

Impact of fuel and injection system on particle emissions from a GDI engine

Wang, C. , Xu, H. , Herreros, J. M. , Wang, J. and Cracknell, R.

Author post-print (accepted) deposited in CURVE January 2016

Original citation & hyperlink:

Wang, C. , Xu, H. , Herreros, J. M. , Wang, J. and Cracknell, R. (2014) Impact of fuel and injection system on particle emissions from a GDI engine. Applied Energy, volume 132 : 178-191

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.06.012>

ISSN 2154-8633

DOI 10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.06.012

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Impact of Fuel and Injection System on Particle Emissions from a GDI Engine

Chongming Wang¹, Hongming Xu^{1,3*}, Jose Martin Herreros¹, Jianxin Wang²,
Roger Cracknell³

1. University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

2. State Key Laboratory of Automotive Safety and Energy, Tsinghua University, Beijing

3. Shell Global Solutions, UK

Abstract

In recent years, particulate emissions from the gasoline direct injection (GDI) engine, especially the ultrafine particulates, have become a subject of concern. In this study, the impact of fuel (gasoline versus ethanol) and injection system on particle emissions was investigated in a single cylinder spray-guided GDI research engine, under the operating conditions of stoichiometric air/fuel ratio, 1500 rpm engine speed and 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP. Two fuels (gasoline and ethanol), four injection pressures (50, 100, 150 and 172 bar) and three injectors (one clean and two fouled injectors) were studied. The results show that, in a spray guided GDI engine, ethanol combustion yields much lower particle mass (PM) but higher particle number (PN) emissions, compared to gasoline. Depending on the fuel used, the PM and PN emissions respond differently to injection pressure and injector condition. For gasoline, the injection system has a significant impact on the PM and PN emissions. High injection pressure and clean injector condition are both essential for low particle emissions. Compared to gasoline, the particle emissions from ethanol combustion is less sensitive to the injection system, due to its higher volatility and diffusive combustion which produces less soot. Furthermore, a PM and PN trade-off was observed when using gasoline and ethanol, and when using high injection pressures.

Keywords: Particulate matter; Injector fouling; Injection pressure; GDI

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: h.m.xu@bham.ac.uk

28 1. INTRODUCTION

29 Historically, particulate emissions have been related to diesel engines [1-3]. However in recent years,
30 particulate emissions from the gasoline direct injection (GDI) engines, especially the ultrafine particulates,
31 have become a subject of concern. Research evidence shows that the particle mass (PM) and particle number
32 (PN) emissions from GDI engines are similar in level or even higher than those of the diesel engines equipped
33 with diesel particulate filters (DPFs) [4-7]. As a result of environmental and health concerns, Euro 5+
34 regulations limit the PM emissions from vehicles equipped with GDI engines. The proposed Euro 6
35 regulations, for the first time, enforce a limit on the PN emissions.

36 The particulate emissions from GDI engines should be addressed through either the combustion process or
37 after-treatment systems. Therefore, it is of vital importance to understand the characterization of particulates
38 (i.e. nature, size, morphology, structure, etc.) as well as the influence of different factors on their
39 formation/oxidation mechanisms, which includes the engine type, fuel properties, and injection system.

40 Engine type shows a direct link to the particle emissions. Research evidence shows that particles from the
41 wall-guided and spray-guided GDI engines demonstrate significantly different characteristics. Andersson et al.
42 studied PM emissions from wall-guided GDI engines and found that elemental soot was the most abundant
43 component (72%) in its composition, which is similar to that of diesel engines [8]. Price et al. investigated PM
44 emissions from a spray-guided GDI engine, and concluded that the particle composition was dominated by
45 volatile organic materials whilst the elemental carbon/soot fraction accounted for at most 2%-29% of its
46 composition, depending on the injection pressure, air/fuel ratio and start of injection [9]. The difference
47 mentioned above is because of the differences in the air-fuel mixture preparation for wall-guided and spray-
48 guided engines. Unlike wall-guided GDI engines, spray-guided GDI engines have less fuel impingement on
49 the piston crown; therefore the combustion is less diffusive.

50 The particle emissions vary widely, depending on fuel properties such as aromatic content, volatility and
51 oxygen content [10-16]. The fuel volatility is directly linked to air/fuel mixture preparation and thus particle
52 emissions [17]. Liquid fuels like iso-octane produces more PM emissions than gaseous fuels such as propane

[18]. Aikawa et al. suggested that fuel vapour pressure and fuel structure (double bond and aromatic ring) play important roles in the PM formation. A 'PM Index' for predicting PM emissions in gasoline vehicles was concluded [10]. They calculated the PM Index distribution of 1445 commercially available gasoline fuels from around the world and found that the PM Indices of gasoline fuels sold globally fall in a very wide band. Leach et al. studied the influence of fuel properties on PN emissions from a GDI engine, by designing fuels with differing volatility and aromatic content, and validated a 'PN index' for evaluating the PM emissions from commercial gasoline fuels [19]. It is well reported that compared to gasoline, pure ethanol produces much less PM emissions in GDI engines [12, 20, 21]. The effect of ethanol blending levels in gasoline on PM emissions in the GDI engine is not well understood. Mohammad et al. reported a significant reduction of soot formation by using alcohol blends [22], which is supported by other publications [23-26]. However Chen et al.'s data shows that increases in both PM and PN emissions were observed with ethanol addition, particularly in a cold engine [11]. Other publications also concluded that a low ethanol-gasoline blend had higher or similar PM emissions compared with pure gasoline [12, 17, 21, 27].

