# ISOTOPIC EXPERIMENTAL AND MODELLING STUDY OF ACETYLENE FORMATION IN A PLASMA REACTOR USING AN A.C CORONA DISCHARGE

T. Pham, T. Hoang, L.Lobban, and R. Mallinson

School of Chemical, Biological and Material Engineering University of Oklahoma 100 East Boyd St, Room T335, Norman, OK, 73019

## Abstract

The mechanism of  $C_2$  formation in methane conversion using plasma discharge has been studied by researchers around the world with ambiguous conclusions. Motivated by this challenge, this paper discusses the pathway of acetylene formation based on experimental results using deuterium isotope. Methane was fed with deuterium with a ratio of 1 to 5. Ethane and acetylene were also fed with deuterium at the same ratio (1 to 5) to study the composition of acetylene products. Experimental results suggest that ethane, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub>, was formed from the coupling of CH<sub>3</sub> radicals; C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> was formed from the coupling of CH<sub>2</sub> or CH and CH<sub>4</sub>; C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> formed involving C and C<sub>2</sub> radicals. Secondary dehydrogenation may also account for some production of ethylene and acetylene from ethane and ethylene, respectively, and is insignificant compared to the radical coupling mechanism. A modeling study was done to try comparing and explaining the experimental work, particularly in C<sub>2</sub> selectivity and acetylene formation. C<sub>2</sub> selectivity of methane conversion by non-thermal plasma has been found to be a function of the specific power input. At low power, ethane is the major product; while at high power, acetylene is mainly produced. However, in some cases even at low specific energy input (low temperature) and low electron density such as corona discharge, acetylene is still the main product. There are two parts of the model: plasma physics and free radical chemistry, the results showed that all  $C_2$ products are produced simultaneously from  $CH_x(x=0-3)$  radical's reactions at low temperature. The free radical distribution created initially from direct methane electron impact reactions depends on the applied reduced electric field strength (E/N): CH<sub>3</sub> radicals are the most abundant species at low E/N while C, CH, CH<sub>2</sub> radicals are present at high E/N (precursors of  $C_2$  radicals).

# Part I: Isotopic Study of Acetylene Formation

# Introduction

Natural gas has been considered a bridge energy source from fossil to non-fossil into the hydrogen economy. Methane conversion using cold plasma discharge has been under investigation by many scholars around the world<sup>1-6</sup>. In a plasma discharge, methane can be converted into many useful products such as hydrogen and  $C_2$ hydrocarbons, including acetylene, ethylene and ethane. The advantage of low temperature plasma methane conversion is that the products are not limited by thermodynamics indicating that a non-equilibrium composition of products can be obtained. The controlling factors, however, are the electrical parameters such as electric field, electron density and power consumption. Manipulating these factors might lead to better optimization of the system and control toward the desired products, for example hydrogen and ethylene.

The objective of this work is to have a better understanding of  $C_2$  formation pathway by studying the formation of acetylene that is the predominant  $C_2$  product observed in corona discharge. This is a building block that will further help understanding other product formation mechanisms when oxygen species such as steam, carbon dioxide and oxygen are present. The goal is to control the pathways to get the desired products with yields as high as possible and with low power consumption.

In this paper, a deuterium isotope  $(D_2)$  was used as a reactant fed with methane to trace the products and study their compositions from which the pathways of  $C_2$  formation can be determined. By deconvoluting the mass spectroscopic signals obtained from the product gas, the composition of the deuterated species was calculated, and its contribution to the underlying pathway revealed.

# Experimental

The reactor configuration is point-to-point with two electrodes placed vertically in a 10 mm-ID quartz tube. The gap between the electrodes is 5 mm. Discharge occurs between this gas gap when a sufficiently high voltage (2-5 kV) is applied to the system. The reactor configuration is summarized in Figure 1. Feed gas includes methane 99.9% (AirGas) and deuterium 99.6% pure (0.4% HD from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories, Inc.) Typical methane conversions and selectivities are shown in Table 1.

