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Laser-induced fluorescence (LIF) has proven a reliable technique for nitric oxide (NO) diagnostics in practical combustion systems. However, a wide variety of different excitation and detection strategies are proposed in the literature without giving clear guidelines of which strategies to use for a particular diagnostic situation. We give a brief review of the high-pressure NO LIF diagnostics literature and compare strategies for exciting selected transitions in the $A-X\,0,0$, $0,1$, and $0,2$ bands using a different detection bandpass. The strategies are compared in terms of NO LIF signal strength, attenuation of laser and signal light in the hot combustion gases, signal selectivity against LIF interference from $O_2$ and $CO_2$, and temperature and pressure sensitivity of the LIF signal. The discussion is based on spectroscopic measurements in laminar premixed methane–air flames at pressures between 1 and 60 bars and on NO and $O_2$ LIF spectral simulations. © 2003 Optical Society of America

1. Introduction

Laser-induced fluorescence (LIF) is an important tool\textsuperscript{1–3} to help understand nitric oxide (NO) formation in both practical combustion systems and laboratory flames. Investigations aim to develop engineering solutions to minimize NO effluent, as well as to develop and validate chemical kinetic models of NO formation and destruction. The high operating pressure of practical combustors [internal combustion (IC) engines, gas turbines] requires strategies for quantitative NO LIF measurements at pressures exceeding 50 bar.

Different approaches for NO excitation have been previously suggested, including NO excitation in the $D-X(0, 1)$ band and in several $A-X$ vibrational bands, without, however, giving clear guidelines as to the transitions favorable in a given diagnostic situation.

This paper is the third in a series of papers where we compare excitation strategies in the $A-X$ band to evaluate strategies for LIF at elevated pressures. In the previous papers we investigated different excitation strategies within single vibrational levels [NO $A-X(0, 0)$\textsuperscript{4} and $A-X(0, 1)$\textsuperscript{5}] and provided recommendations for specific NO excitation features within these bands. In earlier papers we focused on $A-X(0, 2)$ excitation.\textsuperscript{6,7} Our aim in this paper is to compare the best strategies found in the previous papers to provide guidelines for the optimum excitation and detection strategies for NO LIF in specific combustion situations and pressures. The comparison takes into account the influences of signal strength, laser and signal transmission, signal interference, and pressure and temperature dependence. The discussion is based on spectrally resolved NO LIF measurements in premixed methane–air flames at 1–60 bar and on NO and $O_2$ LIF spectral simulations.

2. Background

A. Interpretation and Quantification of NO Laser-Induced Fluorescence Signals

The conversion of measured NO LIF intensities to relative NO concentrations requires correction for the influence of temperature, pressure, and the concentrations of all other species, as well as the knowledge of the influence of these factors on the NO spectrosc-
copy. We refer to such corrected LIF intensities as semiquantitative NO concentrations. Furthermore, calibration of the corrected LIF intensities to absolute number densities or mole fractions is required for quantitative NO concentration measurements, accounting for the influence of collection optics, detector quantum efficiency, and laser energy density.

The main temperature influence of the NO LIF signal strength arises from the ground-state population of the laser-coupled levels. Furthermore, temperature, pressure, and gas phase composition affect the frequency and cross section of collisions that a NO molecule encounters. This influences both the excitation efficiency by altering the shape of the absorption spectra and the fluorescence quantum yield. Collisional (pressure) broadening and line shifting have been measured for the NO A–X band for collisions with the main combustion species. Variations in pressure, temperature, and (less importantly) gas phase composition influence the spectral overlap of the laser line profile with the NO absorption features. As a result, excitation efficiency and therefore the LIF signal decrease with increasing pressure. Collisional fluorescence quenching of the NO A state has been investigated in detail, and models have been established and validated to describe the effects of temperature and colliding species on quenching cross sections. The quenching rate scales directly with pressure. Because quenching is the dominant depopulation path of the NO A state, the fluorescence quantum yield and therefore the LIF signal decrease strongly with increasing pressure and further vary with temperature and gas composition.

Pressure can be measured accurately in most situations and with high temporal resolution by use of piezoelectric sensors, and the correction of the LIF signals for pressure is therefore quite feasible. The measurement of temperature, on the other hand, requires a large experimental effort, and it is usually not feasible to obtain temperature information simultaneously for NO LIF data in practical, often turbulent, applications. Modeled temperatures can be used to correct NO LIF intensities; however, the accuracy is severely limited in unsteady flames. Thus quantitative NO concentration measurements without the exact knowledge of local temperature often require the choice of a transition that minimizes the total temperature sensitivity of the LIF signal. This does not necessarily mean that one has to choose a level with a population with minimum temperature sensitivity. In some cases a systematic variation of the ground-state population with temperature might be desired to compensate for other temperature-dependent effects.

Even less available than temperature is the concentration of colliding species. Although chemical simulations are feasible in laminar flames and multispecies Raman measurements can provide the required information for point or line measurements, NO LIF imaging in turbulent combustion situations normally cannot be corrected for composition fluctuations. The introduced error, however, is relatively small for premixed combustion because NO is present only in the post-flame-front gases where the majority species concentrations are known relatively precisely.

B. Motivation for Different A–X Excitation Strategies: Transmission Properties

Excitation within the A–X(0, 0) band is the established standard technique for LIF diagnostics of NO (see Subsection 2.D). However, the relatively short laser wavelengths involved (around 225 nm) are strongly absorbed in high-temperature, high-pressure combustion environments. Recently it was recognized that the main absorbing species are hot CO2 and H2O present in the combustion gases. UV light at short wavelengths (<250 nm) is strongly absorbed by these species, and absorption cross sections increase with temperature and decrease with wavelength. The effect increases with pressure because of the increasing number density of absorbers, leading to strong attenuation of both laser and signal light even in small-flame geometries.

