Supersonic Microwave Plasma: Potential and Limitations for Energy-**Efficient CO₂ Conversion**

Vincent Vermeiren[®] and Annemie Bogaerts^{*®}

Department of Chemistry, Research Group PLASMANT, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Antwerp, Belgium

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Supersonic flows provide a high thermodynamic nonequilibrium, which is crucial for energy-efficient conversion of CO₂ in microwave plasmas and are therefore of great interest. However, the effect of the flow on the chemical reactions is poorly understood. In this work, we present a combined flow and plasma chemical kinetics model of a microwave CO₂ plasma in a Laval nozzle setup. The effects of the flow field on the different dissociation and recombination mechanisms, the vibrational distribution, and the vibrational transfer mechanism are discussed. In addition, the effect of experimental parameters, like position of power deposition, outlet pressure, and specific energy input, on the CO₂ conversion and energy efficiency is examined. The short residence time of the gas in the plasma region, the shockwave, and the maximum critical heat, and thus power, that can be added to the flow to avoid thermal choking are the main obstacles to reaching high energy efficiencies.



1. INTRODUCTION

The threat of man-made climate change is one of the most prominent problems of the 21st century. A possible pathway to limit the scope of this problem is CO_2 capture. This process is cost intensive, both for capture from ambient air, as for capture from point sources,¹ resulting in extensive research in converting this waste product to value-added chemicals.

Low-temperature plasmas are gaining increasing interest for the dissociation of CO₂ into CO, which can be combined with hydrogen gas to synthesize hydrocarbons. These plasmas are characterized by a high thermodynamic nonequilibrium between the electrons and the so-called heavy plasma species, allowing endothermic reactions to take place without heating the gas.² In particular, microwave plasmas show promising results for the energy-efficient conversion of CO2.2,3 This is attributed to the important role of vibrational induced dissociation.²⁻⁶ Indeed, in microwave CO₂ plasmas, the relatively low electron temperature of about 1 eV allows for an efficient energy transfer from the electrons to the asymmetric mode vibrational levels of CO2.² An excess of 90% of the electron energy is converted to vibrational energy.

These vibrationally excited CO₂ molecules will exchange vibrational energy with other vibrationally excited molecules until they reach the dissociation limit, in a process called vibrational-vibrational (VV) relaxation.^{2,4-6} This process is energetically more favorable than direct electron impact dissociation,² which is the main dissociation reaction in other plasma reactors, such as dielectric barrier discharges.^{4,7,8} However, part of the vibrational energy is also converted to translational energy, or gas heating, in a process called

vibrational-translational (VT) relaxation.^{2,4-6} The key to higher energy efficiency is limiting the VT relaxation with respect to VV relaxation.

Berthelot and Bogaerts studied the effect of different discharge conditions on the energy efficiency and CO₂ conversion in microwave plasmas.⁶ They concluded that lower pressures, higher power densities, lower temperature, and cooling of the afterglow had a beneficial effect on the efficiency of the dissociation process. The lower pressure and higher power densities lead to more vibrational excitation, which is beneficial for the conversion. A lower temperature results in more pronounced VV transfer with respect to VT transfer, whereas cooling of the afterglow limits the recombination of CO and O back to CO₂.

The requirement of low pressure and low temperature, however, poses challenges for industrial application of the technique. A microwave supersonic flow reactor can tackle these two issues and has therefore demonstrated the maximum energy efficiency to date.⁹ In this setup, a pressure difference is applied over a converging-diverging nozzle. The adiabatic expansion of the nozzle cross section accelerates the flow to supersonic velocities. A first benefit of this type of reactor is that the acceleration to supersonic speed creates a pressure drop, from high-pressure conditions (≥ 1 bar) to intermediate pressure (around 100 mbar), the latter being more beneficial for energy-efficient conversion.^{2,6,10} A second benefit is that

Received: August 31, 2018 Revised: October 18, 2018 Published: October 19, 2018 the rapid increase in kinetic energy reduces the internal energy of the gas, thus lowering the temperature.¹¹ This allows the use of higher power densities, while staying at low temperatures, which is also beneficial for energy-efficient CO_2 conversion.

Even in the absence of electromagnetic coupling, the supersonic flow field can drive the overpopulation of the highly excited vibrational states, leading to dissociation of CO_2 .² This effect of supersonic expansion on the non-equilibrium vibrational distribution function (VDF) in CO_2 was theoretically studied by Peerenboom et al.¹² in a quasi 1D model, which includes 21 asymmetric mode vibrational levels and state-to-state vibrational kinetics. The model shows that supersonic expansion indeed has a beneficial effect on the population of the highest vibrational levels.

In this paper, we present a combined supersonic flow model and chemical reaction kinetics model of a supersonic microwave CO_2 plasma in a converging-diverging nozzle geometry. The aim of this work is to study the effect of different characteristics of supersonic flow, for example, pressure drop, and the shockwave, on the reaction kinetics. On the basis of this information, we will change the flow conditions in the model, to manipulate the flow field to examine the effect of the latter on the CO_2 conversion.

2. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

The study consists of two separate parts. First, nonreactive flow simulations are performed in COMSOL Multiphysics. A 2D axisymmetric high Mach flow number k/ϵ -model is used to calculate the flow for pure CO₂ at room temperature. This model combines the standard Reynolds average Navier–Stokes (RANS) k/ϵ -model with Euler's equations for inviscid flow, and will be explained in more detail in Section 2.1. This model is chosen based upon its user-friendly nature and the limited amount of computational resources and time needed to acquire results. Certain aspects of the flow behavior are not captured in our model in contrast to more complex simulations.¹³ However, the effect of the approximations are not to an extent that will be relevant for this study.

Subsequently, a center cut line of the flow results is used as input in a zero-dimensional chemical kinetics model, described in more detail in Section 2.2. The chemistry set that is used is presented in Section 2.3. During the different simulations, the pressure and temperature will be fixed. The flow and plasma description are thus decoupled. The validity of this assumption, as well as other model approximations, will be discussed in more detail in Section 2.4.

2.1. Flow Model. The standard RANS k/ϵ -model is well known in computational fluid dynamics theory and can describe a wide range of turbulent flows.¹⁴ It is a two-equation turbulence model that solves for the mass and momentum continuity partial differential equations

$$\nabla \cdot (\rho \vec{u}_{g}) = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$\rho(\vec{u}_{g} \cdot \nabla)\vec{u}_{g} = \nabla \left[-p\vec{I} + (\mu + \mu_{T})(\nabla \vec{u}_{g} + \nabla (\vec{u}_{g})^{T}) + \frac{2}{3}(\mu + \mu_{T})(\nabla \cdot \vec{u}_{g})\vec{I} - \frac{2}{3}\rho k\vec{I} \right] + \vec{F}$$
(2)

where ρ stands for the gas density, \vec{u}_g is the gas flow velocity vector, superscript T stands for transposition, p is the gas pressure, μ and μ_T are the dynamic and turbulent viscosity of the fluid, respectively, k is the turbulent kinetic energy, \vec{I} is the

unity tensor and \vec{F} is the body force vector. Next to this, the turbulence is modeled by adding two additional equations that solves for the turbulent kinetic energy k and the turbulent dissipation rate ϵ

$$\rho(\vec{u}_{g} \cdot \nabla)k = \nabla \cdot \left[\left(\mu + \frac{\mu_{T}}{\sigma_{k}} \right) \nabla k \right] + P_{k} - \rho \epsilon$$
(3)

$$\rho(\vec{u}_{g} \cdot \nabla)\epsilon = \nabla \cdot \left[\left(\mu + \frac{\mu_{T}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}} \right) \nabla \epsilon \right] + C_{\epsilon 1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} P_{k} - C_{\epsilon 2} \rho \frac{\epsilon^{2}}{k}$$
(4)

Equations 3 and 4 calculate the transport of turbulent energy and its dissipation into heat (ϵ), respectively. P_k represents the production term for turbulent kinetic energy. σ_{k} , σ_{e} , C_{e1} , and $C_{\epsilon 2}$ are model constants which are experimentally determined.¹⁴

Because all flow properties are coupled to each other, the number and combinations of boundary conditions that are needed for well posedness depend on the flow state.¹⁵ To provide consistent inlet and outlet boundary conditions, the speed at which the different flow quantities propagate at the boundary needs to be known.

A plane wave analysis of the inviscid part of the flow is performed to apply a consistent number of boundary conditions, using the method described in detail in ref 16. Inviscid flow is described by Euler's equations, which can be written as

$$\frac{\partial \vec{Q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \vec{F}_j}{\partial \vec{Q}} \frac{\partial \vec{Q}}{\partial x_j} = 0$$
(5)

where

$$\vec{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho \\ u_i \\ p \end{bmatrix}$$

where \vec{Q} is the state vector to be solved for, \vec{F}_j is the flux vector, and ρ , u_i , and p are the mass density, velocity components, and pressure, respectively.