The power supply system includes an Elgar AC power supply model 251B, a Wavetek model 182A waveform generator, and a midpoint grounded Magnetec Jefferson high voltage transformer. The low side voltage is in a range of 40V-100V. Frequency can be varied from 100 Hz to 600 Hz; for this study the operating frequency is 300 Hz. The power analyzer includes a Tektronics TDS 754 oscilloscope, an A622 current probe and a P6139A voltage probe. Further experimental details have been described elsewhere<sup>18</sup>



Figure 1: Reactor configuration point-topoint with tubular reaction inside quartz wall

Table 1: Experiments of  $CH_4$  and  $D_2$  ratio 1:5 at 300 Hz, 5mm gas gap, 10 mm ID varying residence time

An MKS mass spectroscopy (MS) system model QMG 420 was used for the isotopic study. The product gas was analyzed with the MKS Quadruple Residual Gas Analyzer. The bulk chamber and vacuum pumps are from a preexisiting Balzer's unit. The data is analyzed using the PPT software package by MKS. The closed system pressure is  $10^{-7}$  Torr, while the operating pressure is desired to be in  $10^{-6}$ - $10^{-5}$  Torr. The mass spectrometer is connected after the Gas Chromatograph Carle Series 400 AGC, Model 04157 with a thermal conductivity detector, an HTS system for hydrogen separation and analysis.

#### **Results and Discussion**

### Methyl radical formation:

Experiments with methane and excess deuterium (ratio 1:5) as the feed were carried out and the MS signals of methane in the products were deconvoluted to show the isotopic distribution/composition. Methane compositions show about 90% CH<sub>4</sub> and about 10% isotopically substituted methane, the compositions of the methane isotopes are slightly higher in the order  $CH_3D > CH_2D_2 > CHD_3 > CD_4$  (Figure 2). This suggests that experimentally, the probability of formation of the radicals CH<sub>3</sub>, CH<sub>2</sub>, CH and C is in agreement with Hoang's calculations<sup>12</sup>, and Kado and Nozaki's work<sup>4,7</sup> where their concentrations are in the same order of magnitude for a corona discharge.



Figure 2: Methane composition after the reaction with methane to D<sub>2</sub> ratio 1:5 at 300 Hz 10mm ID reactor

The data for acetylene and its isotopes from these experiments are shown in Figure 3. The deconvolution finds that the composition includes  $C_2H_2$ ,  $C_2HD$  and  $C_2D_2$ . With a feed ratio of 5 to 1 of  $D_2$  to  $CH_4$ , the primary isotope of the acetylene species that is observed is  $C_2D_2$ . The composition of acetylene itself,  $C_2H_2$ , is very low compared to  $C_2D_2$  and also  $C_2HD$ . Also in Figure 3, it may be seen that as residence time increases, the  $C_2D_2$  composition decreases while  $C_2HD$  and  $C_2H_2$  compositions increase. This happens because at high residence time, more methane is converted and more hydrogen (H) is produced from that conversion (Table 1). More hydrogen can facilitate the incorporation of H into acetylene species either by CH coupling or  $C_2$  abstracting H. The increase in  $C_2HD$  composition may be due to higher CH radical composition and CH coupling with CD to form  $C_2HD$ . Higher CH results from the initial electron impact and also from C abstracting H.



Figure 3: Acetylene composition from 5:1 D<sub>2</sub>: CH<sub>4</sub> experiment at 300 Hz, 5mm gg, 10 mm ID reactor.

An argument may be made that the high composition of  $C_2D_2$  is just due to scrambling effects of high amounts of  $D_2$  with  $C_2H_2$  in the products. To check the scrambling effect of deuterium, acetylene  $C_2H_2$  was fed with  $D_2$  with a ratio of 1 to 5  $(C_2H_2: D_2)$  and the composition of the product gas was analyzed after the plasma was turned on. The experiment was repeated with varying total flowrates to give different residence times but keeping the same ratio of acetylene and deuterium. The results in Figure 4 show that  $C_2D_2$  is lowest in composition compared to  $C_2H_2$  and  $C_2HD$ . The total composition of the latter two components is less than 20% while composition of  $C_2H_2$  stays above 80% and  $C_2HD:C_2D_2$  ratio >1 with  $C_2HD$  being the primary (first) scrambling product. These results suggest that the extent of deuterium exchange is very low.



