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The production of the fire suppressant CF$_3$Br has been banned, and finding a replacement with all of its desirable properties is proving difficult. Iron pentacarbonyl has been found to be up to several orders of magnitude more effective than CF$_3$Br, but it is flammable and highly toxic. Ferrocene [Fe(C$_5$H$_5$)$_2$], which is much less toxic and flammable than Fe(CO)$_5$, can also be used to introduce iron into a flame. We present the first experimental data and numerical modeling for flame inhibition by ferrocene and find it to behave similarly to Fe(CO)$_5$. A ferrocene mole fraction of 200 ppm reduced the burning velocity of slightly preheated premixed methane/air flames by a factor of two, and the effectiveness dropped off sharply at higher mole fractions. For air with a higher oxygen mole fraction, the burning velocity reduction was less. We also present experimental data and modeling for flames with ferrocene blended with CO$_2$ or CF$_3$H. The combination of the thermally acting agent CO$_2$ with ferrocene mitigated the loss of effectiveness experienced by ferrocene alone at higher mole fractions. An agent consisting of 1.5% ferrocene in 98.5% CO$_2$ performed as effectively as CF$_3$Br in achieving a 50% reduction in burning velocity. Likewise, four times less CO$_2$ was required to achieve the 50% reduction if 0.35% ferrocene was added to the CO$_2$. In contrast, addition of 0.35% ferrocene to the hydrofluorocarbon CF$_3$H reduced the CF$_3$H required to achieve the 50% reduction in burning velocity by only about 25%. Thermodynamic equilibrium calculations predict that the formation of iron/fluoride compounds can reduce the concentrations of the iron-species oxide and hydroxide intermediates which are believed to be responsible for the catalytic radical recombination cycles.

Introduction

The production of CF$_3$Br has been banned. As a flame inhibitor, iron pentacarbonyl, Fe(CO)$_5$, is about two orders of magnitude more efficient than CF$_3$Br [1–3], but it is flammable and highly toxic, and its addition to premixed flames at mole fractions above a few hundred parts per million does not further reduce the burning velocity. (Note that all references to percent and parts per million in this work are on a volume basis.) If other iron compounds can be identified which show such strong inhibition but are less toxic and do not lose their effectiveness, they may find use in fire suppressants, particularly in unoccupied areas. Previous research has shown that the moiety responsible for iron pentacarbonyl's inhibition is the iron atom in the gas phase and that the main property required for the parent molecule is that it decomposes at flame temperatures to release iron atom. Hence, we searched for a suitable iron-precursor molecule. A candidate parent molecule is ferrocene, Fe(C$_5$H$_5$)$_2$ (Fec), which modifies the sooting tendency of flames [4–9], is added to materials as a flame retardant [10], and is an antiknock agent. It is also commonly used as a source of iron atoms for kinetic studies. Fec is far less toxic than Fe(CO)$_5$ and may produce the same iron-containing intermediates. Here, we present the first measurements of flame inhibition by ferrocene and the results of numerical calculations using the iron-species mechanism developed for studies of Fe(CO)$_5$ flame inhibition. We also compare ferrocene’s performance with that of Fe(CO)$_5$ and CF$_3$Br in the same flames and present results on the performance of Fec in combination with other agents.

