



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Vidal Roncero, A., Kolovos, K., Gold, M., Pearson, R., Koukouvini, P. & Gavaises, M. (2021). Preferential cavitation and friction-induced heating of multi-component Diesel fuel surrogates up to 450MPa. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 166, 120744. doi: 10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2020.120744

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/25310/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2020.120744>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

1 **Preferential cavitation and friction-induced heating of multi-component Diesel** 2 **fuel surrogates up to 450MPa**

3 Alvaro Vidal^{1,*}, Konstantinos Kolovos^{1,2}, Martin R. Gold³, Richard J. Pearson³, Phoevos
4 Koukouvinis¹, Manolis Gavaises¹

5 ¹City University London – Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom

6 ²Perkins Engines Company Ltd – Peterborough PE1 5FQ, United Kingdom

7 ³BP Formulated Products Technology, Pangbourne, UK

8 *Corresponding author: alvaro.vidal-roncero@city.ac.uk

9 **Abstract**

10 The present work investigates the formation and development of cavitation of a multicomponent Diesel fuel surrogate
11 discharging from a high-pressure fuel injector operating in the range of injection pressures from 60MPa to 450MPa. The
12 compressible form of the Navier-Stokes equations is numerically solved with a density-based solver employing the
13 homogeneous mixture model for accounting the presence of liquid and vapour phases, while turbulence is resolved using a
14 Large Eddy Simulation approximation. Simulations are performed on a tapered heavy-duty Diesel engine injector at a nominal
15 fully-open needle valve lift of 350 μ m. To account for the effect of extreme fuel pressurisation, two approaches have been
16 followed: (i) a barotropic evolution of density as function of pressure, where thermal effects are not considered and (ii) the
17 inclusion of wall friction-induced and pressurisation thermal effects by solving the energy conservation equation. The PC-
18 SAFT equation of state is utilised to derive thermodynamic property tables for an eight-component surrogate based on a
19 grade no.2 Diesel emissions-certification fuel as function of pressure, temperature, and fuel vapour volume fraction.
20 Moreover, the preferential cavitation of the fuel components within the injector's hole is predicted by Vapour-Liquid
21 Equilibrium calculations; lighter fuel components are found to cavitate to a greater extent than heavier ones. Results indicate
22 a significant increase of temperature with increasing pressures due to friction-induced heating, leading to a significant
23 increase in the mean vapour pressure of the fuel and an increase of the mass of fuel cavitating, but at the same time to an
24 unprecedented decrease of cavitation volume inside the fuel injector with increasing injection pressure. This has been
25 attributed to the shift of the pressure drop from the feed to the back pressure inside the injection hole orifice as fuel
26 discharges; as injection pressure increases, so does the pressure inside the orifice, confining the location of cavitation
27 formation to a smaller volume attached to the upper part of orifice, thus restricting cavitation growth.

28 **Keywords:** cavitation, multicomponent, PC-SAFT, Diesel, thermal effects, preferential vaporisation

29

30 1. Introduction

31 The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) reported in November 2018 mentions that “pathways reflecting current
32 nationally determined contributions imply global warming of about 3°C by 2100, with warming continuing afterwards” in its
33 assessment of the Paris Agreement¹. As the transport sector accounts for ~23% of the total Greenhouse Global Emissions²,
34 attempts have been made to study and find a means to reduce them, including utilisation of Diesel surrogates³, additives in
35 Diesel and bio-Diesel blends⁴, multiple injections per power cycle⁵ and increase in injection pressure⁶. Modern Diesel engines
36 operate with upstream pressures of around 200MPa at full load, although the current trend is to increase them up to 300MPa,
37 in accordance with the latest emission regulations. Experimental studies have been done regarding sprays at extreme
38 injection pressures, up to 500MPa⁷, reporting an increase in the spray tip penetration, better mixing, and flame stability,
39 potentially driving towards a better combustion and less emissions. However, due to the micrometre scales of injectors, high
40 injection pressures will irremediably cause very high fuel velocities which, combined with the sharp geometric changes in the
41 injector passages, lead to local depressurisation with significant pressure gradients. If the pressure decreases beyond the
42 fuel’s saturation point, the fuel cavitates, which in turn, results to injector underperformance⁸ while it is related to mass flux
43 choke due to blocking of the free flow⁹ and possible cavitation erosion. Despite this, cavitation can be beneficial when
44 managed effectively, as it promotes liquid jet atomisation¹⁰⁻¹⁴ increases the spray cone angle¹⁵ and thus, mixing and
45 combustion¹⁶ is enhanced.

46 As cavitation measurements with real-size injectors operating pressures beyond 200MPa^{17, 18} is not possible up to now,
47 simulation models can offer further insight into the nozzle flow. Both the Volume of Fluid method (VOF)^{19, 20} and the
48 Homogeneous Equilibrium Model (HEM)²¹ have been used to simulate the presence of the second phase due to cavitation
49 and validated against relevant experiments at lower pressures²². Such models can be used to study the formation and
50 transport of the vapour phase, the turbulent fluctuations in velocity and pressure and the effect of non-condensable gases²³.
51 It has been also possible to look into the effect of liquid and vapour compressibility on supercavitation formation²⁴.

52 An additional complexity related to the increase of injection pressure in modern fuel injection systems is related to the strong
53 velocity gradients that induce wall friction, generating an important source of heating^{25, 26}. Nonetheless, thermal effects are
54 typically neglected in relevant simulation studies and the flow within the fuel injector is considered isothermal, while the
55 thermodynamic properties of the fuel are assumed constant. However, as the pressure increases within the injector,
56 significant changes to fuel physical properties are realised, which are critical in the formation of cavitation²⁷ and affect
57 combustion and emissions²⁸. With regards to liquid density variation, a barotropic evolution of the liquid density as function
58 of pressure is frequently utilised²⁹. A barotropic equation has been derived in past studies following Kolev’s Diesel properties
59 collection³⁰ or single component surrogates using the NIST Refprop³¹ database. Such simplifications may lead to deviations in
60 the discharge coefficient and fuel heating predictions with respect to the real fuel, particularly in cases of high pressure
61 injections²⁵. For the vapour phase, the usual assumption adopted is the ideal gas law behaviour.

62

63 Real Diesel fuels are typically composed of hundreds of components, which cannot be addressed using constant properties
64 or a simplified equation of state (EoS). Composition effects in Diesel fuel are related to changes in the spray atomisation³²
65 and spray tip penetration³³, but the cavitation of each component in the multicomponent fluid during injection has not been
66 addressed. There is only one related study in which the effect of non-condensable gas on cavitation of a single component
67 fuel during injection is analysed³⁴, modelled with a cubic EoS. Experiments of Diesel and biodiesel fuel mixtures have shown
68 that the biodiesel content slows down cavitation due to its higher molar weight³⁵, which was also seen numerically at extreme
69 temperatures³⁶. Still, most studies regarding preferential cavitation and transport based on the solution of the full Navier-
70 Stokes equations are based on models for fuel droplets in a gaseous environment³⁷⁻³⁹.