These observations made clear that excitation at longer wavelengths is desirable. They motivated a comparison of the conventional A–X(0, 0) excitation with strategies exciting transitions within the A–X0, 1) (around 236 nm) and the A–X0, 2) (around 247 nm) bands. Because excitation within the (0, 0), (0, 1), and (0, 2) all populate the same excited vibrational level (v’ = 0), quenching and excited-state energy-transfer processes and therefore signal interpretation are similar for these approaches. However, a careful consideration of signal interference and temperature dependence is necessary to assess the feasibility of these different approaches.

C. Signal Strength and Signal Interference

LIF measurements of NO are faced with difficulties in selectivity. This is true especially in high-pressure combustion environments, where laser-induced emission not only from NO but also from other species present in the flame becomes important if not dominant. Use of an appropriate excitation wavelength and detection bandpass is crucial to maximize signal strength and minimize potential interference. This has been discussed in detail in our previous studies for selection of excitation wavelength in each individual vibrational band. In this paper we compare the differences for exciting using the three vibrational bands. There are three primary sources of signal interference, and their influence depends on the specific combustion situation.

• O2 LIF interference. Hot O2 is the main contributor to LIF interference in lean and nonpremixed flames. The B3Σ−–X3Σ+ Schumann–Runge bands of O2 overlap with the A 2Σ++–X 1Π NO gamma bands over a wide range of excitation wavelengths resulting in overlapping absorption features and fluorescence signals. Because the fluorescence lifetime of the relevant excited states of O2 is limited by predis-
sociation, the pressure influence on line broadening and fluorescence quantum yield is much smaller than for NO. This leads to an increase of the relative contribution of O$_2$ LIF background with increasing pressure. To avoid this interference problem with broadband LIF detection, a careful choice of excitation transition is necessary. Furthermore, different strategies have been suggested to correct for the remaining interference. For example, DiRosa et al. suggested broadband detection (200–290 nm) with subsequent subtraction of the O$_2$ LIF contribution measured simultaneously in another detection band (310–400 nm). However, this approach has not yet been used for measurements in practical systems, mainly because the measurement of O$_2$ LIF without additional interference is not an easy task.

- CO$_2$ broadband LIF emission. The contribution of CO$_2$ LIF was recently identified in lean, stoichiometric, and rich high-pressure methane–air and methane–oxygen–argon flames. This signal consists of a broad (200–450 nm) continuum with a faint superimposed band structure, and its fluorescence yield is constant for pressures up to at least 40 bar. Like with O$_2$, the relative influence of the CO$_2$ LIF increases with pressure as the NO fluorescence yield is proportional to 1/p. Although the signal is comparatively weak, it can become an important contribution to the overall signal when detection over wide spectral ranges is used.

- Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) LIF interference in rich flames. In rich and nonpremixed flames additional broadband fluorescence interference has been observed that is usually attributed to PAHs and partially burned hydrocarbons (aldehydes, ketones). In sooting flames at high laser energies, interference by LIF of laser-generated C$_2$ has also been reported. Laser-induced incandescence is observed in sooting flames, however at considerably longer wavelengths (>350 nm) than normally used for NO detection (<300 nm). The research reported here concentrates on premixed flames with the equivalence ratio $\phi < 1.2$ where the PAH interference is relatively minor. Research on CO$_2$ LIF shows the onset of strong PAH interference near $\phi = 1.6$.

An appropriate choice of the NO LIF signal detection wavelength is most important for the discrimination against interfering signals. With A–X(0, 0) excitation, detection is possible only at longer wavelengths (red shifted) relative to the excitation wavelengths. Excitation within the A–X(0, 1) and (0, 2) bands offers the possibility for blue-shifted detection, leading to more effective suppression of CO$_2$ and PAH LIF signals that occur almost exclusively red shifted relative to the excitation wavelength.

D. Literature Review

A large number of NO LIF measurements have been performed in high-pressure flames with both D–X and A–X strategies. In this subsection we give a brief review of that research. We focus on elevated pressure combustion, but some atmospheric-pressure studies are also cited where appropriate.

1. D–X(0, 1) Excitation

The NO D–X(0, 1) system at 192–195 nm can be probed with 193-nm radiation from an ArF excimer laser. Andersen et al. applied this approach for qualitative NO LIF imaging in a spark-ignition gasoline engine fueled with isoctane. Arnold et al. carried out measurements in a direct-injected (DI) Diesel engine fueled with n-heptane. Ter Meulen and co-workers showed NO imaging in a prechamber-injected Diesel engine fueled with n-heptane and Diesel fuel. They subsequently performed measurements in a DI Diesel engine with maximum pressures of 75 bar. Tanaka et al. performed measurements in a spark-ignition engine. In most of the research, the ArF excimer laser was tuned to the D–X(0, 1) $R_1(26.5) + Q_1(32.5)$ transition at 193.38 nm with subsequent detection of D–X(0, 3) emission around 208 nm. This transition was shown earlier to minimize O$_2$ LIF interference.

The major drawback of the D–X excitation approach is the severe attenuation of the short-wavelength laser beam and signal light in the high-pressure combustion atmosphere, leading to complete signal loss over portions of the engine cycle and disabling the quantitative interpretation of the signal. Andersen et al. reported complete laser absorption in the cylinder after ignition to crank angles as late as 150 deg after top dead center, when pressure has dropped from the maximum of 30 bar to below approximately 5 bar. Stoffels et al. observed transmissions of $0–1.2\%$ through the 82-mm-diameter cylinder for all investigated crank angles between $20$ and $100$ deg relative to top dead center. Techniques that were developed to correct for the laser attenuation are based the questionable assumption that attenuation is caused by light scattering only.

Interpretation of the LIF signals is further complicated by the fact that little is known about quenching and electronic energy-transfer processes of the NO D state. Attempts for absolute interpretation must rely on unverified assumptions about the dependence of fluorescence quantum yield on pressure and temperature.