Flame inhibition by highly effective chemical inhibitors has been described in the literature, and their reduced effectiveness at higher mole fractions has been discussed in detail [11–13]. Since the chemicals are believed to act through homogeneous gas-phase catalytic radical recombination cycles [14], the inhibition mechanism is most effective when super-equilibrium concentrations of radicals are present. Consequently, once radicals are reduced to equilibrium levels via inhibitor addition, further reduction in the overall reaction rate from further inhibitor addition is minimal. This loss in effectiveness due to super-equilibrium radical concentrations approaching their equilibrium values has been demonstrated for increasing mole fraction of inhibitor in calculations employing both an idealized “perfect”
inhibitor [12] and Fe(CO)5 [13], and it has been discussed by Rosser et al. [15] and Hastie [16]. Nonetheless, the measured loss in effectiveness of Fe(CO)5 occurs at a lower mole fraction than expected based on these calculations; the actual cause appears to be condensation of iron compounds and the resulting limit to the gas-phase iron-species concentrations [17,18]. Independent of the actual cause of the loss of effectiveness, previous researchers [15,16,19–22] have suggested that combinations of thermally acting and catalytic agents might prove beneficial. The effectiveness of iron pentacarbonyl in premixed flames has been shown to be greatly increased at lower oxygen mole fraction, and the effect has been attributed to the larger superequilibrium ratio (the peak radical mole fraction divided by the equilibrium value) which exists at lower oxygen mole fraction [11]. In contrast, the effectiveness of inert agents such as N2 and CO2 is not a strong function of the oxygen mole fraction in the oxidizer stream. Since adding a thermal agent is equivalent to lowering the oxygen mole fraction, the possibility exists for very effective blends of catalytically and thermally acting agents.

The present results are relevant to the suppression of practical fires. Despite the fact that methane oxidation is, in some respects, atypical of that of larger hydrocarbons, the behavior of Fec and Fe(CO)5 in the methane flames is likely to represent that in flames of larger hydrocarbons. Babushok and Tsang [23] have recently observed that for a wide variety of hydrocarbons, the burning velocity is most sensitive to the rates of the same reactions. Since these reactions are the ones most influenced by an inhibitor, the trends in inhibitor effectiveness are the same for most hydrocarbons. Further, although pre-mixed flame inhibition is distinct from fire suppression, burning velocity reduction is clearly an important first test of an inhibitor’s effectiveness, as has been discussed previously [22]. Nonetheless, it would be desirable in future research to test these highly effective agents in flames resembling fires.

**Experiment**

The premixed laminar flame speed \( S_f \) provides a measure of the effect of the inhibitor on the overall reaction rate. The present experimental arrangement, described in detail previously [11,22,24], has been modified to accommodate a new evaporator for ferrocene and heating of the gas lines and burner tube. A Mache–Hebra nozzle burner (1.0 cm ± 0.05 cm diameter) produced a premixed Bunsen-type flame about 1.3 cm tall with a straight sided schlieren image that was captured by a video frame-grabber board in a personal computer. Digital mass flow controllers held the oxygen mole fraction in the oxidizer stream \( X_{O_2,ox} \), the equivalence ratio \( \phi \), and the flame height constant while maintaining the inlet mole fraction of the inhibitor \((X_{in})\) at the desired value. The average burning velocity was determined from the reactant flows and the schlieren image using the total area method. The fuel gas was methane (Matheson UHP, 99.9%), and the oxidizer stream consisted of nitrogen (liquid N2 boil-off) and oxygen (MG Industries, H2O < 50 ppm; total hydrocarbons < 5 ppm). The inhibitors used were Fec (Aldrich), Fe(CO)5 (Aldrich), CF3H (DuPont), CF3Br (Great Lakes), N2, and CO2 (Argas). The Fe(CO)5 was added to N2 carrier gas using a two-stage saturator in an ice bath. Because the vapor pressure of Fec is much lower than that of Fe(CO)5, Fec addition at mole fractions up to 650 ppm requires both higher bath temperature (79.1 °C held within 0.1 °C) and higher nitrogen carrier gas flow rates (up to 2800 cm³/min relative to Fe(CO)5). Also, the solid state of Fec requires an evaporator with larger surface areas for heat and mass transfer. Our evaporator design, based upon that of Megaridis [5], had a (30 ± 5) cm³ packed bed (to provide the bulk of the ferrocene), followed by 30 sublimation stages (to ensure that the carrier gas was saturated with Fec at the bath temperature). Each sublimation stage consisted of a 5 mm layer of ferrocene on a 2.36 cm diameter, 60 mesh stainless steel screen. A 4 mm gap separated each stage. The vapor pressure correlation of Pelino et al. [25] was used to determine the ferrocene mole fraction in the carrier gas. Temperature controllers maintained the transfer lines at (80 ± 3) °C and the burner tube at (80 ± 1) °C. For all flames, the equivalence ratio (in the absence of inhibitor) was 1.0, and agent mole fraction was calculated relative to the total reactant flow. The flows of fuel, oxidizer, Fec/N2, and CO2 (or CF3H) were mixed after the Fec evaporator. The inlet reactant stream temperature was (353 ± 1) K, which corresponds to a calculated adiabatic flame temperature of 2260 K and 2391 K at \( X_{O_2,ox} = 0.21 \) and 0.244, respectively. Addition of 200 ppm of Fec raises the calculated adiabatic flame temperature by only a few degrees.