71

72 In an effort to simulate in a more accurate way the effect of fuel property variation at different conditions for multi-
73 component fuels, the PC-SAFT equation of state⁴⁰ can be used. This is a theoretically derived model, based on the perturbation
74 theory⁴¹⁻⁴⁴, that requires only three molecular-based parameters per component for fluid property calculations. There are
75 several advantages in using the PC-SAFT compared to a cubic equation of state for calculating fluid properties. The PC-SAFT
76 predicts derivative properties (such as the speed of sound) with satisfactory accuracy, reducing errors by a factor of up to
77 eight^{45, 46}, as compared to predictions with a cubic equation of state (such as the Peng-Robinson⁴⁷ or Soave-Redlich-Kwong⁴⁸).
78 Density predictions with the PC-SAFT exhibit six times lower error for a widely used surrogate such as dodecane⁴⁹ and half
79 the error of those made with improved cubic equations, such as volume-translated versions⁵⁰. The PC-SAFT provides
80 satisfactory agreement between calculated and experimental properties of reservoir fluids⁵¹ and natural gas⁵².

81

82 The aim of the current work is to investigate the in-nozzle flow and cavitation forming in heavy-duty Diesel injector at injection
83 pressures up to 450MPa, using a realistic multicomponent Diesel surrogate. This surrogate is a mixture of eight components
84 based on the composition of a grade no. 2-D S15 Diesel emissions certification fuel from Chevron-Phillips Chemical Co.⁵³,
85 already modelled by the authors using the PC-SAFT⁵⁴. The surrogate mass composition is listed in Table 1. Two different
86 methodologies have been utilised: one neglecting the thermal effects and one where the energy equation is solved
87 considering thermal effects due to wall-induced friction and fuel depressurisation. To the best of the author's knowledge,
88 this is the first study in the literature where the PC-SAFT is utilised in nozzle flow simulations addressing the preferential
89 cavitation of the fuel components and their evolution at extreme injection pressures.

90

Compound Name	M_w [g/mol]	T_b [K]	z_i [% mass]	m_i [-]	σ [Å]	ϵ/k_B [K]
n-octadecane	254.5	590.0	27.3082	7.438	3.948	254.90
n-hexadecane	226.4	560.0	3.2477	6.669	3.944	253.59
heptamethylnonane	226.4	520.0	35.1237	5.603	4.164	266.46
1-methylnaphthalene	142.2	518.0	10.8772	3.422	3.901	337.14
n-butylcyclohexane	140.3	456.2	10.8149	3.682	4.036	282.41
trans-decalin	138.2	460.5	4.0392	3.291	4.067	307.98
tetralin	132.2	480.9	3.8009	3.088	3.996	337.46
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	120.2	442.6	4.7883	3.610	3.749	284.25

Table 1. Mass composition for the Diesel surrogate modelled on this work. Boiling points at 0.1 MPa taken from the literature.

91

92 Following the above brief introduction, the next section gives the outline of the case set-up, the geometry and CFD model
93 used for the simulations. The results are shown including the internal flow, the effects on temperature due to friction and
94 the preferential vaporisation of the components within the multicomponent mixture. Lastly, the final section gives a summary
95 and critique of the findings.

96

97 2. Numerical Method

98 2.1. CFD model

99 The in-house density-based CFD codes used in this work solves the compressible Navier-Stokes equations utilising the open-
100 access OpenFOAM⁵⁵ platform. The two-phase flow is assumed to be a homogeneous mixture of vapour and liquid in
101 mechanical equilibrium, i.e. both phases share the same pressure and velocity fields. This implies that as there is only one
102 fluid in the entire domain, the discharge is on liquid; this configuration resembles that of injector test benches, where fuel is
103 squirted for thousands of hours into a liquid-filled collector. The barotropic behaviour of the fluid does not consider the
104 energy conservation equation. The second thermodynamic closure solves for both the Navier-Stokes system and the energy
105 conservation equation. Both solvers share a system which consists of the continuity equation:

$$106 \quad \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0 \quad (1)$$

107 Where ρ is the mixture density and \mathbf{u} the velocity vector field, and the momentum equations:

$$108 \quad \frac{\partial (\rho \mathbf{u})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) = -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} \quad (2)$$

109 where p is the pressure and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ is the stress tensor defined as $\boldsymbol{\tau} = \mu_{eff} [\nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T]$, with μ_{eff} defined as the sum of
110 laminar, μ given by the thermodynamic table, and turbulent, μ_T , dynamic viscosities. Regarding the turbulence model, a Large
111 Eddy Simulation (LES) model is used^{56,57}. In particular, the turbulent viscosity is modelled using the Wall Adaptive Large Eddy
112 (WALE) model⁵⁸, by the equation:

$$113 \quad \mu_t = \rho L_s^2 \frac{(S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{3/2}}{(S_{ij} S_{ij})^{5/4} + (S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{5/4}} \quad (3)$$

114 where S_{ij} is the rate of strain tensor and S_{ij}^d is the traceless symmetric part of the square of the strain of the velocity gradient
115 tensor, i.e.:

$$116 \quad S_{ij}^d = \frac{1}{2} (g_{ij}^2 + g_{ji}^2) - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} g_{kk}^2 \quad (4)$$

117 With, $= \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}$ and δ_{ij} the Kronecker delta. The length scale, L_s , is based on the filter size and the cell to wall distance, d_{wall} , as
118 follows:

$$119 \quad L = \min\{\kappa d_{wall}, C_w V^{1/3}\} \quad (5)$$

120 where the used model constants are: κ the von Karman constant, 0.41, and $C_w = 0.325$. The energy conservation equation is
121 also solved:

$$122 \quad \frac{\partial (\rho E)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} E) = -\nabla \cdot (p \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - \nabla \cdot (k_T \nabla T) \quad (6)$$

123 where E is the specific total energy of the system, defined as internal energy plus the kinetic energy, i.e. $E = h - \frac{p}{\rho} + \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2}$

124 where h is the enthalpy, and k_T the thermal conductivity of the fluid given by the thermodynamic tables.

125 Hybrid flux model

126 Two-phase flows are characterised, among others, by large variations in the speed of sound. While the speed of sound in the
127 liquid phase is of the order of $O(10^3)$ m/s and that of gas is $O(10^2)$ m/s, in the liquid-vapour mixture it drops down to

128 $O(1)$ m/s. Therefore, for a typical velocity at the orifice of $O(10^2)$ m/s, it can be expected a range in the Mach number from
 129 $O(10^{-1})$ to $O(10^2)$ m/s. For density-based solvers, low Mach numbers are causing convergence problems and dispersion, so
 130 a hybrid flux is used for accounting for both low and high Mach numbers. That, in terms of the interface pressure within the
 131 approximated Riemann solver scheme is:

$$132 \quad p = [1 - \beta(M)]p^{inc} + \beta(M)p^{comp} \quad (7)$$

133 where

$$134 \quad p^{inc} = \frac{C^L p^R + C^R p^L}{C^L + C^R} \quad (8)$$

$$135 \quad p^{comp} = \frac{C^L p^R + C^R p^L + C^R C^L (u^L - u^R)}{C^L + C^R} \quad (9)$$

136 where $C = \rho c$ is the acoustic impedance, u is the interface velocity, L and R refer to the left and right side of the interface
 137 and:

$$138 \quad \beta(M) = 1 - e^{-aM} \quad (10)$$

139 where a is a blending coefficient, set to 1.5. Thus $\beta(M) \rightarrow 0$ when $M \rightarrow 0$, and therefore $p = p^{inc}$. On the other
 140 hand, $\beta(M) \rightarrow 1$ when $M \rightarrow \infty$, and therefore $p = p^{comp}$.

