Determination of aircraft gas turbine combustion engine nvPM charge state and its impact on sampling system losses

Authors: F, O, N, Lidstone-Lane¹. P, I, Williams^{1,2}. E, Durand³. M, Johnson⁴. A, Lea-Langton⁵. A, Crayford³. D, Kilic¹, G. McPherson³.

1. Department Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, M14 9PS, UK

2. National Centre for Atmospheric Science, Manchester, M14 9PS, UK

3. Cardiff School of Engineering, Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales, UK

4. Rolls-Royce plc, Derby, DE24 7XX, UK

5. School of Engineering, University of Manchester, Manchester, M14

28th ETH Nanoparticle Conference 2025



The University of Manchester



Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council









H Background

Aircraft nvPM emissions and regulations

- Aircraft nvPM emissions are damaging for the environment and public health.
 - > 16,000 premature death [1]
- Regulations used to measure, quantify, and reduce nvPM emissions.
- nvPM is very difficult to measure due to large particle losses.
- Corrections used to determine to 'real' engine exit nvPM concentrations.



Corrections contain various assumptions

Jonsdottir, H, R. et al. (2019). Non-volatile particle emissions from aircraft turbine engines at ground-idle induce oxidative stress in bronchial cells. Communication Biology. 2:90
Durand, E, F. et al. (2020). Experimental validation of thermophoretic and bend loss for a regulatory prescribed aircraft nvPM sampling system. Aerosol Science and Technology. 17(3):2012

Study on electrostatic loss

- Electrostatic loss accounts for below 3% in correction models.
- Conducted a laboratory study to try and test model assumptions and validate its use.
- Representative tubing and a range of particles and charge states where used.
- Large additional losses from electrostatic loss were observed.



But was this representative of aircraft nvPM charge?

1. Lidstone-Lane et al (2025). Experimental characterisation of electrostatic loss relevant to aircraft nvPM sampling. Aerosol Science and Technology. 59(1):79-95

nvPM charge – previous studies

- Combustion particles are generally considered to be highly charged bi-polar.^[1]
- Previous studies on diesel engine found nvPM to be highly charged bi-polar.
- Theoretical studies have shown the nvPM is highly charged bi-polar.
- Some studies have measured high ion concentrations in aircraft engine combustion test rigs and in exhaust plumes. [4]



- 1. Hinds, C, H & Zhu, Y. (2022). Aerosol Technology. Third Edition. Wiley. New Jersey, USA
- 2. Jung, H & Kittelson, D, B. (2007). Measurement of electrical charge on diesel particles. Aerosol Science and Technology. 39(12):1129-1135
- 3. Sorokin, A & Arnold, F. (2004). Electrically charged small soot particles in the exhaust of an aircraft gas-turbine engine combustor: comparison of model and experiment. Atmospheric Environment. 38:2611-2618.
- 4. Starik, A. M. (2008). Gaseous and particulate emissions with jet engine exhaust and atmospheric pollution. Advances on propulsion technology for high-speed aircraft. 1:1-15

nvPM charge – basic theory

Ion emissions from flames well known and generated through chemiionisation - bi-polar charge distribution expected."



1. Fiakow. (1997). Investigation on ions in flames. Progression in Energy and Combustion Science. 23:399-528

2. Burthscher. (1992). Measurement and characteristics of combustion aerosol with special consideration of photoelectric charging and charging by flame ions. Journal of Aerosol Science. 32(2):549-595





Test Rig – general charge measurement



Engines and fuels



Honeywell ALF502R-3 turbofan engine (502)

- Reverse flow annular combustion
- ➤ ~30 kN of thrust
- > 1 LP compressor

Honeywell LF507-1H turbofan engine (507)

- Reverse flow annular combustion
- ➤ ~31 kN of thrust
- > 2 LP compressor

Fuel

- Hawardan airport onsite JetA & SAF, Neste JetA & SAF
- ➢ SAF = 50% blended JetA + HEFA SAF