Figure 4: Acetylene and  $D_2$  experiment with 1: 5 ratio varying residence time at 300 Hz 10 mm ID

As previously discussed, the high  $C_2D_2$  composition among acetylene species is not due to scrambling effect. The formation of  $C_2D_2$  must be due to one or more of the following pathways:

(a)  $C_2D_4 \rightarrow C_2D_2$ (b)  $C + CD_3 \rightarrow C_2D_3$ ;  $C2D3 + D \rightarrow C_2D_2 + D_2$  (Hoang's model<sup>12</sup>) (c)  $CD + CD \rightarrow C_2D_2$  (CD coupling) (d)  $C + C \rightarrow C_2$ ;  $C_2 + D \rightarrow C_2D$ ;  $C_2D + D \rightarrow C_2D_2$  ( $C_2D_2$  via C and  $C_2$  radicals)

The objective is then to develop an understanding of the dominant pathways for acetylene and  $C_2$  formation by examining the production of the primary isotopic  $C_2$  products.

#### a. Dehydrogenation:

In order to study the formation of acetylene from dehydrogenation of ethane, an experiment with ethane and deuterium (ratio 1:5) was carried out to determine the acetylene isotope distribution compared to the methane with deuterium experiments. The results show that the major composition is  $C_2D_2$  and  $C_2HD$  with about equal probability, and the composition of  $C_2H_2$  is much lower, seen in Figure 5. If dehydrogenation of ethane to acetylene is the major route, the highest acetylene composition suggests that ethane must dissociate into CH or C radicals by electron impact; these radicals, then abstract the dominant D to form  $C_2D_2$  and  $C_2HD$ . The similar composition of  $C_2D_2$  and  $C_2HD$  may be due to the competing reactions that

include  $C_2$  abstracting D and CD coupling with CH. The rate constants for both reactions are in the same order of magnitude according to the NIST kinetics database<sup>15</sup>. Thus, the decomposition and radical combination pathway, rather than dehydrogenation, is the major route for forming acetylene from ethane. Also in these experiments, the methane selectivity is higher than acetylene selectivity. So the breakage of C-C bond produces substantial formation of methane by CH<sub>3</sub> recombination with H or D radicals and also confirms C-C bond cleavage.



Figure 5: Acetvlene deconvolution for ethane and deuterium ratio 1:5 at 300 Hz 10-mm ID

#### b. $C + CH_3$ combination:

Recent modeling results using a published hydrocarbon radical reaction mechanism (Hoang<sup>12</sup>) suggest that a major pathway is the coupling of C and CH<sub>3</sub> radicals. Forming  $C_2D_2$  by this pathway would require the coupling of C and CD<sub>3</sub> radicals:

 $C + CD_3 \rightarrow C_2D_3; C_2D_3 + D \rightarrow C_2D_2 + D_2$ 

Hoang's results<sup>12</sup>, however, are not consistent with the high composition of  $C_2D_2$  observed since it would require substantial  $CD_3$  radicals. Figure 3 shows the deconvoluted methane composition from the methane conversion experiments. The  $CD_4$  composition, formed from  $CD_3$ +D, is indicative of the relative amount of  $CD_3$  radicals and is relatively small compared to the more abundant isotopes including  $CH_3D$ . Acetylene formed via the pathway suggested by Hoang, with  $CH_3$  as the dominant inferred methyl isotope, would form  $C_2H_2$ .

This leaves two possible routes (c and d) forming  $C_2D_2$ : the route from CD radical coupling and the route from C and  $C_2$  radicals. The reaction rate constants for both are obtained from the NIST database<sup>15</sup>. The data suggest that these two routes may co-exist and compete to form  $C_2D_2$  with comparable rates. Further discussions and conclusions can be referred to the presentation.

