

# Transmission of a detonation wave across an inert layer

Kelsey C. Tang-Yuk<sup>1\*</sup>, XiaoCheng Mi<sup>1</sup>, John H.S. Lee<sup>1</sup>, Hoi Dick Ng<sup>2</sup>, Ralf Deiterding<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, McGill University,  
Montreal H3A 0C3, Canada.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mechanical, Industrial and Aerospace Engineering, Concordia University,  
Montreal H3G 1M8, Canada.

<sup>3</sup>Aerodynamics and Flight Mechanics Research Group, University of Southampton,  
Southampton SO171BJ, United Kingdom.

\*Correspondence to: kelsey.tangyuk@mail.mcgill.ca

## Abstract

The transmission of a detonation wave across a layer of inert gas is studied via one-dimensional numerical simulations. The transient transmission process is first explored in detail, and is analyzed via distance-time characteristic diagrams. The physics of this transient process is the same until the end of a quasi-steady period. Afterward, the energy release from the combustion may couple to the gas dynamics. Through this coupling, the pressure pulse accompanying the energy release can be rapidly amplified, and consequently, leads to detonation onset. If the inert layer is too thick, the detonation cannot be successfully re-initiated downstream. This inert thickness beyond which a detonation fails to be re-initiated is determined as the critical thickness. The mechanisms underlying the scenarios with a successful and unsuccessful re-initiation are demonstrated in detail. A parametric study considering simplified and detailed chemical kinetics is performed to assess the dependence of the critical thickness on reactive mixture parameters.

**Keywords**– Detonation transmission; Inert layer; Detonation onset; Numerical simulation

## 1 Introduction

Detonation research has focused mainly on uniform mixtures. However, the propagation of detonation waves in non-uniform mixtures is of both practical and fundamental interest. In terms of the fundamental aspect, studying the transient response can help to elucidate the detonation propagation and onset mechanism. On the practical side, in accidental vapor cloud explosions, dispersion and mixing of the fuel and air will invariably lead to a highly inhomogeneous mixture. There can be variations in thermodynamic state such as density, and variations in mixture composition such as pockets of unmixed air embedded in the cloud. In previous work, the transmission of a detonation wave across an interface with an abrupt change in thermodynamic state (i.e., density and temperature) was investigated [1]. The present study is concerned specifically with the transmission of a detonation wave across a pocket of inert gas.

A layer of inert gas is embedded in an otherwise uniform reactive gas as shown in Fig. 1. When a detonation enters the inert layer, there will be a reduction in the energy release from chemical reactions. This reduction will cause the detonation to decay, with the leading shock separating from the reaction zone. Therefore, the leading shock will be attenuated as it emerges from the inert layer, with the amplitude of this transmitted shock depending on the thickness of the inert layer. If the inert layer is sufficiently thin, i.e., the transmitted shock is sufficiently strong, ignition of the downstream<sup>1</sup> reactive mixture will occur. If the subsequent reaction rate is sufficiently rapid, the shock will accelerate resulting in a re-initiation of a detonation wave. Therefore, there will be a critical thickness in which ignition and acceleration of the shock lead to the onset of a detonation. The present study

---

<sup>1</sup>As the incident detonation propagates rightwards in all of the simulations reported in this paper, “upstream” and “downstream” mean towards the left and right ends of the domain, respectively.




Figure 1: Problem schematic.

attempts to determine the critical thickness for the re-initiation of detonation downstream of the inert layer via one-dimensional computational analysis.

There have been a few previous studies on the transmission of a detonation across an inert layer. Bull *et al.* [2] investigated the transmission of detonation waves in stoichiometric propane-air and ethylene-air mixtures across an inert air gap. The mixtures were contained in polythene bags, and the reactive sections were separated from the air gap by thin Melinex diaphragms which were withdrawn just prior to detonation initiation. A microwave interferometer monitored the detonation velocity, and piezoelectric transducers recorded the time of arrival and the magnitude of the detonation pressure. In addition, detonation occurrence was indicated by the size of the polythene bag fragments. Detonation was found to re-initiate across an air layer less than 0.15 m for the ethylene-air and 0.12 m for the propane-air.

Similar studies were later carried out by Bjerketvedt, Engebretsen and colleagues [3, 4]. They used a square detonation tube of internal dimension of 125 mm, containing an air section either 100, 150 or 200 mm long. The air section was separated from the reactive sections by slide valves which were rapidly removed just prior to the experiment. With the prescribed air gap of 0.1-0.2 m, detonation was successfully re-initiated for stoichiometric acetylene-air, but not for ethylene-air. Pressure transducer records showed a build-up of pressure and then the onset of a detonation immediately behind the transmitted shock. Gavrilenko *et al.* [5] and Teodorczyk *et al.* [6] have also performed similar experiments with slight variations in introducing an inert layer. Gavrilenko *et al.* [5] used rubber membranes to separate the reactive and inert gases, which were punctured prior to the experiment; whereas Teodorczyk *et al.* [6] injected an inert gas into a channel filled with a reactive gas.