Injection system, such as the injection pressure and injector condition, is important in determining the engine-out PM characteristics. Higher DI injection pressure leads to higher spray velocity, shorter injection pulse and smaller droplets which are more widely distributed [28]. He et al. studied various injection pressures (33-68 bar) in a wall-guided GDI engine and found that a high injection pressure reduced PN emissions [29]. Matousek et al. investigated DI injection pressure in a single-cylinder GDI engine and found that the PN emission was reduced by 70% using 200 bar instead of 100 bar injection pressure, and was reduced by another 50% by using 300 bar injection pressure [30].

Injector conditions affect the quality of spray and atomisation directly [31, 32], and thus they subsequently affect the engine-out emissions [31, 33-35]. Injector fouling in GDI engines is a far greater concern than in PFI engines due to the injectors' harsher thermal conditions and its direct impact on the fuel and air mixture process, and combustion [32, 33, 36, 37]. A fouled injector is expected to cause issues. For example spray quality will be reduced leading to poor local mixing, the injector nozzles can be blocked reducing flow which

could lead to Engine Management System (EMS) trim and set-point changes, and uneven flow between holes can occur leading to misdistribution in the cylinder (lean / rich regions). It is reported that a fouled injector with a 22% fuel flow rate loss led to 30% and 190% more HC and CO emissions respectively compared to a clean injector [38]. Similar results were also observed in [39]. There are limited publications concerning the impact of injector condition on particle emissions in GDI engines. Berndorfer et al. [40] studied a fouled injector and observed diffusion combustion phenomenon near the injector tip, after the main combustion in a GDI optical engine, leading to high soot and high HC emissions.

Based on the literature study, it can be concluded that there is an increasing interest in understanding the PM characteristics of GDI engines, but detailed investigations of the effect of fuel and injection system are limited, especially concerning spray-guided GDI engines. Even though it is clear that gasoline fuel and injection pressure both have significant impact on the particulate emissions in GDI engines, it is not clear which of those two factors is more prominent. Therefore, this paper examines the impact of fuel and injection system on PM emissions in a spray-guided GDI engine. Two fuels (gasoline and ethanol), four injection pressures (50, 100, 150 172 bar) and three injectors (one clean injector and two fouled injectors) were tested. The test conditions were stoichiometric air-fuel ratio, 1500 rpm engine speed and 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP engine load.

2. EXPERIMENTAL SYSTEMS AND METHODS

2.1. ENGINE AND INSTRUMENTATION

The specifications of the single cylinder GDI research engine used in this study are listed in Table 1 and its experimental system is shown in Figure 1. The engine was coupled to a direct current (DC) dynamometer to maintain a constant speed (± 1 rpm) regardless of the engine torque output. The in-cylinder pressure was measured using a Kistler 6041A water-cooled pressure transducer. All temperatures were measured with K-type thermocouples. Coolant and oil temperatures were maintained at 358 K and 368 K (± 3 K) respectively,

102 using a Proportional Integral Differential (PID) controller and heat exchangers. A 100 L intake buffer tank
103 was used to stabilize the intake air flow.

104 The engine was controlled using an in-house control software written in LabView. The HC emissions
105 were measured using a Horiba MEXA-7100DEGR gas Analyser with a resolution of 1 ppm. Exhaust samples
106 were taken 0.3 m downstream of the exhaust valve and pumped via a heated line (maintained at 464 K)
107 leading to the gas Analyser. The PM emission was measured using a Scanning Mobility Particle Sizer
108 Spectrometer (SMPS3936) supplied by TSI. PM samples were taken 0.33 m downstream of the exhaust valve
109 via a rotational disk dilution system supplied by TSI. The sampling head was maintained at 425 K, the highest
110 setting available for the rotational disk dilution system. A dilution ratio of 50 was set in this study.

111

112 2.2. INJECTOR AND FLOW RATE TEST

113 The injectors used in this experimental study include two GDI injectors which were used in previous
114 engine experiments in the Future Engines and Fuels Lab at Birmingham, using various fuels for about 3
115 months under engine load conditions ranging from 3.5 to 8.5 bar IMEP. Carbon deposits were accumulated in
116 the injector nozzle and also on the injector tip. To quantitatively characterise the status of the two injectors,
117 their flow rates were measured on a test bench with 150 bar injection pressure using iso-octane as the test fuel.
118 Ten injection pulse widths ranging from 0.3 to 6 ms were selected, and the fuel from 1000 injections was
119 quantitatively measured by a balance with a resolution of 0.1 g. All the measurements were repeated at least
120 three times and the averaged results were used to calculate the flow rate loss, shown in Figure 2. Injector 1
121 showed a flow rate loss of 8.5%, and injector 2 showed a flow rate loss of 5.3%. Injector 3 is the clean injector
122 used as the benchmark. After the flow rate test, the injectors were used to study of the effect of injector
123 fouling on the PM emissions.

124 It is important to maintain the injector condition consistently throughout the PM measurement, and thus
125 the possibility that injector deposits are washed away or further accumulated during the present experimental
126 investigation has been considered. The variation in injection pulse width for a certain injection quantity was

used as a simple indicator of the variation of injector condition. The engine test designed for the study of the effect of a fouled injector on PM emissions lasted 3 hours for each injector. Each engine operating point (3.5-8.5 bar IMEP) was repeated at least three times and the injection pulse width was recorded. There was no evidence that injector 1 and 2 experienced any noticeable change during the PM measurement in this study. Figure 3 shows the injection pulse width of injector 1 throughout the PM measurement. It is clear that the injection pulse width in the 3 tests had very good repeatability and therefore, it is believed that the injector conditions throughout the experimental study were consistent.

In summary, although the injectors were not fouled using a bespoke technique, the level of flow loss in each injector has been accurately characterised, and it has been shown that the level of flow loss has remained consistent throughout the experimental study.

