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Abstract

This paper reviews the properties and application of di-methyl ether (DME) as a candidate fuel for compression-ignition engines. DME is produced by the conversion of various feedstock such as natural gas, coal, oil residues and bio-mass. To determine the technical feasibility of DME, the review compares its key properties with those of diesel fuel that are relevant to this application. DME’s diesel engine-compatible properties are its high cetane number and low auto-ignition temperature. In addition, its simple chemical structure and high oxygen content result in soot-free combustion in engines. Fuel injection of DME can be achieved through both conventional mechanical and current common-rail systems but requires slight modification of the standard system to prevent corrosion and overcome low lubricity. The spray characteristics of DME enable its application to compression-ignition engines despite some differences in its properties such as easier evaporation and lower density. Overall, the low particulate matter production of DME provides adequate justification for its consideration as a candidate fuel in compression-ignition engines. Recent research and development shows comparable output performance to a diesel fuel led engine but with lower particulate emissions. NOx emissions from DME-fuelled engines can meet future regulations with high exhaust gas recirculation in combination with a lean NOx trap. Although more development work has focused on medium or heavy-duty engines, this paper provides a comprehensive review of the technical feasibility of DME as a candidate fuel for environmentally-friendly compression-ignition engines independent of size or application.
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DME-fuelled vehicles is projected to be 22.5% and 19%, respectively [4]. This is comparable to LPG and compressed natural gas (CNG) fuelled vehicles but less than the highest energy efficiency of 26% in direct-injection (DI) diesel fuelled vehicles [4]. On the other hand, the well-to-wheels carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) emissions of a DME-fuelled vehicle is comparable to those using DI diesel or CNG fuelled engines [4]. However, an oxidation catalyst would be necessary to meet ULEV carbon monoxide (CO) and hydrocarbon (HC) emission limits [5].

DME was also found to be an excellent gas turbine fuel with emission properties comparable to natural gas [6]. DME-fuelled turbine also allows to achieve a significant performance improvement through thermochemical recuperation with 44% higher power output and an 8% decrease of the specific CO$_2$ emissions compared to the present plant [7]. However, DME is not a suitable fuel for spark-ignition (SI) engines due to its high cetane number, though the burning velocity is similar to hydrocarbon fuels [8]; the easily-induced knock would limit the operation of SI engines.
Overall, the key to the development of a dedicated low-emissions, DME-fuelled engine is the performance and durability of its fuel-injection system [1,2]. In this review, the features considered to be most important in developing the potential for widespread utilization of DME to reciprocating engines are: the production and properties of DME, the fuel-injection system and the spray characteristics which contribute to the engine’s performance and exhaust emissions.

2. DME properties

The key properties of DME and diesel fuel are shown in Table 1 [9,10]. In addition to the advantages above, it has a low carbon-to-hydrogen ratio (C:H) with a chemical formula of CH$_3$–O–CH$_3$ as shown in Fig. 1. DME in a gaseous state is invisible under standard atmospheric conditions (0.1 MPa at 298 K). When it is pressurized above 0.5 MPa, it condenses to the liquid phase. Gaseous DME is denser than air while liquid DME has a density two thirds that of water. The vapour pressure is similar to that of LPG and requires the same handling and storage precautions. It dissolves in water up to 6% by mass. However, it is not compatible with most elastomers due to its corrosiveness, so that careful selection of materials is necessary to prevent deterioration of seals after prolonged exposure to DME. The sealing of DME filled vessels, for example, can be achieved with inert material, such as polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE).

Table 1
Properties of DME and diesel fuel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property (unit/condition)</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>DME</th>
<th>Diesel fuel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>CH$_3$–O–CH$_3$</td>
<td>CH$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molar mass</td>
<td>g/mol</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon content</td>
<td>mass%</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen content</td>
<td>mass%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen content</td>
<td>mass%</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon-to-hydrogen ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical temperature</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical pressure</td>
<td>MPa</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.00$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical density</td>
<td>kg/m$^3$</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid density</td>
<td>kg/m$^3$</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative gas density (air = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cetane number</td>
<td>&gt;55</td>
<td>40–50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-ignition temperature</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoichiometric air/fuel mass ratio</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling point at 1 atm</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>248.1</td>
<td>450–643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthalpy of vapourization</td>
<td>kJ/kg</td>
<td>467.13</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower heating value</td>
<td>MJ/kg</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaseous specific heat capacity</td>
<td>kJ/kg K</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignition limits</td>
<td>vol% in air</td>
<td>3.4/18.6</td>
<td>0.6/6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of elasticity</td>
<td>N/m$^2$</td>
<td>6.37E+08</td>
<td>14.86E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinematic viscosity of liquid</td>
<td>cSt</td>
<td>&lt;.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface tension (at 298 K)</td>
<td>N/m</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapour pressure (at 298 K)</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Estimated on the basis of the equivalent chemical formula.

DME is non-toxic and environmentally benign. At low mole fractions (a few percent by volume) the gas has hardly any odour and causes no negative health effects. Even at high mole fractions (>10% by volume) there is no effect on human health except narcotic effects after long exposure and it may be recognized by the odour. DME displays a visible blue flame when burning over a wide range of air-fuel ratios, similar to natural gas, which is an important safety characteristic. Nevertheless, the operation of DME combustion system needs the adoption of rigorous procedures for safe operation due to the wide flammability limits.

The importance of the properties of DME can be identified by examining its advantages and disadvantages as a candidate fuel for replacing diesel fuel in compression-ignition (CI) engines.

2.1. Advantages

(i) **High oxygen content**: Together with the absence of any C–C bonds it is responsible for its smokeless combustion; low formation and high oxidation rates of particulates would therefore be expected under compression-ignition (CI) engine operation.

(ii) **Low boiling point**: Leads to quick evaporation when a liquid-phase DME spray is injected into the engine cylinder.

(iii) **High cetane number**: Results from the low auto-ignition temperature and almost instantaneous vapourization. Teng et al. [11] examined the high cetane number (>55) of DME from the viewpoint of its thermochemical characteristics. Its critical temperature, 400 K ($127^\circ$C) is lower than the compressed air temperature at the later stages of the compression stroke, which allows the DME injected into the cylinder to evaporate immediately. When the temperature of DME is higher than 400 K, it becomes superheated vapour and no evaporation is associated with the mixing. The chain combustion reaction, however, may be initiated by either (or both) of two competing path ways [12,13]:

(a) C–O bond fission (pyrolysis mechanism):

$$\text{CH}_3\text{OCH}_3 = \text{CH}_3\text{O} + \text{CH}_3$$

(1)
The C–O bond energy is smaller than that of the C–H bond (414 kJ/mol [14]) and the distortion of the C–O bonds in the DME molecule weakens the bonding strength; thus, the C–O bond breaks easier than the C–H bond. Therefore, the pyrolysis mechanism may be more able to start the chain reaction at relatively low temperatures, which would result in the low auto-ignition temperature. The physical delay of DME is thus much shorter than that for many conventional fuels, resulting in a shorter total ignition delay and a higher cetane number.