In all of the previous studies, it is clear that obtaining a well-defined boundary between the reactive mixture and inert gas is an experimental challenge. Initially, the gases must be separated by some means such as a diaphragm or slide valve. Removal of this separator invariably generates turbulence, causing mixing and a zone of variable composition at the boundary of the layer to be developed. For example, in the experiments of Bjerketvedt *et al.* [3] the mixing zone created after removal of the slide valves was found to be approximately 30 mm wide, which is fairly large compared to the length of the inert section.

A recent numerical study by Wang *et al.* [7] considered both a single inert layer as well as a series of inert layers. One and two-dimensional simulations were performed. The reactive mixture was stoichiometric hydrogen-oxygen-nitrogen and the inert gas was pure nitrogen. Critical thicknesses of 0.15 mm and 0.3 mm were found for the one and two-dimensional cases, respectively. It of interest to note that these critical thicknesses are about two orders of magnitude smaller than the experimentally observed values.

The studies thus far have allowed for only a few inert lengths [3, 4] or only a couple of reactive mixtures [2, 8]. Therefore, the dependence of the critical inert thickness on the reactive mixture has not been thoroughly explored. The critical thickness should be characteristic of a reactive mixture, and may therefore provide a length scale to describe the detonability of the mixture. Typically, detonation cell size is the length scale used to describe detonability. However, cell size is irregular and its measurement by the soot foil technique is subjective. In addition, cell size cannot in general be used exclusively; cell regularity (or mixture stability) is also important [9–11]. The present study is computational which facilitates a parametric study as mixture parameters can be more readily varied. In addition, numerical simulation avoids the problem of mixing between reactive and inert gases allowing the inert boundaries to be well defined.

## 2 Problem description

### 2.1 Governing equations

For simplicity, the problem is assumed to be one-dimensional, and viscous transport and heat conduction are neglected. In addition, the initial pressure and temperature are uniform throughout the domain. The governing equations are the one-dimensional inviscid Euler equations with reactive source terms, describing the conservation

of mass, momentum and energy. That is,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial \tilde{t}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U})}{\partial \tilde{x}} = \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{U}) \quad (1)$$

with conserved variables  $\mathbf{U}$ , convective fluxes  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U})$ , and source terms  $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{U})$  given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U} &= (\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\rho}\tilde{u}, \tilde{\rho}\tilde{e}, \tilde{\rho}Y_n)^T \\ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}) &= (\tilde{\rho}\tilde{u}, \tilde{\rho}\tilde{u}^2 + \tilde{p}, \tilde{u}(\tilde{\rho}\tilde{e} + \tilde{p}), \tilde{\rho}\tilde{u}Y_n)^T \\ \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{U}) &= (0, 0, 0, \tilde{\omega}_n)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here  $\tilde{\rho}$ ,  $\tilde{u}$ ,  $\tilde{p}$ ,  $\tilde{e}$  are the density, particle velocity, pressure and specific total energy, respectively. The chemical species are represented by subscript  $n$ , where  $Y_n$  are their mass fractions, and  $\tilde{\omega}_n$  their production rates. In the present study three different chemical kinetic models are used which will be described in turn.

### 2.1.1 Three-step chemical kinetic model

For the majority of the study, a three-species, three-step reaction model was used to represent features of chain branching kinetics. This model has been used in previous studies [12–15]. A calorically perfect gas with a constant ratio of specific heats  $\gamma$  is assumed, and dimensionless quantities are defined as,

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \frac{\tilde{p}}{\gamma\tilde{p}_0}, \quad \rho = \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}_0}, \quad T = \frac{\tilde{T}}{\gamma\tilde{T}_0}, \\ u &= \frac{\tilde{u}}{\tilde{c}_0}, \quad e = \frac{p}{(\gamma-1)\rho} + \frac{u^2}{2} - q \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $q$  is the local heat released by combustion, and  $c$  is the sound speed. The tilde denotes a dimensional quantity, and the subscript 0 refers to the initial unburnt state.

The three species are fuel, radical and product, which are denoted F, Y and Z, respectively. The chain initiating reaction is represented by  $F \rightarrow Y$ , the chain branching reaction by  $F + Y \rightarrow 2Y$ , and the chain terminating reaction by  $Y \rightarrow Z$ . The initiating and branching reaction rates have a dependence on temperature of an Arrhenius form, and the chain terminating reaction is assumed to be independent of temperature. The system of equations is,

$$\frac{d(\rho f)}{dt} = -(\omega_A + \omega_B), \quad \frac{d(\rho y)}{dt} = \omega_A + \omega_B - \omega_C \quad (4)$$

with,

$$\omega_A = \rho f \exp \left[ E_A \left( \frac{1}{T_A} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \right], \quad \omega_B = \rho f y \exp \left[ E_B \left( \frac{1}{T_B} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \right], \quad \omega_C = \rho y \quad (5)$$

where  $f$  and  $y$  are the mass fractions of fuel and radical species, and  $\omega_A$ ,  $\omega_B$  and  $\omega_C$  are the chain initiating, branching and terminating reaction rates.  $E_A$  and  $E_B$  are the activation energies of the chain initiating and chain branching reactions, respectively, and  $T_A$  and  $T_B$  are their crossover temperatures. The initiating and branching reactions are assumed to be thermally neutral, such that only the chain terminating reaction is exothermic. Thus the local chemical energy release,  $q$  is,

$$q = Q(1 - f - y) = Qz \quad (6)$$

where  $z$  is the product mass fraction, and  $Q$  is the total chemical energy released per unit mass. The activation energies have been non-dimensionalized as follows,

$$E_A = \frac{\tilde{E}_A}{\tilde{c}_0^2}, \quad E_B = \frac{\tilde{E}_B}{\tilde{c}_0^2}. \quad (7)$$