2.3. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

The gasoline and ethanol used in this study have the properties listed in Table 2 and they were supplied by Shell Global Solutions (UK) without any performance additives. The test matrix is listed in Table 3. The engine was firstly warmed up with the coolant and lubricating temperatures stabilized at the selected conditions for the fixed engine speed of 1500 rpm, which was controlled by the DC dynamometer. The engine speed of 1500 rpm is the engine speed used at the Ford worldwide mapping point. All of the tests for each fuel carried out in this work were done under the fuel-specific optimum spark timings [20], known as the maximum brake torque (MBT) timings. Spark sweeps were performed for each fuel at various loads (3.5-8.5 bar IMEP at 1 bar IMEP intervals). On the boundary of knocking or combustion instability (COV of IMEP > 5%), the MBT timing was retarded by 2 CAD. In such cases, the optimum ignition timing is referred to as the knock-limited spark advance (KLSA) [20]. The engine load ranging from 3.5 to 8.5 bar IMEP was controlled by adjusting both the injection pulse width and throttle position while keeping the air/fuel ratio at stoichiometric condition. After the specific engine load was stabilized, the PM and HC emissions were measured by the SMPS and Horiba MEXA-7100DEGER respectively. In-cylinder pressure and exhaust

152 temperature were monitored as indicators of engine stability. For each operating point, three to five
153 measurements were made and the averaged data was presented.

154

155 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

156 The results and discussion are divided into two sections, injection pressure and injector condition
157 (fouled/clean). In each section, the results for both gasoline and ethanol are presented. For all the particulate
158 size distributions, ordinates of the graphics were normalized by the differential logarithm interval of the
159 particulate size. The data has been corrected by the dilution ratio factor set in the sampling and dilution
160 system.

161 3.1. IMPACT OF INJECTION PRESSURE

162 3.1.1. GASOLINE

163 Figure 4 presents the effect of injection pressure on the HC emissions for gasoline at 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP.
164 Higher injection pressure consistently led to decreased HC emissions within the entire tested load range,
165 resulting from improved spray quality atomization [29, 30]. Figure 5 shows the effect of injection pressure on
166 particle size distributions in number (a, b and c) and mass (d, e and f) for gasoline at 4.5, 6.5 and 8.5 bar
167 IMEP. At 4.5 bar IMEP, the particulate size distributions in number (Figure 5 (a)) and mass (Figure 5 (d)) had
168 mono-peak shapes under 100-172 bar injection pressure, indicating that most of the particles were nuclei HCs
169 and there were limited soot emissions. At 6.5 bar IMEP, the differences in particulate size distributions in
170 number (Figure 5 (b)) were limited, however there were obvious differences in particulate size distributions in
171 mass (Figure 5 (e)). At 8.5 bar IMEP, both the particulate size distributions in number (Figure 5 (c)) and mass
172 (Figure 5 (f)) demonstrated dual-modal shapes and had completely different characteristics under various
173 injection pressures.

174 Particle size distributions are composed of particles with different nature: (a) nuclei HCs which mainly
175 compose the nucleation mode, and (b) soot agglomerates with HCs condensed or adsorbed on their surface,
176 which compose the accumulation mode [41]. Injection pressure affects particle size distributions through its

impacts on both HCs and soot formation and the interactions between them. The interactions could be clearly observed in the particle size distributions in number at 8.5 bar IMEP (Figure 5 (c)). An increased injection pressure resulted in increased PN in the nucleation mode. However, at 8.5 bar IMEP, higher injection pressure contributed to lower HC emissions (Figure 4), and lower soot emissions as indicated by the lower PN at the accumulation mode. The opposite trend is because soot not only directly determines the accumulation mode, but also has an indirect impact on the nucleation mode [41]. High injection pressure reduced the soot formation and thus the available soot surface area for the HC adsorption or condensation, favouring hydrocarbon nucleation [41]. Since the nucleation mode is the main contributor of PN emissions and the accumulation mode is the main contributor of PM emissions, it can be seen that there is an apparent trade-off in the PM and PN emission in the GDI engine at high injection pressures. This example reflects the complexity of particle emission analysis, necessitating separating/identifying of particles based on the particle nature.

The separation of particles from GDI engines into the nucleation and accumulation mode is not straightforward. Previous research shows that majority of particulates from GDI engines is composed of volatile material (unburnt HCs and lubricant) while soot only accounts for a small fraction (2%-29%), depending on the engine load, injection pressure, air/fuel ratio and start of injection [9]. Furthermore at low engine loads, the nucleation mode in the particle size distribution overlaps largely with the accumulation mode, making the separation impossible. Only in some cases such as Figure 5 (c)), a dual-mode shape with a light overlap is observed and the separation can be easily made, which is presented in Figure 6 (a). In this operating condition, the high soot concentration increased the weight of PN in the accumulation mode and reduced that in the nucleation mode, which led to two clearly separated modes. However, when soot formation is low, separation based on the particle size distributions expressed in number becomes difficult (e.g. 50 bar injection pressure and 6.5 bar IMEP, Figure 6 (d)).

Another approach to identify PM modes is proposed here. As the accumulation mode is the primary source of PM emissions, particle size distributions in mass could help to separate the modes. At 6.5 bar IMEP

and high injection pressure, the particle size distribution expressed in mass had a dual-modal shape with a slight overlap (Figure 6 (d)). In this engine condition, there was a relatively low soot formation and lower HC emissions, compared with those of the lower injection pressure.

Table 4 and Table 5 listed the possibility of particle mode separation based on particle size distributions in number and mass respectively. It can be concluded that high soot formation at high engine loads was the key for separation based on the particle size distribution in number, while at medium level of soot formation (such as 6.5 bar IMEP), the separation based on the particle size distribution in mass is possible.