2.2. Plasma Model. The plasma chemistry is described with the ZDPlasKin code.¹⁷ This model describes the time evolution of different plasma species in a nonequilibrium discharge. The time evolution of the different species through the reactor can be converted to an axial evolution through the discharge tube by calculating the velocity u of the considered volume element. Given the input values for pressure, temperature, and mass flow rate that were acquired from the flow model, the velocity is calculated from the conservation of mass flow rate

$$u = \frac{\dot{m}}{\rho A} \tag{6}$$

where \dot{m} is the mass flow rate, $\rho = \sum_{j} n_{j} M_{j}$ is the mass density of the gas, and A is the tube cross-sectional area, which is a function of the axial position because of the convergingdiverging nozzle. n_{j} is the number density of element j, and M_{j} the mass of element j. The model starts at the inlet (z = 0) with pure CO₂. The plasma is assumed to be ignited at a certain axial position in the reactor. In the plasma region, two plasma parameters are fixed. The reduced electric field is fixed to a value of 50 Td, and the ionization degree to 10^{-6} , which are both typical values for CO₂ microwave plasmas.^{3,10} A certain power deposition density $Q_{dep}(z)$ is applied to sustain the plasma with these values for electron density and energy. The total power input $P_{dep}(z) = \int_{z_0}^{z} A(z)Q_{dep} dz$ (with A(z)the cross section of the tube at position z) is then used to calculate the specific energy input (SEI [eV/molecule]) at position z

$$SEI(z) = \frac{P_{dep}(z)}{\Phi} \frac{T_{ref}}{p_{ref}} \frac{k_{\rm B}}{e} \frac{1}{10^{-3}}$$
(7)

where Φ [sls] is the gas flow rate in standard liters per second, $T_{\rm ref} = 273.15$ K and $p_{\rm ref} = 101325$ Pa are the temperature and pressure at standard conditions, *e* is the elementary charge to convert *J* into eV, and $k_{\rm B}$ is the Boltzmann constant. The factor 10^{-3} comes from the conversion of $l = {\rm dm}^3$ to ${\rm m}^3$. We use a fixed value for the SEI and apply a power deposition until the value for the SEI is reached at $z = z_0 + z_{\rm p}$, where $z_{\rm p}$ is the plasma length, after which the power deposition drops to 0. This approach can be seen in Figure 1 and was used in similar



Figure 1. Schematic presentation of the Laval nozzle geometry (top) with plasma (orange) and SEI (bottom) in function of the axial distance in the geometry. The plasma starts at z_0 and continues until the cutoff value for the SEI is reached at $z_0 + z_p$, with z_p the plasma length.

studies by our group.^{18,19} The plasma length is calculated by the model, based on the SEI value used. This is preferable because no experimental data are available on the plasma length in this type of reactor.

The microwave power is mainly absorbed by the electrons in the system because of their lower mass and thus higher mobility. Given the importance of the electron energy distribution function (EEDF) to the chemistry, the model has a built-in Boltzmann solver BOLSIG+²⁰ that uses the two-term approximation to calculate EEDF, the electron kinetics, and the energy dependent rate coefficients of the various electron impact reactions (Table S1 in the Supporting Information), using the Phelps 7 eV excitation cross section²¹ recommended by Bogaerts et al.²² The heavy particles are assumed to be in thermal equilibrium and are just described by the mean gas temperature $T_{\rm g}$. The Boltzmann solver is coupled to the chemical kinetics

The Boltzmann solver is coupled to the chemical kinetics part of the model. In the latter part, the species densities n_s are calculated at every timestep by a set of conservation equations

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}n_{\mathrm{s}}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sum_{j} R_{j} [a_{\mathrm{s}j}^{\mathrm{R}} - a_{\mathrm{s}j}^{\mathrm{L}}] = \sum_{j} \left(k_{j} \prod_{l} n_{l} \right) [a_{\mathrm{s}j}^{\mathrm{R}} - a_{\mathrm{s}j}^{\mathrm{L}}]$$
(8)

`

Index *j* refers to reaction *j* and index *l* refers to the different reactants of reaction *j*. a_{sj}^{R} and a_{sj}^{L} are the right- and left-hand side stoichiometric coefficients of species *s*, respectively. k_j is the reaction rate coefficient of reaction *j*, with $R_j = k_j \prod_l n_l$ as the reaction rate.

One of the main objectives of this study is to examine conditions for the highest CO_2 conversion and energy efficiency. The model calculates the conversion (χ) and energy efficiency (η) as follows

$$\chi(z) = 100 \times \left(1 - \frac{N_{\rm CO_2}(z)\nu(z)A(z)}{N_{\rm CO_2}(0)\nu(0)A(0)}\right)$$
(9)

$$\eta = \chi \frac{\Delta H^{\circ}}{\text{SEI}} \tag{10}$$

where N_{CO_2} is the number density of CO₂, v(z) is the velocity of the volume element at position z, A(z) is the cross section of the discharge tube at position z, and ΔH° is the enthalpy of the reaction CO₂ \rightarrow CO + 1/2O₂.

2.3. Chemistry Set. *2.3.1. Species.* The chemistry set, used in this model, is based on the chemistry set reported in refs.^{18,19} This set resulted from a chemistry reduction process,²³ initiated from the original set by Kozák and Bogaerts^{4,5} that was later fine-tuned by Koelman et al.²⁴ In this reduction, the species of minor importance to the plasma chemistry were removed, which reduces not only the complexity but also the uncertainty on the outcome of the model results.¹⁸

The species included in this model are listed in Table 1. The set includes 21 asymmetric mode vibrational levels $CO_2[\nu_{1-21}]$ up to the dissociation limit, as well as 4 symmetric mode levels $CO_2[\nu_{a-d}]$. For CO, 10 vibrational levels are included. The energy of the different CO_2 vibrational levels is calculated using formula 11, as in refs^{4,25}

$$E_{CO_{2}} = \sum_{i} \omega_{i} \left(v_{i} + \frac{d_{i}}{2} \right) + \sum_{j \ge i} x_{ij} \left(v_{i} + \frac{d_{i}}{2} \right) \left(v_{j} + \frac{d_{j}}{2} \right) + x_{l_{2}l_{2}} l_{2}^{2}$$
(11)

in which ω_i , x_{ij} , and $x_{l_2l_2}$ are spectroscopic constants determined by experiments and $d_i = (d_1 \ d_2 \ d_3) = (1 \ 2 \ 1)$ are the degeneracies of the three modes of vibration. The values for the spectroscopic constants can be found in ref 25: $\omega_1 =$ 1354.31 cm⁻¹, $\omega_2 = 672.85 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $\omega_3 = 2396.32 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $x_{11} =$ -2.93 cm⁻¹, $x_{12} = -4.61 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $x_{13} = -19.82 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $x_{22} = 1.35$ cm⁻¹, $x_{23} = -12.31 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $x_{33} = -12.47 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $x_{l_2l_2} = -0.97$ cm⁻¹.

The energies of the CO vibrational levels are calculated using the anharmonic oscillator formula 26

$$E = \omega_{\rm e}(\nu + 0.5) - \omega_{\rm e} x_{\rm e}(\nu + 0.5)^2$$
(12)

where ν is the vibrational quantum number, $\omega_e = 2169.81 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and $x_e = 6.12 \times 10^{-3}$ is the anharmonicity coefficient. The values for these spectroscopic constants are taken from the NIST database.²⁷ The energies of the O₂ vibrational levels are taken from the Phelps database.²¹

		neutral ground states	
		CO ₂ , CO, O ₂ , O, C	
charged species			
CO ₂ ⁺ , CO ⁺ , CO ₄ ⁺ , O ⁻ , O ₂ ⁻ , CO ₃ ⁻ , CO ₄ ⁻ , e ⁻			
	excited states	associated energy [eV]	state ^a
	$O_2[v_{1-4}]$	anharmonic oscillator	
	$CO[v_{1-10}]$	anharmonic oscillator	
	$CO_2[\nu_{1-21}]$	anharmonic oscillator	(00n)
	$CO_2[\nu_a]$	0.083	(010)
	$CO_2[\nu_b]$	0.167	(020) + (100)
	$CO_2[\nu_c]$	0.252	(030) + (110)
	$CO_2[\nu_d]$	0.339	(040) + (120) + (200)
	$CO_2[e_1]$	10.5	$({}^{1}\Sigma_{u}^{+}) + ({}^{3}\Pi_{u}) + ({}^{1}\Pi_{u})$
	$O_2[e_1]$	0.98	$(a^1\Delta_g) + (b^1\Sigma_g^+)$
	$O_2[e_2]$	8.4	$(B^3\Sigma_u^-)$ + higher triplet states
	$CO[e_1]$	6.22	$(a^3\Pi_r)$
	$CO[e_2]$	7.9	$(A^1\Pi)$
	$CO[e_3]$	13.5	$(a'^{3}\Sigma^{+}) + (d^{3}\Delta_{i}) + (e^{3}\Sigma^{-}) + (b^{3}\Sigma^{+})$
	$CO[e_4]$	10.01	$(C^{1}\Sigma^{+}) + (E^{1}\Pi) + (B^{1}\Sigma^{+}) + (I^{1}\Sigma^{-}) + (D^{1}\Delta)$