## Part II: Modeling Study of C<sub>2</sub> Production Pathways

Conversion of methane to higher value commodities such as acetylene, ethylene, or hydrogen is of interest for monetizing some natural gas reserves. Low temperature plasmas have been found to have potential for smaller scale conversion processes. However, products of natural gas conversion are a mixture of ethane, ethylene, and acetylene. Ethane is non-reactive and primary used as a cracking feed, thus, low market value. Although both ethylene and acetylene are used as chemical feedstocks, ethylene is in much higher demand for polyolefin production and can be oligomerized to make fuels. Acetylene processes have disappeared primarily due to safety issue. Thus, control of selectivity to minimize ethane or maximize desirable ethylene remains to be achieved.

 $C_2$  selectivity from methane conversion by non-thermal plasmas has been found to be a function of the specific power input. Ethane is the main product at low power and acetylene is the main product at high power. However, in some cases, at low specific energy input (low temperature) and low electron density such as in a corona discharge, acetylene is the main product, with some disagreement on the proposed pathways.

The objective of this work is to understand the pathways controlling  $C_2$  selectivities through the development of a two part model: plasma physics and free radical chemistry. The plasma physics model solves the Boltzmann equation for the electron energies as a function of reactor geometry and reduced electric field by ELENDIF<sup>19</sup>. The reaction rate constants for electron impact reactions with methane are then obtained and calculation of rates of production of CH<sub>x</sub> radicals made.

$\mathrm{CH}_4$	+ e	$\Rightarrow$ CH <sub>3</sub>	+ H	+ e	$\varepsilon_{d1} = 9.0 \text{ eV}$	( <b>R</b> .1)
CH <sub>4</sub>	+ e	$\Rightarrow$ CH <sub>2</sub>	+ H <sub>2</sub>	+ e	$\varepsilon_{d2} = 10.0 \text{ eV}$	(R.2)
CH <sub>4</sub>	+ e	⇔ CH	+ H <sub>2</sub>	+ H+ e	$\varepsilon_{d3} = 11.0 \text{ eV}$	(R.3)
$CH_4$	+ e	⇔C + 2	2H <sub>2</sub> + e		$\varepsilon_{d4} = 12.0 \text{ eV}$	(R.4)

where  $\varepsilon_d$  is threshold energy for the dissociation processes

A free radical chemistry model based on the GRI combustion mechanism <sup>20</sup> is used to compute the C<sub>2</sub> pathways (Table 2). The results show that all C<sub>2</sub> products are produced simultaneously from  $CH_{x(x=0-3)}$  radical reactions at low temperature. The free radical distribution is created initially from direct methane electron impact reactions that depend on the reduced electric field (E/N): CH<sub>3</sub> radicals are the most abundant species at low E/N while C, CH, CH<sub>2</sub> radicals (precursors of C<sub>2</sub> radicals<sup>21</sup>) are prevalent at high E/N. High electric field operation (eg. 600Td) (small gas gap and sharp tip electrode) give a higher concentration of energetic electrons and reduce the wasted energy from vibrational excitation. The results of C<sub>2</sub> selectivities from the model are compared to experimental results (Figure 6). Coupling  $CH_3$  is the main path for ethane formation at low electric field; while coupling and hydrogen abstraction by the  $C_2$  radical formed from C + CH<sub>2</sub> coupling is the main production route for acetylene at high electric field (Figure 7).

In conclusion, the model shows that in non-thermal plasma, either ethane or acetylene is the favor product depended on electric field operating conditions. In order to maximize ethylene production, a catalyst may be used to selective hydrogenation acetylene. In fact, Gordon et al has successfully achieved ethylene production in corona discharge with Pd and Ag-Pd-Y-zeolite catalyst <sup>22</sup>



Figure 6 - C<sub>2</sub> product selectivity results in simulation and experiments



Figure 7 – Proposed pathway of C2 production in non-thermal plasmas of methane conversion