2.2. Disadvantages

(i) Low combustion enthalpy: Lower than that of diesel fuel due to the oxygen content of the molecules, which necessitates a larger injected volume and longer injection period for DME in order to deliver the same amount of energy to that provided by diesel.

(ii) Low viscosity: Lower than that of diesel fuel, causing leakage from the fuel supply system which relies on small clearances for sealing. Its lower lubricity characteristics can cause intensified surface wear of moving parts within the fuel-injection system which requires attention.

(iii) Low modulus of elasticity: Lower than that of diesel fuel, with the difference being greatest at lower pressures. Thus, the compressibility of DME is usually four to six times higher than that of diesel in a closed system and the compression work of the fuel pump for DME is greater than it is for diesel fuel by up to 10% in an open system [10].

3. Fuel specification and production

3.1. Fuel specification of DME

Recommendations have been made concerning permissible levels of impurities present in DME [2]. Most impurities are recommended to be negligible such that the proportions in mass are less than 0.05% for methanol, higher alcohols, higher ethers and ketones. Water is recommended to be less than 0.01% while methyl ethyl ether should be less than 0.2%. An odorant such as ethylmercaptane can be included up to 20 ppm.

3.2. DME production

DME has been produced world wide in quantities of 100,000–150,000 tonnes per annum from 1996 or earlier [1,2], and is used as a propellant for spray cans for cosmetics instead of chloro-fluoro-carbons (CFC’s). It can be produced from carbonaceous feedstock, both from fossil fuels like natural gas and renewable sources like wood. Its production method most closely resembles that of methanol. DME production methods are of the following type [1,2,15]

(a) De-hydrogenation of methanol
(b) Direct conversion from synthesis gas (syngas)

direct conversion from synthesis gas (syngas) which have essentially similar features.

Currently, most DME is produced by de-hydrogenation of methanol from syngas which is a mixture of hydrogen (H₂), carbon monoxide (CO) and carbon dioxide (CO₂), but may also contain impurities like methane (CH₄).

The direct conversion method is the simultaneous production of DME and methanol from syngas using appropriate catalysts. The first step of direct DME production is the conversion of the feedstock to syngas, most common by steam reforming of natural gas and for coal, oil residues and bio-mass by partial oxidation through gasification with pure oxygen. The second step for the direct route is via methanol synthesis using a copper-based catalyst while the third step is the de-hydrogenation of methanol to DME using alumina- or zeolite-based catalysts. With the direct conversion of syngas to DME, the second and third steps can occur simultaneously in one reactor using appropriate catalysts (different to those described above). The final step is the purification of the raw product, which may also contain some methanol and water.

Although it is possible to produce DME from both fossil and renewable sources, bio-DME is very attractive; however, producing DME from fossil sources is the only viable route at present from a cost perspective since bio-DME is very expensive relative to diesel fuel. Because natural gas at remote locations will, more likely, be the lowest-cost feedstock [4], the most cost-effective route for DME production is by direct synthesis of syngas (possibility with methanol as an intermediate step or co-product), from natural gas. From both the cost and product-yield points of view, the synthesis of DME directly from syngas may be the preferred route for large scale production. It has been claimed that DME produced from natural gas wells in Southeast Asia or the Middle East is economical enough [16] to be supplied at a lower price than diesel by up to 40% [17].

Increasing the purity requirements of the final product will increase production costs of DME. Nevertheless, it is still considered that DME, with its very low percentages of methanol and water, should not exhibit problems when used in internal combustion engines.

Flexible plants can be set-up to produce methanol and DME in different ratios, depending on the relative demand, so that a large production capacity can be realized in a limited amount of time. Converting a methanol plant to produce DME, besides building new DME facilities, is an attractive option for DME production. DME can also be produced in a coal-fired power plant and in plants close to urban or industrial areas, where waste-heat from the
production process can be used for heating or generating hot water.

4. Fuel-injection system

The features of a fuel-injection system for DME and the characteristics of the flow in the injector nozzle are different from those for diesel fuel due to the different physical and chemical properties. In what follows these features and a suggested appropriate fuel-injection system for DME are summarized.

4.1. Features of the fuel-injection system

(i) **Closed pressurized fuel system:** Because of the low boiling point of DME (248 K = −25 °C), it is a gas under standard atmospheric conditions and therefore must be pressurized in a fuel system, including a storage tank, and handled like a liquefied gas. Thus, the low boiling point of DME necessitates a closed pressurized fuel system. The vapour pressure of DME, roughly the same as LPG, demands the same kind of handling and storage considerations as for LPG.

(ii) **Cavitation in the fuel-injection system:** The high vapour pressure of DME means that cavitation, which prevents stable fuel-injection operation, is unavoidable in the fuel-injection equipment [2]. Although DME is kept in the liquid phase under atmospheric temperature conditions, when pressurized to above 0.5 MPa the fuel-supply pressure (the feed pressure from the storage tank to the fuel pump) must be between 1.2 and 3 MPa to avoid cavitation in the fuel line. This is the case not only because of the higher temperatures during engine operation, when the saturated vapour pressure of DME is higher, but also due to dynamic flow effects leading to the formation of vapour zones in the fuel line [12].

(iii) **Low injection pressure:** DME gasifies immediately during injection, due to its low boiling point, even though it is injected as a liquid. Therefore, the high fuel injection pressures, such as 50–150 MPa, used in modern diesel injection systems are not required for DME and there is a consensus that 20–30 MPa is sufficient as long as the required amount of DME can be supplied during the corresponding injection period even at high engine speeds [18].

(iv) **Leakage:** Because of its low viscosity, currently available fuel-injection systems are not suitable for DME due to leakage problems. Even at atmospheric conditions the leakage of DME can be significant in regions of small clearance such as between the plunger and barrel of a rotary-type fuel-injection system. Leakage rates of DME along the plungers, of up to 40–50% of the fuel, have been reported in the literature [12]. In heavy-duty engines, leakage along the plungers is more serious than in light-duty engines where the drive mechanism is engine-oil lubricated.

To prevent this, most sealing material made of conventional elastomers should be replaced with anti-corrosive material such as Teflon-coated o-rings or PTFE based high-tension sealing components, if there is an expectation for DME use in fuel-injection equipment to reach mass production [19].

(v) **Low lubricity:** The lower lubricity of DME than that of diesel fuel leads to wear problems. The lubricity can be enhanced with up to 2000 ppm of a lubricity additive; examples include Lubrizol (1000 ppm) [12], Hitec 560 (100 ppm) [9] and Infineum R655 (500 ppm) [15]. Even diesel fuel, di-methyl carbonate (DMC) and fatty acids have been suggested as viscosity enhancing additives [20,21]. However, it might be possible to adapt the materials of the bearing surfaces and plunger/barrel interfaces to the low lubricity of DME [1]. It is expected that the experience gained in the past with the use of methanol in fuel-injection systems will prove useful in developing a leakage-free and durable injection system for DME operating at injection pressures not exceeding 30 MPa [1], while current common-rail systems for diesel fuel could be adapted for DME with the use of lubricity additives at injection pressures up to 55 MPa [19].