^aCO₂ electronic states designation from Grofulović et al.,²⁸ O₂ and CO electronic states notation from Huber & Herzberg.²⁹

2.3.2. Reaction Kinetics. The reactions included in the model are listed in the Supporting Information. The electron impact reactions are shown in Tables S1 and S2. The reactions of Table S1 are described by electron impact cross sections, found in the LXCat database,³⁰ while the reactions in Table S2 are described by rate coefficients, calculated with analytical expressions. Given that the cross sections for vibrational excitation are available only from ground-state molecules to the lowest levels, the other cross sections for electron impact excitation between different vibrational levels are calculated using the Fridman approximation,² which is based on the semiempirical formula

$$\sigma_{nm}(\epsilon) = \exp\left(\frac{\alpha(m-n-1)}{1+\beta n}\right)\sigma_{01}(\epsilon + E_{01} - E_{nm})$$
(13)

in which $E_{01} = E_1 - E_0$ and $E_{nm} = E_m - E_n$ are the energy differences between vibrational states 1 and 0 and states m and *n*, respectively, ϵ is the electron energy, and the parameters are $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\beta = 0.4.5$ The neutral-neutral reactions are shown in Table S3. The rate coefficients are Arrhenius expressions.

$$k(T_{\rm g}) = AT_{\rm g}^{\ B} \exp\left(\frac{E_{\rm a}}{k_{\rm B}T_{\rm g}}\right)$$
(14)

where k is the rate coefficient, T_g the gas temperature, E_a the activation energy, and A and B are experimentally or theoretically determined constants. Molecules in vibrationally excited levels need lower energy to overcome the activation energy barrier. The efficiency of this lowering is described by the Fridman-Macheret approximative α model.² More information about the effect of this efficiency determining α parameter on the reaction mechanisms of microwave CO₂ plasmas can be found in ref 19.

The rate coefficients for VV and VT transfer between different molecules can be found in Table S4. They are calculated by the Schwartz-Slawsky-Herzfeld (SSH) theory.³¹ More information about the implementation of this SSH theory in the 0D model can be found in ref 4.

2.4. Model Approximations. Every model needs approximations, so here we would like to point out the validity of the approximations made in this work. First, the setup is studied with a 0D model. This model is radially averaged and can thus not take into account any spatial gradients in the radial direction. In reality, a MW plasma can become contracted when operating at higher pressures,³ which can thus not be captured by our model. A 0D model is however still favorable because it yields a detailed description of the plasma chemistry needed to evaluate the CO₂ conversion and energy efficiency, within limited calculation time

Further approximations are related to the temperature of the molecules. When a supersonic flow expands, internal energy is converted to kinetic energy to fuel the acceleration.^{11,33,34} This acceleration happens adiabatically if no heat source is applied on the flow. The flow is then described by the isentropic flow relations between pressure, temperature, and density for a perfect gas

$$\frac{p}{p_{\rm t}} = \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{\rm t}}\right)^{\gamma} = \left(\frac{T}{T_{\rm t}}\right)^{\gamma/\gamma - 1} = \left(1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2}M^2\right)^{-\gamma/\gamma - 1} \tag{15}$$

where p, T, ρ are the static pressure, temperature, and mass density, respectively, and p_{tr} T_{tr} ρ_{t} are the total pressure, temperature, and mass density, $\gamma = C_p/C_v$ is the ratio of specific heats, respectively, and M the Mach number of the flow. The total pressure, mass density, and temperature are those when the flow is isentropically brought to rest, that is, when M = 0, and are assumed to stay constant when no heat is exchanged with the environment.

Given that the flow and the plasma are decoupled, the effect of the plasma on the flow is not included in this model. When a plasma is created in the supersonic region, the applied electrical energy can either dissociate the gas, or can be lost in gas heating. Gas expansion due to conversion and rising temperature can lead to an increase in the molar flow rate. In this paper, however, the conversion is limited to a few percent (see Section 3), so the effect of the conversion on the flow will be low.

The Journal of Physical Chemistry C

When heat is added to supersonic flow, the trends of the different physical parameters are quite different with respect to subsonic flow. Contrary to subsonic flow, heat addition in supersonic flows will lead to a deceleration of the flow to lower Mach numbers.³⁴ Such flow with heat addition is called Rayleigh-line flow³⁴ and is described by a Rayleigh curve. The added heat will lead to both a temperature and pressure increase.³⁴ This phenomenon is very unfavorable for MW plasma-based CO₂ conversion.⁶ The amount of heat can increase until a critical value for added heat is reached. At that point, the gas is decelerated to $M \approx 1$, after which the flow will be thermally choked, ^{2,33,35,36} and a shock is generated. The critical heat (Q_{cr}) that can be added to a system, and still avoid thermal choking of the flow, can be estimated by the formula

$$Q_{\rm cr} = C_p T_0 \left[\frac{(M^2 - 1)^2}{2(\gamma + 1)M^2 [1 + (1/2)(\gamma - 1)M^2]} \right]$$
(16)

where C_p is the specific heat capacity and T_0 is the inlet nozzle gas temperature. The critical heat can be augmented by an increase of the inlet nozzle temperature T_0 or by reagents dilution in noble gasses.³⁶

Equation 16 is valid for constant area ducts. The deceleration of the flow, due to heat addition, can be countered by increasing the cross-sectional area of the discharge over the region in which the heat is added.³⁶ This phenomenon is called "nozzle profiling" and can double the critical heat with a sixfold increase of the cross-sectional area.³⁶ However, because the 0D model does not take into account radial contraction of the plasma, the plasma length is shorter than it would be in a full 3D (or 2D cylindrically symmetric) calculation. Hence, the plasma length is only a few millimeters long (see Section 3). The formula of the constant area duct (eq 16) can thus serve as a good estimate for our case because a significant increase of the cross-sectional area over this distance is too complex and maybe impossible.

Figure 2 shows the critical heat as a function of Mach number. We can see that the critical heat rises with higher Mach numbers, until a maximum value of 0.1867 eV/molecule is reached at Mach ∞ .

The heat that is added to the system, by the plasma, is $Q = (1 - \eta) \times SEI$. This heat will increase the total temperature, while the total pressure is unaffected. The static pressure and



Figure 2. Critical heat before thermal choking of the flow occurs, as a function of Mach number (full line). With the maximum critical heat at high Mach numbers (dashed line) and the critical heat and the deceleration heat for an example at Mach = 5 (dotted line).

temperature will increase (i.e., closer to the total values) because of the deceleration of the Mach number (see eq 15). In this study, we use nonreactive flow results from COMSOL (i.e., without plasma) as input in a 0D plasma model. This means that the pressure and temperature remain fixed in the 0D model. Given that the total temperature (i.e., when the flow is at M = 0) remains at room temperature, we can assume that the reported energy efficiencies are maximum values of what can be achieved with this model, given that heat from the plasma would increase the total and static temperature and thus lower the energy efficiency.⁶ To make sure that after the plasma is applied, the static temperature and pressure conditions are still valid, we will assume that the heat from the plasma has decelerated a hypothetical initial flow with much higher Mach number to the one which we are using. The maximum deceleration heat for a certain Mach number can then be defined by

$$Q_{\rm dec}(M) = Q_{\rm cr}(M_{\infty}) - Q_{\rm cr}(M) \tag{17}$$

where the flow decelerates from Mach ∞ to the Mach number from the flow results. For example, if flow conditions are used in which the Mach number reaches 5, then the maximum heat that can be added is the heat that slowed the flow down from Mach ∞ to Mach 5, that is, $Q_{dec}(5) = Q_{cr}(M_{\infty}) - Q_{cr}(5) =$ 0.1867 - 0.1338 = 0.0529 eV/molecule. The maximum deceleration heat and the critical heat are displayed in Figure 2 for the example of Mach = 5. In this study, we make sure that the SEI is always chosen as not to violate the criterion of eq 17. As mentioned above, the rising gas temperature due to the plasma can increase the molar flow rate. This effect is not taken into account in our flow model, because the plasma and flow model are decoupled. The magnitude of this effect is unclear and will depend on the SEI and the energy efficiency of the conversion process. We plan to study this effect in our future work, for which we will need to develop a fully coupled model.