**Numerical Modeling**

One-dimensional freely propagating premixed flames were simulated using the Sandia flame code PREMIX [26], the CHEMKIN subroutines [27], and the transport property subroutines [28]. For all of the calculations the absolute tolerance was \( 10^{-14} \), the relative tolerance was \( 10^{-7} \), GRAD was 0.20, and CURV was 0.40. Solutions contained between 85 and 130 grid points. The initial temperature was 353 K, and the pressure was 1 atm. Little is known about the chemical kinetic behavior of ferrocene in flames. The thermal decomposition rate has been measured by Lewis and Smith [29]: \( k = 2.188 \times 10^{16} \exp(–384 kJ/RT) \). However, the high activation
energy suggests the ferrocene could be consumed through reactions with radicals, and this possibility should be investigated further. Thermodynamic data for gaseous ferrocene were from Turnbull [30] and Sabbah and Perez [31], and the transport properties were estimated [32,33]. A reaction set for the methane combustion and for the decomposition and oxidation of the larger hydrocarbon fragments was adopted from Sung et al. [34]. The mechanism included chemistry of C6 compounds, with C1 and C2 chemistry from GRIMech 1.2 [35], and with C3 and above chemistry from a variety of sources. We added iron chemistry from a chemical kinetic mechanism developed for flame inhibition by Fe(CO)5 [13]. Overall, the kinetic model contains 105 species and 677 reactions. Calculations showed that addition of C5H5 at mole fractions up to 400 ppm has negligible effect on the burning velocity and that the major effect of Ferrocene is from the iron chemistry. Consequently, we also employed a reduced mechanism based on GRIMech 1.2 and the iron-inhibition mechanism described in Ref. [13]. In this smaller mechanism, the decomposition of Ferrocene was approximated by a one-step process with an overall activation energy of 209 kJ/mol, followed by a reduced scheme for conversion of C6H5 to simpler hydrocarbons. This lower activation energy was selected to more realistically simulate the overall decomposition rate of Ferrocene. In the calculated results for the Ferrocene-inhibited flames presented in this paper, the two mechanisms yield normalized burning velocities within a few percent of each other; in the figures which follow, the calculated burning velocities were obtained using the smaller mechanism. It should be emphasized that the reaction mechanism used for the present calculations should be considered only as a starting point. Numerous changes to both the rates and the reactions incorporated may be made once a variety of experimental and theoretical data are available for testing the mechanism.