2. A–X(0, 0) Excitation

The largest number of NO LIF measurements that were performed in low-, atmospheric-, and high-pressure flames use A–X(0, 0) excitation at 224–227 nm. It is thus the standard technique for NO detection in flames, and it is the only technique sensitive to cold NO, e.g., in flow-field diagnostics. High-pressure applications include small-scale laboratory flames and gasoline and Diesel IC engines with different signal collection strategies varying from narrowband detection [3-nm bandpass detecting A–X(0, 1) emission] to broadband detection integrating over several vibrational bands [for example, Dec and Canaan: A–X(0, 1) to (0, 4)].
Alatas et al.\textsuperscript{43} performed the first in-cylinder measurements with $A$–$X(0, 0)$ excitation to our knowledge. They showed qualitative NO LIF images in a direct-injection Diesel engine. Unfortunately they did not give any details about the excitation and detection wavelengths used, which makes it hard to judge the level of selectivity they reached.

Bräumer et al. used the $R_1 + Q_{21}(21.5)$ transition at 225.25 nm for quantitative in-cylinder NO number density measurements in a spark-ignition engine fueled with propane.\textsuperscript{44} The transition was chosen on the basis of the available laser source: The 248-nm output of a tunable narrowband KrF excimer laser was shifted to its first anti-Stokes wavelength at 226 nm in a 10-bar hydrogen cell\textsuperscript{45}; this approach yielded sufficient laser energy (several millijoules) for imaging measurements.

Dec and Canaan\textsuperscript{42} performed imaging measurements in a DI Diesel engine fueled with low-sooting Diesel fuel. They used average LIF intensity images to derive semiquantitative in-cylinder NO concentrations throughout the combustion cycle with pressures up to 65 bar. A frequency-doubled optical parametric oscillator system was used to excite the $P_1(23.5), Q_1 + P_{21}(14.5), Q_2 + R_{12}(20.5)$ feature at 226.03 nm. This transition was proposed by Battles and Hanson,\textsuperscript{46} based on detailed spectroscopic investigations and studied in flames up to 10 bar by DiRosa et al.\textsuperscript{24} Van den Boom et al. used the same transition in a DI Diesel engine fueled with commercial Diesel.\textsuperscript{47} Nakagawa et al. used 226.29-nm excitation in Diesel spray flames in a modified single-cylinder engine.\textsuperscript{48}

A large number of NO measurements were presented in high-pressure laboratory burners. Laurer and co-workers studied NO formation in premixed, partially premixed, and nonpremixed flames. They showed quantitative NO point measurements in ethane–air flames up to 15 bar,\textsuperscript{49–52} ethylene–air flames up to 12 bar,\textsuperscript{53} methane–air flames up to 15 bar,\textsuperscript{41} heptane spray flames at 2–5 bar,\textsuperscript{54–56} and CO/H$_2$/CH$_4$–air flames at 1–12 bar.\textsuperscript{57} For most of the measurements, they tuned their frequency-doubled dye laser system to the $Q_1(26.5)$ transition at 225.58 nm. This transition was chosen to minimize temperature dependence of the ground-state population. Spectroscopic measurements in the 1–15-bar range were carried out to investigate O$_2$ LIF interference,\textsuperscript{58,59} and the influence of pressure on calibration was investigated.\textsuperscript{60} Narrowband monochromator detection (<5-nm bandpass) was used in most of the research for effective interference suppression; however, significant interference was observed with broadband imaging detection in the 4-bar spray flame.\textsuperscript{55,61}

In previous research, we investigated different transitions within the $A$–$X(0, 0)$ band in detail in premixed flat CH$_4$–air flames up to 60 bar and discussed their applicability for high-pressure combustion situations.\textsuperscript{4} It was shown that the transition originally proposed by DiRosa et al.\textsuperscript{24} is clearly superior to other approaches in terms of both signal strength and suppression of O$_2$ LIF interference. This transition was used for quantitative temperature and NO concentration imaging in high-pressure flames.\textsuperscript{22,62} Temperature measurements with NO LIF were also performed by Vyrodov et al. in rich premixed methane–air flames up to 30 bar.\textsuperscript{63}

Several authors reported strong attenuation of the 226-nm laser beam in engines, making in-cylinder measurements impossible at crank angles around top dead center.\textsuperscript{43,47} In earlier measurements, we reported laser and signal absorption of nearly 45\% at 60 bar despite the small size (8-mm diameter) of our laboratory flame.\textsuperscript{22} Thus absorption is of big concern with $A$–$X(0, 0)$ excitation and motivates the investigation of excitation in longer-wavelength vibrational bands.

3. $A$–$X(0, 1)$ Excitation

Application of NO $A$–$X(0, 1)$ excitation in the 233–237-nm wavelength range is promising because it reduces laser beam attenuation [which is a problem with $D$–$X$ and $A$–$X(0, 0)$ excitation] while still providing strong signals [which is a problem with $A$–$X(0, 2)$ excitation]. Furthermore, optical parametric oscillator systems provide high laser-pulse energies throughout the UV (up to 30 mJ) that is needed for imaging measurements.

To our knowledge, the first application of NO $A$–$X(0, 1)$ LIF in high-pressure combustion was performed by Jamette et al. in a DI spark-ignition gasoline engine.\textsuperscript{64} These authors chose the $R_1 + Q_{21}(22.5), Q_1 + P_{21}(8.5), Q_2 + R_{12}(17.5)$ feature at 236.22 nm based on simulations of LIF excitation spectra of NO and O$_2$ to maximize the NO/O$_2$ LIF ratio. However, no experimental spectroscopic data were available to support this choice. Signals were detected within the $A$–$X(0, 2)$ band.