Given that microwave CO₂ plasmas are characterized by their high thermodynamic nonequilibrium, the effect of the supersonic flow on the rotational and vibrational temperature needs to be discussed. In this study, the rotational degrees of freedom are assumed to be in equilibrium with translation and will not be separately described. This assumption is valid for microwave CO₂ plasmas³⁷ because the rotational-translational relaxation slows down only at high gas temperatures.³⁸ We assume in this study that the vibrational temperature is also not affected by the supersonic expansion. Given that most of the energy for supersonic acceleration comes from translational energy, yielding a drop in gas temperature while the vibrational temperature remains constant, the non-equilibrium between these two is enhanced, leading to overpopulation of the vibrational levels with respect to the Boltzmann distribution.^{2,12} This assumption is also used in vibrational collision studies of hypersonic flows^{39,40}

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Section 3.1, we will illustrate the flow field results without plasma, that is, for pure CO_2 at room temperature inlet conditions. In Sections 3.2 and 3.3, we will describe the evolution of the plasma through the reactor, with focus on the CO_2 dissociation and recombination mechanisms and the evolution of the VDF. In Sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6, we will discuss in more detail the effect of plasma position, flow conditions, and power, on the overall energy efficiency and

 CO_2 conversion. Finally, in Section 3.7, we will study the maximum theoretical energy efficiency for different inlet and outlet pressures.

3.1. Flow Field Results without Plasma. The three parameters that define the geometry (see Figure 1) are chosen to resemble the dimensions in which high energy efficiency is reported:⁹ $r_1 = 0.4$ cm, $r_2 = 2$ cm, and $z_1 = 10$ cm. The inlet nozzle is slightly larger than that reported in ref 9. The flow results for an inlet pressure $p_{in} = 2$ bar and outlet pressure $p_{out} = 1$ bar are plotted in Figure 3, illustrating the axial velocity



Figure 3. (a) Axial velocity magnitude, (b) Mach number, (c) static pressure, and (d) static temperature in the case of $r_1 = 0.4$ cm, $r_2 = 2$ cm, $z_1 = 10$ cm, $p_{in} = 2$ bar, $p_{out} = 1$ bar.

profile, the Mach number, the static pressure, and the static temperature. The results are shown only in the expansion region of the nozzle, where the supersonic acceleration affects these quantities. We discuss here one flow field case, for one geometry, inlet and outlet pressures, in detail, but additional flow results for different conditions and geometries (i.e., different values for z_1) can be found in the Supporting Information.

The flow field consists of two distinct regions (depicted in Figure 3a). First, the flow accelerates due to the nozzle expansion (region I), from an axial velocity of 6 m/s before the nozzle to 415 m/s (Figure 3a). This corresponds to a Mach number of 1.9 (Figure 3b). The static pressure exhibits a drop from 2 to 0.3 bar (Figure 3c), while the static temperature drops from 300 to 187 K (Figure 3d).

The supersonic region I is followed by a discontinuous deceleration to sonic conditions called a shockwave. This is characterized by a decrease in Mach number and an increase in pressure and temperature. At the inlet pressure of 2 bar, the flow shows a single shock with bifurcated ends.^{41,42} This shape is a result of boundary layer separation.⁴¹ When the flow accelerates to a lower Mach number, the shockwave could exhibit a more curved shape.⁴¹

The shockwave separates the supersonic region from the mixing region (region II in Figure 3a). In this region, the pressure increases monotonically to the outlet pressure of 1 bar. The same trend is observed in the axial velocity, Mach number, and temperature, where a gradual return to sonic conditions takes place.

It can be seen in Figure 3a that a part of the axial velocity (close to the walls) is negative. There is indeed a small portion of the flow that recirculates along the walls, after the shockwave. This effect can not be taken into account in a 0D model, but is of no importance, given that the ideal plasma location lies in the supersonic region, before the shockwave.

When the flow in the supersonic region accelerates to higher Mach numbers, a third region forms between the supersonic region and the mixing region, that is called the shock train. The shock train is characterized by a sequence of shocks separating subsonic from supersonic regions.⁴¹ After each shock, the flow accelerates again to supersonic velocities, after which it is decelerated by the following shock. The region is characterized by pressure and temperature oscillations. This can be seen in Figure S1 of the Supporting Information (region III), for an inlet pressure of $p_{in} = 4$ bar and outlet pressure of $p_{out} = 1$ bar, in which the flow accelerates to Mach 2.5. We want to note that in this case, the calculated minimum temperature of 141 K is far below the desublimation point of CO_2 at the corresponding pressure of 0.2 bar, which is about 180 K.43 In reality, cluster formation can occur in supersonic flow.44 When a plasma is applied, the temperature will most likely stay above this desublimation point, so including this phenomenon in our model is not relevant for this study.

3.2. Main CO₂ Dissociation and Recombination Mechanisms in the Plasma and Afterglow Region. The mechanisms will be studied by looking at the so-called reduced reaction rates of the different processes (i.e., $100 \times R/N$ [%/s], with R and N the reaction rates and the total gas density, respectively). This approach is chosen to take into account the change of total density through the reactor. The results can hence be interpreted as the percentage of CO₂ that is converted or recombined through these processes, with 100%/s meaning that all CO₂ is converted in 1 s. Note that the values exceed far beyond 100%/s because the residence time is in the order of microseconds.

Figure 4 (top) shows the main dissociation and recombination mechanisms, when applying a SEI of 0.2 eV/molecule,



Figure 4. Top: Evolution of the main CO_2 dissociation and recombination mechanisms in the plasma and afterglow for the following conditions: SEI = 0.2 eV/molecule, $p_{in} = 2$ bar, $p_{out} = 1$ bar, and geometry dimensions: $r_1 = 0.4$ cm, $r_2 = 2$ cm, $z_1 = 10$ cm. Bottom: Absolute pressure as a function of axial position with the plasma indicated as a purple rectangle.

in the supersonic flow region of a flow case with $p_{in} = 2$ bar and $p_{out} = 1$ bar, rendering $M \approx 1.9$. The pressure variation as a function of position is illustrated in Figure 4 (bottom). The plasma covers a domain of 1 mm (see purple rectangle in Figure 4), which corresponds to a residence time of 2.7 μ s. The three main CO₂ dissociation mechanisms are electron impact dissociation (X4, blue curve), dissociation of ground-state, and vibrationally excited CO₂ by collision with any molecule M (N1, red curve) and by reaction with an O radical



Figure 5. Evolution of the VDF for different axial positions as indicated on the pressure evolution in the lower panel, for the following conditions: SEI = 0.2 eV/molecule, $p_{in} = 2$ bar, $p_{out} = 1$ bar, and geometry dimensions: $r_1 = 0.4$ cm, $r_2 = 2$ cm, $z_1 = 10$ cm.

(N2, yellow curve). The main recombination mechanism is recombination of CO with an O radical (N4, purple dotted curve).

At the start of the plasma, electron impact dissociation is the most prominent dissociation reaction. The reaction continues to be relevant in the entire plasma region because of the abundance of free electrons and drops to 0 at the end of the plasma. Vibrationally induced dissociation upon collision with any molecule (N1) becomes the most important dissociation mechanism at about 1/3 of the plasma length. The reason is that some time is required for the vibrational energy of CO_2 to climb the ladder up to the higher levels, from which dissociation can more easily take place. Given the high velocity, the gas travels some distance before this reaction becomes important. The same applies to dissociation by recombination with an O radical (N2), which even lags a little behind because the O radicals first need to be produced by reaction (N1). At the same time, when the conversion rises in the plasma, recombination also becomes active, although the rate is much lower than for the dissociation reactions, given the low gas temperature.