Results and Discussion

Inhibition by Ferrocene

The experimentally determined burning velocity reduction caused by the addition of Ferrocene to stoichiometric methane flames is presented in Fig. 1. (The uncertainties in the experimental data, described in detail previously [36], are about ±5%). As the figure shows, addition of Ferrocene (open symbols) is similar to the addition of iron pentacarbonyl (closed symbols). Data are plotted as normalized burning velocity, which is the burning velocity of the inhibited flame divided by the value for the same flame in the absence of inhibitor. The uninhibited experimental burning velocities used for the normalizations are (53.7 ± 3) cm/s and (75.9 ± 6) cm/s for $X_{O_2}$ = 0.21 and 0.244, respectively; for comparison, the calculations for uninhibited flames using GRIMech 1.2 yield 55.5 cm/s and 72.6 cm/s. Data collected at slightly fuel lean and fuel rich conditions ($\phi$ = 0.9 and 1.1), but not presented here, show that the slope of the burning velocity reduction is about twice as steep for the lean conditions compared to rich and that the Ferrocene loses its effectiveness at a somewhat lower mole fraction for the lean case (again, essentially the same as was observed for Fe(CO)5-inhibited methane flames in Ref. [11]). Fig. 1 shows that for both Ferrocene and Fe(CO)5, the magnitude of the inhibition is strongly dependent upon the oxygen mole fraction in the oxidizer, with oxygen-deprived flames showing more rapid burning velocity reduction. These results foretell the potential of blends of inert agents with iron-containing compounds.

The modeling results for the Ferrocene-inhibited flames are also shown in Fig. 1. The calculations (dotted lines) predict the flame speed reduction caused by Ferrocene reasonably well. The major difference between the Ferrocene reaction scheme and that for Fe(CO)5 is in the decomposition of the iron precursor. The present large mechanism for Ferrocene includes only the high-activation energy thermal decomposition step for Ferrocene consumption, $FeC_10H_{10}$ → Fe + 2 $C_5H_5$, which has a peak reaction flux at about 900 K in the present flames. In contrast, iron pentacarbonyl decomposition has a peak reaction flux at about 1800 K in the present flames.
with 400 ppm of ferrocene as a function of the activation energy of the one-step ferrocene decomposition reaction. For other conditions, however (for example, non-preheated reactants and highly diluted flames), the decomposition of Fec may need to be modeled more accurately to provide agreement with experimental data.

Since both the Fec and Fe(CO)$_5$ mechanisms use the same iron submechanism, the mode of flame speed reduction is similar. Decomposition of the ferrocene molecule releases iron atom in the gas phase. Iron reacts with O$_2$ to form FeO$_2$, which reacts with O atom to form FeO. FeO is a long-lived intermediate, which together with Fe(OH)$_2$ and FeOH enters into the catalytic cycle for H-atom recombination

\[ \text{FeOH} + \text{H} \leftrightarrow \text{FeO} + \text{H}_2 \]
\[ \text{FeO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \leftrightarrow \text{Fe(OH)}_2 \]
\[ \text{Fe(OH)}_2 + \text{H} \leftrightarrow \text{FeOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \]
\[ \text{(net: H} + \text{H} \leftrightarrow \text{H}_2) \]

The modeling results show that the stronger burning velocity reduction for the cooler flames ($X_{\text{O}_2,\text{in}} = 0.21$) is due to their smaller radical pool; in these flames, a given amount of iron can remove a larger percentage of the hydrogen radicals.

Ferrocene appears to be an alternative to the highly toxic iron pentacarbonyl for addition of gas-phase iron to a flame. Unfortunately, its effectiveness also appears to diminish as the mole fraction increases. (For Fe(CO)$_5$ the loss of effectiveness has been identified to be formation of condensed-phase particulates in the reaction zone [18]). Since addition of nitrogen clearly increases the rate of burning velocity reduction at low mole fraction (note the results in Fig. 1 for $X_{\text{O}_2,\text{in}} = 0.21$ and 0.244), it is of interest to determine if other thermally acting agents can be combined with Fec to mitigate the loss of effectiveness and perhaps enhance the flame speed reduction at low Fec mole fraction. It is desired to take advantage of the strong initial flame speed reduction from iron species in the flame, while avoiding the loss of active species due to condensation. A drawback, however, is that addition of an inert, while reducing the burning velocity, also increases the residence time for particle formation in the flame, so that condensation is increased [18]. It is not known a priori if the net effect of combining thermal and iron-containing agents will reduce the overall reaction rate faster than the increase of the rate of active-species condensation.

