	-	versus
$V$	-	Volume
$V$	-	velocity
$We$	-	Weber number
$x$	-	distance
$Z$	-	Z number
$^{\circ}\text{C}$	-	degree Celsius
$^{\circ}$	-	degree
$\Sigma$	-	summation
$\Delta$	-	differential
$\alpha$	-	vane angle
$\sigma$	-	stress
$\pi$	-	phi $\left(\frac{22}{7}\right)$
$\lambda$	-	wavelength
$\theta$	-	angle
$\rho$	-	density
$\mu$	-	dynamic viscosity
$\gamma$	-	ratio of specific heat
$\text{C}$	-	carbon
$\text{CH}$	-	methylidyne
$\text{CH}_2$	-	methylene
$\text{CH}_4$	-	methane
$\text{CHO}$	-	formyl radical
$\text{CN}$	-	cyano radical
$\text{CO}$	-	carbon monoxide
$\text{CO}_2$	-	carbon dioxide
$\text{C}_{12.5}\text{H}_{22.2}$	-	Diesel
$\text{H}$	-	hydrogen
$\text{H}_2$	-	Hydrogen
$\text{HCN}$	-	hydrogen cyanide

H <sub>2</sub> CN	-	amidogen, methylene-
HO <sub>2</sub>	-	hydrogen dioxide
NCO	-	isocyanato radical
N	-	nitrogen
N <sub>2</sub>	-	nitrogen
NO	-	nitrogen oxide
NO <sub>2</sub>	-	nitrogen dioxide
N <sub>2</sub> O	-	nitrous oxide
NO <sub>x</sub>	-	oxides of nitrogen
O	-	oxygen (atom)
O <sub>2</sub>	-	oxygen (Gas)
OH	-	hydroxyl radical
O <sub>3</sub>	-	ozone
SO <sub>2</sub>	-	sulphur dioxide
AFR	-	air fuel ratio
ASME	-	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
CFC	-	chlorofluorocarbon
EGR	-	exhaust gas recirculation
EQR	-	equivalence ratio
FAR	-	fuel air ratio
FGR	-	flue gas recirculation
FLR	-	filter, lubricator and regulator
HHV	-	higher heating value
ppm	-	part per million
RQL	-	rich-burn quench lean-burn
<i>SMD</i>	-	Sauter mean diameter
SCR	-	selective catalytic reduction
SNCR	-	selective non-catalytic reduction
UHC	-	unburned hydrocarbon

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A	Relatives Merits of Various types of Fuel Injectors	149
B	Swirl Number Calculation	154
C	Experimental Set Up Layout	155
D	Plenum Chamber Drawing	156
E	Combustion Chamber Drawing	157
F	Extension Chamber Drawing	158
G	Safety Chamber Drawing	159
H	Swirler Design Drawing	160
I	Orifice Plate Design Drawing	161
J	Fuel Nozzle Design Drawing	162
K	Nozzle Connector Drawing	163
L	Fuel Air Nozzle Flange Drawing	164
M	Downstream Injection Extension Drawing	165
N	Swirler-Orifice Plate Attachment Flange Drawing	166
O	Burner Assembly Drawing	167
P	Calibration Chart of Diesel Fuel	168
Q	Calibration Chart of Thermocouples	169
R	Equivalence Ratio of Fuel and Air	170



S	Combustion Calculation	171
T	List of Publication	174

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

Global environmental problems such as global warming, acid rain, ozone layer depletion and photochemical smog have become serious problems all over the world. Pollution and environmental degradation are discussed in a great deal today, but it is often spoken of in a way that is disconnected from its cause. Conventional energy processes can cause major problems to the environment, and it is important to consider energy issues alongside environmental issues in order to seek solution effectively.

The increasing use of gas turbine power plants for electricity generation, motor vehicles and other industrial application causes atmospheric pollution. For several decades, the gas turbine has been the prime movers for aircrafts, due to the tremendous advantages in term of speed, fuel economy and passenger comfort.