We performed detailed investigations of three different $A$–$X(0, 1)$ excitation schemes in premixed flat methane–air flames up to 60 bar.\textsuperscript{5,55,66} Although the scheme used by Jamette et al. showed best performance in terms of signal strength, reduced O$_2$ LIF interference in lean flames was found with $P_1(25.5), R_1 + Q_{21}(11.5), Q_1 + P_{21}(17.5)$ excitation at 235.87 nm.

4. $A$–$X(0, 2)$ Excitation

$A$–$X(0, 2)$ excitation at 244–247 nm is popular because of the availability of strong KrF excimer lasers providing appropriate wavelengths to excite the O$_{12}$ bandhead at 247.94 nm. This approach was first proposed by Schulz et al.\textsuperscript{67} to avoid the strong laser and signal attenuation observed with $D$–$X(0, 1)$ or $A$–$X(0, 0)$ excitation. They performed detailed spectroscopic investigations in premixed flat methane–air flames up to 40 bar to assess interference from O$_2$ LIF and found that the NO $A$–$X(0, 2)$ O$_{12}$ bandhead coincides with a local minimum in the O$_2$ $B$–$X$ band. In addition, (0, 2) excitation offers the possibility of blue-shifted detection of the (0, 0) and (0, 1) emission, providing an important advantage by eliminating the detection of CO$_2$ and PAH LIF.\textsuperscript{69} This scheme was also investigated in sooting high-pressure ethylene–
air flames where strong PAH fluorescence is observed red shifted to the excitation wavelength but the blue-shifted NO detection minimizes this interference. The signal from the $A-X(0, 0)$ band can potentially be attenuated by fluorescence trapping if the signal travels through areas with high NO concentrations over long path lengths. However, even in engine experiments it was shown that this effect is negligible (<5%) compared with light attenuation by hot combustion products ($CO_2$). Simultaneous Rayleigh temperature measurements were performed and used to quantify the NO LIF images. Quantitative imaging measurements were also performed in spark-ignition engines fueled with isooctane running under premixed and nonpremixed (DI) conditions and in DI Diesel engines fueled with commercial Diesel fuel. Schulz and co-workers applied this scheme for quantitative NO concentration imaging in a spark-ignition engine fueled with propane. Simultaneous Rayleigh temperature measurements were performed and used to quantify the NO LIF images. Quantitative one-dimensional measurements were also performed in spark-ignition engines fueled with isooctane running under premixed and nonpremixed (DI) conditions and in DI Diesel engines fueled with commercial Diesel fuel.

The $A-X(0, 2)$ approach was proposed independently by Andresen and co-workers. They performed spectroscopic investigations on NO LIF with $A-X(0, 2)$ excitation in an atmospheric-pressure flame, measured transmission properties in a spark-ignition engine fueled with isooctane, and showed qualitative NO LIF distributions in that engine. Quantitative one-dimensional measurements were also performed in spark-ignition engines fueled with isooctane and regular gasoline. The spectrograph detection used in these measurements enabled the assessment of Raman and LIF interferences as well as investigation of fluorescence trapping. Qualitative in-cylinder measurements with $A-X(0, 2)$ bandhead excitation have been performed by Akihama et al. in a port-fuel-injected spark-ignition engine fueled with isooctane at pressures up to 15 bar.

3. Experiment

A. High-Pressure Burner

The experimental setup is identical to the ones previously used. LaminaR, premixed methane–air flat flames at pressures from 1 to 60 bar were stabilized on a porous, sintered stainless-steel plate of 8 mm in diameter; this burner was mounted in a stainless-steel housing with an inner diameter of 60 mm with a pressure stabilization of ±0.1 bar. Investigations were performed for fuel/air equivalence ratios of $\phi = 0.83, 0.93, 1.03, $ and 1.13. All measurements were carried out with 300-parts per million (ppm) NO seeded to the feedstock gases to mimic enginelike conditions. Optical access to the flame was possible through four quartz windows (Fig. 1). A Nd:YAG-pumped (Quanta Ray GCR250) frequency-doubled (Ba-barium borate) dye laser (LAS, LDL205) produced laser light [approximately 1-mJ, 0.4-cm$^{-1}$ full width at half-maximum (FWHM)] at 224–227 nm for NO $A-X(0, 0)$ excitation (Coumarin 120 dye), 233–238 nm for $A-X(0, 1)$ excitation (Coumarin 102 dye), and 245–248 nm for $A-X(0, 2)$ excitation (Coumarin 307 dye). The laser beam was aligned parallel to the burner surface and passed through the center of the flame 2 mm above the burner matrix. The beam was focused with lenses into the flame. The pulse energy was measured with a photodiode (LaVision). Fluorescence signals were collected at right angles to the laser beam and line imaged with a $f = 105$ mm, $f$-number = 4.5 achromatic UV lens (Nikon) onto the horizontal entrance slit of a 250-mm imaging spectrometer (Chromex 250IS) equipped with a 600-grooves/mm grating. The dispersed fluorescence signals were detected with an intensified CCD camera (LaVision FlameStar III). Each laser pulse yielded a complete fluorescence spectrum maintaining one-dimensional spatial resolution along the laser light path. In these images the central area of the flame where temperature and concentrations are homogeneous was then chosen and integrated over the spatial axis, yielding a fluorescence spectrum.

The laser was tuned to record excitation spectra in a ±0.0125-nm range around specific NO transitions within the $A-X$ bands. The transitions investigated in each band are summarized in Table 1. Their choice is based on previous results and simulation calculations as described in Refs. 4 and 5. The signal was averaged over 20–50 laser pulses for each excitation wavelength and stored for further evaluation before the laser was scanned to the next wavelength. The applied laser fluences ($<35$ MW/cm$^2$) are in the range of linear LIF laser excitation for pressures above 5 bar. This corresponds to the relevant pressure range for comparison of NO LIF with interference signals (interference signal strengths were below the detection limit for $p < 5$ bar throughout the complete set of measurements). The spectra were therefore linearly corrected for variations in laser-pulse energy.
In addition, we investigated information about the contribution of broadband signals. The spectroscopic data of the transitions used in the NO A-X bands are shown in Table 1. The intensities of simulated NO and O₂ LIF emission spectra, experimental CO₂ LIF emission spectra, and a Rayleigh signal were simultaneously fitted to the experimental data. The O₂ LIF emission spectra are complex because of overlapping absorption lines leading to simultaneous excitation into multiple vibrational states. Furthermore, vibrational energy transfer in the upper electronic (B) state was evident from the O₂ LIF emission structure. Therefore emission signals from multiple upper vibrational O₂ B states were fitted independently.