In addition, the length and time scales are such that the rate constant of the chain terminating reaction ( $\omega_C$  in Eq. 5) is unity. For reference, all non-dimensionalization is identical to that in [14].

In order to represent real chain branching reactions, the kinetic parameters must satisfy,

$$T_A > T_{vN}, \quad T_B < T_{vN}, \quad E_B \ll E_A \quad (8)$$

where  $T_{vN}$  is the von Neumann shock temperature [12, 13]. These criteria are based on the fact that the initiating reaction generally requires a large activation energy to break the relatively strong bonds of the fuel, whereas the branching reaction generally requires less energy. In addition, the chain branching reaction is the most critical reaction in systems with chain branching chemistry [16]. Therefore, both of the chain branching parameters, namely the crossover temperature,  $T_B$  and the activation energy,  $E_B$  are varied. In the present study,  $T_B = 0.84-0.95T_{vN}$ ,  $E_B = 10$  or  $15$ ,  $T_A = 3T_{vN}$ , and  $E_A = 37.5$ .

### 2.1.2 Two-step chemical kinetic model

A simpler two-step chemical kinetic model is used for comparison, which has also been used in previous studies [17]. Dimensionless quantities can be defined as before (Eq. 3). The reaction is split into a thermally neutral induction stage and a reaction stage. Both stages have a temperature-sensitive Arrhenius form of the reaction rate. The system of equations is,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d(\rho\xi)}{dt} &= H(1-\xi)\rho k_I \exp\left[E_I\left(\frac{1}{T_{vN}} - \frac{1}{T}\right)\right], \\ \frac{d(\rho\lambda)}{dt} &= (1-H(1-\xi))\rho k_R(1-\lambda) \exp\left(\frac{-E_R}{T}\right)\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

with the step function,

$$H(1-\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \xi < 1 \\ 0 & \xi \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Here  $\xi$  is progress variable, so that at the end of the induction process all of the fuel is converted to radicals instantaneously. Then  $\lambda$  can be thought of as the mass fraction of product. The parameters  $k_I$  and  $k_R$  are rate constants, and  $E_I$  and  $E_R$  are activation energies for the induction and reaction steps, respectively. Thus, the local chemical energy release,  $q$  is now,

$$q = \lambda Q. \quad (11)$$

Again, activation energies can be non-dimensionalized as above (Eq. 7), i.e.,

$$E_I = \frac{\tilde{E}_I}{\tilde{c}_0^2}, \quad E_R = \frac{\tilde{E}_R}{\tilde{c}_0^2}. \quad (12)$$

In addition, the rate constant  $k_I = -u_{vN}$ , where  $u_{vN}$  is the von Neumann particle velocity in the shock fixed frame. This defines the length and time scales so that the ZND (Zeldovich, von Neumann, and Döring) induction length is unity [17]. The activation energy of the induction step is generally much larger than the reaction step, i.e.,

$$E_I \gg E_R. \quad (13)$$

Again this is because it involves breaking the relatively strong fuel bonds, and since this is the most crucial step  $E_I$  is varied. In the present study, the rate constant  $k_R = 0.8$  or  $1$ , the activation energy  $E_R = T_{vN}$ , and the activation energy of the induction,  $E_I = 6-10T_{vN}$ .

### 2.1.3 Detailed chemical kinetic model

Finally, a detailed chemical kinetic mechanism for hydrogen-air combustion is used. The mechanism is a subset of the hydrocarbon kinetic mechanism of Westbrook [18]. There are 34 elementary reactions and 9 species, including  $H_2$ ,  $O_2$ ,  $H$ ,  $O$ ,  $OH$ ,  $H_2O$ ,  $HO_2$ ,  $H_2O_2$  and  $N_2$ . The combustible mixture is always stoichiometric hydrogen-air, while the inert layer is always air. The initial temperature throughout the domain is 295 K, and the initial pressure is varied from 0.1-1 atm.

## 2.2 Generalized parameters

The chemical kinetic parameters described above are specific to each model, but might be more useful in a general form that is applicable to all models. For any detonable gas there are three universal governing parameters [19]. These parameters are the induction time/length scale, the activation energy, and the thermal energy release.