By combining the information from Table 4 and Table 5, it is possible to study the effect of injection pressure on different types of particle mode independently, the result of which is presented in Figure 7. Increased injection pressure led to reductions of both PM and PN emissions in the accumulation mode. However, high injection pressure seemed to have a negative effect on PN emissions in the nucleation mode. The injection pressure of 172 bar consistently led to increased PN emissions in the nucleation mode compared to other tested injection pressures. This could be related to the reason mentioned earlier: low soot formation leads to less soot surface available for HCs to be condensed or adsorbed on.

3.1.2. ETHANOL

Figure 8 shows the effect of injection pressure on HC emissions for ethanol at 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP. Unlike from gasoline combustion, HC emissions from ethanol combustion were not sensitive to injection pressure. The explanation is that ethanol has a 34.8% gravimetric oxygen content, which gives it an advantage of lower soot formation compared with gasoline, due to more complete combustion and more post-flame oxidation [11, 12]. On the other hand, even though low injection pressure led to more fuel impingement on the piston and cylinder liner, ethanol evaporated more easily due to its lower boiling point compared with gasoline. Figure 9 shows the effect of injection pressure on the particulate size distributions in number (a and b) and in mass (c and d) for ethanol at 4.5 and 8.5 bar IMEP. For all tested load and injection pressure conditions of ethanol, the

particle size distributions consistently demonstrated mono-peaks, with the majority of particles in the range of 30-50 nm, suggesting that the soot formation in ethanol combustion is limited.

Figure 10 shows the comparison of PM and PN emissions from gasoline and ethanol combustion under 150 bar injection pressure. Compared with the PM emissions, the PN emissions are less sensitive to fuel. The differences between the two fuels in the PN emissions are in the range of 6-16% whilst the difference in the PM emissions is about 3% at low load (3.5 bar) and up to 900% at high load (8.5 bar). The reason why ethanol has lower PM emissions compared to gasoline is due to ethanol's oxygen content and high volatility. The higher PN emissions from ethanol compared to gasoline is because of the following two reasons. Firstly, while soot as nuclei provides the surface on which unburnt HC is adsorbed or condensed, ethanol has reduced soot particles and therefore most of the HC is formed from the particles in nucleation mode, which is the main contributor to the ethanol PN emissions. Secondly, the ethanol adsorbed on the soot has higher volatilities, compared to typical HCs in gasoline, and thus the PN emissions from ethanol combustion are higher.

3.2. IMPACT OF INJECTOR FOULING

3.2.1. GASOLINE

Figure 11 presents the effect of a fouled injector on HC emissions for gasoline at 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP at 150 bar injection pressure. Compared with the clean injector (#3), the fouled injector (#1) yielded approximately 10% higher HC emissions at the engine load range of 5.5-8.5 bar IMEP. Similar results are also reported in other publications [38, 39]. This is possibly linked to the increased fuel impingement due to longer injector pulse width resulting from injector fouling. The fuel film continues to evaporate during the combustion stroke and therefore diffusive combustion occurs, which leads to high HC and soot formation. Another reason is possibly related to the gasoline adsorbed on carbon deposits near the injector tip. The adsorbed gasoline contributes to the diffusive combustion after the main combustion, which is reported in [40] using optical diagnostics. The distorted spray which leads to imperfect air/fuel mixture preparation is also another reason for high HC emissions [32, 33, 36, 37].

Figure 12 shows the impact of injector fouling on the particulate size distributions in number (a, b and c) and mass (d, e and f) for gasoline at 4.5, 6.5 and 8.5 bar IMEP under 150 bar injection pressure. The clean injector (#3) consistently had better particulate size distributions in number and mass. At 4.5 and 6.5 bar IMEP, it is clear that the fouled injector (#1) produced significantly higher particulate size distributions in number. At 8.5 bar IMEP, the benefit of the clean injector (#3) regarding particulate size distributions in mass is obvious.

The particulates at 6.5-8.5 bar IMEP were separated into the nucleation and accumulation modes, using the same method described in the section 3.1.1. Figure 13 presents the impact of injector fouling on PM and PN emissions at 6.5-8.5 bar IMEP at 150 bar injection pressure. At all tested engine loads, the clean injector 3 (#3) consistently led to the lowest PM and PN emissions. The high PM and PN in the accumulation mode for the fouled injector is the direct indicator of high soot formation, which is a result of diffusive combustion. Increased fuel impingement, gasoline adsorption on the deposit on the injector tip, and distorted spray all contribute to the diffusive combustion. The maximum difference was observed at the highest engine load 8.5 bar IMEP, in which the PN emissions of the clean injector (#3) were nearly 53% and 58% of those of the fouled injectors (#1) and (#2) respectively.

Figure 14 shows the comparison of PM and PN emissions for injectors (#1) and (#3) under 150 and 50 bar injection pressure at 6.5-8.5 bar IMEP. Compared with the fouled injector (#1) at 50 bar injection pressure (the worst injection system), the clean injector (#3) at 150 bar injection pressure (the best injection system) led to a reduction of the PM emission by 80.3-88.2%. This demonstrates how much difference the condition of the injection system can make to the particle emissions from the gasoline engine.