We reevaluated the A--X(0, 0) and (0, 1) data from our previous studies using this more sophisticated fitting technique and incorporating new data on CO₂ fluorescence. Compared with the previous approach (based on Gaussian fits only), the new technique (based on simulated spectra) allows larger spectral regions to be fit and therefore yields information about the contribution of broadband signals. In addition, we investigated A--X(0, 2) O₁₂ bandhead excitation at 247.94 nm. The overall fit reproduces the experimental data well. Figure 2 shows emission spectra and fitting results for the excitation strategies compared in this paper for lean 60-bar flames.

C. Quantification of NO Laser-Induced Fluorescence Signals

Despite constant NO seeding (300 ppm in the fresh gases), the actual NO concentrations decrease in rich gases because of NO reburn chemistry. More precisely, the NO concentration in the flame equals the natural NO concentration (without NO seeding) plus the NO seeding concentration multiplied by an equivalence-ratio-dependent reburn factor. Furthermore, the NO LIF signal yield depends on temperature, pressure, and the equivalence ratio. Thus the ratio of the NO LIF signal to the background signal is biased for different flame conditions. To enable an accurate comparison for different flames (pressure, equivalence ratio), the following quantification procedure is applied to calculate LIF signal intensities for a constant NO concentration of 300 ppm in all flames.

The NO LIF signal strength measured in the φ = 0.93 flames is quantified by the temperature and concentration data of our previous research. Reburn is known to be minimal for these slightly lean conditions, and a 10% reburn of the seeded NO is assumed. From the derived NO concentration value at φ = 0.93, the expected LIF signal intensities of...
300-ppm NO are calculated for $\phi = 0.83, 0.93, 1.03,$ and 1.13. In these calculations, we consider the variation of the quenching rate using calculations of equilibrium exhaust gas compositions, and an invariant flame temperature is assumed for the investigated range of equivalence ratios. Temperature-dependent quenching cross sections are calculated on the basis of published data.\textsuperscript{16,18} The calculations are performed individually for each investigated pressure. We can therefore compare the $O_2$ and $CO_2$ background signal strengths with the LIF signal of 300-ppm NO for our flame conditions.

4. Comparison of $A$–$X$ Strategies

The choice of a NO LIF detection strategy is governed by the combined effects of NO spectroscopy (signal strength, signal interference, pressure and temperature dependence, saturation), experimental setup (availability of laser source, detection system), measurement conditions (fixed or varying pressure, scale), and aim of the measurement (qualitative or quantitative, imaging or point measurements). The optimization of all these factors does not lead to a single excitation and detection strategy, but instead provides guidelines for the careful choice needed for any given diagnostic situation. The following discussion focuses on high-pressure combustion, but the same trends are true for atmospheric- or low-pressure flames, or reactive or nonreactive flows.

We compare one excitation strategy within each of the $A$–$X(0, 0), (0, 1),$ and $(0, 2)$ bands that was shown previously to yield best performance in terms of signal strength and interference suppression.\textsuperscript{4–6} The particular transitions and their spectroscopic data are summarized in Table 1. For each excitation scheme, different detection strategies relevant for bandpass-filtered imaging in practical application are compared. With $(0, 0)$ excitation only red-shifted detection is possible, but for $(0, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ excitation we compare both red- and blue-shifted detection. In particular, we simulate 20-nm bandpass detection of two NO vibrational emission bands [except for blue-shifted detection after $(0, 1)$ excitation where only one band can be detected]. The details for these five strategies are given in Table 2.

Usually, bandpass detection of the LIF signal is performed, acquiring the emission of one or more vibrational emission bands. The signal strength can easily be increased by detection of multiple bands (usually at the cost of increased interference). In many high-pressure burner applications, on the other hand, point measurements with narrowband monochromator detection were performed (see sub section 2.D). This strategy yields better signal/interference ratios, however at the cost of signal strength. When complete emission spectra are recorded (e.g., by use of an imaging spectrograph like the one used in this study), the selectivity can be further enhanced by fitting the different contributions of interfering species to the spectra prior to evaluating the NO LIF intensity. A comparison of these strategies is not attempted in this paper. The number of parameters that allows the optimization in a given situation is too large for a discussion of useful typical cases. Our data set, however, allows to us evaluate either of these strategies.

A. Signal Strength in Nonabsorbing Environments

To maximize signal strength, a NO transition with a large ground-state population at flame temperatures and high oscillator strength should be chosen. At typical combustion temperatures of 1500–2500 K, the largest vibrational population is present in the $X$ $v^* = 0$ state. The $v^* = 1$ and $2$ states have respective energies of 1846 and 3724 cm$^{-1}$ above the ground state,\textsuperscript{83} corresponding to maximum populations at $\sim$2700 and $\sim$5400 K, respectively. The largest lower-state populations are therefore found in the $A$–$X(0, 0)$ band in most combustion applications. Slightly higher oscillator strengths of the $(0, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ bands [factor of 1.4 and 1.1 higher than the $(0, 0)$ strength, respectively] cannot compensate for the lower population. Because NO LIF involves excitation with narrow-bandwidth lasers, not only the vibrational strength but the strength of the particular rovibrational transition is relevant. Furthermore, absorption features consisting of multiple transitions (e.g., bandheads) can easily be found in the NO spectra and yield stronger signals than single transitions for pressures up to approximately 40 bar (before pressure broadening becomes dominant).