141 **2.2. Injector geometry and operating conditions**

142 The examined injector geometry was based on a common rail 5-hole tip injector with tapered holes. The most important
 143 dimensions for this injector are shown in Table 2. The nominal mass flow rate at a reference condition of $P_{inj}=180$ MPa has
 144 been also included. Although the simulation is transient, the needle valve was assumed to be still at its full lift of $350\mu\text{m}$
 145 during the main injection stage. The simulated geometry considers only one fifth of the full injector geometry, as shown in
 146 Figure 1, imposing periodic boundary conditions on the symmetry planes. A hemispherical volume is attached to the nozzle
 147 exit; this volume is added in order to be able to capture the cavitation cloud inside the nozzle and avoid interference with the
 148 outlet boundary. Characteristic volumes of the injector geometry are also pointed out by colour in Figure 1(a); the walls are
 149 assumed to be adiabatic. Constant pressure boundary conditions of 60, 120, 180, 250, 350 and 450MPa at the inlet and 5MPa
 150 at the outlet have been considered. The temperature at the inlet boundary is fixed and corresponds to that of an isentropic
 151 expansion from the reference point set at 5MPa and 324K, shown in Table 3. This reference temperature is chosen based on
 152 the theoretical outlet temperature for operation at a reference injection pressure of 180MPa and a discharge coefficient of
 153 unity, i.e. the ideal case without pressure losses, as calculated in⁵⁹ using the same geometry. The temperature at the outlet
 154 of the domain is calculated by the solver. Also, in Table 3 the calculated mean exit velocity, speed of sound on the liquid,
 155 Mach number and discharge coefficient for each injection pressure are indicated.

156

Geometrical characteristics		
Needle radius at inlet (mm)		1.711
Inlet orifice rounding (mm)		0.05
Orifice length (mm)		1.262
Orifice diameter (mm)	Entrance D_{in}	0.37
	Exit D_{out}	0.359
Sac volume (mm ³)		1.19
k-factor = $(D_{in} - D_{out})$, D in μm		1.1
Nominal mass flow rate at $P_{inj}=180\text{MPa}$ (g/s)		41.32

Table 2. Dimension of the injector used for the simulations on this work and nominal flow rate at the reference condition of $P_{inj}=180\text{MPa}$.

157

$P_{inj}[\text{MPa}]$	$T_{inlet}[\text{K}]$	$U_{exit}[\text{m/s}]$	$c_{liquid}[\text{m/s}]$	$M_{liquid}[-]$	C_d
60	332	332.39	1128	0.2946	0.842
120	340	461.02	1066	0.4324	0.819
180	345	564.69	1057	0.5342	0.813
250	350	664.77	1045	0.6361	0.812
350	359	781.67	1012	0.7724	0.807
450	365	881.74	1001	0.8808	0.804

Table 3. For each injection pressure, inlet temperatures, mean exit velocity, speed of sound on the liquid, Mach number and discharge coefficient. Results come from simulations with thermal effects being considered.

158




Figure 1. Simulated geometry (one fifth of the complete injector nozzle). Characteristic volumes are coloured, and the boundary conditions are indicated. The transition between the two distinct topologies at the orifice and the contour plot at $P_{inj}=450\text{MPa}$ for the estimated y^+ values are also added.

159

160 Regarding the computational mesh, two topologies have been used. As shown in Figure 1(b), upstream of the orifice entrance,
 161 i.e. inside the nozzle's sac volume, an unstructured tetrahedral mesh is utilised. For the rest of the computational domain, a
 162 hexahedral block-structured mesh is used. Given the flow conditions inside the injector nozzles, the Reynolds number at the
 163 orifice, where cavitation develops, varies significantly between the cases. For 60MPa, it is ~ 35000 , for 180MPa is ~ 60000 and
 164 ~ 90000 for 450MPa. This corresponds to Taylor length scales, λ_g :

$$165 \quad \lambda_g = \sqrt{10} Re^{-0.5} D \in (4\mu\text{m}, 6.5\mu\text{m}) \quad (11)$$

166 Where D is an indicative length of the geometry; in this case the nozzle hole exit diameter. The resolution in the core of the
 167 orifice is $\sim 5\mu\text{m}$, with refinement near the walls down to a minimum cell size of $\sim 2\mu\text{m}$. As also shown in Figure 1(c), for the

168 most restrictive case of 450MPa, the maximum y^+ was 25. Due to the unfeasible computational effort a domain with a smaller
 169 cell size would entail, the near wall flow was treated with two wall functions: (i) $kqRWallFunction^{60}$ for the turbulent kinetic
 170 energy and (ii) $nutkwallfunction^{60}$ for the turbulent viscosity. The timestep was adapted to a fixed acoustic Courant number
 171 of 0.5, thus the timestep varied from 8ps for the 450MPa case to 100ps for the 60MPa case. Table 4 shows integral quantities
 172 of engineering interest, such as the overall mass and energy balance for each injection pressure, with thermal effects being
 173 considered. The last column in Table 4 shows the difference found in the mass flow rate at the exit for the most refined mesh,
 174 decreasing the smallest cell size to $1.06\mu m$ and, therefore, increasing the number of cells to 11M. No significant differences
 175 were found and therefore the 1.5M cells mesh was used for all following simulations.

$P_{inj}[MPa]$	Mass flow rate [g/s]		Energy flow rate [kJ/s]		%change in \dot{m}_{out} after refinement
	Inlet	Outlet	Inlet	Outlet	
60	24.37	24.53	31.97	32.19	-
120	33.89	34.16	42.08	42.43	-
180	41.32	41.72	48.19	48.67	0.0528
250	49.06	49.38	53.91	54.28	0.0785
350	58.09	58.38	57.74	58.11	0.1169
450	66.31	66.59	59.17	59.44	0.1542

Table 4. Time-averaged mass and energy flow rates at the inlet and outlet for all cases, with thermal effects being considered. The last column shows the percentage change in mass flow rate at the outlet after a refinement from 1.5M to 11M cells for cases 180MPa to 450MPa, decreasing thus minimum cell size from $2.12\mu m$ to $1.06\mu m$.

176

177 **2.3. Thermodynamic properties**

178 As already mentioned, the thermodynamic properties of the Diesel surrogate are modelled using the PC-SAFT EoS⁶¹ for a
 179 density range of $0.001-1100kg/m^3$ and an internal energy range of $-1.40779-4.7529MJ/kg$ in a tabulated format. The pure-
 180 component and ideal gas parameters can be found in the Tables A.1 and A.2 of the Appendix. The range in internal energy
 181 corresponds to temperatures in range of 280-2000K. These limits allow the correct characterisation of the vaporised and
 182 compressed fuel alike while also capturing the increased temperatures due to friction-induced heating. The structure of the
 183 table consists of 1000×1000 elements separated by constant intervals of the decimal logarithm (\log_{10}) of the density and
 184 internal energy. The properties are calculated every $0.006047 \log_{10}(kg/m^3)$ and $6.16696kJ/kg$. For the barotropic approach,
 185 the properties were calculated maintaining the entropy of the fluid constant to that obtained at 324K and the imposed outlet
 186 pressure of 5MPa. Figure 2 shows the properties that govern the behaviour of the Diesel surrogate with respect to pressure
 187 following different isentropic curves, depending on the assumed reference temperature. While the black line refers to the
 188 one used in the barotropic approach, the other two refer to reference temperatures of: (i) 384K that is the maximum
 189 temperature reached in the liquid-vapor equilibrium phase for $P_{inj}=180MPa$ considering thermal effects, and (ii) 484K that is
 190 the maximum temperature reached in the liquid-vapor equilibrium regime for $P_{inj}=450MPa$ when thermal effects were
 191 considered.