It is known that variations of fuel specifications on the market lead to variations of PM emissions from gasoline fuelled vehicle engines [10, 14, 17]. Aikawa et al. proposed a ‘PM index’ for predicting the PM emissions for gasoline vehicles (Equation 1) [10].

$$\text{PM Index: } I(VP, DBE) = \sum_{i=1}^n (DBE_i + 1) / (VP_{443 K})_i \times W_{ti} \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

Here, $VP_{443\text{ K}}$ means vapour pressure of a single component i at the temperature of 443 K. W_{ii} means the weight fraction of the single component i . DBE represents the double bond equivalent (Equation 2).

$$DBE = (2C - H + 2)/2 \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

More detailed information about the ‘PM Index’ is available in [10]. Aikawa et al. calculated the PM Index distribution for 1445 worldwide commercially available gasoline fuels (Fig.12 in [10]) and found that the PM Indices for the gasoline fuels sold globally fell in a very wide band, ranging from 0.67 to 3.86. If excluding the top and bottom 10% of the data, the PM Indices for the remaining 80% fuels fall into the range of 1 to 2.2. Based on the PM Index model, the fuel with the PM index value of 1 reduces the PM emissions by 54.5% compared to the fuel with a PM index value of 2.2. Given the results in the present study using a different injection system, it appears that the difference in PM emissions made by the injection system cleanliness can be more important than that made by the gasoline fuel composition.

3.2.2. ETHANOL

Figure 15 presents the effect of injector fouling on HC emissions for ethanol at 150 bar injection pressure. Fouled injectors had a limited impact on the HC emissions from the ethanol fuelled GDI engine. Figure 16 shows the effect of injector fouling on the particulate size distributions in number (a and b) and mass (c and d) for ethanol at 4.5 and 8.5 bar IMEP at 150 bar injection pressure. Again, injector fouling had a limited impact on the particulate size distributions. It is certain that fuel impingement and fuel adsorption on the deposit near the injector tip is increased due to injector fouling. However the reason that, unlike gasoline, HC and soot formation is not increased when using ethanol is because ethanol evaporates more easily and diffusive combustion is not increased as much as when using gasoline. On the other hand, compared to the diffusive combustion of gasoline, the diffusive combustion of ethanol leads to lower HC and soot formation due to the oxygen content within the ethanol molecule.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The impact of fuel (gasoline versus ethanol) and injection system on the particle emissions has been studied in a spray guided GDI engine under the operating condition of stoichiometric air/fuel ratio, engine speed of 1500 rpm and 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP engine load. The conclusions drawn from the investigation are as follows:

1. Compared with gasoline, ethanol yielded considerably less PM emissions due to a significantly lower soot formation resulting from its oxygen content and higher volatility. However, the PN emissions from ethanol were higher than those from gasoline. This is because, unlike gasoline, most of unburnt HC from ethanol formed the nanoparticles in the nucleation mode, whilst only a small fraction of unburnt HC is attached or adsorbed on the limited soot.

2. High injection pressure improves the particle emissions from a GDI engine fuelled with gasoline, because of better spray atomization. By increasing the injection pressure from 50 bar to 150 bar, the PM and PN emissions were reduced by up to 22% and 78% respectively. Increasing the injection pressure to 172 bar further reduced the soot emission, however the PN emission was increased due to a significant increase in the nucleated HC particles. It seems that there is a trade-off between the PM and PN emissions from GDI engines at certain engine conditions.

3. Injector fouling should be considered carefully in the combustion system design for spray-guided GDI engines. Injector fouling affects the PM emissions through affecting the HC and soot formation, which itself is affected by the diffusive combustion that results from both the fuel impingement and fuel adsorption on the deposit near the injector tip. Deteriorated injectors could increase PM emissions by up to ten times as shown in this study. Unlike in the case of gasoline, the PM emissions from ethanol combustion are not affected by the injection system. The HC and soot formation are not evidently increased using low injection pressure and when the fouled injectors are used, because ethanol evaporates more easily and thus experiences less diffusive combustion.

Furthermore, it is hypothesised that the differences in PM emissions made by injection system (pressure and injector condition) are more significant than the differences made by the composition of commercial

326 gasoline fuels on the market. The data from Honda shows that the PM Index of 80% of worldwide
327 commercially available gasoline fuels is within the range of 1 to 2.2, indicating a difference of up to 54.5% in
328 the corresponding PM emissions. The difference made in PM emissions by the injection system is up to 88%
329 in this study. However, this hypothesis requires further and comprehensive investigation.

330

331

332

333

334 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

335 This study was funded by the Royal Society International Exchange programme, Advantage West Midlands
336 (AWM) Science City and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Technical Communication
337 and Cooperative Research: 51211130117). The authors would like to acknowledge the support from Jaguar
338 Land Rover and Shell Global Solutions UK. They also thank Peter Thornton and Carl Hingley for their
339 technical support of the engine testing facility.

340

List of Tables

341 Table 1 Single Cylinder Engine Specification

342 Table 2 Properties of the Fuels Studied

343 Table 3 Engine operating conditions

344 Table 4 Possibility of PM mode separation based on Particle size distribution expressed in number

345 Table 5 Possibility of PM mode separation based on Particle size distribution expressed in mass

346

347

Table 1 Single Cylinder Engine Specification

Engine Type	4-Stroke, 4-Valve
Combustion System	Spray Guided GDI
Swept Volume	565.6 cc
Bore x Stroke	90 x 88.9 mm
Compression Ratio	11.5:1
Engine Speed	1500 rpm
DI Pressure/Injection Timing	15 MPa/280° bTDC*
Intake Valve Opening	16.5° bTDC*
Exhaust Valve Closing	36.7° aTDC*

348 * TDC refers to the one in the combustion stroke

349

350

Table 2 Properties of the Fuels Studied

	Gasoline	Ethanol
Chemical Formula	C ₂ -C ₁₄	C ₂ H ₆ O
Gravimetric Oxygen Content (%)	0	34.78
Density @ 20°C (kg/m ³)	744.6	790.9
Research Octane Number (RON)	96.8	107
Motor Octane Number (MON)	85.7	89
Stoichiometric Air-Fuel Ratio	14.46	8.95
LHV (MJ/kg)	42.9	26.9
LHV (MJ/L)	31.9	21.3
Heat of Vaporization (KJ/kg)	373	840
Initial Boiling Point (°C)	32.8	78.4