REACTIONS A(cm <sup>3</sup> /mol/s) b E (cal/mol/s)						
	Reaction	[ref]				
1	2H + M	$\Leftrightarrow$ H <sub>2</sub> + M	1 00E+18	-10	0	
2	$2H + H_2$	$\Leftrightarrow$ 2H <sub>2</sub>	9.00E+16	-0.6	ů 0	
3	H+CH	$\Leftrightarrow C + H_2$	1.65E+14	0.0	0	
4	$H+CH_2(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow$ CH <sub>2</sub> (+M)	6.00E+14	Ő	ů 0	
5	$H + CH_2(S)$	$\Leftrightarrow$ CH + H <sub>2</sub>	3.00E+13	Õ	ů 0	
6	$H+CH_3(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow$ CH <sub>4</sub> (+M)	1.39E+16	-0.5	536	
7	H+CH₄	$\Leftrightarrow$ CH <sub>3</sub> + H <sub>2</sub>	6.60E+08	1.6	10840	
8	$H+C_{2}H(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_2$ (+M)	1.00E+17	-1.0	0	
9	$H+C_2H_2(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_3$ (+M)	5.60E+12	0	2400	
10	$H+C_2H_3(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_4$ (+M)	6.08E+12	0.3	280	
11	H+C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub>	$\Leftrightarrow$ H <sub>2</sub> + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	3.00E+13	0	0	
12	$H+C_2H_4(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_5$ (+M)	5.40E+11	0.5	1820	
13	$H+C_2H_4$	$\Leftrightarrow$ C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> + H <sub>2</sub>	1.32E+06	2.5	12240	
14	$H + C_2 H_5(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow C_2 H_6  (+M)$	5.21E+17	-1.0	1580	
15	$H+C_2H_5$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H <sub>2</sub> + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	2.00E+12	0	0	
16	$H+C_2H_6$	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_5 + H_2$	1.15E+08	1.9	7530	
17	$C+CH_2$	$\Leftrightarrow H + C_2 H$	5.00E+13	0	0	
18	$C+CH_3$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + $\tilde{C_2H_2}$	5.00E+13	0	0	
19	CH+H <sub>2</sub>	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + CH <sub>2</sub>	1.08E+14	0	3110	
20	CH+CH <sub>2</sub>	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	4.00E+13	0	0	
21	CH+CH <sub>3</sub>	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub>	3.00E+13	0	0	
22	CH+CH <sub>4</sub>	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	6.00E+13	0	0	
23	$CH_2 + H_2$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + CH <sub>3</sub>	5.00E+05	2	7230	
24	$2CH_2$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H2 + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	1.60E+15	0	11944	
25	$CH_2 + CH_3$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	4.00E+13	0	0	
26	$CH_2 + CH_4$	$\Leftrightarrow$ 2CH <sub>3</sub>	2.46E+06	2	8270	
27	$CH_{2(S)} + H_2$	$\Leftrightarrow$ CH <sub>3</sub> + H	7.00E+13	0	0	
28	$CH_{2(S)}$ + $CH_3$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	1.20E+13	0	-570	
29	$CH_{2(S)}$ + $CH_4$	$\Leftrightarrow 2CH_3$	1.60E+13	0	-570	
30	$CH_{2(S)}+C_{2}H_{6}$	$\Leftrightarrow$ CH <sub>3</sub> + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	4.00E+13	0	-550	
31	$2CH_3$ (+M)	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_6$ (+M)	6.77E+16	-1.2	654	
32	$2CH_3$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	6.84E+12	0.1	10600	
33	$CH_3 + C_2H_4$	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_3 + CH_4$	2.27E+05	2	9200	
34	$CH_3 + C_2H_6$	$\Leftrightarrow$ C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> + CH <sub>4</sub>	6.14E+06	1.7	10450	
35	$C_2H + H_2$	$\Leftrightarrow$ H + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	5.68E+10	0.9	1993	
36	$C_2H_4$ (+M)	$\Leftrightarrow$ H <sub>2</sub> +C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub> (+M)	8.00E+12	0.4	86770	
37	$CH+H_2(+M)$	$\Leftrightarrow$ CH <sub>3</sub> (+M)	1.97E+12	0.4	-370	
38	$CH_2 + CH_2$	$\Leftrightarrow 2H + C_2H_2$	2.00E+14	0	10989	
39	CH + CH	$\Leftrightarrow C_2H_2$	5.00E+13	0	0	