### 2.2.1 Induction length

For a two-step chemical kinetic model, the induction length can be clearly defined in the ZND detonation structure and used to non-dimensionalize the length scales of the problem. For three-step and detailed chemical kinetic models, there is no standard definition of induction length. However, it can be defined as the distance to the maximum thermicity, where the thermicity is a measure of the rate of heat release. In general for ideal gases, the thermicity is defined by,

$$\dot{\sigma} = \sum_n \left( \frac{\tilde{W}}{\tilde{W}_n} - \frac{\tilde{h}_n}{\tilde{C}_p \tilde{T}} \right) \frac{dY_n}{dt}. \quad (14)$$

where  $\tilde{C}_p$  is the mixture specific heat at constant pressure,  $\tilde{W}$  the mean molar mass, and  $\tilde{h}$  is the specific enthalpy. For the three-step chemical kinetic model it reduces to,

$$\dot{\sigma} = (\gamma - 1) \frac{Q}{c^2} \frac{dz}{dt}. \quad (15)$$

### 2.2.2 Effective activation energy

An effective activation energy is defined dimensionally as,

$$E_a = \frac{\tilde{E}_a}{\tilde{R}\tilde{T}_0}. \quad (16)$$

It describes the sensitivity of the induction time to a thermodynamic perturbation and therefore indicates the mixture stability, where a lower value of  $E_a$  corresponds to a more stable mixture. Schultz and Shepherd [pp. 81-94, 19] have calculated  $E_a$  for a wide variety of combustible mixtures. A global Arrhenius form for the induction time is assumed, given by,

$$\tilde{\tau}_i = A \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{E}_a}{\tilde{R}\tilde{T}}\right). \quad (17)$$

Two initial temperatures corresponding to shocks at  $\pm 1\%$  the CJ detonation velocity are used, and the corresponding constant volume induction times are found. Then, the two induction time and initial temperature pairs are used to solve Eq. 17 for the activation energy. This method was applied to the present three-step and detailed chemical kinetic models. For the detailed chemistry model the Chemkin software [20] was used for the constant volume calculation. For the two-step model, this parameter is simply  $\tilde{E}_1/\tilde{R}\tilde{T}_{vN} = E_1/T_{vN}$ .

### 2.2.3 Thermal energy

The thermal energy release is the energy released by combustion, defined non-dimensionally as,

$$Q = \frac{\tilde{Q}}{\tilde{R}\tilde{T}_0}. \quad (18)$$

For the two-step and three-step chemical kinetic models the present values of  $Q = 30$  or  $50$ , with  $\gamma = 1.2$ , are chosen to give typical CJ (Chapman-Jouguet) detonation Mach numbers of 4.9 or 6.2. For the detailed chemistry model it is calculated following [19] using,

$$Q = \frac{\tilde{R}_{CJ}\tilde{T}_{CJ}}{\tilde{R}_0\tilde{T}_0} \left( \frac{\gamma_{CJ}}{\gamma_{CJ} - 1} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_{CJ} - 1}{2} \right) - \left( \frac{\gamma_0}{\gamma_0 - 1} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma_0 - 1}{2} M_{CJ}^2 \right). \quad (19)$$

The Chemkin software [20] was also used for equilibrium calculations to give the CJ detonation properties  $\tilde{R}_{CJ}$ ,  $\tilde{T}_{CJ}$ ,  $\gamma_{CJ}$  and  $M_{CJ}$ .

## 2.3 Computational methodology

For the two-step and three-step chemical kinetic models the simulation was based on a uniform Cartesian grid. Strang splitting is used to treat the hydrodynamic and reactive processes separately. The homogeneous PDE was solved using the second-order MUSCL-Hancock scheme with a van Leer slope limiter and a Harten-Lax-van Leer-contact (HLLC) approximate Riemann solver [21]. A CFL (Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy) number of 0.7 was used. A second-order, two-stage Runge-Kutta method was used for the respective reaction ODEs. The code was validated by comparison to the results in [14, 17]. In both cases a minimum resolution of 100 cells per unit length was used. However, convergence has been verified with resolutions of 200-400 computational cells, and the majority of the presented results utilize the highest resolution.

For the detailed reaction mechanism the problem was simulated using the AMROC framework (Adaptive Mesh Refinement in Object-Oriented C++), developed by Deiterding [22]. AMROC employs the block-structured adaptive mesh refinement (SAMR) of Berger and Colella [23]. The coarsest grid has 100 cells per cm (10 cells per mm), and four additional levels of refinement are allowed with refinement factors of 2, 2, 4 and 4, respectively. The resolution at the highest level is therefore 640 cells per mm, or  $\Delta\tilde{x} = 1.6 \mu\text{m}$ . With the range of initial pressures used, this resolution corresponds to 128-1240 cells per ZND induction length.

In all cases the left boundary condition was transmissive. To begin the simulation the incident ZND detonation was placed on the grid at the left of the domain, and the inert layer was placed ahead of it as shown in Fig. 1. The thickness of the inert layer,  $\delta_i$ , was increased in steps of approximately two ZND induction lengths until failure was obtained.

## 3 Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Transmission into an infinitely long inert layer

In this section, typical results with the three-step chemical kinetic mechanism are used. Consider first the transmission of the detonation wave into the inert medium. Figure 2 shows the flowfield pressure and thermicity at selected times. The initial boundary between reactive and inert gas is at  $x = 0$ , and the shaded regions define the inert gas. Figure 2(a) shows the incident ZND detonation just prior to entering the inert gas. The leading shock is at the von Neumann value, and behind the shock is the induction zone. At the end of the induction, the thermicity rises rapidly and the pressure drops in the reaction zone.