In high-pressure systems, where line broadening and shifting severely influence the excitation efficiency, an optimized strategy for NO LIF should involve excitation at a wavelength yielding maximum signal strength for each individual pressure. Be-

### Table 2. Results of the Analysis for the Different Excitation and Detection Strategies: Comparison of Signal Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO $A$–$X$ Band</th>
<th>Excitation</th>
<th>Detection</th>
<th>Excitation</th>
<th>Detection</th>
<th>Excitation</th>
<th>Detection</th>
<th>Excitation</th>
<th>Detection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(0, 0)$</td>
<td>$(0, 1)$</td>
<td>$(0, 0)$</td>
<td>$(0, 1)$</td>
<td>$(0, 0)$</td>
<td>$(0, 2)$</td>
<td>$(0, 0)$</td>
<td>$(0, 2)$</td>
<td>$(0, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>$(0, 1) + (0, 2)$</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>$(0, 2) + (0, 3)$</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>$(0, 0) + (0, 1)$</td>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>$(0, 3) + (0, 4)$</td>
<td>Detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1$-bar excitation wavelength</td>
<td>235.870</td>
<td>235.870</td>
<td>247.941</td>
<td>247.941</td>
<td>255–275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental, $\phi = 0.83$</td>
<td>100 (100)</td>
<td>18 (17)</td>
<td>42 (39)</td>
<td>4.1 (3.4)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated, $T = 1900$ K</td>
<td>100 (100)</td>
<td>15 (14)</td>
<td>28 (26)</td>
<td>3.1 (3.1)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cause the pressure shift is in the range of 0.2 cm\(^{-1}\)/bar,\(^{8–11}\) this means that we tune the laser by several wave numbers in typical pressure ranges of 10–50 bar when exciting at the maximum of a single, isolated transition. In practical applications, however, pressure often varies rapidly (e.g., in IC engines). Here, a fixed excitation wavelength must be chosen. The resulting signal loss is most pronounced for pressures between 1 and 5 bar because of the simultaneous action of pressure broadening and shift. This effect can partly be reduced when broad, multiline absorption features are chosen.\(^4\) In this paper, we acquired all results shown with the laser tuned to the strong fluorescence light. The fluorescence light is visible in the figure for each individual pressure.

Figure 3 shows measured and simulated signal strengths for the different A–X strategies for excitation in a 10-bar flame, normalized to the signal strength of the (0, 0) approach. The results are summarized in Table 2 that also gives the data for 60-bar flames. The simulations have been performed for a typical flame temperature of 1900 K.\(^{22}\) The measurements in the different vibrational bands were carried out with different dye laser configurations over a period of several months. The comparison between these different schemes is therefore possible only within an estimated \(\pm 25\%\) accuracy. Within this range, the experimental and simulated signal strengths agree well. The vibrational band strengths, however, are well known. Therefore there is no reason to doubt the relative intensities predicted by the simulations. A–X(0, 0) strategies clearly show the strongest signals; A–X(0, 1) excitation yields signal intensities approximately an order of magnitude lower. Signal is decreased by another order of magnitude with A–X(0, 2) excitation. The difference between red- and blue-shifted detection reflects the different Franck–Condon factors.

Considering signal strength alone, (0, 0) excitation is clearly the strategy of choice. However, in the hot postflame combustion gas where absorption coefficients are strongly wavelength dependent, the other strategies should not be discarded simply on the basis of signal strength. This is discussed in Subsection 4.B. Furthermore, the high laser power of the tunable excimer laser usually used for (0, 2) excitation may partially compensate for the low signal strength for imaging measurements where the output of dye lasers limits the excitation energy for the laser sheet.

### B. Influence of Attenuation by Hot CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\)O

Hot combustion products such as CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\)O have long been ignored as potential absorbers in laser-based combustion diagnostics research. However, at wavelengths shorter than 250 nm for CO\(_2\) and shorter than 230 nm for H\(_2\)O, their influence becomes relevant at flame temperatures and increases toward shorter wavelengths.\(^{20,21}\) This causes attenuation of the laser as well as the fluorescence light. The transmission depends not only on the wavelength, but also on the path length and therefore on flame geometry and the experimental configuration. This produces nearly opposite effects: With (0, 0) excitation and red-shifted detection, strong laser attenuation with less signal attenuation occurs; with (0, 2) excitation and blue-shifted detection, laser attenuation is less but signal attenuation is stronger. For a quantitative comparison, laser and signal transmission are calculated for flame center positions in two typical high-pressure flame configurations: case 1, high-pressure burner, 40 bar, 1900 K, 8 mm in diameter (e.g., Ref. 22); case 2, DI Diesel engine, 50 bar, 2400 K, 80 mm in diameter, laser travels through cylinder window, detection is through piston window (e.g., Ref. 74).

The calculations are performed with the expressions given by Schulz et al.\(^{23}\) for \(\phi = 0.9\) equilibrium exhaust gas concentrations of CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\)O. The results are given in Table 3. The different influence on laser and signal wavelengths can clearly be followed. In case 1, the high-pressure flame, total transmission (laser and signal) varies between 75 and 92\% for the investigated strategies, and the difference between (0, 0) excitation/(0, 1), (0, 2) detection and (0, 2) excitation/(0, 0), (0, 1) detection is small (75 versus 82\% total transmission). In case 2 for the Diesel engine, absorption is much stronger because of the higher temperatures and longer paths involved. In this geometry with a long laser path and a short signal path (detection through piston window), (0, 0) excitation has a strong disadvantage. In this case there is a large difference when comparing (0, 0) excitation/(0, 1), (0, 2) detection and (0, 2) excitation/(0, 0), (0, 1) detection, the latter strategy yielding a total transmission of 26 times that of the former.