Table 2 – The important reactions in plasma chemistry model - rate coefficient in form  $k = A x (T)^{b} x EXP(-E/RT)$ 

**Reactions involved with C<sub>2</sub> radicals** 

40	$C_2 + H_2$	$\Leftrightarrow$ C <sub>2</sub> H+H	4.00E+5	2.4	1000
41	CH+CH	$\Leftrightarrow$ C <sub>2</sub> +H <sub>2</sub>	5.00E+12	0	0
42	C+C+M	⇔C₂+M	3.00E+14	0	-1000
43	C+CH	⇔C2+H	5.00E+13	0	0
44	C+CH <sub>2</sub>	$\Leftrightarrow$ C <sub>2</sub> +H <sub>2</sub>	2.40E+12	0	980

[3]

## References

1. Eliasson. B, Liu. C.J, Kogelschatz. U, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 39, 1221 (2000)

2. Yang. Y, Plasma Chem. Plasma Proc. 25, 2, 327 (2003)

3. Yang. Y, Plasma Chem. Plasma Proc. 25, 2, 283 (2003)

4. Kado. S, Urasaki. K, Sekine. Y. Fujimoto. K, Nozaki. T, Okaraki.K, Fuel 82, (2003), 2291-2297

5. Larkin. D, PhD thesis dessertation, University of Oklahoma (2000)

6. Le. H, MS thesis dissertation, University of Oklahoma (2003)

7. Nozaki. T, Muto. N, Kado. S, Okazaki. K, Catal. Today 89, 57-75 (2004)

8. Fan. W.Y, Knewstubb. P.F, Kaning. M, Mechold. L, Ropcke. J, Davies. P.B, J. Phys. Chem. A 1999, **103**, 4118

9. Zhao, G.B., John, S., Zhang, J.J., Wang, L., Muknahallipatna, S., Hamann, J.C., Ackerman, J.F., Argyle, M.D., Plumb, O.A., *Methane Conversion in Pulsed Corona Discharge Reactors*, 2005, unpublished Reviewed Paper.

10. Billaud. F.G, Baronnet. F, Gueret. C.P, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 32, 1549 (1993)

11. Heintze. M, Magureanu. M, Kettlitz. M, J. of Appl. Phys. 92, 12, 7022 (2002)

12. Hoang. T, M.S Thesis Dissertation, University of Oklahoma (2005)

13. Kirikov. A.V, Ryzhov. V.V, Suslov, A. I, Tech. Phys. Letts. 25, 10, 794 (1999)

14. Caldwell. T.A, Mallinson. R.G, Lobban. L.L, Gordon. C.L, Howard. P.J, Book of Abstracts, 218<sup>th</sup> ACS National Meeting, New Orleans, Aug. 22-26 (1999) FUEL-093

15. NIST chemical reaction kinetics database, www.kinetics.nist.gov/index.php

16.Baulch. D.L, Cobos. C.J, Cox. R.A, Esser. C, Frank. P, Just. T, Kerr. J.A, Pilling. M.J, Troe. J, al., e., J. of Phys. and Chem. Ref. Data. **21** (3), 411-734 (1992)

17. Meites. L, Handbook of Analytical Chemistry, 1st Ed, New York, McGraw-Hill (1963).

18. Pham. T, M.S Thesis Dissertation, University of Oklahoma (2006)

19. Morgan, W.L. and B.M. Penetrante, *Elendif - a Time-Dependent Boltzmann Solver for Partially Ionized Plasmas*. Computer Physics Communications, 1990. **58**(1-2): p. 127-152.

20. GRI-Mech, http://www.me.berkeley.edu/gri\_mech/index.html. .

21. Smith, G.P., et al., *C-2 Swan band laser-induced fluorescence and chemiluminescence in low-pressure hydrocarbon flames.* Combustion and Flame, 2005. **141**(1-2): p. 66-77.

22. Gordon, C.L., L.L. Lobban, and R.G. Mallinson, *Ethylene production using a Pd and Ag-Pd-Y-zeolite catalyst in a DC plasma reactor*. Catalysis Today, 2003. **84**(1-2): p. 51-57.