**Inhibition by Ferrocene Blends**

Figure 3 presents experimental data for addition of pure CO$_2$ (and pure N$_2$) as well as for CO$_2$/Fec blends corresponding to five values of the percentage of Fec in CO$_2$: 0%, 0.05%, 0.25%, 0.53, and 1.5%. For the pure compounds, addition of about 10% of CO$_2$ (or 25% N$_2$) reduces $S_4$ by a factor of
two. Although not presented in the figure, tests at $X_{O_2,inf} = 0.244$ also show that about 10% CO$_2$ is required to reduce the burning velocity by a factor of two. Adding Fec to CO$_2$ produces a particularly effective agent. The equivalent of 0.25% Fec in CO$_2$ reduces the required CO$_2$ by about a factor of three, and 1.3% Fec reduces the required CO$_2$ by ten, making this blend about as effective as CF$_3$H with 0.35% ferrocene, together with data for CF$_3$Br. Lines are curve fits to the data.

The condensation behavior of the blends can be discerned from Fig. 4, which presents additional data for CO$_2$ and ferrocene in stoichiometric flames with $X_{O_2,inf} = 0.21$. In Fig. 3, the CO$_2$ and ferrocene were added together in proportional amounts, whereas in Fig. 4, CO$_2$ is first added at a constant mole fraction (0%, 1%, 2%, 3%, and 6%), and then the Fec is added. This approach allows a clearer delineation of the effects of each component of the blend. As Fig. 4 shows, the curve with 0% CO$_2$ (pure Fec) has a decreasing slope magnitude as $X_{O_2,inf}$ increases (due to increased condensation). For each of the other curves, the added amount of CO$_2$ reduces the normalized burning velocity before the Fec is added, so that each curve starts at a value less than unity; addition of Fec further reduces the flame speed. Below an Fec mole fraction of about 70 ppm, the curves are all roughly parallel, but any curve which extends out beyond this value shows a decreasing effectiveness. For the range of conditions of the figure, the added CO$_2$ and consequent lower temperature and higher particle residence time does not cause a more rapid loss of effectiveness. Rather, higher Fec mole fractions appear to be related to the loss in effectiveness. These results imply that combinations of non-condensing quantities of several catalytic agents combined with a thermal agent can be particularly effective.

Many compounds are candidates for blending with catalytic agents, including thermally acting and other chemical agents. Hydrofluorocarbons, which are easily stored at relatively low pressure, are of interest since they are presently used as halon replacements. These compounds have been found to reduce the burning velocity of premixed methane/air flames by reducing peak H-atom mole fractions by acting as a sink for H atoms through reactions forming HF and by lowering the temperature of the flame. Since they have also been shown to reduce the equilibrium mole fractions of radicals in flames lower than expected based on temperature reduction alone [37], they might be expected to show enhanced performance relative to CO$_2$ when combined with catalytic agents.

Figure 5 presents the burning velocity reduction caused by pure CF$_3$H addition to the above flames; a mole fraction of about 5% is required to reduce $S_L$ by two. Data are also presented for addition of 0.35% Fec in CF$_3$H. Unlike ferrocene addition to CO$_2$, in which 0.35% Fec in CO$_2$ reduces the amount of CO$_2$ required by a factor of about five, this amount of ferrocene in CF$_3$H reduces the amount of CF$_3$H required only by about a third. This

![Fig. 4. Normalized burning velocity of CH$_4$/N$_2$/O$_2$ flames with 0, 1, 2, 3, and 6 mol % of CO$_2$ added to the reactant stream, as a function of added ferrocene (lines are curve fits to the experimental data).](image1)

![Fig. 5. Normalized burning velocity of premixed CH$_4$/O$_2$/N$_2$ flames inhibited by pure CF$_3$H and by CF$_3$H with 0.35% ferrocene, together with data for CF$_3$Br. Lines are curve fits to the data.](image2)
poor performance may be due to reactions between iron species and fluorine, which reduce the gas-phase mole fraction of the active iron-species intermediates, effectively poisoning the iron catalyst [16].