192

193 As shown in Figure 2, at higher temperatures the values for density, viscosity and thermal conductivity decrease, while
 194 increasing the heat conductivity. Regarding density, an exponential-like increase can be seen in the liquid phase converging

195 at very high pressures for the distinct reference temperatures. It can also be seen a sudden increase in density at the
 196 saturation pressure, as the phase change is almost isobaric. Moreover, this saturation pressure changes significantly for the
 197 different cases, increasing with the reference temperature. This increase can be explained by the temperatures observed in
 198 Figure 2(b). For a higher temperature, the easier it is for the substance to evaporate and therefore its vapour pressure is
 199 enhanced. The change in temperature from vapour to liquid is seen smoother than for density. The vapour volume fraction
 200 shown in Figure 2 (c) highlights that the phase change is almost isobaric at bubble point, i.e. at low vapour volume fraction,
 201 while needing an additional pressure drop to complete the vaporisation. The dynamic viscosity, shown in Figure 2(d), shows
 202 how dependent it is on pressure, while it is inversely proportional with temperature. Figure 2(e) shows how significantly
 203 smaller the thermal conductivity is in the vapour phase compared to that of the liquid phase (of the order of O(100)), which
 204 will contribute to the vapour heating up more rapidly than the liquid. Similarly, another factor that will contribute to a faster
 205 heating up of the vapour is the heat capacity, shown in Figure 2(f), due to its lower values compared to those of the liquid
 206 phase.

207

208 The calculation of the vapour volume fraction α_v is determined by minimizing the Helmholtz Free Energy, according to the
 209 algorithm recently presented by the authors in⁶², consisting on a stability analysis followed by a phase equilibrium calculation
 210 in case the mixture is found unstable. For the conditions studied in these isentropic simulations, the vapour pressure for the
 211 isentropic Diesel fuel is predicted to be 230Pa. For the case where the complete thermodynamic range is resolved, the
 212 saturation pressure is not fixed and will depend as well on the internal energy. The speed of sound c is calculated for a single
 213 phase directly from its definition:

$$214 \quad c = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial \rho}\right)_s} \quad (12)$$

215 Where the subscript s indicates that the derivative is computed at constant entropy. When the fluid is in the two-phase
 216 region, the speed of sound follows the Wallis' rule⁶³:

$$217 \quad \frac{1}{\rho c^2} = \frac{\alpha_v}{\rho_v c_v^2} + \frac{1 - \alpha_v}{\rho_l c_l^2} \quad (13)$$

218 where the subscripts v and l stand for vapour and liquid phase.

219 The dynamic viscosity, μ , is calculated by using an entropy scaling method⁶⁴, while the mixing rule is taken from the author's
 220 previous work⁶². The parameters used for the calculation of viscosity are found in Table A.3 of the Appendix. In the case of
 221 the two-phase region, the homogeneous viscosity is calculated with the expression⁶⁵:

$$222 \quad \mu = (1 - \alpha_v) \left(1 + \frac{5}{2}\right) \mu_l + \alpha_v \mu_v \quad (14)$$

223 Regarding the thermal conductivity, it is also calculated using the entropy scaling method⁶⁶. The parameters used for its
 224 calculation can be also found in the Appendix, on Table A.4. A simple weighted mixing rule with the vapour volume fraction
 225 is used:

$$226 \quad k_T = (1 - \alpha_v) k_{T,l} + \alpha_v k_{T,v} \quad (15)$$




Figure 2. Thermodynamic data following an isentropic expansion of the Diesel surrogate. Three cases are shown depending on the reference temperature at 5MPa: (i) 324K for the barotropic method used in this work, (ii) 384K as the maximum temperature reached in the liquid-vapor equilibrium phase for $P_{inj}=180\text{MPa}$ considering thermal effects, and (iii) 484K as the maximum temperature reached in the liquid-vapor equilibrium phase for $P_{inj}=450\text{MPa}$ considering thermal effects.

227

228 **2.4. Limitations, link to previous works and present contribution**

229

230 Limitations arising from both the validity of the models themselves utilised and the selection of the specific conditions

231 investigated, include: (1) the lack of detailed validation against experimental data for the extreme pressure values tests; (2)

232 the dependency/accuracy of the simulations on the equations describing the fuel properties as function of pressure and

233 temperature; (3) the assumption of local mechanical and thermal equilibrium, i.e. vapour and liquid have, locally, the same

234 velocity (no slip) and same temperature, utilised in order to predict the amount of fuel that cavitates; and (4) the omission of

235 transient effects ought to the movement of the injector's needle valve as well as the dependency of the obtained results on

236 the specific geometry investigated here. A short evaluation of those factors is provided below before the presentation of the

237 results obtained.

238

239 (1) With regards to the lack of experimental validation for the conditions tested, several comments and reference to prior

240 studies can be made. For injection pressures up to 500MPa only spray formation results have been reported⁷, but without

241 information about the in-nozzle flow. As stated in the introduction, cavitation measurements in real-size injectors operating

242 pressures beyond 200MPa¹⁷ has not been possible up to now, due to transparent material constrains. Even for lower pressure

243 conditions, only qualitative images have been obtained but not quantitative data for the cavitation volume fraction or the

244 velocity field. Nevertheless, validation works have been thoroughly reported at lower injection pressures utilising similar

245 models to those reported here. More specifically, homogeneous mixture models (either barotropic or mass transfer) have

246 been found to have very similar performance^{57, 67} in the limit of large mass transfer rates of the former. Also, such models

247 have been validated for predicting the 3D distribution of vapor fraction within the validation uncertainty ($\pm 7\%$, including both

248 numerical and experimental uncertainties). Further validation has been obtained for the flow field distribution, cavitation

249 shedding frequency and turbulent velocities in the same single-hole injector against high energy X-ray phase contrast imaging
250 (XPCI) measurements for conditions covering a range of cavitation regimes (incipient, fully developed and vortex/string
251 cavitation)^{68, 69}. Additionally, validation against Laser Doppler Velocimetry (LDV) measurements have been also reported in⁵⁷.
252 ⁷⁰ utilising the WALE LES model for turbulence, suggest that it can reproduce the turbulent structures found in Diesel nozzles.
253 These studies suggest that the model can capture both incipient and developed cavitation features. In the present study, the
254 Reynolds number is $\sim[35000-90000]$ and thus, it is within the range of applicability of the selected model. As the vaporous
255 core of cavitating vortices has been found to be in the order of $20\mu\text{m}$ ⁷¹, the smallest cell size of $\sim 2\mu\text{m}$ used suggests that
256 there are no under-resolved vortical structures that may cavitate and significantly influence the obtained results. For injection
257 pressures in the range of 180MPa, the same simulated injector geometry was previously validated for predicting cavitation
258 erosion damage⁵⁹ utilising the barotropic model. Cavitation erosion predictions have been also validated recently against
259 measurements in a fuel pump⁷². These studies give confidence that the barotropic model is performing relatively well for
260 similar cases as those studied here. Turning to thermal effects, there are no experiments available that can be used for
261 validation. The earlier studies⁷³⁻⁷⁶ from the authors performed also under both fixed needle valve conditions and including
262 the movement of the injector's needle valve⁷⁷ have been compared results against 0-D predictions of the mean fuel heating
263 up as it discharges through the fuel injector up to 300MPa, with very good accuracy^{25, 26}.