(vi) **Long injection period:** The low liquid density and low calorific value require a higher volume of DME to be injected into the cylinder, compared with that for diesel fuel. In particular, 1.8 times the volume of diesel fuel is needed (to supply the same amount of energy) which necessitates a longer injection period and advanced injection timing.

(vii) **Large compression work:** The compression work of the fuel pump for DME will always be larger than that for diesel fuel, since DME has lower density and higher compressibility than diesel [11].

(viii) **Sealing material:** DME is not compatible with most elastomers and can chemically attack some commonly used sealing materials and other plastic components, raising questions about the durability of injection systems handling DME. A careful selection of sealing materials is necessary to prevent deterioration after prolonged exposure to DME. Sealing of DME-filled storage vessels and supply lines can, for example, be achieved with PTFE (as mentioned in Section 2).

4.2. Flow phenomena in the injector nozzle

The physical properties of DME give rise to different characteristics of the needle lift of the injector, of the pressure oscillation in the fuel line, and of the flow phenomena in the injector nozzle compared to those for diesel fuel. The flow in the nozzle is of prime importance with respect to the fuel-spray development and mixture preparation in the combustion chamber [9]. In particular flow cavitation in the nozzle orifice was found to play a crucial role in the formation of the emerging from the nozzle spray.
Needle lift behaviour: In view of DME’s lower modulus of elasticity compared to diesel, the needle lift profile of the conventional injector is expected to be different. With the resulting higher compressibility (relative to diesel) the nozzle opening stage is slower in the case of DME [22]. Kajitani et al. [23] suggested that the feed pressure is an important factor affecting the nozzle-opening time and that the nozzle opens earlier when the feed pressure is higher. With DME, the feed pressure in the fuel line is required to supply the fuel from the storage tank to the fuel pump. Thus due to the higher feed pressure of DME in the fuel line, the start of nozzle opening should be earlier for DME than for diesel fuel. Considerable residual needle bouncing was also observed with the low nozzle-opening pressure (6.86 MPa), because of the reduced spring preload on the nozzle needle. This is in contrast to the relatively well-defined injection behaviour at higher opening pressures (8.82 MPa) and, as a result, it has become necessary to optimize the injector specifications in order to prevent needle bouncing.

Pressure drop: In the case of DME, there is a considerable pressure drop across the valve seat due to the high fuel compressibility [22]. A loss of pressure across the valve seat reduces the pressure drop across the nozzle holes which, in turn, reduces the velocity of the injected spray.

Pressure oscillations and residual pressure in the injection line: After injection, DME exhibits larger pressure oscillations and a higher residual pressure in the injection line between the fuel pump and the injector, compared to diesel fuel [10]. The reason for the larger pressure oscillations with DME is believed to be its higher compressibility compared to diesel. A larger amount of energy is stored in the compressed DME than in the diesel fuel during the injection process which gives rise to larger pressure oscillations in the injection line; these slowly decay between injections giving rise to the high residual pressure.

Flow phenomena and flow rate in the nozzle orifice: Kapus and Ofner [9], using model orifice experiments and numerical methods, described the flow in the model orifice for DME to be in the gas–liquid two-phase regime. In contrast, the same analysis showed diesel fuel to exhibit both liquid single-phase and gas–liquid two-phase flow characteristics. For a high pressure drop between the inlet and the outlet edge of the orifice, gas bubbles emerging from cavitating locations with high fluid velocities and low static pressures (mainly at the inlet edges of the contraction) are mixed with the liquid to form an apparently homogeneous zone of gas and liquid. Once this zone covers the whole cross-sectional area of the orifice, the flow characteristics become independent of the back pressure. This means that, for a given inlet pressure, the flow rate can not be increased further by lowering the back pressure. In this case, complex gas-dynamic processes lead to an increase in the exit angle of the discharging spray.

4.3. DME fuel-injection system options

The two methods of developing a fuel-injection system for DME involve (1) modification of conventional pump–pipe–nozzle fuel-injection systems or (2) new system with a variable displacement pump or common-rail. In light-duty vehicles, it is common to use either dual-fuel or retrofit engines by converting existing pump–pipe–nozzle systems. However, in view of the high reliability requirements, this method is difficult to use and it is uncertain whether it can be applied in practice to light-duty vehicles [1,2]. State of the art common-rail diesel systems are also promising for implementation in passenger car engines operating with DME [18,22,23]; this is because these systems may require no more than 8 MPa injection pressure to operate satisfactorily. In heavy-duty vehicles, however, new dedicated DME fuel-injection systems are under development based on the common-rail concept. For demonstration purposes it is probably more cost effective to convert conventional fuel injection equipment [1]. On the other hand, Tsuchiya and Sato [18] found that an in-line fuel-injection pump (Jerk type) with conventional spring-loaded needle injector was more suitable than a common-rail system for heavy-duty DME engines due to the maximum injection pressure characteristics.

In order to meet future emissions legislation for vehicles, it is necessary to develop a fuel-injection system that is able to control injection timing, injection duration, quantity of injection and rate-shaping in combination with EGR systems. Injection rate-shaping which reduces the rate of injection during the ignition delay period, can decrease the rate of heat release just after ignition (‘premixed’ combustion) as well as the peak firing pressure and temperature in the cylinder, thus leading to NOx and noise reduction [5]. High EGR rates can also be employed due to the very low soot-producing capability of DME. It is considered that by optimization of the injection system at high EGR rates, NOx and PM can both be reduced simultaneously. For NOx reduction using a catalyst, post-injection after the main injection event is crucial for controlling the exhaust gas temperature and composition. This is important for new generation diesel engines equipped with storage type De-NOx catalysts which necessitates development of flexible multi-injection systems capable of variable post-injection patterns.

4.3.1. Common-rail system

A purpose-built common-rail fuel-injection system is probably the best solution for a dedicated DME engine [1]. The independence of injection pressure on engine speed gives a significant boost to the DI engine irrespective of the fuel used and allows optimization of injection timing, injection duration, rate of injection, and rate-shaping to be
achieved. AVL has developed a DME common-rail fuel-injection system with solenoid valves (which are three-way-valves) specifically for large truck and bus engines [24]. This system, which has leakage control with double seals and a purge system, has shown promising results for engine performance, exhaust emissions and safety in operation.