Since there presently exist no experimental data on the rates of reactions of iron species with fluorine containing species in flames, the poisoning effect of fluorinated hydrocarbons on iron-catalyzed radical recombination reactions is assessed through equilibrium calculations for the combustion products. The species included in the calculations are those in the hydrocarbon, the iron-inhibition, and the NIST C1–C2 fluorinated hydrocarbon [38] mechanisms as well as the iron-fluorine species: FeF, FeF₂, FeF₃, Fe₂F₄, Fe₂F₆ [39]. Calculations were performed for the equilibrium products of a stoichiometric methane/air flame with 1 to 4% CF₃H containing 0.35% Ferrocene (the conditions of Fig. 5). The results are presented in Fig. 6, which shows the equilibrium mole fractions of FeF, FeF₂, and FeF₃ together with those of the active inhibiting iron species Fe, FeO, FeOH, FeO₂, and Fe(OH)₂, and Fe₂F₄, as a function of the CF₃H mole percent. The figure indicates the presence of relatively large quantities of fluorinated iron species (especially FeF₂), which increase in proportion as [CF₃H] increases. The formation of fluorinated iron species with strong bonds can clearly act as a sink for iron in the flame and reduce the mole fractions of active iron-containing species available to participate in the flame inhibition reactions. While the experiments and calculations are presented for CF₃H, the results are likely to be the similar for larger hydrofluorocarbons such as C₂HF₅ and C₃HF₇ since the decomposition of each proceeds largely through the CF₃, CF₂, and CFO intermediates [24,37,40].

Conclusions
We have presented the first data on ferrocene flame inhibition and have shown it to be as efficient as Fe(CO)₅ at reducing the burning velocity of premixed methane flames. Ferrocene, like Fe(CO)₅, loses its effectiveness at a mole fraction above a few hundred parts per million. The experimental results are reasonably predicted by a previously developed mechanism for gas-phase inhibition by iron pentacarbonyl. The results imply that any rapidly decomposing iron-containing agent that releases atomic iron in the gas phase can act as an effective precursor for the iron-species intermediates and that the results are not unique to Fe(CO)₅. As with Fe(CO)₅, the magnitude of the inhibition by ferrocene has a strong dependence on the oxygen mole fraction. Consequently, many combinations of CO₂ and Ferrocene show strong inhibition, mitigating the loss of effectiveness observed for pure Ferrocene or Fe(CO)₅. The results imply that an inert agent, together with multiple catalytic agents (to keep the absolute mole fraction of each below its saturation point) may prove to be highly effective for all conditions. In contrast to the results with CO₂, blends of CF₃H and Ferrocene are not particularly effective, implying that iron species and halogens enter into undesired reactions which poison the catalytic cycles. If means can be identified to safely introduce gas-phase iron compounds into fires, combinations of catalytically and thermally acting inhibitors may prove to be an efficient approach for fire suppression.
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A. R. Masri, The University of Sydney, Australia. Can you please comment on the underlying mechanism that leads to the increased effectiveness when ferrocene is mixed with CO₂?

Author’s Reply. Our previous research has shown that for flames with an added inert gas, N₂, the chain-branching radical concentrations are lower. With the smaller radical pool, a fixed amount of iron will recombine a larger fraction of the radical pool, providing enhanced performance. This finding is likely to be relevant to flames with Fe(OC)₅ and N₂ as opposed to the flames with Fe(OC)₅ and N₂ studied previously.

G. Dixon-Lewis, University of Leeds, UK. Have you made any measurements of flame extinction, for example, your Fe-CO₂ mixtures?

Author’s Reply. The present experiments are carried out up to mole fractions of Fe which cause the premixed flame to lose stabilization, but this is not true flame extinction. In previous work, we have conducted experiments with Fe(CO)₅ in counterflow diffusion flames with added diluent N₂. The results are similar to those in premixed flames: the flames with added N₂ show stronger inhibition by iron. We are presently conducting experiments in coflow, liquid-pool diffusion (cup burner) flames, and will report the results soon.