In Fig. 2(b), the detonation has entered the inert gas. Since the gas behind the shock front is moving in the positive  $x$  direction, the inert gas will be advected with the shock. Consequently, the shocked inert gas is compressed to a thin region within the induction zone, and the reactive gas from upstream still fills the reaction zone. Therefore, the reaction zone of the ZND detonation is unchanged, and the energy release maintains the leading shock amplitude at the von Neumann value.

In Fig. 2(c) and (d), the inert gas enters the reaction zone, and the energy release decreases. Thus, the pressure behind the leading shock decreases and the shock decays continuously. The shock decay begins at about  $x = 7$ , and the burnout of the reactive gas is completed at about  $x = 20$ . It is thus of importance to note that even after the detonation enters the inert layer, the mixture behind the leading shock continues to react and the energy release contributes to maintain the shock and slow its decay. Afterward, in Fig. 2(e), the shock continues to decay due to the expansion behind it. Eventually, a constant velocity shock will be obtained. The analytic solution for this final transmitted shock has been obtained by previous researchers [24–26].

### 3.2 Transmission into downstream reactive gas

Now consider the wave transmission into the downstream reactive gas. Figure 3 shows the leading shock pressure for the detonation transmission across inert layers of different thicknesses,  $\delta_i$ . The  $y$ -axis is the leading shock pressure normalized by the von Neumann shock pressure and the  $x$ -axis is the shock location. The upstream boundary of the inert layer is at  $x = 0$ , indicated by the vertical dashed line.

As shown in Fig. 3, the initial decay of the shock follows the case where the inert layer is infinitely long ( $\delta_i = \infty$  case from Fig. 2). In general, when the shock reaches some lower amplitude, the downstream mixture begins to react and the decay slows. The energy release supports the shock so that the shock amplitude remains more or less constant. During this “quasi-steady” period, the fluctuations are a consequence of pressure waves generated by non-steady energy release of the mixture behind the shock.

If  $\delta_i \leq 8$ , the shock is accelerated to form an overdriven detonation (as indicated on the green dotted curve in Fig. 3). It then decays asymptotically, and the characteristic ZND detonation is re-formed. In such a case, a detonation is successfully re-initiated in the downstream reactive gas. If  $\delta_i \geq 10$ , no acceleration of the shock is observed (note that the simulation was run up to a shock location  $x_{\text{shock}} > 1000$ ). Such a case is considered as a failure of detonation re-initiation in the downstream reactive gas. Thus, one can determine a critical value of the inert layer thickness for a successful re-initiation in a given reactive mixture. For the mixture with the three-step kinetics considered in this section, the critical thickness is equal to  $\delta_{i,\text{cr}} = 9 \pm 1$ . The transient processes for cases with a successful re-initiation and a failure of re-initiation are demonstrated in detail in the following two subsections, i.e., Sects. 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, respectively.

#### 3.2.1 Successful re-initiation

First consider near-critical case where the detonation is successfully re-initiated downstream, with inert thickness  $\delta_i = 8$ . Figure 4(a) shows the normalized pressure and thermicity, while Fig. 4(b) shows the normalized temperature and mass fraction of the radical species at selected times. The first profile is the incident ZND detonation, and again the vertical dashed line is the upstream boundary of the inert layer at  $x = 0$ .

Upon transmission downstream of the inert layer, the transmitted shock is decaying. Near  $x = 20$ , ignition of the downstream reactive gas can be observed, shown by a new exothermic peak ( $\dot{\sigma}$ ) as indicated in Fig. 4. The energy release is able to slow the decay and allow the shock to quasi-stabilize. During the quasi-steady period (also labeled in Fig. 3), the reaction front is not coupled to the shock and lags behind. However, the energy release generates small pressure pulses, one of which can be seen near  $x = 50$ . These pulses propagate forward to temporarily strengthen the shock, and are responsible for the fluctuation of the shock during the quasi-steady period (as was seen in Fig. 3).

When the shock amplitude fluctuates, a disturbance is created in the temperature of the shocked particles. This disturbance is seen afterward in the induction zone of the temperature profiles near  $x = 70$ . A new reaction front




Figure 2: The flowfield pressure normalized by the von Neumann state ( $p/p_{vN}$ ), and the thermicity ( $\dot{\sigma}$ ), for detonation transmission into the inert gas ( $\delta_i = \infty$ ), where  $\gamma = 1.2$ ,  $\gamma Q = 30$ ,  $E_B = 10$  and  $T_B = 0.95T_{vN}$ .




Figure 3: The leading shock pressure normalized by the von Neumann shock pressure ( $p_{\text{shock}}/p_{\text{vN}}$ ) against the shock location ( $x_{\text{shock}}$ ) for inert thicknesses  $\delta_i = 2-10$  and  $\delta_i = \infty$ , where  $\gamma = 1.2$ ,  $\gamma Q = 30$ ,  $E_B = 10$  and  $T_B = 0.95T_{\text{vN}}$ .