In order to accurately measure the rated injection of DME and to investigate the possibility of rate-shaping of the injection period, Ikeda et al. [25] connected an injection rate meter (based on the Zeuch method) to a common-rail fuel-injection system. It was shown that, if the dimensions of the measuring system are modified appropriately, the injection rate meter can be applied to the common-rail fuel injection system to characterize the DME injection pattern. The maximum injected quantity seemed to depend on the cavitation factor (number) in the case of DME. The cavitation factor was defined as the pressure drop of the nozzle normalized by the inlet pressure minus the vapour pressure [9,25]. They also suggested that multiple fuel-injection, including pre- and post-injection, was only possible by the use of a common-rail fuel-injection system. Ikeda et al. [25] calibrated and assessed the accuracy of the injection rate meter with multiple injection rates and quantities, including five-stage injection, and showed that the common-rail injection system was able to realize the required programmed injection accurately. Yu and Bae [19] also utilized commercial diesel common-rail and solenoid-driven diesel injectors for DME injection tests with the help of pneumatic pumps to compress DME up to 55 MPa. They measured DME injection rates from the solenoid injector using the so-called Bosch tube method based on the hydraulic pulse theory.

4.4. A liquid DME fuel tank

Although the DME tank could be designed similarly to those used for LPG, a low-pressure pump and cooling system would be needed between the DME fuel tank and the injection pump, further complicating the fuel design. To simplify the McCandless et al. [26] developed a liquid DME fuel tank by considering the thermodynamic behaviour of DME. The fuel tank, of cast aluminum with a capacity of 40 l, was essentially a thermodynamic pump containing two fluids: liquid DME and a vapour–liquid mixture of driving fluid (mainly propane) with a diaphragm separating the two fluids. The propane pressurized the DME into a sub-cooled-liquid state and functioned as a driving fluid that pumped the liquid DME from the tank to the injection pump by means of its vapour pressure.

5. Spray characteristics and combustion

5.1. Spray characteristics

When it is injected into the engine cylinder, DME vaporizes immediately due to its low boiling point at atmospheric pressure; as a result of its low critical temperature and critical pressure, the behaviour of liquid DME is sensitive to the in-cylinder thermo-dynamic conditions [11]. Investigations into the spray characteristics of DME have been carried out by various groups [9,10,19,23,27,28]. Wakai et al. [27] performed experiments using a Schlieren optical system on a DME spray injected by means of a diesel injector into a vessel in the low- to middle-pressure range of 0.1–1.5 MPa. Sorenson et al. [10] studied high-pressure liquid DME injection into a nitrogen environment at temperatures <413 K (40 ºC) and pressures of 1.5, 2.5, 4.0 and 5.5 MPa, using a lubricity additive to the fuel. Teng et al. [11] analysed the hydrodynamic behaviour of a DME spray in a DI diesel engine cylinder by referring to the investigations carried out by Glensvig et al. [28] and Sorenson et al. [10]. Kajitani et al. [23] observed sprays of DME at atmospheric pressure while Yu and Bae [19] characterized the injection rate and spray development with a common-rail system operating at pressures up to 55 MPa. The experimental conditions of these investigations are shown in Table 2 and the spray behaviour of DME can be classified according to the ambient pressure $P_a$ as explained and summarized below.

5.1.1. $P_a < \text{saturated vapour pressure of DME or low ambient pressure (0.1 MPa)}$ [19,23,27]

When DME is injected into a lower ambient pressure than its saturated vapour pressure, the pressure of the DME spray falls below the saturated vapour pressure and flash boiling occurs. Several rugged clusters have been observed at the peripheral region of the spray, when viewed on a relatively large scale, considered to be the vapour cloud. The tip penetration of the DME spray is less than or almost the same as that of a diesel fuel spray but a wider spray angle is observed with DME compared to diesel. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigators</th>
<th>Wakai et al. [27]</th>
<th>Sorenson et al. [10], Glensvig et al. [28], Teng et al. [9]</th>
<th>Yu and Bae [19]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Injection system</td>
<td>In-line type Bosch injection pump, single-hole-nozzle</td>
<td>In-line pump, single-hole-nozzle and pintle-nozzle</td>
<td>Common-rail, solenoid-driven injector five-hole mini-sac nozzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozzle diameter (mm)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve opening – or common-rail pressure (MPa)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13 at $P_a = 1.5$ and 2.5, 20 at $P_a = 4.0$ and 5.0</td>
<td>25, 40 and 55 (common-rail pressure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient pressure (MPa)</td>
<td>0.1 and 1.5</td>
<td>1.5, 2.5, 4.0 and 5.5</td>
<td>0.1 and 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient temperature (K) (ºC)</td>
<td>293 K (20 ºC)</td>
<td>413 K (38 ºC)</td>
<td>&lt;413 K (40 ºC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increased spread of the DME spray (wider spray angle and larger spray volume) is thought to be mainly due to the enhancement of fuel atomization by flash boiling and faster evaporation of DME.

5.1.2. Saturated vapour pressure of DME < $P_a$ < critical pressure of DME [10,11,27]

In this case the behaviour of the DME spray is similar to that of diesel fuel in terms of general shape. The tip penetration is less than or almost the same as that of the diesel fuel spray and the spray angle is greater than that of diesel fuel. The evaporation of the DME spray is more rapid than that of the diesel fuel spray and enhanced evaporation rates have been observed at higher pressures. Unlike a diesel fuel spray, the boundary of the DME spray seems to be irregular and this irregularity increases with increasing cylinder pressure. At cylinder pressures near the DME critical pressure, breakup of the DME spray occurs unlike the behaviour of the diesel fuel spray.

5.1.3. $P_a$ > critical pressure of DME [10,11]

When the pressure of DME droplets enters the supercritical region, the spray turns into a miscible turbulent jet (a single-phase phenomenon). In this case, the liquid–vapour interface disappears and the droplets spread to the neighborhood in an explosive way. The spray angle increases as the ambient pressure decreases, whereas a diesel fuel spray demonstrates the opposite tendency. The transition from a spray to a miscible turbulent jet may be encountered during the spray development. If the size of the droplets is small enough, the droplets may completely vaporize before reaching the spray tip due to the temperature distribution in the spray. In this case, during the spray development, the dispersing droplets may dominate the spray hydrodynamics in the early stages, while air entrainment may considerably affect the later stages of the spray evolution.

Wakai et al. [27] suggested that, in the low-pressure regions in the nozzle sac chamber and in the holes, cavitation in DME occurs more easily than in the diesel fuel. It was considered that such cavitation formation in the form of vapour bubbles can enhance the atomization of the DME spray and influence the spray characteristics. Kapus and Öfner [9] also suggested that complex gas–liquid two-phase dynamic flow with cavitation, may occur for DME which increases the exit angle of the discharging spray. The effect of cavitation on the enhancement of atomization and on the spray global characteristics for DME is still unclear.