As it takes some time for vibrationally induced dissociation to become a more active dissociation pathway, it is clear from these results that the short residence time (i.e., 2.7 μ s) is also a limiting factor at this low SEI value. Indeed, after the high vibrational levels become more populated, the dissociation has little time to occur through this energetically favorable pathway. However, this could also be a result of working with a 0D model. In reality, radial contraction can increase the axial plasma length and thus the residence time, which would result in a greater importance of vibrationally induced dissociation, with respect to electron impact dissociation, in the plasma. At this stage, it is not possible to quantify this effect, but we plan to investigate this in the future, when developing a full 2D model. Furthermore, the residence time would also increase if the E/N (now set to 50 Td) or the ionization degree (now set to 10^{-6}) were lower. While reducing the ionization degree will have a negative impact on the energy efficiency, a reduction of the E/N has a positive impact.¹⁹ However, values of 50 Td are characteristic for MW plasmas.³

In the afterglow, reactions N1 and N2 remain active, but the latter becomes the most dominant dissociation reaction. Both reactions are, however, quenched when the pressure increases in the shockwave region (between the lines at 19.22 and 19.36 cm). The most important recombination reaction (N4) shows an opposite trend. The reduced rate of this reaction remains the same in the afterglow, compared with the end of the plasma but exhibits a pronounced rise in the shockwave region. After the shockwave, this reaction becomes more important than the dissociation reactions, which will limit the overall CO_2 conversion and energy efficiency.

3.3. Vibrational Distribution Function. To better understand the results of the previous section, we take a closer look at the evolution of the VDF; see Figure 5, for the same conditions as in Figure 4. The three upper panels show VDFs, calculated at different axial positions, as indicated by the corresponding numbers in the plot of the pressure in the lower panel. At the plasma onset, the VDF shows no significant overpopulation of the vibrational levels and is close to a Boltzmann distribution (no. 1). The vibrational temperature at that point is 237 K, while the gas temperature is 198 K. Because the supersonic acceleration increases the nonequilibrium between the gas temperature and the vibrational temperature, the value of the latter is slightly higher.¹² Very quickly, however, the vibrational levels get populated (no. 2-3), until the VDF reaches a stationary distribution (no. 4-7). This evolution explains the spatial delay in the rates of reactions N1 and N2, as displayed in Figure 4. In the afterglow, the VDF retains a high population of the higher vibrational levels (no. 8-10). However, in the shockwave, the pressure increases sharply from 305 mbar to about 1.15 bar over a distance of 1.4 mm, and the higher vibrational levels are depopulated (no. 11-14) due to VT relaxation and VV ladder downclimbing (see below). Right after the shockwave, the vibrational temperature is still high (1520 K). However, because the higher vibrational levels, from which dissociation occurs, are depopulated by VT relaxation and VV downclimbing, there is no more CO_2 dissociation at that position.

To understand what happens with the vibrational energy, we take a look at the main vibrational reaction mechanisms, namely, VV and VT relaxation.

Figure 6 shows the density averaged reaction rate for electron impact vibrational excitation (eV), VV relaxation (VV), and VT relaxation (VT), multiplied with the energy transfer of the different processes. For eV en VV (top panel), it



Figure 6. Evolution of electron impact vibrational excitation (eV, top panel), the VV relaxation (VV, top panel) and VT relaxation (VT, middle panel) through the plasma and afterglow, for the following conditions: SEI = 0.2 eV/molecule, $p_{in} = 2$ bar, $p_{out} = 1$ bar, and geometry dimensions: $r_1 = 0.4$ cm, $r_2 = 2$ cm, $z_1 = 10$ cm. Bottom panel: Absolute pressure as a function of axial position with the plasma in purple rectangle.

can be interpreted as the energy that is transported up minus the energy transported down the vibrational ladder per second. For VT relaxation (middle panel), it is the energy lost to heat per second. This approach is chosen to give more weight to reactions with higher energy gains or losses.

To realize efficient vibrationally induced dissociation, the higher vibrational levels must be very quickly populated. At the start of the plasma, electron impact vibrational excitation is the only process that transports energy up the vibrational ladder (see Figure 6, top panel). This process continues to transport energy up the vibrational ladder in the rest of the plasma. In the afterglow, this process obviously does not occur anymore. Initially, VV relaxation transports energy from the higher vibrational levels to lower vibrational levels in a ladder downclimbing process (see Figure 6, top panel). This can be explained because most of the net energy from electron impact vibrational excitation goes to the second and third levels and is partially returned to the first level in a ladder downclimbing process. This happens until the lower levels are sufficiently populated, and a stationary VDF is reached. More information about this can be found in the Supporting Information (Figures S2 and S3). In the second half of the plasma region, there is VV ladder climbing to the higher vibrational levels. This is continued in the afterglow, but the energy transported up the ladder gradually decreases and reverses at some point (19.25 cm), so there is ladder downclimbing through the shockwave region.

The main vibrational energy loss, namely, VT relaxation, rises in the plasma region (see Figure 6, middle panel) because of the increasing vibrational overpopulation (cf. Figure 5). In the afterglow, the VT energy loss slightly drops, but in the shockwave region, it rises again because of the rising pressure and temperature (see Figure 3 above).

It is clear that the depopulation of the higher vibrational levels, as shown in Figure 5, is the result of VV ladder downclimbing and increased VT relaxation.

3.4. Effect of Plasma Position on the CO₂ Conversion and Energy Efficiency. In the above results, the plasma was exactly located in the supersonic region. In this section, we will explore how changing the plasma position, by moving the position of the waveguide in the supersonic flow reactor, will affect the CO₂ conversion and corresponding energy efficiency. In Figure 7 (top panel), we indicate different starting positions



Figure 7. Top figure: Illustration of different plasma positions and plasma lengths as a function of the position in the reactor (dotted line), for which the CO_2 conversion and energy efficiency are calculated. Also shown is the pressure as a function of position in the reactor (full line). Bottom figure: Calculated energy efficiency and conversion for the different plasma positions indicated in the top figure.

of the plasma region, keeping a fixed total SEI of 0.2 eV/ molecule in a supersonic flow reactor with $r_1 = 0.4$ cm, $r_2 = 2$ cm, $z_1 = 10$ cm, at an inlet pressure of 2 bar and an outlet pressure of 1 bar (i.e., the same as in previous sections). In addition, the pressure evolution is shown. Note that the plasma lengths in the reactor are different, depending on the starting position, to keep the same SEI. While a larger reactor radius will result in a shorter axial plasma length, the plasma length seems more correlated with the pressure at which the plasma is ignited. Indeed, when the pressure is higher, the plasma length is shorter. This is a result of the higher power density applied to ignite a plasma with an ionization degree of 10^{-6} . In reality, axial and radial contraction of the plasma is observed at higher pressures,⁴⁵ but so far this has not been studied in CO₂ microwave plasmas.

Figure 7 (bottom panel) shows the energy efficiency (left axis) and CO_2 conversion (right axis) for the different plasma positions displayed in the top panel. The most energetically favorable position is colored in green in the top panel. The energy efficiency increases from 20.5 to 26.5% when moving deeper into the supersonic region. The conversion rises accordingly from 1.4 to 1.8%. Note that the calculated energy efficiency and conversion are proportional to each other, as the SEI is kept constant here (see eq 10 above).

It can be seen that the most energetically favorable position (top panel) does not lie closest to the shockwave, where the pressure reaches its minimum. In fact, the energy efficiency is more than 1% lower when the plasma lies directly in front of the shockwave. This is the result of the vibrational quenching effect because of the rising pressure in the shockwave (cf.

The Journal of Physical Chemistry C

Figure 5 above) and the increasing importance of recombination, with respect to CO_2 dissociation (cf. Figure 4 above). In contrast, when the plasma is generated somewhat before the shockwave, the dissociation reactions (N1, N2) continue to be important right after the plasma before the shockwave (see Figure 4), and this has a beneficial effect on the overall conversion and energy efficiency.

Note that the results for energy efficiency and conversion were calculated in all cases with a fixed temperature profile, as obtained from the flow simulations (cf. Figure 3). When the temperature would be calculated self-consistently, the energy efficiency and conversion, displayed in Figure 7, would be somewhat lower.

3.5. Effect of Flow Conditions on the CO₂ Conversion and Energy Efficiency. With a fixed geometry, the main parameters that can be modified to change the flow field are the inlet and outlet pressures. Their effect on the flow field parameters can be seen in detail in the Supporting Information (Figures S5 and S6). Increasing the inlet pressure from 1 to 2 bar results in a lower temperature, higher Mach number, and lower minimum pressure. However, when the inlet pressure rises above 2 bar, the minimum pressure stays about the same, whereas the temperature keeps decreasing and the Mach number keeps increasing.

Reducing the outlet pressure also yields a higher maximum velocity, a higher Mach number, a lower minimum temperature, and in addition, the minimum pressure drops, in contrast to a rise in inlet pressure where the drop in minimum pressure stops at inlet pressures above 2 bar. For energy-efficient CO₂ conversion, the outlet pressure is thus an ideal parameter to tune the flow field to reach optimum conditions. In this way, the negative effects of plasma heating due to the deceleration, namely, an increase in temperature and pressure (see Section 2.4), can be countered. An increase in inlet pressure would not have the same desired effect because the total pressure is increased, and a similar increase in added heat (and subsequent decrease in Mach number) would result in a faster rise of the absolute pressure in the pressure drop (see eq 15). This means that the inlet pressure is not an ideal parameter to tune the flow to counter the effect of increasing pressure and will hence not be described in this section. The maximum energy efficiencies that can be reached when changing this parameter will, however, be studied in more detail in Section 3.7.