1. CFS Aeroproducts ltd. (2022). Engine manual ALF502R. CFS Aeroproducts ltd. Warwick, UK

2. AlliedSignals Aerospace. (1996). Engine manual KF507-1H. AlliedSignals Aerospace. New Jersey, USA

Test matrix and temperatures

			a). 502	[1]
Test Point	Engine Condition	Nominal Normalized Power [%]	900 800 700 500 600 800 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	
0	Ground Idle	4	400 -	
1	Idle	5	a 300 -	
2	Taxi	7	200 -	
3	Approach	30	100 -	
4	Approach (NO _x)	40	0 0 20 40 60 80 10 Normalised Power [%]	00
5	Cruise	70	Both up and down cycles.	
6	Climb	85		
8	Take-off	100	Engine temperatures recorded – assumed most relevant tei for charge is exhaust.	mpera

Test Rig – CFS Aero



















nvPM particle size distributions



JetA produced larger and more nvPM compared to SAF

Total charge fraction

507 significantly more variable – engine stability issues?



Charge increases with engine temperature

Size-resolved charge fraction – engine comparison

Shoulder present at lower sizes for 507



Increase in charge with engine power and size

Mean charge per particle

507 very variable – perhaps due to engine stability and rain ingested into the engine (humidity effects).



Increase in charge to positive with increase in engine power – due to increase in thermal ionization.

Charge becomes more positive with increasing power



- Implications

Implication of charged emissions



Increase in electrostatic loss mechanism causing an under-predicting of nvPM reporting.



Increased formation of contrails due to ions acting as centres for rapid concentration and coagulation of aerosol clusters from enhanced electrostatic effects.^[1]



Increase human uptake of nvPM particles through airways – negatively charged particles have been found to have enhanced penetration through mucus and into the deep lung.^[2]

^{1.} Yu, F & Turco, R, P. (1997). The role of ions in the formation and evolution of particles in aircraft plumes. Geophysical Research Letters. 24(15):1927-1930

^{2.} Zhu, J et al. (2024). Inhaled immunoantimicrobials for the treatment of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

Increased electrostatic loss?



Note these are only preliminary estimates – lots of assumptions!

- 1. Paper under review. Lidstone-Lane et al. (2025)
- 2. Lidstone-Lane. (2024). Particle transport and loss when sampling aircraft gas turbine combustion emissions. PhD thesis. University of Manchester.





Summary & future work

Summary:

- > Charge of two aircraft engine using four fuels was measured
- Increase in charge as particle size and engine power increased increase in particle size provided a better ability for the particles to carry charge.
- > Positive charge bias observed as engine power increased thermal ionization.
- Some indication of more electrostatic losses occurring.

Future Work:

- Investigate the charge state of the emissions produced in other combustors and engines particularly where larger exhaust temperatures are possible.
- Investigate the charge state of emissions through different lengths of sample tubing along with various distances inside of exhaust plumes.
- Separate polarities to investigate electrostatic dispersion more accurately

Q&A



Electrostatic dispersion prediction – bias

- Prediction of the electrostatic dispersion mechanism can be derived from electrostatic charge measurements of nvPM
- First: estimate the charged particle concentration bias, assuming the 1 charge per particle using electrometer current:

$$N_{bias} = \frac{i}{\bar{q} \cdot Q \cdot e}$$

Correct charged particle concentration bias to that of the engine exit – 25:1 dilution and estimated diffusional + thermophoretic loss of 20%



Large particle concentration bias at high engine power (exhaust temperature)

Electrostatic dispersion prediction - loss

- Now the electrostatic dispersion loss, through the transport tubing before the measurement instrumentation, can be estimated.
- > Assuming a tube ID of 10 mm, flowrate of 35 L/min, a tube length of 5 m, and all conditions at STP.
- > The particle concentration bias is taken as the probe inlet concentration

$$P = \frac{1}{1 + 4\pi Z e n_p^2 N_o t}$$

- $\label{eq:constraint} \begin{array}{l} Z = \text{Electrical Mobility} \\ e = \text{Elementary Charge} \\ n_p = \text{Number of Charges} \\ N_o = \text{Inlet Number Concentration} \\ t = \text{time in plug flow} \end{array}$
- > Note **stainless steel** tubing was used throughout all experimental setups.

Electrostatic dispersion prediction – loss (502)



- Problem bounded for high and lower power with the UTRC model electrostatic prediction included for comparison.
- Potentially around ~15% additional particle losses
- Most particle losses occur for small particles due to the balance between electrical migration (to wall) and momentum (to outlet).

ESTIMATION!! Lots of assumptions!!