Figure 4: **(a)** The flowfield pressure normalized by the von Neumann state ( $p/p_{\text{vn}}$ ), and the thermicity ( $\dot{\sigma}$ ) **(b)** The flowfield temperature normalized by the von Neumann state ( $T/T_{\text{vn}}$ ), and radical species mass fraction ( $y$ ), for inert thickness  $\delta_i = 8$ , where  $\gamma = 1.2$ ,  $\gamma Q = 30$ ,  $E_B = 10$  and  $T_B = 0.95T_{\text{vn}}$ .

forms at this disturbance near  $x = 90$  as indicated in Fig. 4, creating a second peak in temperature, radical species, and exothermicity in front of the original reaction zone. The energy release at the new reaction front increases rapidly, and an accompanying pressure pulse coupled to the reaction front is formed. The coupled pressure pulse and reaction front are amplified simultaneously, and the front of the pressure pulse steepens into a secondary shock. The pulse-shock complex catches up to the transmitted leading shock, and gives rise to the onset of detonation. When the two shocks collide a contact surface is formed near  $x = 110$ , at which the right side has a higher temperature. The process repeats, in that a new reaction front forms at the contact surface. The energy release at the new reaction front leads to further pressure increase and a more strongly overdriven detonation. Again, the old reaction front burns out.

The onset of detonation is analyzed in more detail via a distance-time ( $x-t$ ) diagram as shown in Fig. 5. The solid black line is the leading shock front. The red dashed lines are the reaction fronts, which are defined as the trajectory of the maximum thermicity, i.e.,  $\dot{\sigma}_{\max}$ . Finally, the blue dotted lines are representative C+ characteristics. In addition, profiles of pressure and  $\dot{\sigma}$  are shown again for reference, at selected times indicated by the green arrows.

In the first profile at  $t = 40.5$ , the new reaction front is forming ahead of the original reaction front. The energy release at the new front is smaller than at the original reaction front. In this region of the  $x-t$  diagram, both reaction fronts are receding, i.e. progressively decoupling, from the shock front. In the second profile at  $t = 41.75$ , the energy release at the new reaction front has increased to become larger than that at the original front. Simultaneously, in this region of the  $x-t$  diagram, the new reaction front is abruptly accelerated toward the shock. Notice that the reaction front becomes briefly parallel to the C+ characteristic at this location, which is shown by a thicker line for emphasis. Therefore, when this characteristic compresses the gas ahead of the reaction front its reaction is intensified, driving the reaction front forward. Henceforth, the energy release and pressure pulse are mutually amplified; the energy release amplifies the pressure pulse, and in turn compression of the gas by the pulse intensifies the reaction. This mutual amplification is evident in the last two profiles at  $t = 43.5$  and  $t = 44.75$ . Simultaneously, the original reaction front burns out. In addition, the front of the pressure pulse is steepening into a shock, as observed in the last profile and the convergence of the characteristics at the top right of the  $x-t$  diagram.

### 3.2.2 Failure of re-initiation

Consider now a case where the detonation fails to re-initiate downstream, with inert thickness  $\delta_i = 10$ , which is shown in Fig. 6. In this case the process initially proceeds as before. The decaying leading shock ignites the downstream reactive mixture by  $x = 30$ ; however, the reaction front lags behind the shock. Nevertheless, a small pressure pulse is formed at  $x = 75$  which catches up to the shock. The fluctuation in shock amplitude creates a temperature disturbance in the induction zone near  $x = 100$ . At the temperature disturbance, a new reaction front develops near  $x = 150$ . However, contrary to the “go” case, there is no rapid increase in reaction rate or pressure at the new reaction front. In the last profile, the pressure pulse is decoupled from the reaction front. It is not large enough to maintain the shock amplitude, thus the shock decays.

### 3.3 Effect of chemical kinetics on the critical thickness

The critical thickness was found for the three chemical kinetic models and their corresponding parameters. The results are plotted in Fig. 7, where the  $y$ -axis is the critical thickness,  $\delta_{i,cr}$  normalized by the ZND induction length,  $\Delta_I$ . The  $x$ -axis is the effective activation energy,  $E_a$ . In this plane the data lie on a curve, shown by the dashed line. Points below (or to the left of) the curve constitute transmission success, whereas points above (or to the right of) the curve constitute transmission failure. For the cases with  $E_a \lesssim 24$ , a distinct critical thickness cannot be found. Thus, the dashed line is extended towards infinity beyond this point. Nevertheless, activation energies below 24 are generally unrealistic for detonable mixtures.

Overall, the critical thickness is shown to be dependent on the mixture parameters  $\Delta_I$  and  $E_a$  only, regardless of the chemical kinetic model. In general, the detonability of a mixture is dependent on both a characteristic length scale such as the cell size, and the mixture stability which can be manifested for example by the cell regularity [9–11]. In the present study, the characteristic length scale is  $\Delta_I$ , and the mixture stability is captured by  $E_a$ .