Here, we present the effect of the flow fields on the CO_2 conversion and energy efficiency, by varying the outlet pressure. Because a lower outlet pressure will increase the Mach number of the flow (see the Supporting Information), and to stay consistent with the upper limit of the added heat (see eq 17), we perform this study with a SEI of 0.15 eV/molecule instead of 0.2 eV/molecule.

Figure 8 shows the energy efficiency and conversion as a function of plasma position in the reactor, for three different outlet pressures (bottom panel). The pressure variation in these three cases is illustrated in the top panel. When the outlet pressure drops from 1 to 0.4 bar, the maximum energy efficiency increases from 20.46 to 23.84% (see bottom panel). When the outlet pressure is 1 bar, the minimum pressure is 307 mbar. The optimal plasma position for energy-efficient CO_2 conversion is then found between 19 cm (at a pressure of 365 mbar) and 19.08 cm (at a pressure of 342 mbar). When the outlet pressure is at 0.4 bar, the minimum pressure is 77 mbar. In this case, however, the highest energy efficiency is



Figure 8. Top figure: Pressure distributions for three different values of outlet pressure (colored lines) as a function of position in the reactor (dotted lines). Bottom figure: Energy efficiency and CO_2 conversion as a function of the plasma position, for the same three different values of outlet pressure as in the top figure.

reached when the plasma is located between 19.8 cm (at a pressure of 180 mbar) and 19.95 cm (at a pressure of 158 mbar), hence much earlier than the shockwave position, compared with the case with outlet pressure of 1 bar. The reason is that the pressure for highest energy efficiency was found at pressures between 100 and 300 mbar.^{2,6,10} Closer to the shockwave, where the minimum pressure of 77 mbar is reached, the energy efficiency is only 14.8%.

3.6. Effect of Power on the CO₂ Conversion and **Energy Efficiency.** When a high amount of heat is applied on a supersonic region, the flow needs to accelerate to higher Mach numbers, to avoid thermal choking of the flow (see Figure 2). For that reason, it is interesting to study the effect of power on the dissociation pathways and the energy efficiency because a lower amount of heat is then added to the flow, avoiding the initial acceleration to high Mach numbers. In this section, we will study these pathways for SEI of 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, and 0.2 eV/molecule. We will not study the effect of higher SEI values, to avoid violating the maximum deceleration heat criterion (see eq 17). The energy efficiency and CO_2 conversion as a function of plasma starting position for the above mentioned SEI values are included in the Supporting Information (Figure S4). They show the same trends as presented in Section 3.4. The values for the maximum energy efficiency are 0.06, 9.4, 20.52, and 26.5%. The maximum energy efficiency thus increases much faster than the SEI (or input power). It should be noted that at higher SEI, a higher amount of heat is added to the flow, in spite of the higher energy efficiency. Indeed, $Q = (1 - \eta) \times SEI$ is 0.05, 0.0906, 0.1192, and 0.1470 eV/molecule, for the SEI values of 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, and 0.2 eV/molecule, respectively. Note that if flow and plasma would be coupled together, this could have a negative impact on the VT-VV relaxation balance, which moves in favor of VT when the temperature increases, and this would decrease the relative contribution of N1 and N2 to the CO₂ dissociation and hence lower the energy efficiency.

The plasma positions for highest energy efficiency for all 4 cases lie at the same position (see Figure S4). The Mach number at that position is 1.83. However, higher SEI values give higher decelerations because they add more heat (see above). According to eq 17, the initial Mach numbers to end up with M = 1.83 are M = 3, M = 4.4, M = 6.1, and M = 12.8,

respectively. A higher SEI thus requires a higher initial Mach number to counter the stronger deceleration.

The nonlinear increase of the energy efficiency with increasing power (or SEI) is a result of the longer residence time. For SEI of 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, and 0.2 eV/molecule, the residence time is 0.66, 1.37, 1.98, and 2.7 μ s, respectively. The residence time affects the relative contribution of the different dissociation processes, explained in more detail in Section 3.2. These relative contributions are plotted in Figure 9, for the



Figure 9. Relative contribution of the main CO_2 dissociation mechanisms at different SEI for the following conditions: $r_1 = 0.4$ cm, $r_2 = 2$ cm, $z_1 = 10$ cm, $p_{in} = 2$ bar, $p_{out} = 1$ bar.

four different SEI values. For SEI of 0.1, 0.15, and 0.2 eV/ molecule, the energetically efficient vibrationally induced dissociation processes (N1 and N2) contribute most to the overall dissociation. However, the relative contribution of N1 (with reaction enthalpy $\Delta H = 5.5$ eV) is higher than the contribution of the most energetically favorable reaction N2 (with the lowest reaction enthalpy: $\Delta H = 0.35$ eV). In an ideal case, these two reactions should have an equal relative contribution, so that the O atom created in N1 is used in N2.¹⁹ The contribution of N2 increases from 26% at SEI = 0.1 eV/molecule to 35% at SEI = 0.2 eV/molecule, which explains the higher energy efficiency (see above).

When the SEI is 0.05 eV/molecule, the residence time is so short that there is not enough time for VV relaxation to populate the highest vibrational states. The dissociation is almost exclusively caused by electron impact dissociation, which is the least energy-efficient process (with $\Delta H = 7$ eV), explaining the very low conversion and energy efficiency.

3.7. Theoretical Maximum Energy Efficiency for Different Inlet and Outlet Pressures. It is clear from Section 3.6, that the two main limiting factors for high energy efficiency are the short residence time of the gas in the plasma region and the maximum deceleration heat (see eq 17). In this section, we present the maximum calculated energy efficiency for supersonic conditions with different inlet and outlet pressures. Given that the temperature profile, used in this study, is without effect of plasma heating, and given that a higher temperature will negatively affect the energy efficiency of the system,⁶ the reported efficiencies should be considered as maximum values that are achieved with this model.

The maximum heat that can be added to a certain supersonic flow is according to the criterion, described in eq 17. This criterion is checked when applying different SEI values in the pressure drop region. The results are taken into account only if the criterion is not violated at any of the plasma starting positions. In principle, the plasma could be applied before the pressure drop, in which the pressure drop serves as cooling for the afterglow,⁴⁶ which has a beneficial effect on the energy efficiency.⁶ It is also important to note that the conditions used in this section represent the flow conditions, assuming that the deceleration due to the plasma has already taken place and not the initial conditions before applying the plasma (in accordance with eq 17). If these were initial conditions, the cases with a lower Mach flow number would have a lower allowed heat addition (see eq 16).

Figure 10 shows the maximum energy efficiency as a function of inlet pressure, at an outlet pressure of 1 bar. The



Figure 10. Maximum energy efficiencies as a function of inlet pressure, at an outlet pressure of 1 bar. The color legend gives the maximum SEI that can be applied for each case, assuming a deceleration from high Mach number flows. Error bars have been added to take into account the stepwise increase of the SEI because higher energy efficiencies might exist at intermediate values of the SEI (see text).

colors of the bars represent the maximum SEI that can be applied at any position in the pressure drop, without violating the above mentioned criterion of maximum deceleration heat. At lower inlet pressures, the acceleration of the flow is limited (see the Supporting Information). This means that a higher SEI can be applied to the system (see eq 17) to decelerate it from high initial Mach numbers. At higher inlet pressure, when the pressure difference between the inlet and the outlet increases, the acceleration of the flow becomes stronger, limiting the maximum SEI that can be applied to the flow. At an inlet pressure of 1.2 bar, the maximum energy efficiency is 27.4%. As the inlet pressure increases, the maximum energy efficiency rises, until values of about 28% are reached at inlet pressures of 1.7-2.4 bar. Note that this study is performed with stepwise increases of the SEI. Because higher energy efficiencies might exist at intermediate values of the SEI, error bars have been added, based upon the value of the energy efficiency obtained when the criterion of eq 17 is first broken. When the inlet pressure is further increased to 3.1 bar, the maximum energy efficiency decreases to 27.3%, as explained below.