264

265 (2) A critical question relative to this study is related to the dependency/accuracy of the simulations on the equations
266 describing the fuel properties as function of pressure and temperature. As mentioned, the simulations carried out have
267 utilised properties derived by the PC-SAFT EoS. This EoS has been previously used with the Diesel surrogate of this work and
268 compared with experimental results up to 500MPa and 600K for density, viscosity and volatility⁷⁸ with an accuracy of 1.7%
269 for density, 2.9% in volatility and 8.3% in viscosity. Diesel fuels with different compositions have been also modelled at
270 pressures up to 300MPa and temperatures up to 532K⁷⁹ and the obtained accuracy against those measurements was $\sim 2\%$ for
271 density and $\sim 10\%$ for viscosity. Other Diesel properties, such as thermal conductivity, at extreme conditions up to 450MPa
272 and 360K can also be found accurately predicted by PC-SAFT^{80, 81} with an accuracy of 3%. It can thus be claimed that the
273 selected EoS is a good compromise for studying such effects in high pressure injectors.

274

275 (3) One of the main assumptions in the described methodology is the mechanical and thermodynamic equilibrium between
276 the liquid and the vapour phases. With regards to the mechanical equilibrium assumption, the recent study from the authors
277 using a two-fluid model has confirmed that differences between liquid and vapour velocities are less than 10% and only in
278 localised locations of the flow^{82, 83}; they have been found not to affect the overall growth rate and production of vapour. The
279 assumption of thermodynamic equilibrium is more significant. A metastable, i.e. non-thermodynamic equilibrium, state
280 occurs when the pressure of the liquid drops below the saturation pressure and no vapour is formed due to the rapid
281 expansion of the liquid^{84, 85}. In the literature, non-thermodynamic equilibrium models, such as the well-known mass transfer
282 models of Schnerr and Sauer⁸⁶, Singhal et al.⁸⁷ and Zwart et al.⁸⁸ are used. Predictions utilising such mass transfer models

283 tend towards equilibrium by increasing the evaporation/condensation coefficients^{67, 89}. Apart from mass transfer models, in
284 the literature there are models relying on the solution of the full Rayleigh-Plesset equation, commonly done in a Lagrangian
285 reference frame, thus incorporating second order effects and the influence of surface tension. However, such models
286 inherently assume a spherical bubble shape, the interaction between bubbles (break-up, coalescence) is not easy to describe
287 and the coupling with the continuous phase (liquid) is difficult in areas of large void fractions⁹⁰⁻⁹⁴. The relaxation time of the
288 tensile stresses, i.e. those acting in the metastable state, was numerically estimated to be of the order of 10ns in a flow
289 configuration where a vertical tube filled with liquid was impacted vertically, leading to an expansion wave of 30MPa⁹⁵.
290 However, the nuclei concentration used in this study was infinitesimally small, which is not applicable to real systems and
291 thus its result is a significant overprediction. Nevertheless, it is possible to use this time-scale to estimate that, as the
292 residence time of the fluid in the injection hole has a minimum value of the order of 1 μ s, that for the 450MPa case, the time
293 to reach equilibrium would be, at least, 100 times faster.

294

295 (4) Finally, the present work omits transient effects related to the motion of the needle valve⁹⁶, while it refers to only one
296 injector geometry utilised with heavy-duty diesel engines featuring hole tapering. It has been reported in the literature that
297 cavitation reduces the mixing uniformity within circular, sharp-edged orifices⁹⁷ while tapered nozzles reduce its
298 appearance⁹⁸. Thus, although the studied geometry is representative for such application, it can be expected that different
299 cavitation volume fraction will be developing for other nozzle geometries. With regards to the needle valve motion, it is well
300 documented in the literature that depending on the nozzle geometry and needle valve position, cavitation may appear to the
301 bottom part of the injection hole as well as the needle seat area and inside the nozzle's sac volume at low needle lifts⁹⁹⁻¹⁰¹.
302 More recent studies have shown that the initial air/liquid distribution inside the nozzle volume prior to the start of injection
303 are also complex, with large air bubbles been present^{99, 101-103}; these are formed during the needle valve closure that induces
304 back flow to the injector. However, such effects and flow regimes are not realised when the needle valve is at its nominal full
305 lift position. At the same time, the needle remains still for a relatively large duration, typically more than 10times longer
306 compared to the opening/closing time. Transient effects although important for cavitation erosion¹⁰⁴, nozzle wall wetting and
307 formation of non-well atomised liquid fragments that can affect emissions are out of scope of the present work.

308

309 Despite those limitations, the present work aims to make the following contributions: To the best of the author's knowledge,
310 this is the first study in the literature where the PC-SAFT is utilised in nozzle flow simulations addressing the preferential
311 cavitation of the fuel components and their evolution at injection pressures up to 450MPa. For this, an 8-component Diesel
312 surrogate¹⁰⁵ is modelled using the PC-SAFT EoS, considering the effects of variable thermal conductivity, heat capacity and
313 viscosity due to extreme pressurisation. The authors also take advantage of PC-SAFT to calculate the individual vaporisation
314 of each component within the vapour cloud during cavitation, as each component vaporises at a distinct rhythm, different to
315 that of the mixture and to that of the other components.

316

317 **3. Results**

318 In this section, the results obtained for the range of injection pressures from 60MPa and up to 450MPa are presented. If not
319 stated otherwise, all results consider thermal effects. Firstly, the internal flow through the injector is inspected. Secondly, the
320 changes in temperature and vapour pressure are investigated and compared with the case where thermal effects are
321 neglected. Thirdly, the formation of cavitation inside the nozzle orifice is analysed. Lastly, due to the multicomponent nature
322 of the fuel, the preferential cavitation of its components is examined.

323 **3.1. Flow field**

324 Figures 3 through 5 show predictions of three time-averaged (i) magnitude of the vorticity on a logarithmic scale, (ii) density
325 and (ii) viscosity at three injection pressures; results are presented in two sets of slices: one longitudinal to the injector
326 geometry and four transversals to the nozzle hole. Thin solid black lines are added for clarity; all plots on each Figure share
327 the same colour scale. Vorticity indicates locations where thermal effects become significant due to shearing. Lower values,
328 of the order of $10^5/s$ or smaller, are seen in the core of the flow as it travels through the sac volume as well as into the orifice.
329 Close to the walls, vorticity is generated reaching values up to $10^8/s$, due to the large shear induced from the no-slip wall
330 velocity boundary condition. High values of $\sim 10^7/s$ are also found on a relatively wide region located on the top half of the
331 orifice volume, where separation of the flow occurs, and cavitation is forming. Density and viscosity show similar behaviour
332 throughout the injector. Inside the nozzle's sac volume, densities take values from 845 kg/m^3 for injection pressure of 60MPa,
333 900.342 kg/m^3 for 180MPa and up to 982.345 kg/m^3 for 450MPa. This density decreases as the fuel expands through the
334 orifice down to $\sim 720 \text{ kg/m}^3$ at the exit of the orifice where the pressure is set to 50MPa. As the flow separates at the entrance
335 of the injector orifice and the fuel cavitates, densities decrease locally 3 orders of magnitude, to $\sim 10^{-3} \text{ kg/m}^3$, inducing strong
336 density gradients. It can be also clearly seen that as injection pressure increases, the extend of low-density values for the
337 vapour-liquid mixture is significantly reduced, due to the gradual condensation of vapour caused by the increased pressures
338 present inside the injection hole. The iso-surface of 50% vapour volume fraction is also depicted, showing for the 180 and
339 450MPa cases two coherent structures separated at the symmetry midplane; thorough discussion of the cavitation formation
340 and development will be given in the following subsections. Regarding viscosity, the increase with injection pressure in the
341 nozzle's sac volume is significantly higher than that for density. At 60MPa, the viscosity of the fuel is $2.66 \text{ mPa}\cdot\text{s}$, doubling to
342 $5.2 \text{ mPa}\cdot\text{s}$ at 180MPa and then quadrupling up to $19.64 \text{ mPa}\cdot\text{s}$ at 450MPa. Average values at the nozzle exit are $\sim 1.3 \text{ mPa}\cdot\text{s}$.
343 Minimum values of $7 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ mPa}\cdot\text{s}$ are found again at the entrance of the orifice where the flow separates.