The combustion of fossil fuels is also a major contributor of four main environmental concerns. These environmental problems are caused by air pollution that contains oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide and oxides of sulphur. These environmental problems concern has prompted many governing bodies to legislate new regulations regarding emissions from combustion process in the hope that these environmental problems will be reduced.

## 1.2 Review of Previous Works

Past researchers who studied on the effect of varying the swirl strength were mainly interested on the flow pattern and temperature profiles resulted from varying the swirl strength. They were emphasizing the effect of swirl on the generation of toroidal central recirculation zones and flame geometry rather than the effect of swirl strength on emissions formation.

Mikus, T. and Heywood, J.B. (1971) in their work on automotive gas turbine concluded that leaning out the primary zone or reducing the residence time of conventional combustor designs using conventional fuel injection techniques was unlikely to reduce NO emissions enough to meet emissions standard. This was due to the presence of stoichiometric fuel and air ratio in parts of the flow within the primary zone even if the excess air was present. To achieve a significant reduction in NO emissions, combustors need to be developed with both a leaner and more homogeneous fuel and air ratio distribution in the primary zone that is attainable in conventional designs.

Mestre (1974) compared the effect of swirling and non-swirling system on combustion. He demonstrated that swirl helps to improve combustion efficiency, decreases all pollutants and increases flame temperature. He also observed that during the present of swirl, a shorter blue flame was observed indicating good mixing while non-swirling system showed a longer yellow flame indicating that there is still some fuel left unvapourized.

A series of combustor tests were conducted by Mularz et. al. (1975) to evaluate three improved designs of swirl-can combustor modules, using axial swirlers and their objectives were to obtain low levels of exhaust pollutants while maintaining high combustion efficiency at combustor operating conditions. He came with an opinion that swirl-can modules consisted of three components; a carburettor, an inner swirler and a flame stabiliser. The functions of the module were to mix fuel and air, swirl the mixture, stabilise combustion in its wake and provide large interfacial mixing areas between the bypass air around the module and combustion gases in its wake. They found that swirl-can combustor model performed with high

combustion efficiency at all conditions tested but the  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions were still higher than the maximum allowable level of 20ppm which was needed to achieve the 1979 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emissions standards.

Meanwhile, Ballal and Lefebvre (1979), in their study, stressed that for a premixed flame, the weak extinction limits were governed mainly by inlet air temperature, to a lesser extent by air velocity and turbulence level and were almost independent of pressure.

Past researchers also have studied the effect of varying the vane angle, which in turn vary the swirl number, on combustion performance. Claypole and Syred (1981) investigated the effect of swirl strength on the formation of  $\text{NO}_x$ . At swirl number of 3.04, much of the  $\text{NO}_x$  in the exhaust gases was recirculated into the flame front. The total emissions of  $\text{NO}_x$  were reduced, however, at the expense of reduced combustion efficiency.

Noyce and Sheppard (1982) investigated the influence of equivalence ratio on air and fuel mixing. They suggested that at low and high power conditions the high CO emissions could be minimised by better mixing.

Al-Kabie (1989), on the other hand, studied the effect of radial swirler on emission reduction in gas turbine combustor. In his study, he imposes swirler expansion ratio of 1.8 to achieve adequate combustion efficiency. Al-Kabie, in his study, showed that high efficiency was not achieved in weak region until there was a significant outer expansion and associated recirculation zone. However, there was a little influence of the expansion ratio on the weak extinction limit. Alkabie have shown that if fuel is injected into the outer recirculation zone, in the corner of the dump expansion region, then  $\text{NO}_x$  emission are high as this recirculation zone has a high residence time and low refreshment rate with air. To minimise this effect for burner application, the use of an orifice restriction at the outlet of the wall fuel injector was used. The intention was to deflect any fuel in the wall region radially inwards into the shear layer. Various non-conventional fuel injection methods was studied such as swirler vane passage, radial central and wall injection were used with gaseous propane and natural gas and liquid kerosene and gas oil. The test was

conducted using lean-lean two stage combustion concept. He demonstrated that there is no significant effect on  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions by varying the vane angle from  $20^\circ$  to  $60^\circ$ , hence varying the swirl number from 0.41 to 3.25, respectively. However, he found that at very high swirl number of 3.25,  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions were considerably higher than the rest at all associated equivalence ratios for two different inlet air temperature of 400 K and 600 K. This may be due to increased residence time in the rich stabilizing shear layer and hence increased  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions. The same effect was demonstrated when he switched from natural gas to propane. Another way to increase the strength of swirl without changing the vane angle is to decrease the vane depth of the swirler. Combustion efficiencies were also improved as the swirl strength increased. Increasing the swirl strength also extends the lean flammability limits.