Table 3 also gives relative signal strengths, normalized to the signal strength of the (0, 0) strategy without absorption. These data are also shown in Fig. 4. In the high-pressure flame the strong difference in signal strength in nonabsorbing environments persists; however, in the Diesel engine the signal strengths are all within the same order of magnitude. Longer-wavelength excitation should be...
The advantage of long-wavelength excitation is most pronounced at high pressure (above approximately 40 bar) and long laser path lengths.

C. Signal Interference

High-pressure NO LIF suffers from two types of interference: (i) narrowband in excitation and emission (O₂ LIF) and (ii) broadband in excitation and emission (CO₂ and PAH LIF). Although the choice of the vibrational bands used for excitation affects the broadband interference problems, the choice of a particular rotational absorption feature within the vibrational band is largely responsible for the contribution of narrowband O₂ LIF interference. The choice of the detection bandpass is important for efficient suppression of both kinds of interference.

Figure 5 shows the contribution of interference to the LIF signal of 300-ppm NO for the different strategies for lean (φ = 0.83) and rich (φ = 1.13) flames with pressures between 1 and 60 bar; these results are also summarized in Table 4 for 10 and 60 bar. We quantified the LIF signal ratios O₂/NO and CO₂/NO as well as the LIF signal ratios of NO to the total emission (NO + O₂ + CO₂). This latter ratio is a measure for the spectral purity of the detected NO LIF signal. The interference strongly increases with pressure. NO emission gets weaker with increasing pressure because of pressure broadening leading to a decrease in excitation efficiency, whereas the effects of fluorescence quantum yield and NO number density cancel for constant mole fraction. O₂ and CO₂ emission increases linearly with pressure because of the increase in number density, whereas their fluorescence quantum yields stay approximately constant as is expected for excited electronic states with lifetimes limited by fast collision-independent processes (i.e., predissociation).

O₂ LIF is the main source of interference in lean flames. Note that all schemes were chosen to minimize O₂ absorption in the respective vibrational bands. Still, its LIF contribution can reach the same order of magnitude as the NO signal in the lean 60-bar flame investigated here. The relative O₂ LIF interference increases in the order of (0, 0), (0, 1), and (0, 2) excitation. With (0, 1) excitation there is essentially no difference between red- or blue-shifted detection; with (0, 2) excitation, blue-shifted detection suppresses the O₂ LIF signal by a factor of 2 in comparison with red-shifted detection.

CO₂ LIF is important in both lean and rich flames,
especially if a broad detection bandpass is used. Its relative contribution is strongly increasing in the order of (0, 0) and (0, 1) excitation and is the dominant source of interference with (0, 2) excitation because the NO LIF intensity shows a stronger decrease with increasing excitation wavelength than the CO\textsubscript{2} LIF intensity. CO\textsubscript{2} LIF is generally much stronger with red-shifted detection in comparison with blue-shifted detection.

The signal purity (NO/total emission) is the most relevant parameter for a practical imaging application because it is the direct measure of how much of the detected signal is due to NO. From Fig. 5 it can be seen that it decreases almost linearly with pressure for all investigated strategies. It is also generally lower in lean flames than in rich flames because of both higher O\textsubscript{2} and CO\textsubscript{2} interference. The (0, 0) excitation strategy is the best choice for highest signal purities; (0, 1) strategies with both red- and blue-shifted detection yield only slightly lower purities. With (0, 2) excitation, blue-shifted detection shows a much better performance than red-shifted detection; still, signal purity may become as low as 50% in the lean 60-bar flame.

The discussion so far was based on the results of the seeded laminar high-pressure burner (LIF signal of 300-ppm NO). In IC engines, NO concentrations may be much higher (>1000 ppm), whereas in unseeded high-pressure burners NO concentration is often much lower (<100 ppm). The importance of signal interference therefore strongly depends on the particular combustion situation.

Note that the measurements in modestly rich (ϕ < 1.2) premixed flames avoid the potential PAH interference present in rich or nonpremixed combustion environments. The quantitative assessment of PAH interference is beyond the scope of this paper.

D. Temperature and Pressure Dependence

Quantitative NO concentration measurements without the exact knowledge of local temperature require us to choose a transition that minimizes the temperature sensitivity. The main temperature influence of NO LIF signal strength (on a per molecule basis) arises from the ground-state population of the laser-coupled levels. Because line broadening and shifting is temperature dependent, the overlap of the spectral features with the spectral shape of the laser also shows temperature dependence. Temperature furthermore influences the fluorescence quantum yield by changing collisional frequencies and quenching cross sections. The combined temperature effects of ground-state population, spectral overlap,
and quantum yield were calculated for the different strategies in the 10-bar flame with a 0.4-cm\(^{-1}\) laser FWHM based on a nontransient three-level NO LIF model.\(^4\)

LIF signals are proportional to the local NO number density \(N_{\text{NO}}\) (in molecules per volume). In many combustion situations, not only the measurement of number density but the direct measurement of mole fractions \(x_{\text{NO}} = N_{\text{NO}}/N_{\text{total}}\) is of interest, where \(N_{\text{total}} = p/kT\) (ideal gas law). Thus

\[
I_{\text{LIF}} \sim N_{\text{NO}} = x_{\text{NO}} \times p/kT. \quad (1)
\]

When mole fractions are evaluated from LIF intensities, the overall temperature sensitivity is altered because of the additional \(1/T\) term. Typically this reduces the temperature sensitivity of hot transitions in the moderate temperature range and thus enables their use for quantitative measurements without temperature corrections.\(^4,73,75\)

Figure 6 shows and compares the temperature sensitivity of LIF intensities for both fixed NO number density and fixed mole fractions. The data are also given in Table 5. For number density measurements, the LIF signal yield is relatively independent of temperature for \(A-X(0,0)\) excitation strategies. Because of the large ground-state energies of \(A-X(0,1)\) and \(A-X(0,2)\) transitions, the maximum LIF signal is found at high temperatures of 2815 K for the \(A-X(0,1)\) strategy and 3770 K for the \(A-X(0,2)\) strategy, and signals are strongly decreasing toward lower temperatures. Correction for this temperature effect is necessary for interpretation of the LIF signal when NO number densities are measured.