Teng and McCandless [29] conducted a comparative study of the characteristics of diesel fuel and DME sprays under realistic engine conditions on the basis of momentum conservation. Their analysis revealed that the DME spray in the diesel combustion system may not develop as well as that of the diesel fuel at high engine loads and speeds due to the longer injection duration and increased spray angle. Being less dense and more volatile than diesel, DME has a higher gas-to-liquid density ratio in the spray, which also tends to increase the spray angle. Because of the large spray angle, the fuel-rich boundaries (due to the rapid fuel evaporation) of the DME sprays from the different nozzle holes tend to overlap under long injection duration and create strong swirl which is unfavourable for complete combustion. The characteristics of the DME spray suggest that the DME may need a larger combustion chamber for better mixing and combustion than diesel fuel. Fig. 2 shows typical DME spray images compared to diesel spray.

5.2. Spray combustion of DME [26–29]

Wakai et al. [27] also performed experiments on the spray combustion characteristics of DME, using a constant volume vessel at 3.1 MPa and 823 K, and found that the DME spray was ignited at 2.6 ms after the start of injection. The first ignition occurred around the middle portion of the spray, and the flame spread mainly in the downstream direction. The flame was non-luminous and light emission from the flame was very weak. Under lower ambient pressures (2.1 and 1.1 MPa), the ignition delay of the DME spray was shorter than that of a diesel fuel spray, whereas it was almost the same as the diesel fuel at higher ambient pressures (4.1 and 3.1 MPa). At an ambient pressure of 1.1 MPa, the DME spray could be ignited at temperatures >770 K, contrary to the diesel fuel which could not be ignited.

5.3. Numerical simulation of DME spray combustion

Numerical simulations of spray combustion for DME were carried out by Golovichev et al. [30,31]. Their numerical model was based on the KIVA-3 code, with modified sub-models accounting for spray atomization, detailed oxidation chemistry, soot formation and the effects of chemistry-turbulence interaction. The leading role of the methyl formate reaction path was recognized in the ignition process and the detailed chemical mechanism (43 species and 222 reactions), including soot formation, was used. The predictive capability of the model was evaluated through comparison of numerical and experimental data on liquid and vapour penetration and on ignition in a constant-volume chamber under diesel-like conditions for both n-heptane and DME. The predictions of the ignition point and delay time were found to be in agreement with the experimental data. The calculations showed ignition to start after evaporation of a major portion of the fuel which allowed an auto-ignition wave to propagate in a partially premixed mixture. The flame propagation process exhibited oscillatory characteristics where the auto-ignition kernels moved forwards and backwards, due to pressure waves and the cooling effect of the evaporating fuel. A high-temperature zone became visible in the central part of the spray. Simulation of an engine fuelled with neat DME was also carried out using the same CFD model. The DME fuel spray was rapidly atomised and vapourised. In the initial stage of
ignition the heat release zone appeared to be associated with a diffusion flame but later on the flame propagated in a partially premixed mixture. Under these conditions, the ignition mechanism showed the well-known two-step characteristics, with the maximum heat release taking place after TDC. Better performance and peak combustion pressures were demonstrated at lower injection pressures and reduced injection velocities (<170 m/s). The validation data for the CFD model was given by Zhao et. al [32]. Following this it was argue that the application of neat DME would require the development of low-pressure fuel-injection equipment, properly matched to the combustion system.

6. Engine performance and emissions

6.1. Exhaust emissions and fuel consumption

In previous investigations [3,5,9], it has been demonstrated that emissions of particulate matter (PM), NO\textsubscript{x}, and combustion noise from compression-ignition engines are significantly lower when DME is used instead of diesel fuel, while DME fuel consumption can be kept close to the DI diesel value on an energy basis. Fig. 3 illustrates some of the most recent data on brake specific fuel consumption (BSFC), NO\textsubscript{x} and CO\textsubscript{2} specific emissions for DME compared with diesel fuel from a six-cylinder 71 turbocharged/intercooled heavy-duty diesel engine operating in the Japanese JE-05 test mode [18]. The data demonstrates the reduction in NO\textsubscript{x} and CO\textsubscript{2} emissions that can be achieved with DME at a similar fuel economy. Smoke (PM) and THC together with NO\textsubscript{x} are shown in Fig. 4 from experiments obtained in a small single-cylinder engine of 638 cm\textsuperscript{3} [33]. The data in Figs. 3 and 4 show the reduction in NO\textsubscript{x} and particulate emissions that can be achieved with DME at equal power and torque and equal fuel economy. It can be argued that any particulate emissions come from the lubricant oil and not from DME. Because ignition delay is shorter with DME, NO\textsubscript{x} emissions should, in principle, be lower than those for diesel fuel.

6.1.1. Particulate matter (PM)

It is well known that soot is formed in fuel-rich regions under high temperature conditions. The precursors of soot...
are unsaturated hydrocarbons such as acetylene (C₂H₂), ethylene (C₂H₄), and propargyl (C₃H₃), found in diesel combustion products [34]. The proportion of fuel carbon forming soot precursors has been found to decrease with increased oxygen content in the fuel [34] and with decreased number of C–C bonds [35].

The effect of oxygen content in the fuel on the PM from a diesel engine was investigated experimentally by Miyamoto et al. [36]. The PM emissions reduced from the value for conventional diesel fuel with no oxygen content to less than 2% of that value when the oxygen content of the fuel was 25–30% by mass. Curran et al. [37] showed the influence of the oxygen content of fuels on the production of soot precursors using a detailed chemical kinetic model; the calculated values of the soot precursors decreased with increased oxygen content in the fuel. Therefore, it can be concluded that the soot formed in DME combustion should be almost zero at an oxygen content of 35% and no C–C bonds. This implies that DME-fuelled engines would not need a particulate filter in the aftertreatment system. Sidhu et al. found in [38] that DME yields much lower particulates (0.026%) than other fuels under compression-ignition conditions such as diesel (0.51%), biodiesel (0.52%) and CNG (0.30%). A DME-fuelled engine was also found to have in the exhaust gas higher (71%) soluble organic fraction (SOF) than in a diesel (20%) of total carbon.

### 6.1.2. NOₓ

Comparative values of NOₓ emissions from DME CI engines and those from diesel fuel seem to vary depending on the engine conditions and the fuel supply system, according to various sources in the literature. NOₓ was found to be lower with DME than with diesel fuel [3,9], which was attributed to the shorter ignition delay for DME than for diesel, the smaller amount of fuel injected during the ignition delay period and the smaller amount of fuel burned during the pre-mixed burning phase. The initial enthalpy change was thus lower, resulting in a reduction of the peak combustion temperature. However, it is possible that higher NOₓ can be produced from DME than from diesel fuel for an early start of injection since the duration of the peak combustion temperature would be
longer in the initial combustion period due to the shorter ignition delay of DME [39]. When injection retardation is optimized for each fuel, NO\textsubscript{x} from DME is lower than from diesel fuel [39,40]. Teng et al. [11] suggested that, although DME is an oxygenated fuel, the release of free oxygen is very limited as revealed by chemical kinetics calculations [12] which makes the effect of the oxygen content in DME on NO\textsubscript{x} formation insignificant. Egnell [22] studied NO\textsubscript{x} formation for DME using a reaction enthalpy analysis, by maintaining similar injection conditions for DME and diesel fuel. It was shown that the rate of reaction is not fundamentally different for DME and diesel fuel under these conditions. One explanation for the lower NO\textsubscript{x} emissions with DME, when compared to diesel fuel injected at considerably higher oxygen levels, was that the local equivalence ratio was higher for DME, giving a lower local oxygen concentration and thus NO\textsubscript{x} levels. It was suggested that because the gaseous specific heat capacity of DME is higher than that of diesel fuel, the adiabatic flame temperature for DME is slightly lower than for diesel fuel (represented in this analysis by dodecane). This resulted in the proposition that lower NO\textsubscript{x} emissions for DME should be expected if all other conditions are identical; this could again be explained by the lower rate of energy release [41]. A zero-dimensional multizone model has also been implemented to qualitatively simulate model the combustion characteristics of DME within a compression-ignition engine with particular reference to NO\textsubscript{x} formation; the predictions indicated that DME forms less NO\textsubscript{x} than diesel fuel [42,43].

Exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) reduces both burned gas temperature and NO\textsubscript{x} formation inside the burned gas region. DME engines allow a higher EGR rate for NO\textsubscript{x} reduction without being restricted by the NO\textsubscript{x}-soot tradeoff, because DME has a high cetane number and fuel droplets in a DME spray within the engine cylinder evaporate – about three times faster than diesel fuel [44]; further NO\textsubscript{x} reduction can be achieved with higher EGR rate [45]. Teng and McCandless [46] found that “engine-out” NO\textsubscript{x} emissions were less than the 2007 regulated level during tests in a heavy-duty truck engine. The longer injection duration for DME with current fuel-system technology was, however, unfavourable for NO\textsubscript{x} reduction; to prevent this a multiple-injection strategy was proposed [47].

6.1.3. HC and CO

Table 3 shows HC and CO emissions in the literature from CI engines fuelled with DME, compared to those with diesel fuel. It can be seen that HC emissions from DME are usually lower than or equal to those from the combustion of diesel fuel; HC emissions consist of partially or completely unburned fuel, produced in locations where combustion takes place under fuel-rich conditions, due to incomplete air-fuel mixing. Teng et al. [11] explained that, because DME has a short ignition delay period, the over-rich and over-lean mixture regions formed during the ignition delay period might be smaller, resulting in significantly reduced HC emissions. It should be added that DME is an oxygenated fuel containing 35% by mass of oxygen, has good mixing characteristics and is a superheated vapour after entering the engine cylinder. The volume of fuel-rich regions existing during the combustion period could thus be less, resulting in reduced HC emissions.

The data of CO emissions show some contradictions depending on the engine system and operating conditions. The higher CO emissions sometimes associated with DME could result from the longer injection duration, coupled with lower injection pressures and larger spray holes. Since there is production of CHO and CH\textsubscript{2}O involved in the combustion of DME, depending on the reaction process, a larger amount of CO may be produced compared with diesel fuel [24]. Impingement of the DME fuel spray on the cooled combustion chamber wall could raise HC and CO emissions by quenching the DME reaction process [48]. CO may also be produced in locations of over-lean conditions. Due to the faster evaporation and better mixing with air, despite the shorter ignition delay for DME, more over-leaning can occur and, if the local equivalence ratio becomes too low to support combustion, an increase of CO emissions may result. Higher emissions of CO and HC have been reported along with lower NO\textsubscript{x} in many investigations [49–53].

On the other hand, DME has good mixing characteristics, so that the locations of the fuel-rich regions in the combustion period could be reduced, resulting in lower CO emissions [11]. Egnell [22] argued that the lower emissions of HC and CO are linked to the structure of the DME molecule, similarly to soot formation. The low C/H ratio, the lack of C–C bonds and the high oxygen content of

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Test condition</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>McCarthy et al. [54]</td>
<td>ECE R49 13-mode cycle – estimation</td>
<td>Almost equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Kajitani et al. [39]</td>
<td>Steady-state test</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Kajitani et al. [23]</td>
<td>Steady-state test</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Egnell [22]</td>
<td>Steady-state test</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the fuel should give faster and more effective oxidation of
intermediate species. The interaction between fuel-injection
system behaviour and the combustion chamber design
should be optimized to minimize HC and CO emissions.
HC and CO could nevertheless be treated relatively easily
with an oxidation catalyst in the aftertreatment system.


Since ignition delay is shorter for DME than for diesel,
the pressure rise for DME during the premixed burning
stage is slower than with diesel fuel which results in reduced
combustion noise.

6.1.5. Non-regulated exhaust emissions

It is likely that some formaldehyde (CH$_2$O) is formed
during combustion of DME in a CI engine, but significant
emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), polycyclic aromatic
hydrocarbons (PAH) and benzene, toluene and xylene
(BTX) are expected. The formaldehyde emissions could
be 1–10% of the non-methane hydrocarbon emissions
[1,35]. Aldehydes may also be high because associated
CO emissions are high, although formaldehydes can be eas-
ily reduced by oxidation catalysts to a negligible level [55].

6.2. Effect of fuel-injection equipment (FIE) and
combustion system parameters

The effect of the fuel-injection equipment and combus-
tion system parameters on fuel consumption, NO$_x$
emissions and combustion noise has been investigated for
various DME-fuelled engines [5,9,18,36,56]. The parame-
ters examined included injection pressure, start of injection,
rate of injection, compression ratio, piston-bowl shape and
EGR level; each of these parameters is examined later on.
Fig. 5 shows an example of exhaust emissions affected by
injection pressure [18].

Optimization of these parameters for a DME-fuelled
engine (single cylinder, 2 l) equipped with a pintle nozzle
injector and EGR [9] achieved combustion noise of about
76 dB(A) at both part load (IMEP = 0.2 MPa) and full
load (0.75 MPa). On the other hand, for diesel fuel without
EGR the noise levels were 80 dB(A) at part load and
86 dB(A) at full load. NO$_x$ emissions were below 2 g/
kWh, i.e. over 50% lower than for diesel, when the fuel con-
sumption for DME was almost equal to that of diesel fuel.

For a DME-fuelled engine (four cylinder, 2 l) equipped
with a five-hole injector nozzle and no EGR [5], although
the fuel consumption was slightly higher at higher load
than with diesel, the NO$_x$ emissions were over 50% lower.
At full load, the combustion noise reached levels of about
80–82 dB(A), about 10% lower than diesel fuel.

(i) Injection pressure: It was found that higher injection
pressures, between 19 and 25 MPa, degraded fuel
economy and increased CO and THC emissions in
a heavy-duty engine (1.15 l/cylinder) equipped with
a jerk pump type FIE, as shown in Fig. 5 [18]. How-

ever, another investigation with a common-rail sys-
tem in a smaller engine (0.5 l/cylinder) showed an
opposite trend [56] i.e. that higher injection pressure
in the range 25–55 MPa, improved fuel economy with
comparable or even reduced CO and THC emissions.
Kook et al. [56] showed that the implications of better
mixing between DME and air through higher injec-
tion pressure are higher power output but higher
NO$_x$; the higher the injection pressure of DME
(between 20 and 55 MPa of common-rail pressure),
the higher was the IMEP, due to the improvement
of the atomization process and mixing over a wide
range of injection timings.