Bicen et. al. (1990), have reported temperature and species measurements for annular and tubular combustors using the same axial swirler for flame stabilisation. The annular combustor was operated at an air/fuel ratio of 29 and fuelled by natural gas; it displayed a marked improvement in combustion efficiency, 94% compared to 69%, when the inlet air temperature was raised from 315K to 523K. This improvement was observed to be a result of improved fuel and air mixing. Meanwhile, the tubular combustor was operated at a leaner fuel/air ratio of 57 and fuelled by propane, showed a more modest improvement in combustion efficiency, 97.7% compared to 98.8%, when the inlet air temperature was raised from 315K to 523K. They then concluded that from detailed measurements, the increase in efficiency was due to improved mixing in the combustor. Whitelaw commented that combustor aerodynamics was more dominant characteristic compared to chemical kinetics in the primary zone combustion (Bicen, A.F. et. al, 1990).

Escott, N.H. (1993) studied the combusting flow of three method of swirling generation namely single, coswirl and counterswirl. He used three basic fuel injection modes of swirler vane passage, central and wall injection. Escott finds that low  $\text{NO}_x$  emission was achievable through central fuel injection mode, but the lowest emission results were shown by wall injection method. However, Escott insisted that the results were strongly dependent on the input temperature and pressure provided to the flow. Escott also run an experiment on simple fuel staged injection system and concluded that there was no improvement in either emission or stability compared to

non-staged modes. Coswirl and counterswirl combustion system with passage fuel injection into half of the air flow improved the flame stability but with unacceptable increase in  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions. From his observation, he concluded that lower  $\text{NO}_x$  emission was generated by counterswirl system with deteriorated flame stability due to more vigorous air mixing and consequently leaner fuel occurring in the interjet shear layer.

Kim, M.N. (1995), in his study, stresses on curved blade radial swirlers with wall injection and vane passage injection. The fuels were natural gas, propane and gas oil. He concluded that vane passage injection mode produce lower emission results compared to 76mm wall injection because of wall injections mode injects the fuel in the high residence time corner recirculating zone. This created locally rich zone and high thermal  $\text{NO}_x$ . He also find that natural gas produce lower emission compared to propane due to the better fuel and air mixing between natural gas and air since natural gas has a lower molecular weight than propane which means high diffusivity action and natural gas can be quickly dispersed into turbulent region of shear layer and hence low  $\text{NO}_x$  formation.

Mohd. Radzi Mohamed Yunus (2002), studied the effect of varying swirler vane angles on emissions reduction. He found that optimum swirler vane angle for  $\text{NO}_x$  emission found to be  $60^\circ$ ; for CO was  $80^\circ$  and for  $\text{SO}_2$  was  $70^\circ$ . He suggested that recirculation zone size and turbulence flow affects emissions significantly.

Present researches give more importance on post combustion method which could reduce double of the amount of emissions that was reduced by pre-combustion methods. But, this probably increases the cost. The raise of awareness on importance of emission reduction makes researchers to emphasize on post combustion methods.

### **1.3 Problem Statement**

Current researchers hastily moved their intension to post combustion methods as they found out that post combustion methods could possibly reduce emissions twice of the pre combustion methods. But, take note that this would heavily increase the cost which would discourage the industries to venture in. Besides that, post combustion methods at present situation were almost impossible to apply in aircraft engines as it would increase the engine weight which opposes the aircraft applications requirement of producing low weight-high trust engines. This research concerns on the above mentioned problems and carried out a study to discover a better solution on reducing emission from gas turbine, mainly for aircraft applications.