Furthermore, it can be seen that the critical thickness ranges from the order of magnitude of the ZND induction length to an order of magnitude larger. It is worth noting that the critical thickness obtained in the 1D numerical study of Wang *et al.* [7] was 0.15 mm, which is similar in magnitude to those obtained in the present study. However, the critical thicknesses obtained in the experiments of Bull *et al.* [2] and Bjerketvedt *et al.* [3], are of the order of  $\delta_{i,cr} \sim 100$  mm or  $100 \Delta_I$ . Therefore, the one-dimensional simulations under-predict the critical thickness by at least an order of magnitude. This discrepancy is likely due to the transverse wave instabilities that are present




Figure 5: (a) Distance-time ( $x-t$ ) diagram and (b) The normalized pressure ( $p/p_{vn}$ ) and thermicity ( $\dot{\sigma}$ ) flowfield at  $t = 40.5, 41.75, 43.5, 44.75$ , for the pressure pulse at the end of the quasi-steady period with inert thickness  $\delta_i = 8$ , where  $\gamma = 1.2$ ,  $\gamma Q = 30$ ,  $E_B = 10$  and  $T_B = 0.95T_{vN}$ .




Figure 6: **(a)** The flowfield pressure normalized by the von Neumann state ( $p/p_{vn}$ ), and the thermicity ( $\dot{\sigma}$ ) **(b)** The flowfield temperature normalized by the von Neumann state ( $T/T_{vn}$ ), and radical species mass fraction ( $y$ ), for inert thickness  $\delta_i = 10$ , where  $\gamma = 1.2$ ,  $\gamma Q = 30$ ,  $E_B = 10$  and  $T_B = 0.95T_{vn}$ .




Figure 7: The critical inert thickness ( $\delta_{i,cr}$ ) normalized by the ZND induction length ( $\Delta_I$ ) against the effective activation energy ( $E_a$ ), for all chemical kinetic models and parameters.

in multi-dimensional gaseous detonations. Collision of the transverse waves can create similar reaction spots with higher exothermicity, assisting in detonation onset and extending the critical thickness.

Finally, the incident ZND detonation has been assumed to be followed by combustion products at a constant thermodynamic state. This setup represents an idealized case of an infinitely long tube. More generally, an expansion wave referred to as the Taylor wave trails behind the detonation, further expanding the combustion products. In this case the transmitted shock would decay further to an acoustic wave, at a rate dependent on the Taylor wave. Therefore, the amplitude of the transmitted shock at some given inert thickness may decrease, and so the critical thickness may decrease. In particular, for the mixtures with very low  $E_a$  to the left of the vertical line in Fig. 7, a critical thickness could be found if the Taylor wave were included. Therefore, the present results can be thought of as an upper bound for the critical thickness.

## 4 Concluding remarks

In the present study, the transmission of a detonation wave across a layer of inert gas has been examined via one-dimensional numerical simulations. A decaying shock is transmitted into the reactive gas downstream of the inert layer. This transmitted shock is sufficiently strong to trigger reactions in the downstream gas, and the resulting energy release generates pressure pulses. During the quasi-steady period, the pressure pulses are not coupled to the energy release, so they remain small and propagate ahead of the reaction front. Nevertheless, they support the shock and allow it to quasi-stabilize at a relatively low speed. At the end of the quasi-steady period, the pressure pulses may couple to the energy release. The critical process was found to be the acceleration of the reaction front to the characteristic speed. This coupling leads to a rapid amplification of the energy release and of the pressure pulse, resulting in an acceleration of the transmitted shock and the onset of detonation.

The critical thickness is the thickness of the inert layer above which the detonation cannot be re-initiated downstream. A parametric study has shown that the one-dimensional critical thickness,  $\delta_{i,cr}$ , can be adequately described by the ZND induction length,  $\Delta_I$ , and an effective activation energy,  $E_a$ . The one-dimensional simulations, however, under-predict previous experimental results [2, 3] by at least an order of magnitude. This discrepancy is likely due to the multi-dimensional cellular instabilities that are present in real detonation waves. Thus, further analysis in multiple dimensions is motivated, and a complementary two-dimensional study is underway.