On the basis of the above it is hard to ascertain the
effect of injection pressure and further investigation
is needed for different fuel-injection equipment of
parameters such as the injector geometry and the
interaction between the emerging sprays, the in-cylin-
der flow and the combustion chamber geometry.

(ii) Start of injection: Retardation of the start of injection
led to a reduction of NO$_x$ emissions and combustion
noise, but deterioration of the fuel consumption and
increased CO emissions [9].

(iii) Nozzle type: The change of nozzle configuration,
from needle-hole nozzle to pintle nozzle, not only
changed the spray formation but also the injection
process or the rate-shaping of injection. It was shown
that the nozzle type should be matched to the engine design for better fuel distribution and mixing, which would in turn increase power output and reduce exhaust emissions.

(iv) Injection process: Rate shaping of injection [5,9] was carried out using multiple injections. With pilot-injection both NO\textsubscript{x} emissions and combustion noise decreased while fuel consumption increased. As the amount of fuel injected during the initial part of the injection period decreased, combustion noise also decreased. The increase of injection pressure later on further decreased combustion noise over the whole load region.

(v) Number of nozzle holes for a multi-hole nozzle: Three- and seven-hole nozzles were used as alternative configurations to the standard five-hole nozzle in multi-hole nozzles [5]. With the three-hole nozzle, NO\textsubscript{x} emissions were slightly lower than with both the five- and seven-hole nozzles but fuel consumption deteriorated considerably at higher loads. With the seven-hole nozzle, fuel consumption was improved at higher loads due to the better fuel distribution in the combustion chamber but combustion noise increased considerably. It was concluded that the five-hole nozzle was the optimum configuration for DME.

(vi) Intake swirl level: Kapus and Ofner [9] found that swirl flow in the combustion chamber was not necessary with DME because of its fast rate of evaporation and good mixing with air. When the swirl level decreased from 1.8 to 0.1 (AVL swirl number) the wall heat-transfer rate was also reduced due to the weaker air motion in the combustion chamber, resulting in lower fuel consumption. Combustion noise was also reduced with the reduced charge motion.

(vii) Compression ratio (CR): With higher CR, ignition delay was reduced and the amount of fuel burnt during the initial energy release decreased, causing a less-rapid pressure rise in the cylinder. Both NO\textsubscript{x} and combustion noise were correspondingly reduced.

(viii) EGR: NO\textsubscript{x} emissions from DME combustion, similarly to other engine fuels, decreased with increased EGR rate, although CO and HC emissions became higher and fuel consumption increased with higher EGR. EGR is an ideal mechanism, especially at low loads, for decreasing NO\textsubscript{x} emissions in DME engines, due to the smoke-free combustion. At high loads, CO emissions limit the use of EGR for normally aspirated engines as the air-excess ratio, which is already at a low level, is further reduced by EGR.

(ix) Piston-bowl shape: It is generally desirable in engines with a piston-bowl configuration that spray-wall wetting (or spray-wall impingement) should be minimized in order to allow low exhaust emissions, combustion noise and fuel consumption. Kapus and Ofner [9], found that, with respect to combustion noise and CO emissions, a normal piston-bowl (without a central cone) was better than a re-entrant bowl for the case of a pintle nozzle injector. Kapus and Cartellieri [5] also found that, with respect to fuel consumption, a wide shallow bowl offered more advantages than a narrow deep bowl when a multi-hole nozzle was used.

7. Energy efficiency and well-to-wheels emissions

7.1. Well-to-wheels analysis

The well-to-wheels energy efficiency is estimated as the product of the energy efficiency of each individual utilization step. The well-to-filling station step includes the recovery and transport of the feedstock, fuel production and fuel distribution efficiency. For the production of DME and methanol, it is assumed for financial reasons that remotely located gas sites are used. Since waste heating from the fuel production cannot be recovered for district heating, the efficiencies of the fuel production are relatively low. Consequently, the well-to-filling station energy efficiency for DME and methanol are among the lowest. Energy efficiency for the vehicle includes engine efficiency, transmission efficiency and a weight assessed correction factor. Furthermore, the well-to-wheels CO\textsubscript{2} emissions are determined by the CO\textsubscript{2} emissions during the production and distribution of the fuel, the CO\textsubscript{2} produced during the combustion of the fuel, and the overall vehicle efficiency. The CO\textsubscript{2} emissions during fuel production are primarily determined by the energy supplied for the production of the fuel but CO\textsubscript{2} can also be emitted due to molecular changes in the process of making fuel from the relevant feedstock. The emissions of CO\textsubscript{2} during combustion are determined from the carbon content of the fuel and its lower heating-value. Detailed analyses can be found in [1,4].

Table 4 shows the well-to-wheels energy efficiency and CO\textsubscript{2} emissions of both light-duty vehicles (LDV) and heavy-duty vehicles (HDV). The well-to-wheels energy efficiency of DME-fuelled vehicles is generally comparable to that of the LPG and CNG fuelled vehicles, while the energy efficiency is the highest for DI vehicles operating with diesel fuel. The well-to-wheels CO\textsubscript{2} emissions of DME-fuelled vehicles are comparable to those with DI diesel engines and CNG fuelled engines. Amongst the fossil fuel derivatives, diesel and DME from natural gas have the lowest well-to-wheels CO\textsubscript{2} emissions. As expected the fuels produced from renewable feedstock have very low well-to-wheel CO\textsubscript{2} emission levels.

7.2. Assessment of emissions by the sustainable process index

The overall ecological impact of a fuel can be judged by considering other emissions such as NO\textsubscript{x}. Ofner et al. [24] carried out an ecological assessment of DME as a fuel, using the sustainable process index (SPI) proposed by Krotscheck and Narodoslawsky which takes into account
both CO₂ and NOₓ emissions. The concept of the SPI is based on a comprehensive knowledge of the interactions of human-induced mass and energy flows with those of the environment although this comprehensive knowledge does not really exist. With respect to fuels, the SPI is calculated by comparing the natural carbon flow of the life-cycle of the fuel to the human-induced carbon fuel flow. The natural carbon flow for fossil fuels is taken as the rate of carbon sedimentation in the oceans. The carbon flow in the natural cycle can be expressed in terms of the area required for circulation of a kg of carbon per year; for bio-fuels, this area amounts to approximately 7 m². For fossil fuels, sedimentation to accumulate 1 kg of carbon requires approximately 500 m². Thus, the natural carbon flow for fossil fuels is approximately 70 times lower than for bio-fuels. This method transforms the carbon flow estimate into ‘area-year’ in terms of square meters annual (m²a). If an amount of carbon, say in wood, is used for providing energy of 1 kWh at the end use, the carbon flow during production, combustion and utilization of the fuel and the corresponding assimilation by trees, can be expressed in terms of ‘area-year’ per kWh.