When mole fractions are measured, temperature sensitivity is most pronounced for \((0,0)\) excitation, where the signal continually decreases above 1000 K. With \((0,1)\) and \((0,2)\) excitation, the least temperature sensitivity is found around 2055 and 2715 K, respectively. Mole fractions are therefore best derived from experiments with \((0,1)\) or \((0,2)\) excitation for minimum temperature sensitivity.

Table 5 also gives the magnitude of the LIF signal variation between 1700 and 2500 K. This corresponds to the systematic error that is induced in NO concentration measurements in this temperature interval typical for high-pressure combustion situations when no temperature information is available for correction of the LIF signals. For number density measurements, the \((0,0)\) approach yields the least temperature variation of \(\pm 7\%\) (relative to the average signal). For mole fraction measurements, the \((0,1)\) approach yields a temperature variation of only \(\pm 3\%\). If local temperature is not known, these strategies should be chosen to minimize systematic errors, depending on the choice of measured quantity.

The LIF signal depends on pressure through the change in excitation efficiency (line broadening and shifting) and fluorescence quantum yield (quenching).

---

### Table 5. Results of the Analysis for the Different Excitation and Detection Strategies: Simulated Temperature Dependence at 10 Bar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO A–X Band</th>
<th>(0, 0) Excitation</th>
<th>(0, 1) Excitation; either (0, 0) or (0, 2) Detection</th>
<th>(0, 2) Excitation; either (0, 0) or (0, 3) Detection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of maximum LIF signal, number density measurement</td>
<td>1645 K</td>
<td>2815 K</td>
<td>3770 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal variation between 1700 and 2500 K, number density measurement</td>
<td>± 6.8%</td>
<td>± 18%</td>
<td>± 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature of maximum LIF signal, mole fraction measurement</td>
<td>&lt;1000 K</td>
<td>2055 K</td>
<td>2715 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal variation between 1500 and 2500 K, mole fraction measurement</td>
<td>± 25%</td>
<td>± 3.1%</td>
<td>± 19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall effect leads to a strong nonlinear decrease in LIF signal with pressure. The simulated pressure dependence of the NO LIF signal for constant number density (corresponding to the signal strength on a per molecule base) is shown in the upper panel of Fig. 7 for the three excitation strategies. The LIF signal strength decreases by more than 2 orders of magnitude between 1 and 40 bar. In practice this decrease is partly compensated by the effect of an increasing number density with pressure, leading to strong LIF signals even at elevated pressures.

When LIF measurements are performed to quantify mole fractions, quenching (which is $-p$ and therefore decreases the fluorescence quantum yield $\sim 1/p$) cancels with the pressure dependence of the number density [which is $-p$, see Eq. (1)]. The variation of signal with pressure then depends only on the pressure-dependent spectral overlap between laser and absorption feature. The resulting simulated signal strengths are shown in the lower panel of Fig. 7. These data correspond to the pressure dependence of the overlap fraction, i.e., the absorption efficiency.

Because of the particular shape of the absorption feature and the density of transitions nearby, the pressure dependence varies slightly for the different excitation approaches. It is interesting to note that above approximately 50 bar, absorption efficiency does not change any more; instead, all rotational lines of the vibrational band are completely merged by pressure broadening. Because pressure is readily measured in most static and fluctuating combustion situations, we can relatively easily account for the pressure effects.

5. Conclusions

We compared five practical schemes for NO $A-X$ LIF, which involve exciting transitions in the $(0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, and $(0, 2)$ bands and the detection of red- and blue-shifted wavelengths relative to the excitation wavelength. No single best strategy can be suggested for all combustion situations. The choice is a trade-off between selectivity and signal intensity and the optical accessibility in terms of laser and signal absorption. The properties of the five strategies compared in this paper are summarized as follows:

- The $(0, 0)$ approach (excitation at 226.03 nm, only red-shifted detection is possible) clearly offers the best performance in terms of signal strength and selectivity. It is the strategy of choice for combustion diagnostics at all pressures as long as laser attenuation is acceptably low. It is therefore especially suitable for high-pressure combustion with small flame diameters. The temperature sensitivity allows measurement of NO number densities even without detailed knowledge of local temperatures. However, at high pressures and temperatures (>40 bar, >2200 K), especially in IC engines, laser attenuation may reach levels that make quantitative or even qualitative measurements impossible with the $(0, 0)$ excitation strategy. The red-shifted detection of potential PAH interference may further complicate this approach.

- The $(0, 1)$ approach (excitation at 235.87 nm) with red-shifted detection is attractive, although it has scarcely been applied. It offers relatively strong signals [approximately one third of the $(0, 0)$ approach] and at the same time reduces attenuation of both laser and signal light, especially if the experiment requires long signal paths. Signal purity is still good at intermediate NO concentrations (around 300 ppm). The temperature sensitivity allows measurement of NO mole fractions even without detailed knowledge of local temperatures. However, this red-shifted detection scheme may allow unwanted PAH interference.

- Blue-shifted detection after $(0, 1)$ excitation offers no particular advantage in signal strength, signal purity, or transmission properties. This might change in the presence of PAH.

- The $(0, 2)$ approach (excitation at 247.94 nm) with blue-shifted detection has been widely employed in high-pressure high-temperature combustion situations. Although the signal strength is low, it strongly reduces attenuation problems in typical in-cylinder experimental geometries with long laser path and short signal path. Interference levels are acceptable for high NO concentrations (>1000 ppm). In addition, previous literature suggests that this approach is most effective to minimizing PAH interference.
• Excitation within the (0, 2) band with red-shifted detection suffers both in signal strength and in interference and is not recommended.
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