351

352

353

354

355

356

Table 3 Engine operating conditions

Factors	Fuel	Injection Pressure (bar)	Injector number	Others
Injection pressure	gasoline	50, 100, 150, 172	# 3 (clean)	IMEP: 3.5-8.5 Lambda: 1 Engine speed: 1500 rpm, Ignition timing: MBT/KLSA
	ethanol	50, 100, 150	# 3 (clean)	
Injector fouling	gasoline	50, 150	# 1 (8.5%*) # 2 (5.3%*)	
	ethanol	150	# 3 (clean)	

357

*The flow test results were shown in Figure 2

358

359

360

Table 4 Possibility of PM mode separation based on Particle size distribution expressed in number

361

		IMEP (bar)					
		3.5	4.5	5.5	6.5	7.5	8.5
Injection Pressure	50	-	-	-	+	++	++
	100	-	-	-	+	++	++
	150	-	-	-	-	+	++
	172	-	-	-	-	+	++

362

- Refers to the case of impossible mode separation

363

+ Refers to the case of possible mode separation however with some challenges such as in Figure 6 (b)

364

++ Refers to the case of very clear mode separation such as Figure 6 (a)

365

366

Table 5 Possibility of PM mode separation based on Particle size distribution expressed in mass

		IMEP (bar)					
		3.5	4.5	5.5	6.5	7.5	8.5
Injection Pressure	50	-	-	-	+	-	-
	100	-	-	-	++	-	-
	150	-	-	-	++	+	-
	172	-	-	-	++	++	+

367

- Refers to the case of impossible mode separation

368

+ Refers to the case of possible mode separation however with some challenges such as in Figure 6 (d)

369

++ Refers to the case Refers to the case of very clear mode separation such as Figure 6 (c)

List of Figures

- 371 Figure 1 Schematic of Engine and Instrumentation Setup
- 372 Figure 2 Injector Flow Test using iso-octane as the Test Fluid at 150 bar Injection Pressure
- 373 Figure 3 Injection Pulse Width for Injector 1 at 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP under 150 bar Injection Pressure
374 during the PM Measurement
- 375 Figure 4 Effect of Injection Pressure on HC emissions in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline
376 (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 377 Figure 5 Effect of Injection Pressure on Particle Size Distributions in Number (a, b and c) and Mass
378 (a, b and c) in GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 379 Figure 6 PM Mode Separations based on Particle Size Distributions expressed in Number (a, b) and
380 Mass (c, d)
- 381 Figure 7 Effect of Injection Pressure on PN (a, b and c) and PM (d, e and f) Emissions in GDI
382 Engine Fuelled with Gasoline (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 383 Figure 8 Effect of Injection Pressure on HC emissions in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Ethanol (engine
384 speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 385 Figure 9 Effect of Injection Pressure on Particle Size distributions in Number (a, b) and Mass (c, d)
386 in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Ethanol (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 387 Figure 10 Comparison of (a) PN and (b) PM emissions from a GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline
388 and Ethanol (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 389 Figure 11 Effect of Injector Fouling on HC Emissions for Gasoline at 150 bar Injection Pressure
390 (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 391 Figure 12 Effect of Injector Fouling on Particle Size distributions in Number (a, b and c) and Mass
392 (d, e and f) in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500
393 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 394 Figure 13 Effect of Injector Fouling on PN (a, b and c) and PM (d, e and f) Emissions in GDI
395 Engine Fuelled with Gasoline at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 396 Figure 14 Comparison of total PM emissions for injectors 1 and 3 under 150 and 50 bar injection
397 pressure at 6.5-8.5 bar IMEP
- 398 Figure 15 Effect of Injector Fouling on HC Emissions for Ethanol at 150 bar Injection Pressure
399 (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)
- 400 Figure 16 Effect of Injector Fouling on Particle Size Distribution in Number (a and b) and Mass (c
401 and d) in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Ethanol at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500 rpm,
402 $\lambda=1$)

403

404

405




Figure 1 Schematic of Engine and Instrumentation Setup




Figure 2 Injector Flow Test using iso-octane as the Test Fluid at 150 bar Injection Pressure




Figure 3 Injection Pulse Width for Injector 1 at 3.5-8.5 bar IMEP under 150 bar Injection Pressure during the PM Measurement




Figure 4 Effect of Injection Pressure on HC emissions in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 5 Effect of Injection Pressure on Particle Size Distributions in Number (a, b and c) and Mass (a, b and c) in GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 6 PM Mode Separations based on Particle Size Distributions expressed in Number (a, b) and Mass (c, d)




Figure 7 Effect of Injection Pressure on PN (a, b and c) and PM (d, e and f) Emissions in GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 8 Effect of Injection Pressure on HC emissions in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Ethanol (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 9 Effect of Injection Pressure on Particle Size distributions in Number (a, b) and Mass (c, d) in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Ethanol (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 10 Comparison of (a) PN and (b) PM emissions from a GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline and Ethanol (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 11 Effect of Injector Fouling on HC Emissions for Gasoline at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 12 Effect of Injector Fouling on Particle Size distributions in Number (a, b and c) and Mass (d, e and f) in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 13 Effect of Injector Fouling on PN (a, b and c) and PM (d, e and f) Emissions in GDI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 14 Comparison of total PM emissions for injectors 1 and 3 under 150 and 50 bar injection pressure at 6.5-8.5 bar IMEP




Figure 15 Effect of Injector Fouling on HC Emissions for Ethanol at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)