## References

- [1] K. C. Tang Yuk, X. C. Mi, J. H. Lee, and H. D. Ng, "Transmission of a detonation across a density interface," *Shock Waves*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 967–979, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00193-018-0827-z>.
- [2] D. C. Bull, J. E. Elsworth, M. A. McLeod, and D. Hugues, "Initiation of Unconfined Gas Detonations in Hydrocarbon-Air Mixtures by a Sympathetic Mechanism," *Gasdynamics of Detonations and Explosions*, vol. 75, pp. 61–72, Sep. 1979. <https://doi.org/10.2514/5.9781600865497.0061.0072>.
- [3] D. Bjerketvedt, O. K. Sonju, and I. O. Moen, "The Influence of Experimental Condition on the Reinitiation of Detonation Across an Inert Region," *Dynamics of Explosions*, vol. 106, pp. 109–130, 1986. <https://doi.org/10.2514/5.9781600865800.0109.0130>.
- [4] T. Engebretsen, D. Bjerketvedt, and O. K. Sonju, "Propagation of Gaseous Detonations Through Regions of Low Reactivity," *Dynamic Aspects of Detonations*, vol. 153, pp. 324–346, Sep. 1993. <https://doi.org/10.2514/5.9781600866265.0324.0346>.
- [5] T. P. Gavrilenko, A. N. Krasnov, and Y. A. Nikolaev, "Transfer of a gas detonation through an inert gas "plug"," *Combustion, Explosion, and Shock Waves*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 240–244, 1982. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00789625>.
- [6] A. Teodorczyk and F. Benoan, "Interaction of detonation with inert gas zone," *Shock Waves*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 211–223, Aug. 1996. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s001930050039>.
- [7] Y. Wang, R. Deiterding, and Z. Chen, "Propagation of gaseous detonation across inert layers," in *Proceedings of the Combustion Institute*, Jul. 2020. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proci.2020.07.022>.
- [8] C. J. Wang and J. X. Wen, "Numerical simulation of flame acceleration and deflagration-to-detonation transition in hydrogen-air mixtures with concentration gradients," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 42, no. 11, pp. 7657–7663, Mar. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.06.107>.
- [9] I. Moen, A. Sulmistras, G. O. Thomas, D. Bjerketvedt, and P. A. Thibault, "Influence of cellular regularity on the behavior of gaseous detonation," *J. Bowen, J.-C. Leyer (Eds.), Dynamics of Explosions, Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics*, vol. 106, pp. 220–243, 1986. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2514/5.9781600865800.0220.0243>.
- [10] D. Desbordes, C. Gueraud, L. Hamada, and H. N. Presles, "Failure of the Classical Dynamic Parameters Relationships in Highly Regular Cellular Detonation Systems," *Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics*, vol. 153, pp. 347–359, 1993. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2514/5.9781600866265.0347.0359>.
- [11] M. I. Radulescu, G. J. Sharpe, and D. Bradley, "A Universal Parameter Quantifying Explosion Hazards, Detonability and Hot Spot Formation: The  $\chi$  Number," 2013. [https://doi.org/10.3850/978-981-07-5936-0{\\\_}10-01](https://doi.org/10.3850/978-981-07-5936-0{\_}10-01).
- [12] J. W. Dold and A. K. Kapila, "Comparison between shock initiations of detonation using thermally-sensitive and chain-branching chemical models," *Combustion and Flame*, vol. 85, no. 1-2, pp. 185–194, 1991. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-2180\(91\)90186-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-2180(91)90186-F).
- [13] M. Short and J. Quirk, "On the nonlinear stability and detonability limit of a detonation wave for a model three-step chain-branching reaction," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, vol. 339, pp. 89–119, 1997. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002211209700503X>.
- [14] H. D. Ng and J. H. Lee, "Direct initiation of detonation with a multi-step reaction scheme," *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, vol. 476, pp. 179–211, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112002002872>.

- [15] P. A. Blythe, A. K. Kapila, and M. Short, “Homogeneous ignition for a three-step chain-branching reaction model,” *Journal of Engineering Mathematics*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 105–128, Oct. 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10665-006-9055-0>.
- [16] C. K. Law, *Combustion Physics*. Cambridge university press, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511754517>.
- [17] H. D. Ng, M. I. Radulescu, A. J. Higgins, N. Nikiforakis, and J. H. Lee, “Numerical investigation of the instability for one-dimensional Chapman-Jouguet detonations with chain-branching kinetics,” *Combustion Theory and Modelling*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 385–401, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13647830500307758>.
- [18] C. K. Westbrook, “Chemical kinetics of hydrocarbon oxidation in gaseous detonations,” *Combustion and Flame*, 1982. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-2180\(82\)90015-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-2180(82)90015-3).
- [19] E. Schultz and J. Shepherd, “Validation of Detailed Reaction Mechanisms for Detonation Simulation,” California Institute of Technology, Graduate Aeronautical Laboratories, Pasadena, Tech. Rep., 2000.
- [20] R. J. Kee, F. M. Rupley, and J. A. Miller, “Chemkin-II: a Fortran chemical kinetics package for the analysis of gas-phase chemical kinetics,” Tech. Rep.
- [21] E. F. Toro, *Riemann Solvers and Numerical Methods for Fluid Dynamics*. 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1007/b79761>.
- [22] R. Deiterding, *AMROC: Blockstructured adaptive mesh refinement in objectoriented C++*. [Online]. Available: <http://amroc.sourceforge.net>.
- [23] M. J. Berger and P. Colella, “Local adaptive mesh refinement for shock hydrodynamics,” *Journal of Computational Physics*, 1989. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9991\(89\)90035-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9991(89)90035-1).
- [24] R. B. Morrison, “A shock tube investigation of detonative combustion,” Willow Run Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Tech. Rep., 1952, pp. 1–118.
- [25] S. Paterson, “Contact transmission of detonation,” *Symposium (International) on Combustion*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 468–471, 1953. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0082-0784\(53\)80065-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0082-0784(53)80065-2).
- [26] J. T. Peace and F. K. Lu, “Detonation-to-shock wave transmission at a contact discontinuity,” *Shock Waves*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 981–992, Sep. 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00193-018-0804-6>.