The initial rise of the maximum energy efficiency, when increasing the inlet pressure, can be explained by the fact that the higher Mach number in the pressure drop results in intermediate pressures that are favorable for CO_2 dissociation in MW plasmas.^{2,6} The subsequent drop of the maximum

dissociation reactions (see Sections 3.2 and 3.6). Figure 11 shows the maximum energy efficiency at different outlet pressures, while keeping the inlet pressure at 2 bar. At

decreases the contribution of the most energetically favorable



Figure 11. Maximum energy efficiency as a function of outlet pressure, at an inlet pressure of 2 bar. The color legend gives the maximum SEI that can be applied for each case, assuming a deceleration from high Mach number flows. Error bars have been added to take into account the stepwise increase of the SEI, because higher energy efficiencies might exist at intermediate values of the SEI (see text).

lower outlet pressures, the supersonic acceleration increases. This limits the maximum SEI that can be applied to the system (see eq 17) and subsequently shortens the residence time and the contribution of vibrationally induced dissociation (see Sections 3.2 and 3.6). The maximum energy efficiency also decreases with decreasing outlet pressure because the pressure in the pressure drop region was already at optimal conditions for the case of 2 bar inlet pressure (see Figure 10).

From Figures 10 and 11, it is clear that the maximum energy efficiency does not increase above 30%. However, as mentioned above, the initial Mach number should be very high to apply these types of SEI. In the literature, energy efficiencies for MW plasmas at supersonic flow conditions have been reported, in excess of 90%.^{2,9} This is clearly much higher than predicted by our models. A number of reasons could explain this mismatch:

(i) The energy efficiency strongly depends on the CO_2 dissociation upon collision with an O atom. This was studied in previous work, done by our group,¹⁹ where it was shown that the energy efficiency depends on the activation energy of this reaction, which was significantly higher than the reaction enthalpy. However, there is a large uncertainty on the value of this activation energy. If this value would be lower, the calculated energy efficiency would significantly rise.¹⁹ In addition, part of the surplus vibrational energy of CO2, that is used to overcome this energy barrier, might be transferred to the CO vibrational levels, and subsequently redistributed to the CO_2 molecules in VV relaxation. This process is not yet taken into account in our model, but we plan to investigate the effect of it on the energy efficiency in our future work.

(ii) As stated in Section 2.4, nozzle profiling could increase the maximum critical heat that can be added to the system without thermal choking. When this effect is taken into account, it is possible to increase the amount of heat that can be added to the flow, and thus the SEI, probably resulting in a higher energy efficiency as well.

However, even when the energy efficiency would be underestimated in our model, the trends presented, and thus the message, will still be valid.

4. CONCLUSION

We developed a model, based on a combination of 2D fluid dynamics simulations of the gas flow and 0D chemical kinetics modeling of the plasma chemistry, to understand the performance of a supersonic flow microwave plasma reactor for CO_2 conversion.

Adding heat to a supersonic flow slows it down until it chokes. In this study, the plasma that was ignited meets a criterion of maximum deceleration heat, for which the supersonic flow could in theory slow down from high Mach numbers to the Mach number at which the plasma is applied. This criterion limits the SEI to values below 0.24 eV/molecule.

We studied the evolution of the different reaction mechanisms through the plasma and afterglow. At the start of the plasma, electron impact vibrational excitation is the main dissociation mechanism. The model predicts that there is a spatial delay for vibrationally induced dissociation to start because of the high velocity of the gas, combined with the time it takes for the higher vibrational levels to get sufficiently populated. Because of the limited SEI, the residence time of the gas inside the plasma region is short. As a consequence, the vibrationally induced dissociation pathway does not have enough time to operate, hence limiting the energy efficiency of the conversion process. Vibrational induced dissociation still occurs in the immediate afterglow region because of the continued overpopulation of the higher vibrational levels, but the rate is much lower than that in the plasma. The higher vibrational levels are subsequently quenched by the shockwave, which leads to a rise in pressure and temperature, after which recombination becomes more important than CO₂ dissociation.

We studied how the energy efficiency and CO_2 conversion change when moving the applied power profile (from the waveguide) through the supersonic reactor. The energy efficiency increases when the power profile moves into the pressure drop of the supersonic region. However, the most energy-efficient power position does not lie closest to the shockwave, given the continued effect of vibrationally induced dissociation in the early afterglow.

One of the main parameters to tune the energy efficiency is the outlet pressure. By changing the outlet pressure, the temperature and pressure in the supersonic region can be modified. We illustrated that for an inlet pressure of 2 bar, the maximum energy efficiency and CO_2 conversion increase with decreasing outlet pressure. This can be explained by the more optimal pressure regime for efficient CO_2 dissociation,^{2,6,10} that was reached in the supersonic region at lower outlet pressures. However, the most favorable position moves further away from the position of minimum pressure.

The energy efficiency and CO_2 conversion increase upon higher input power. Indeed, the longer plasma residence time enhances the relative contribution from the most energetically favorable dissociation pathway (N1 + N2) because the higher vibrational levels have more time to become populated.

Finally, we examined the maximum energy efficiency for different inlet and outlet pressures. For an outlet pressure of 1 bar, a sufficiently high inlet pressure should be applied to create favorable pressure conditions in the supersonic region. However, a too high inlet pressure will increase the Mach number, limiting the SEI that can be applied, when decelerating from high initial Mach numbers. A lower SEI results in a lower residence time, a shorter time for VV relaxation to take place, and hence a lower energy efficiency. This last phenomenon was also seen when reducing the outlet pressure, which increases the Mach number, allowing for a lower maximum SEI when coming from high initial Mach numbers, and hence a lower energy efficiency. The model predicts a maximum energy efficiency of 28.3% at an inlet pressure of 2.4 bar, an outlet pressure of 1 bar, and a SEI of 0.21 eV/molecule.

In conclusion, the model provides insight into the underlying mechanisms, as well as the limitations for the energy efficiency of supersonic MW plasmas used for CO2 conversion. These limitations include (i) the short residence time of the gas in the plasma region, limiting the time for sufficient population of the higher vibrational levels, which is important for energy-efficient CO₂ dissociation, (ii) the shockwave, resulting in a rise in pressure and temperature, which increases the rate of recombination and quenches the higher vibrational levels from which dissociation occurs, by a rise in VT relaxation and VV ladder downclimbing, and (iii) the maximum heat, and thus power or SEI, that can be added to the supersonic flow by the plasma, to avoid thermal choking, which for CO_2 lies at 0.1867 eV/molecule. In literature, much higher energy efficiencies, up to 90%, were reported,⁹ which could not be reproduced by our model. This might be caused by some inherent limitations of the 0D model, that is, no radial contraction, or by the uncertainty on the activation energy of the most energetically efficient dissociation reaction (N2). However, even with an underestimation of the energy efficiency, the trends presented in this work, and thus the message, will still be valid.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

S Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.jpcc.8b08498.

Reactions included in the models as well as their rate coefficients or cross sections; vibrational energy transfer to the different levels; flow results for different inlet and outlet conditions; and flow results for different Laval nozzle geometries (PDF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: annemie.bogaerts@uantwerpen.be.

ORCID ©

Vincent Vermeiren: 0000-0002-6201-2977 Annemie Bogaerts: 0000-0001-9875-6460

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by the FWO project (grant G.0383.16N). The calculations were performed using the Turing HPC infrastructure at the CalcUA core facility of the Universiteit Antwerpen (UAntwerpen), a division of the Flemish Supercomputer Center VSC, funded by the Hercules Foundation, the Flemish Government (department EWI) and the UAntwerpen.

REFERENCES

(1) Meylan, F. D.; Moreau, V.; Erkman, S. CO_2 Utilization in the Perspective of Industrial Ecology, an Overview. *J. CO2 Util.* **2015**, *12*, 101–108.

(2) Fridman, A. Plasma Chemistry; Cambridge University Press: New York, USA, 2008.

(3) Snoeckx, R.; Bogaerts, A. Plasma Technology - a Novel Solution for CO₂ Conversion? *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2017**, *46*, 5805–5863.

(4) Kozák, T.; Bogaerts, A. Splitting of CO_2 by Vibrational Excitation in Non-Equilibrium Plasmas: a Reaction Kinetics Model. *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.* **2014**, 23, 045004.

(5) Kozák, T.; Bogaerts, A. Evaluation of the Energy Efficiency of CO_2 Conversion in Microwave Discharges using a Reaction Kinetics Model. *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.* **2015**, *24*, 015024.

(6) Berthelot, A.; Bogaerts, A. Modeling of CO_2 Splitting in a Microwave Plasma: How to Improve the Conversion and Energy Efficiency. J. Phys. Chem. C 2017, 121, 8236–8251.

(7) Aerts, R.; Martens, T.; Bogaerts, A. Influence of Vibrational States on CO_2 Splitting by Dielectric Barrier Discharges. J. Phys. Chem. C 2012, 116, 23257–23273.