Figure 16 Effect of Injector Fouling on Particle Size Distribution in Number (a and b) and Mass (c and d) in a GDI Engine Fuelled with Ethanol at 150 bar Injection Pressure (engine speed=1500 rpm, $\lambda=1$)

488	DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS	
489	AECC	Association for Emissions Control by Catalyst
490	AFR	Air-Fuel Ratio
491	AWM	Advantage West Midlands
492	bTDC	Before Top Dead Centre
493	DC	Direct Current
494	DI	Direct Injection
495	DPFs	Diesel Particulate Filters
496	EPSRC	Engineering and Physical Sciences and Research Council
497	ETH	Ethanol
498	GDI	Gasoline Direct Injection
499	GPFs	Gasoline Particulate Filters
500	HC	Hydrocarbon
501	IMEP	Indicated Mean Effective Pressure
502	MBT/KLSA	Maximum Brake Torque/ Knock-Limited Spark Advance
503	MON	Motor Octane Number
504	PID	Proportional Integral Differential
505	PM	Particle Mass
506	PN	Particulate Number
507	rpm	Revolutions per Minute
508	RON	Research Octane Number
509	SMPS	Scanning Mobility Particle Sizer
510	TDC	Top Dead Center
511	TWCs	Three-Way Catalysts
512	ULG	Gasoline

513 REFERENCES

- 514 [1] Zhang ZH, Balasubramanian R. Influence of butanol addition to diesel–biodiesel blend on engine
515 performance and particulate emissions of a stationary diesel engine. *Applied Energy*. 2014;119:530-6.
- 516 [2] Takada Y, Miyazaki T, Iida N. Study on local air pollution caused by NOx from diesel freight
517 vehicle. *SAE Technical Paper 2002-01-065*, 2002.
- 518 [3] Moghbelli H, Ganapavarapu K, Langari R, Ehsani M. A Comparative Review of Fuel Cell Vehicles
519 (FCVs) and Hybrid Electric Vehicles (HEVs) Part I: Performance and Parameter Characteristics,
520 Emissions, Well-to-Wheels Efficiency and Fuel Economy, Alternative Fuels, Hybridization of FCV,
521 and Batteries for Hybrid Vehicles. *SAE Technical Paper 2003-01-2298*, 2003.
- 522 [4] Mathis U, Mohr M, Forss AM. Comprehensive particle characterization of modern gasoline and
523 diesel passenger cars at low ambient temperatures. *Atmos Environ*. 2005;39:107-17.
- 524 [5] ACSS. Particulate Emissions from Petrol-Engined Light-Duty Vehicles taken from the European
525 Fleet. *Presented at the Cambridge Particle Meeting*. 2013.
- 526 [6] EPA US. Integrated science assessment for particulate matter (final report). US Environmental
527 Protection Agency, Washinton, DC, EPA/600/R-08/139F. 2009.
- 528 [7] Parkin C. Update on the UN-ECE particle measurement programme. *UK Department for Transport*,
529 2008.
- 530 [8] Andersson J, Collier A, Garrett M, Wedekind B. Particle and Sulphur Species as Key Issues in
531 Gasoline Direct Injection Exhaust. *Nippon Kikai Gakkai*, 1999.
- 532 [9] Price P, Stone R, OudeNijeweme D, Chen X. Cold Start Particulate Emissions from a Second
533 Generation DI Gasoline Engine. *SAE Technical Paper 2007-01-1931*; 2007.
- 534 [10] Aikawa K, Sakurai T, Jetter JJ. Development of a Predictive Model for Gasoline Vehicle
535 Particulate Matter Emissions. *SAE Int J Fuels Lubr*. 2010;3:610-22.
- 536 [11] Chen L, Stone R, Richardson D. A study of mixture preparation and PM emissions using a direct
537 injection engine fuelled with stoichiometric gasoline/ethanol blends. *Fuel*. 2012;96:120-30.
- 538 [12] Di Iorio S, Lazzaro M, Sementa P, Vaglieco BM, Catapano F. Particle Size Distributions from a
539 DI High Performance SI Engine Fuelled with Gasoline-Ethanol Blended Fuels. *SAE Technical Paper*
540 *2011-24-0211* ; 2011.
- 541 [13] Liang B, Ge Y, Tan J. Comparison of PM emissions from a gasoline direct injected (GDI) vehicle
542 and a port fuel injected (PFI) vehicle measured by electrical low pressure impactor (ELPI) with two
543 fuels: Gasoline and M15 methanol gasoline. *Journal of Aerosol Science*. 2013;57:22-31.
- 544 [14] Leach F. The Effect of Fuel Volatility and Aromatic Content on Particulate Emissions. *Presented*
545 *at the Cambridge Particle Meeting*. 2012.
- 546 [15] Armas O, García-Contreras R, Ramos Á. Impact of alternative fuels on performance and pollutant
547 emissions of a light duty engine tested under the new European driving cycle. *Applied Energy*.
548 2013;107:183-90.
- 549 [16] Labecki L, Cairns A, Xia J, Megaritis A, Zhao H, Ganippa LC. Combustion and emission of
550 rapeseed oil blends in diesel engine. *Applied Energy*. 2012;95:139-46.

551 [17] Khalek IA, Bougher T, Jetter JJ. Particle Emissions from a 2009 Gasoline Direct Injection Engine
552 Using Different Commercially Available Fuels. *SAE Int J Fuels Lubr.* 2010;3:623-37.

553 [18] Xu F. Experimental research on particulate matter emissions from gasoline direct injection
554 engines. PhD thesis, *University of Oxford*. 2012.