### **1.4 Objective of Research**

The objective of this research is to develop a low emission liquid fuel burner. The main concern is on reducing  $\text{NO}_x$  emission, as the controlling technique for CO and  $\text{SO}_2$  emission has already been included in the  $\text{NO}_x$  controlling techniques. The idea is to prevent the formation of  $\text{NO}_x$  emission through rapid mixing combustion system. The research includes design, build and test of the combustion chamber, air-fuel atomizer, swirler and air-fuel system. Various swirler vane angles with different orifice plate diameters at two fuel injection positions will be carried out to study the emissions and temperatures characteristic.

## 1.5 Scopes of Research

- (i) Study the literature on combustion chamber designs, rapid mixing systems, injector requirements and air fuel system.
- (ii) Study the NO<sub>x</sub> emission characteristic and controlling techniques.
- (iii) Design of combustion chamber, air-fuel atomizer, swirlers and air-fuel system.
- (iv) Build the combustion chamber, air-fuel atomizer, swirlers and air-fuel system.
- (iv) Test of various swirler vane angles with different orifice plate diameters at two injection positions.
- (v) Emissions & temperature measurements on each burner configurations.
- (vi) Adjustment and modification of burner system to obtain the lowest burner emissions.

## 1.6 Limitation of the Study

- (i) The research will be conducted using four different swirler vane angles of 30°, 40°, 50° and 60°.
- (ii) Three orifice plate diameters of 20mm, 25mm and 30mm will be used for experimental testing to study the effect of orifice plate insertion.
- (iii) Fuel injection is placed at two positions that is at 15mm upstream or downstream from the swirler exit.
- (iv) Diesel fuel used was supplied by Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, which is obtained bulkily from Petronas fuel station.
- (v) The geometry of combustion chamber, fuel injector, orifice plates and swirlers are as designed.
- (vi) Fuel and injection air are pressurized constantly at 2 bar.
- (vii) Flow rate of injection air is constant at 170 ℓ/m.
- (viii) Swirling air flow rate will be varied from 24 CFM to 9 CFM, which is from 679.608 LPM to 254.853 LPM.



## 1.7 An Outline of the Study

This thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter one describes briefly on the problem statement of current research. Problem statement reveal lacks of previous researches and illustrates the significant of this research. However, there were some limitations in the study which has been expressed.

Chapter two discusses thoroughly on the literature study. Four main items of gas turbine combustor; combustion chamber, flame stabilizer, fuel injector and air-fuel system has been discussed fundamentally. The impact of the emissions towards environment and human was explained in detail. The requirement that to be fulfilled on producing a good combustion chamber, flame stabilizer, fuel injector and air-fuel supply has been discussed for better understanding. Besides that, varieties of these four items have been highlighted in this section to study the availability and manufacturability of these items.

Meanwhile, chapter three concerns on the emissions behaviour and emissions controlling methods. Main concern of this research is to improve the  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions as CO emissions could be reduced through good mixing of air and fuel.  $\text{NO}_x$  emission control techniques have been described briefly.

Chapter four, on the other hand, emphasize on the burner design concepts. This chapter explains the requirement required to build a burner. All four main items of combustor; combustion chamber, swirler, fuel injector and air fuel system design concepts has been discussed.

Chapter five elaborates on the experimental testing setup. This chapter describes clearly on the equipments and instrumentations used for the entire experimental testings. There were also guidelines on how the experiment has been conducted.

Chapter six confers about the experimental results and discussion on the combustion performance of that carried out in the experimental testing. Results has

been compared between four different swirler vane angle of  $30^\circ$ ,  $40^\circ$ ,  $50^\circ$  and  $60^\circ$  using three different orifice plate sizes of 20mm, 25mm and 30mm at upstream and downstream injection position. The behaviour of the emission results and temperature profiles was discussed thoroughly.

Chapter seven concludes the emission results and temperature profiles discussions. Recommendation for future work has been stressed in this chapter to provide inspiration for future researchers to continue delivering improvement in emission reduction from pre combustion burners.