344




Figure 3. Predicted time-averaged vorticity, in logarithmic scale, on different slices at the sac volume and orifice for three injection pressures. Thermal effects are considered.

345




Figure 4. Predicted time-averaged density on different slices at the sac volume and orifice for three injection pressures. Thermal effects are considered. The iso-surface for vapour volume fraction of 50% is included, which shows two coherent structures separated at the midplane for (b) and (c).

346




Figure 5. Predicted time-averaged dynamic viscosity on different slices at the sac volume and orifice for three injection pressures. Thermal effects are considered.

347

348 Figure 6 shows the mass flow rate as function of the pressure drop for all cases, comparing the barotropic approach with that
 349 considering thermal effects. As expected, the mass flow rate increases linearly with the square root of the difference between
 350 the injection and back pressure. This shows that in neither of the two approaches the flow gets choked with increasing
 351 injection pressure. Moreover, the values for the thermal and the barotropic cases are found to be very close. Due to the
 352 temperature increase, the density of the fluid drops for the thermal case, but so does the viscosity, enhancing the velocity of
 353 the flow. For instance, at 180MPa the density of the thermal case is 2.9% smaller than that for the barotropic case, while the

354 velocities are 2.1% greater, while at 450MPa these differences are 2.1% and 1.63%, respectively. As a result, these two effects
 355 offset each other, and the predicted mass flow rate does not vary significantly between the two cases considered.




Figure 6. Mass flow rate at the orifice exit for both the barotropic and thermal cases.

356
 357
 358
 359


3.2. Changes in temperature and vapor pressure due to thermal effects induced by wall friction and depressurisation

360 Figure 7 shows the relative temperature change with respect to the injection temperature, defined as:

$$361 \quad \frac{T - T_{inj}}{T_{inj}} * 100 \quad (16)$$

362 Results are shown for the 60MPa, 180MPa and 450MPa cases, for which the injection temperature is indicated in Table 3. A
 363 solid line in the longitudinal slice shows where $T = T_{inj}$; thus, all points inside this iso-line show cooling and those outside
 364 show heating. Several observations can be made. First, as the injection pressure increases, temperature gradients increase
 365 accordingly, i.e. both lower and higher relative temperatures are found. Liquid fuel is heated up due to friction with the walls,
 366 but its temperature gradually drops towards the centre of the orifice. However, in the locations of cavitation formation inside
 367 the orifice, heating dissipation is not observed due to the vapour's significantly lower thermal conductivity and heat capacity,
 368 in addition to the significantly lower velocities observed in this region. The highest temperatures are found close to the
 369 entrance to the injection hole where the fuel fully cavitates. With respect to the injection temperature, values in this region
 370 are found to be ~5% overall higher with a local peak of 50% higher for 60MPa case; at 180MPa, the fuels heats up ~10% with
 371 a local maximum of 70%; lastly, for the 450MPa case, the highest heating of 25% is estimated, reaching a 80% local maximum.
 372 On the other hand, cooling is also enhanced with injection pressure due to liquid expansion, as seen in the core of the flow.
 373 The cooling observed is 5%, 7.5% and 10% for 60MPa, 180MPa and 450MPa, respectively.

374



(a) 60MPa (b) 180MPa (c) 450MPa
Figure 7. Predicted time-averaged temperature change with respect to the injection temperature, defined as $(T - T_{inj})/T_{inj} * 100$, when thermal effects are considered. The injection temperature for each case is shown in Table 3. A solid thick black line is plotted in the longitudinal slice where $T = T_{inj}$, thus all points inside this iso-line show cooling and those outside show heating. Results are shown on different slices at the sac volume and orifice for three injection pressures.

375

376 Figure 8 (a) shows the temperature range for the liquid, vapour and vapour-liquid equilibrium (VLE) phases; the boiling and
 377 injection temperatures are added as a reference. The range on the vapour phase is significantly higher than that for the liquid
 378 phase. Maximum vapour temperatures take values of 510K, 570K and up to 640K for the 60MPa, 180MPa and 450MPa
 379 pressures, respectively. For the liquid phase, heating effects are more contained: at 60MPa the liquid fuel gets heated up to
 380 360K, while for 180MPa it is 410K and 504K for 450MPa; the slope of temperature increase is around 28K per 100MPa.
 381 Regarding cooling, a rough correlation of a 7K of temperature decrease per 100MPa is calculated. Where the liquid and vapor
 382 coexist, the temperature range is lower than for the liquid phase. The temperatures found are 325-350K for 60 MPa, 335-
 383 400K for 180MPa and 355-485K for 450MPa, thus reaching a maximum temperature range of up to 130K. Figure 8 (b) shows
 384 the average temperature at the orifice inlet and outlet slices. As observed, the temperature at both extremes of the orifice
 385 increase with the injection pressure, due to the enhancing of the friction-induced heating. The difference in temperature
 386 between these two zones also increase with the injection pressure. While the difference is of 2.3K at 60MPa, it is found to be
 387 5.6K at 180MPa and 8.8K at 450MPa.




Figure 8. (a) Variation in temperature for the liquid, vapor and vapor-liquid equilibrium (VLE) phases versus the square root of pressure drop. As a reference, both the injection temperature and the reference temperature used in the barotropic approach are included. (b) Average temperatures at the orifice inlet and outlet slices.

388

389 Figure 9 shows on the density-temperature thermodynamic diagram the distribution of predicted values in the whole
 390 computational domain; the saturation curve of the Diesel surrogate and the isentropic evolution used in the barotropic
 391 approach are also indicated. The colour of the plotted points helps identifying their location within the computational
 392 domain, i.e. in the injector inlet upstream the needle seat passage, along the needle seat passage, sac volume and inside the
 393 injector hole. For all injection pressure cases investigated, it can be clearly seen that the process is not isothermal; as shown
 394 before, the range in temperatures increases with increasing injection pressure. The flow upstream of the nozzle hole (on the
 395 right of the saturation curve) shows a smaller range in temperatures than that through the orifice, mostly following the
 396 isentropic curve with the corresponding cooling effect due to the expansion of the liquid. There are points that diverge from
 397 this isentropic curve both in the needle seat and more clearly in the sac volume, due to thermal effects. This can be clearly
 398 seen in the plot for 450MPa: the flow in the sac volume splits into two legs, one corresponding to the core of the flow cooling
 399 down due to the liquid expansion and following the isentropic curve, while the other one its heated up because of wall
 400 friction.

401




Figure 9. Predicted time-averaged density-temperature values over the whole computational domain for three injection pressures. The saturation curve for the multicomponent Diesel surrogate (solid line) and the isentropic approach (dashed line) are indicated. The colour of the symbols distinguishes the zone in the injector they correspond to. As an inset, the distribution of point close to the saturation curve is added.