555 [19] Leach F, Stone R, Richardson D. The Influence of Fuel Properties on Particulate Number
556 Emissions from a Direct Injection Spark Ignition Engine. *SAE Technical Paper 2013-01-1558*; 2013.

557 [20] Daniel R, Tian G, Xu H, Wyszynski ML, Wu X, Huang Z. Effect of spark timing and load on a
558 DISI engine fuelled with 2,5-dimethylfuran. *Fuel*. 2011;90:449-58.

559 [21] Catapano F, Di Iorio S, Lazzaro M, Sementa P, Vaglieco BM. Characterization of Ethanol Blends
560 Combustion Processes and Soot Formation in a GDI Optical Engine. *SAE Technical Paper 2013-01-
561 1316*; 2013.

562 [22] Fatouraie M, Wooldridge M, Wooldridge S. In-Cylinder Particulate Matter and Spray Imaging of
563 Ethanol/Gasoline Blends in a Direct Injection Spark Ignition Engine. *SAE Int J Fuels Lubr.* 2013;6:1-
564 10.

565 [23] Zhang S, McMahon W, Toutoundjian H, Cruz M, Frodin B. Particulate Mass and Number
566 Emissions from Light-duty Low Emission Gasoline Vehicles. *SAE Technical Paper 2010-01-0795*;
567 2010.

568 [24] Storey JME, Barone TL, Thomas JF, Huff SP. Exhaust Particle Characterization for Lean and
569 Stoichiometric DI Vehicles Operating on Ethanol-Gasoline Blends. *SAE Technical Paper 2012-01-
570 0437*; 2012.

571 [25] Storey JM, Barone T, Norman K, Lewis S. Ethanol Blend Effects On Direct Injection Spark-
572 Ignition Gasoline Vehicle Particulate Matter Emissions. *SAE Int J Fuels Lubr.* 2010;3:650-9.

573 [26] Costagliola MA, De Simio L, Iannaccone S, Prati MV. Combustion efficiency and engine out
574 emissions of a S.I. engine fueled with alcohol/gasoline blends. *Applied Energy*. 2013;111:1162-71.

575 [27] He X, Ireland JC, Zigler BT, Ratcliff MA, Knoll KE, Alleman TL, et al. The Impacts of Mid-level
576 Biofuel Content in Gasoline on SIDI Engine-out and Tailpipe Particulate Matter Emissions. *SAE
577 Technical Paper 2010-01-2125* ; 2010.

578 [28] Oh Y, Lee S, Kim D, Chon M, Park S. Experimental and numerical study on spray characteristics
579 of multi-hole type GDI injectors. *ILASS Americas 2012 conference*; 2012.

580 [29] He X, Ratcliff MA, Zigler BT. Effects of Gasoline Direct Injection Engine Operating Parameters
581 on Particle Number Emissions. *Energy and Fuels*. 2012;26:2014-27.

582 [30] Matousek T, Dageforde H, Bertsch M. Influence of injection pressures up to 300 bar on particle
583 emissions in a GDI engine. *17th ETH Conference on Combustion Generated Nanoparticles*; 2013.

584 [31] Aradi AA, Hotchkiss A, Imoehl B, Sayar H, Avery NL. The Effect of Fuel Composition, Engine
585 Operating Parameters and Additives on Injector Deposits in a High-Pressure Direct injection Gasoline
586 (DIG) Research Engine. *SAE Technical Paper 1999-01-3690*; 1999.

587 [32] Zhao F, Lai MC, Harrington DL. Automotive spark-ignited direct-injection gasoline engines.
588 *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*. 1999;25:437-562.

- 589 [33] Arters DC, Macduff MJ. The Effect on Vehicle Performance of Injector Deposits in a Direct
590 Injection Gasoline Engine. *SAE Technical Paper 2000-01-2021*; 2000.
- 591 [34] Aradi AA, Colucci WJ, Scull HM, Openshaw MJ. A Study of Fuel Additives for Direct Injection
592 Gasoline (DIG) Injector Deposit Control. *SAE Technical Paper 2000-01-2020*; 2000.
- 593 [35] Jackson NS, Stokes J, Whitaker PA. A gasoline direct injection (GDI) powered vehicle concept
594 with 3 litre/ 100 km fuel economy and EC stage 4 emission capability. *Proceedings of the EAEC 6th*
595 *European Congress*1997.
- 596 [36] Bardasz EA, Arters DC, Schiferl EA, Righi DW. A Comparison of Gasoline Direct Injection and
597 Port Fuel Injection Vehicles: Part II - Lubricant Oil Performance and Engine Wear. *SAE Technical*
598 *Paper 1999-01-1499*; 1999.
- 599 [37] Aradi AA, Evans J, Miller K, Hotchkiss A. Direct Injection Gasoline (DIG) Injector Deposit
600 Control with Additives. *SAE Technical Paper 2003-01-2024*; 2003.
- 601 [38] Joedicke A, Krueger-Venus J, Bohr P, Cracknell R, Doyle D. Understanding the Effect of DISI
602 Injector Deposits on Vehicle Performance. *SAE Technical Paper 2012-01-0391*; 2012.
- 603 [39] Sandquist H, Denbratt I, Owrang F, Olsson J. Influence of Fuel Parameters on Deposit Formation
604 and Emissions in a Direct Injection Stratified Charge SI Engine. *SAE Technical Paper 2001-01-2028*;
605 2001.
- 606 [40] Berndorfer A, Breuer S, Piock W, Bacho PV. Diffusion Combustion Phenomena in GDi Engines
607 caused by Injection Process. *SAE Technical Paper 2013-01-0261*; 2013.
- 608 [41] Kittelson DB. Engines and nanoparticles: A review. *Journal of Aerosol Science*. 1998;29:575-88.