(8) Ponduri, S.; Becker, M. M.; Welzel, S.; van de Sanden, M. C. M.; Loffhagen, D.; Engeln, R. Fluid modelling of CO₂ dissociation in a dielectric barrier discharge. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2016**, *119*, 093301.

(9) Asisov, R. I.; Vakar, A. K.; Jivotov, V. K.; Krotov, M. F.; Zinoviev, O. A.; Potapkin, B. V.; Rusanov, A. A.; Rusanov, V. D.; Fridman, A. A. Non-Equilibrium Plasma-Chemical Process of CO₂ Decomposition in a Supersonic Microwave Discharge. *Proc. USSR Acad. Sci.* **1983**, *271*, 94–98.

(10) den Harder, N.; van den Bekerom, D. C. M.; Al, R. S.; Graswinckel, M. F.; Palomares, J. M.; Peeters, F. J. J.; Ponduri, S.; Minea, T.; Bongers, W. A.; van de Sanden, M. C. M.; et al. Homogeneous CO_2 conversion by microwave plasma: Wave propagation and diagnostics. *Plasma Processes Polym.* **2017**, *14*, 1600120.

(11) Kundu, P. K.; Cohen, I. M. Buoyancy-Driven Exchange Flow through Small Openings in Horizontal Partitions; Elsevier: San Diego, USA, 1990.

(12) Peerenboom, K.; Khaji, M.; Degrez, G. Pooling through Cooling: Creating Optimal Vibrational Non-Equilibrium in CO_2 by Supersonic Expansion. J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys. **2017**, 50, 195201.

(13) Quaatz, J. F.; Giglmaier, M.; Hickel, S.; Adams, N. A. Large-Eddy Simulation of a Pseudo-Shock System in a Laval Nozzle. *Int. J. Heat Fluid Flow* **2014**, *49*, 108–115.

(14) Wilcox, D. C. Turbulence Modeling for CFD, 3rd ed.; DCW industries Inc.: La Canada, USA, 2006.

(15) Poinsot, T.; Veynante, D. Theoretical and Numerical Combustion; Edwards Inc.: Philadelphia, USA, 2005.

(16) Larsson, J. Numerical Simulation of Turbulent Flows for Turbine Blade Heat Transfer Applications. Ph.D. Thesis, Chalmers University of Technology, 1998.

(17) Pancheshnyi, S.; Eismann, B.; Hagelaar, G.; Pitchford, L. ZDPlasKin. http://www.zdplaskin.laplace.univ-tlse.fr (2008) (accessed August 2015).

(18) Berthelot, A.; Bogaerts, A. Modeling of CO_2 Plasma: Effect of Uncertainties in the Plasma Chemistry. *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.* **2017**, *26*, 115002.

(19) Berthelot, A.; Bogaerts, A. Pinpointing Energy Losses in CO_2 Plasmas - Effect on CO_2 Conversion. J. CO2 Util. **2018**, 24, 479–499.

The Journal of Physical Chemistry C

(20) Hagelaar, G. J. M.; Pitchford, L. C. Solving the Boltzmann Equation to Obtain Electron Transport Coefficients and Rate Coefficients for Fluid Models. *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *14*, 722–733.

(21) Phelps, A. V. Phelps Database from www.lxcat.net (retrieved Sept 4, 2014).

(22) Bogaerts, A.; Wang, W.; Berthelot, A.; Guerra, V. Modeling Plasma-Based CO_2 Conversion : Crucial Role of the Dissociation Cross Section. *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *25*, 055016.

(23) Berthelot, A.; Bogaerts, A. Modeling of Plasma-Based CO_2 Conversion: Lumping of the Vibrational Levels. *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.* **2016**, 25, 045022.

(24) Koelman, P.; Heijkers, S.; Tadayon Mousavi, S.; Graef, W.; Mihailova, D.; Kozak, T.; Bogaerts, A.; van Dijk, J. A Comprehensive Chemical Model for the Splitting of CO_2 in Non-Equilibrium Plasmas. *Plasma Processes Polym.* **2017**, *14*, 1600155.

(25) Suzuki, I. General Anharmonic Force Constants of Carbon Dioxide. J. Mol. Spectrosc. 1968, 25, 479–500.

(26) Herzberg, G. Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure: Spectra of Diatomic Molecules; Van Nostrand: New York, USA, 1950; Vol. 1. (27) Huber, K.; Herzberg, G. NIST Chemistry WebBook, NIST Standard Reference Database Number 69 Constants of Diatomic Molecules. http://webbook.nist.gov (retrieved Dec 4, 2013).

(28) Grofulović, M.; Alves, L. L.; Guerra, V. Electron-Neutral Scattering Cross Sections for CO₂: a Complete and Consistent Set and an Assessment of Dissociation. *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **2016**, *49*, 395207.

(29) Huber, K. P.; Herzberg, G. Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure IV: Constant of Diatomic Molecules; Springer US: New York, USA, 1979.

(30) Pitchford, L. C.; Alves, L. L.; Bartschat, K.; Biagi, S. F.; Bordage, M.-C.; Bray, I.; Brion, C. E.; Brunger, M. J.; Campbell, L.; Chachereau, A.; et al. LXCat: an Open-Access, Web-Based Platform for Data Needed for Modeling Low Temperature Plasmas. *Plasma Processes Polym.* **2017**, *14*, 1600098.

(31) Schwartz, R. N.; Slawsky, Z. I.; Herzfeld, K. F. Calculation of Vibrational Relaxation Times in Gases. J. Chem. Phys. **1952**, 20, 1591–1599.

(32) Kabouzi, Y.; Calzada, M. D.; Moisan, M.; Tran, K. C.; Trassy, C. Radial Contraction of Microwave-Sustained Plasma Columns at Atmospheric Pressure. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2002**, *91*, 1008–1019.

(33) Shapiro, A. H. The Dynamics and Thermodynamics of Compressible Fluid Flow; John Wiley & Sons, 1953; Vol. 1.

(34) Anderson, J. D. *Modern Compressible Flow;* McGraw-Hill Publishing company: New York, USA, 1990.

(35) Wegener, P. P.; Cagliostro, D. J. Periodic Nozzle Flow with Heat Addition. *Combust. Sci. Technol.* **1973**, *6*, 269–277.

(36) Fridman, A.; Kennedy, L. A. Plasma Physics and Engineering, 2nd ed.; CRC Press: Boca Raton, USA, 2011.

(37) Bruggeman, P. J.; Sadeghi, N.; Schram, D. C.; Linss, V. Gas Temperature Determination from Rotational Lines in Non-Equilibrium Plasmas: a review. *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.* **2014**, *23*, 023001.

(38) Park, C. The Limits of Two-Temperature Kinetic Model in Air. 48th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting Including the New Horizons Forum and Aerospace Exposition, Reston, Virginia, 2010; pp 1–13.

(39) Munafo, A. Vibrational State to State Kinetics in Expanding and Compressing Nitrogen Flows. *10th AIAA/ASME Joint Thermophysics and Heat Transfer Conference*, 2010; pp 1–24.

(40) Munafò, A.; Panesi, M.; Jaffe, R. L.; Colonna, G.; Bourdon, A.; Magin, T. E. QCT-Based Vibrational Collisional Models Applied to Nonequilibrium Nozzle Flows. *Eur. Phys. J. D* **2012**, *66*, 188.

(41) Matsuo, K.; Miyazato, Y.; Kim, H.-D. Shock Train and Pseudo-Shock Phenomena in Internal Gas Flows. *Prog. Aero. Sci.* **1999**, *35*, 33–100.

(42) Ikui, T.; Matsuo, K.; Nagai, M. The Mechanism of Pseudo-Shock Waves. Bull. JSME 1974, 17, 731-739.

(43) Barber, C. R. The Sublimation Temperature of Carbon Dioxide. Br. J. Appl. Phys. 1966, 17, 391-397.

(44) Hagena, O. F.; Obert, W. Cluster Formation in Expanding Supersonic Jets: Effect of Pressure, Temperature, Nozzle Size, and Test Gas. J. Chem. Phys. **1972**, 56, 1793–1802.

(45) Carbone, E. A. D.; Hübner, S.; Palomares, J. M.; van der Mullen, J. J. A. M. The Radial Contraction of Argon Microwave Plasmas Studied by Thomson Scattering. *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **2012**, 45, 345203.

(46) Goede, A. P. H.; Bongers, W. A.; Graswinckel, M. F.; van de Sanden, R. M. C. M.; Leins, M.; Kopecki, J.; Schulz, A.; Walker, M. Production of Solar Fuels by CO₂ Plasmolysis. *EPJ Web Conf.* **2014**, *79*, 01005.