Fig. 6 shows the SPI in terms of m²a/kWh-wheel for different fuels [24]. It is evident that the CO₂ emissions of fossil fuels contribute significantly to the SPI. DME produced from natural gas has a 10% lower overall impact compared to diesel EUROIII because of the reduced NOₓ emissions.

The main advantage of DME is that it can be produced from both fossil and renewable resources. DME produced from renewable feedstock can be added to the DME produced from natural gas without any change of the fuel properties. As a result the overall environmental impact shifts between the values of the fossil and bio-genic primary energy source (e.g. wood) in proportion to the relative mixture ratio. From Fig. 6, it can be deduced that 17% of DME must be produced from wood in order to lower the SPI to the CNG level [24].

8. New DME concept engine

With the objective of improving both engine thermal efficiency and exhaust emissions, several new engine-design concepts such as low compression ratio DI diesel engines and homogeneous charge compression ignition (HCCI) engines have been investigated using DME as an alternative fuel.

Kajitani et al. [33] investigated the concept of using DME as fuel in a direct-injection compression-ignition engine with a low compression ratio, in an effort to identify a combustion regime with the highest possible thermal efficiency. It was shown that:

(i) The lowest compression ratio for easy start and stable operation of a small passenger-car engine was around 12:1.
(ii) The DME-fuelled engine was superior to the conventional diesel engine in terms of thermal efficiency, exhaust emissions and engine noise.
(iii) The ignition delay became longer with a reduction in compression ratio from ~18 to 12.
(iv) The brake thermal efficiency, THC and CO emissions as well as engine noise for DME remained almost constant over this compression ratio range.

![Fig. 6. Sustainable process index (SPI) for various fuels [24].](image-url)
Lowering the compression ratio allowed reduction of the peak firing pressure in the cylinder. Consequently, engines could be designed with a lighter structure than current diesel engines and lower cost. By combining low compression ratio with rate-shaped injection, NO\textsubscript{x} emissions, peak firing pressure and noise could all be further reduced.

There is consensus that the HCCI engine has great potential to simultaneously provide high thermal efficiency, low combustion noise, lower NO\textsubscript{x} levels and soot-free combustion. On the other hand, it appears to be limited to lighter load operation, exhibit difficulty of controlling ignition timing and produce more unburned HC emissions. The HCCI engine is yet in the laboratory research phase owing to the difficulty of making it appropriate for mass production in the transportation sector. To address the problems of the HCCI engine and to overcome future emission legislation limits for vehicle operation, investigations into fuel property and quality (including DME) are being conducted. Since DME injected into the cylinder as a liquid quickly evaporates, it is likely that a homogeneous air–fuel mixture can be more easily formed. Rapidly evaporating DME showed near zero PM and NO\textsubscript{x} emissions without power loss, due to the advantage of no wall-wetting [56]. DME was found to achieve HCCI operation with a diesel FIE system without engine modification. Combustion phasing could be controlled with either EGR or by the addition of high-octane/low-cetane fuels such as alcohols, methane and hydrogen, through suppression of the OH radical production in the premixed charge [57,58].

Takatsuto et al. [59] experimentally investigated auto-ignition and combustion characteristics in homogeneous lean mixtures. Auto-ignition was realized for DME over a wide equivalence ratio range compared to n-butane. NO\textsubscript{x} emissions with DME were much lower than those with n-butane and THC concentrations were also low. For DME, auto-ignition and combustion were always found to include high and low temperature reactions, at all equivalence ratios, which were analysed through various simulation and diagnostics tools [60–63]. Since DME has a high cetane number and fuel drops in the DME spray within an engine cylinder evaporate about three times faster than diesel fuel, low-temperature combustion may be more appropriate for DME engines. This could be achieved by using a multiple-injection strategy with timing for the primary injection determined by the cylinder temperature [46]. DME as an additive or an ignition enhancer even enables the use of various other fuels for conventional diesel combustion, dual-fuel operation and HCCI operation. Propane or LPG, hydrogen and natural gas have all been tested as alternatives to diesel with the assistance of DME [22,49,64–68].

It is also expected that by employing the Miller cycle at low loads and a multiple injection strategy at high loads, combined with a high EGR rate, may allow NO\textsubscript{x} emissions from DME engines to meet the US 2010 standard [46].

9. Summary

Numerous investigations of DME-fuelled engines have indicated that it offers excellent promise as an alternative fuel for compression-ignition operation in the automotive sector.

DME is a liquefied gas that can be produced from a variety of feed stock, is non-toxic and environmentally benign. DME is as easy to handle as LPG since it is condensed by pressurizing above 0.5 MPa. DME’s main feature as an efficient alternative fuel for use in compression-ignition engines is its high cetane number. The fast evaporation of DME can lead to better mixing with air in the engine cylinder and its high oxygen content can achieve smokeless combustion through low formation and high oxidation rates of particulates. However, DME requires a higher injected volume to supply the same amount of energy as the diesel fuel, due to its lower density and combustion enthalpy. DME-fuelled systems also need lubricity-enhancing additives and anti-corrosive sealing materials to secure leakage-free operation.

The DME spray characteristics and combustion process have been investigated for various fuel-injection equipment, ranging from mechanical pump systems to advanced common-rail systems, in a variety of prototype engines with occasional slight modifications. These engine tests with DME proved its potential as a clean alternative fuel achieving smoke-free high power operation provided an optimized fuel injection equipment and the engine configuration are closely matched to reduce fuel consumption and exhaust emissions. Optimisation of the fuel injection equipment, overcoming the problem of low density, low lubricity and corrosiveness, may allow mass production of the DME-fuelled compression-ignition engines when adequate DME supplies become available in the market.

It can be argued however that the well-to-wheels energy efficiency and CO\textsubscript{2} emissions for DME produced from natural gas are not better than for most other fuels, as a result of the high fuel production energy and relevant CO\textsubscript{2} emissions, and that diesel fuel has the highest well-to-wheels energy efficiency. Nevertheless, DME has the advantage that it can be produced from both fossil and renewable resources. DME produced from renewable feedstock may be added to that produced from natural gas, without any change in fuel properties, for use as an alternative automotive fuel. However, extensive studies of the environmental impact of DME are needed to evaluate its full potential, using assessments based on different model assumptions and focusing on local conditions in urban areas or on biological processes.

Recent studies on DME-fuelled engines showed the potential of exploiting new combustion concepts such as low-compression DI diesel engines and homogeneous
charge compression-ignition engines operating in a low-temperature combustion regime.

Overall, DME has been found to be a very promising alternative fuel for compression-ignition engines, capable of providing high thermal efficiency, low combustion noise, low NOx levels and soot-free combustion; it thus merits further research and development before a final decision is taken on its potential as a mass production fuel for the automotive market.
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