402

403 Another interesting result from the comparison between the barotropic approach and the consideration of thermal effects
 404 is shown in Figure 10. This figure shows, for a single-time instance, both the isentropic curve, and the results corresponding
 405 to thermal effects being considered. The symbols are coloured according to the value of vapor volume fraction. In all cases,
 406 the liquid phase follows the isentropic curve reasonably well at high pressures (corresponding to zones before the orifice)
 407 while diverging from it as the pressure falls during the discharge of fuel through the nozzle hole. This divergence is significantly
 408 enhanced as the injection pressure increases and therefore thermal effects become more pronounced. The distribution of
 409 points become progressively wider and shifted to higher pressures, potentially driving towards greater pressure gradients
 410 where vapour is found. As the vapour phase distribution is shifted towards greater pressures, so does the vapour pressure,
 411 shown in Figure 11 for all cases investigated; it increases with injection pressure to a substantial degree, diverging significantly
 412 from the barotropic assumption due to thermal effects. The minimum vapour pressure increases from 290Pa for 60MPa, to
 413 523.5Pa at 180MPa and up to 1259Pa at 450MPa.




Figure 10. Predicted single-time instance of logarithm of pressure versus density values over the whole computational domain for three injection pressures; the curve for the barotropic evolution (dashed line) is indicated. The colour of the symbols shows their value of the vapor volume fraction within different ranges.

414




Figure 11. Predicted saturation pressure versus the square root of the pressure difference when thermal effects are considered.

415

416 3.3. Effect of injection pressure on cavitation

417 Figure 12 shows the time-averaged pressure distribution, in logarithmic scale, for three injection pressures on a longitudinal
 418 slice of the injector. The 50% vapour volume fraction iso-surface and the 5MPa iso-line, i.e. the back pressure value, are
 419 illustrated. As shown, the main difference between the cases is found inside the sac volume, where pressures take values of
 420 55MPa, 162MPa and 405MPa for the 60MPa, 180MPa and 450MPa injection pressure cases, respectively. As the injection
 421 pressure increases, so does the pressure distribution inside the orifice, as indicated by the increased extent of the 5MPa iso-
 422 line within the orifice. Regarding cavitation, the iso-surface of the vaporised fuel appears to reach just slightly the orifice exit
 423 for 60MPa and vortex cavitation is produced as a detached cloud. For 180MPa and 450MPa, cavitation completely reaches
 424 the orifice exit and no vortex cavitation is observed. Moreover, the cavitation cloud for 450MPa appears to be thinner than
 425 that the 180MPa case.




Figure 12. Predicted time-averaged pressure on a longitudinal slice of the injector. A solid black iso-line at 5MPa, the back pressure, and the iso-surface for 50% vapour volume fraction have been included. The colour map is in logarithmic scale and thermal effects are considered.

426

427 These observations of the cavitating cloud are quantified in Figure 13(a), which shows the time-averaged vapor volume
428 fraction inside the injector orifice versus the square root of the pressure drop. Results correspond to both the barotropic and
429 thermal cases. As shown, the barotropic and complete formulation approaches follow similar trends. Due to the higher
430 average temperatures and consequently higher vapour pressures found when considering thermal effects, cavitation growth
431 is enhanced and thus found to be greater than in the barotropic approach. For both cases the volume of vapour formed inside
432 the orifice first increases up to 120MPa and then decreases as the injection pressure increases. This is an unexpected result,
433 as it is commonly believed that increasing the injection pressure results to higher velocities, which induce a greater boundary
434 layer separation inside the orifice. In turn, flow separation would lead to an enhanced contraction of the flow and thus, a
435 greater reduction in the static pressure; if this is below the local vapour pressure, more cavitation would be expected.
436 However, the trend observed does not follow this reasoning. Figure 13(b) quantifies the % distribution of the orifice volume
437 having pressure in three intervals: the first one for pressures above the 5MPa value of the back pressure, the second in the
438 range [5MPa, P_v] and the last one for pressure below P_v , where cavitation is present. As seen, pressures greater than the back
439 pressure occupy ~20% of the volume orifice at 60MPa while this percentage increases to ~55% for 450MPa. The opposite
440 trend is observed for the other two pressure ranges; the volume with pressures below 5MPa but above the vapor pressure
441 decreases from 65% at 60MPa down to 35% for 450MPa, while the volume occupied by pressures lower than the vapor
442 pressure exhibits the same trend.

443




Figure 13. (a) Time-averaged vapor volume fraction inside the injector orifice versus the square root of the pressure drop estimated utilising both the barotropic and thermal models. (b) Orifice volume fraction histogram for different pressure ranges inside the orifice volume when thermal effects are considered.

444

445 Various parametric studies have been performed to disprove these results as a numerical artefact; the relevant results are
446 summarised in Figure 14 and have included injection into gas, constant fuel viscosity, non-tapering of the nozzle hole and
447 different turbulence models such as the k-omega SST RANS model with the Reboud correction¹⁰⁶. Although the absolute
448 values of cavitation volume fraction are not the same, as cavitation is significantly dependant on the model and properties
449 used, a similar reduction trend of cavitation volume fraction with the pressure drop is observed for all cases.

450




Figure 14. Effect of boundary conditions and simulation parameters on calculated vapour volume fraction as function of pressure drop.

451

452 The increased pressures found overall also affect the amount of vapour mass within the orifice, as shown in Figure 15, along
 453 the orifice length for all injection pressures; results from both the barotropic and the thermal cases are indicated. Two insets
 454 of the temperature distribution are added to the thermal case, corresponding to locations of high vapour mass flow rate at
 455 450MPa. On the slices, an iso-line showing the location of vapour is also included. The density of the vapour fuel ρ_v is
 456 calculated by the PC-SAFT EoS during the VLE calculations. As seen, as the injection pressure increases so does the flow rate
 457 of vapour mass along the orifice. For instance, at 20% of the orifice length and for the thermal case, the vapour mass flow
 458 rate is 0.06mg/s for 60MPa, 0.22mg/s for 180MPa and 1.02mg/s for 450MPa. However, the results for the barotropic case
 459 are significantly lower. This difference can be explained because, when in vapour-liquid equilibrium, the vapour density
 460 increases with temperature. For instance, at 350K the saturated vapour density is $2.5 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{kg/m}^3$, at 360K it increases to
 461 $5.03 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{kg/m}^3$, i.e. a 200% difference, and at 370K it doubles again to $9.9 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{kg/m}^3$. This can be also observed on the two
 462 peaks found at approximately 40 and 75% of the orifice length, for the thermal case. In these locations, as shown by the
 463 insets, a significant increase in temperature is found, which produce also an increase in the vapour density.




Figure 15. Time-averaged vapour mass flow rate along the orifice length for both (a) barotropic and (b) thermal cases, for all injection pressures simulated. Two insets of the temperature distribution are added to the thermal case, corresponding to locations of high vapour mass flow rate at 450MPa. On the slices, an iso-line showing the location of vapour is also depicted.

464

465 Figure 16 shows the slope of the vapour mass flow rate along the orifice length, thus presenting the locations of net
 466 evaporation (positive values) and condensation (negative values) per meter of the orifice length as the fuel cavitates within
 467 the nozzle hole. As already seen in Figure 15, overall values are higher in the thermal case due to the dependence of the

468 vapour density on temperature, particularly at 40% and 75% of the orifice length. Nevertheless, both values for evaporation
 469 and condensation are seen to increase with injection pressure for both the barotropic and the thermal cases. This is clearly
 470 shown in the thermal case by the amplitude of the observed positive and negative peaks. For instance, at the hole entrance
 471 the value for evaporation rate is 0.6g/s·m for 60MPa, 2.7g/s·m for 180MPa and 13g/s·m for 450MPa, while at ~45% of the
 472 orifice length the corresponding values for condensation are 0.07g/s·m for 60MPa, 0.62g/s·m for 180MPa and 6g/s·m for
 473 450MPa. Moreover, while for the barotropic case most of the evaporation (values for the 450MPa case) is observed at the
 474 beginning of the orifice, with a value of 1.2g/s·m, followed by small positive values at 40% of 0.1g/s·m and of 0.01g/s·m at
 475 60%, for the thermal case the peak in evaporation occurs at 40% of the orifice length, with a significantly higher value of
 476 32g/s·m, followed by a smaller value of 13g/s·m at the entrance and of 7g/s·m at 60% of the orifice length.




Figure 16. Slope of the vapour mass flow rate along the orifice length, showing locations of net evaporation (positive) and condensation (negative), for both the barotropic and the thermal cases. A dashed horizontal line is added at value 0, for reference.

477

478 An additional interesting finding is related to the influence of varying simultaneously the injection and back pressures on
 479 cavitation vapour volume fraction¹⁰⁷ but keeping the cavitation number fixed; this is defined as:

$$480 \quad CN = \frac{P_{inj} - P_b}{P_b - P_{sat}} \quad (17)$$

481 The cavitation number chosen is 35, which corresponds to the boundary conditions of the 180MPa case. For keeping constant
 482 cavitation number, increasing the injection pressure results to increasing the back pressure and, on the other hand,
 483 decreasing the injection pressure results to decreasing back pressure. Figure 17 shows that the vapour volume fraction still
 484 decreases inside the orifice as the injection pressure increases, even by keeping constant the cavitation number. Thus, for
 485 the same injector and fluid, these results show that a constant cavitation number does not indicate a similar cavity size, but
 486 it strongly depends on the absolute value of the injection and back pressure values used.




Figure 17. Time-averaged vapour volume fraction inside the injector orifice versus the square root of the pressure drop, considering thermal effects. All cases have the same cavitation number, $CN=35$.

487

488 3.4. Preferential cavitation

489 One of the benefits of using the PC-SAFT EoS coupled with a VLE algorithm is that it allows the calculation of the vaporised
 490 amount of each individual fuel component. As an example, Figure 18 shows the vapour mass fraction at 350K of the Diesel
 491 surrogate (dashed line) and of four representative components (the heaviest, lightest and two intermediates, in solid lines),
 492 as a function of the specific volume. As shown, the mixture vaporises at a variable rate as it expands, while each component
 493 vaporises as well at their distinct rhythm. The lightest component, i.e. 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, is seen to vaporise at a higher
 494 rate than the mixture and vaporises completely considerably sooner. The heaviest one, i.e. n-octadecane, vaporises much
 495 slower than the mixture, but reaches the complete vaporisation at the same time. The intermediate components vaporise at
 496 rates in between the previous ones.




Figure 18. Vapour mass fraction of representative components of the fuel surrogate (the heaviest, lightest and two intermediate) as a function of specific volume for a 0D expansion of the fuel at 350K.

497

498 As the volume fraction per component cannot be retrieved from the equation of state, mass fractions are presented. The
 499 vaporised mass fraction of every component v_i , is calculated using the mass vapour fraction of the mixture θ , the composition
 500 of the vapour phase x and the composition of the total mixture z by:

$$501 \quad v_i = \theta * x_i / z_i \quad (18)$$

502 Figure 19 shows iso-surfaces of the mass vapour fraction for selected components. The plotted vapour mass fraction is
 503 selected so that the iso-surface for trimethylbenzene coincides to that of the mixture 50% vapor volume fraction. As shown,
 504 trimethylbenzene is the maximum cavitating component and the heaviest one, i.e. octadecane, cavitates significantly less
 505 and mostly at the entrance of the orifice, where the flow separates, and cavitation is stronger. No significant amount of the

506 5 heavier components are found in the vortex cavitation cloud found at 60MPa. Moreover, as the injection pressure increases,
 507 every component is seen to cavitate further inside the cavitating cloud, observable on the iso-surface for octadecane, due to
 508 both the higher pressures and temperatures occurring in the orifice.

509




Figure 19. Effect of the injection pressure on partial vaporisation of selected components of the Diesel surrogate simulated. Results are time-averaged and thermal effects are considered.

510

511 Figure 20 shows the mass composition of the cavitating cloud inside the orifice for all injection pressures studied while Table
 512 5 shows the actual values. The lighter components are the ones found to be in greater amount due to their higher volatility.
 513 As seen, in all cases the 4 lightest components compose more than 75% of the vapour mass. The compound most present in
 514 the total mass of the Diesel surrogate, heptamethylnonane with 35% in mass fraction, is not the one having the highest
 515 amount of vapour phase, as it is less volatile; it's relative percentage in the vapour composition is just 3.44% at 60MPa and
 516 up to 12.5% at 450MPa. Similar observations can be drawn from octadecane, which consists 27% of the total mass of the fuel
 517 surrogate, but in the vapor cloud it is just above 1%. On the other hand, the lighter butylcyclohexane with a 11% of the total
 518 fuel mass, provides 23% and ~24% of the mass of vapor at 60MPa and 450MPa, respectively. The lightest component in the
 519 surrogate, 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, which 5% of the initial fuel mass, when vaporises provides 23% of the total mass of vapor
 520 at 450MPa. As seen previously in Figure 16, the total mass of vapour, and as a result the mass of vapour of all components,
 521 increases with injection pressure.




Figure 20. Time-averaged predictions for the vaporised mass composition of the vapor cloud, in a stacked fashion, for all injection pressures.

522

Component	z [% mass]	P_{inj} [MPa]					
		60	120	180	250	350	450
n-octadecane	27.308	0.2416	0.2575	0.3487	0.5068	0.8566	1.3300
n-hexadecane	3.2477	0.1050	0.1338	0.1822	0.2517	0.3784	0.5209
heptamethylnonane	35.124	3.4426	4.2924	5.3811	6.7659	8.9891	11.152
1-methylnaphthalene	10.877	8.1457	9.0432	9.8387	10.675	11.723	12.463
n-butylcyclohexane	10.815	22.619	23.278	23.589	23.805	23.807	23.550
trans-decalin	4.0392	15.721	15.431	15.051	14.601	13.894	13.232
tetralin	3.8009	18.597	18.028	17.437	16.743	15.733	14.834
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	4.7883	31.128	29.537	28.174	26.652	24.619	22.918

Table 5. Time-averaged predictions for the vaporised mass composition of the vapor cloud, for all injection pressures. The initial surrogate mass composition is also indicated.

524 **4. Summary and Conclusions**

525 The present study is the first work reporting simulations of cavitation in a Diesel fuel injection at extreme injection pressures
526 up to 450MPa. Additionally, it is the first work to report results using the molecular-based PC-SAFT equation of state for the
527 modelling of the Diesel fuel properties, while has allowed for predictions of the preferential cavitation of the components in
528 a Diesel injector to be reported for the first time. To assess the method against the common assumption of isothermal flow
529 typically considered up to now in nozzle flow simulations, simulations considering an isentropic expansion of the fuel, and
530 thus neglecting friction-induced thermal effects, have been also presented. Two major findings emerge from this study: (i) in-
531 nozzle cavitation volume fraction decreases with injection pressure, although the mass of fuel cavitating increases, and (ii)
532 each component in the surrogate cavitates at a distinct rhythm, different to that of the mixture and to that of the other
533 components. The trend in cavitation has been explained by observing the pressure distribution within the nozzle orifice,
534 which increase significantly with injection pressure and effectively decrease the growth of cavitation. The composition of the
535 fuel vapour shows that the lighter components cavitate at a significantly greater amount than the heavy ones. With increasing
536 injection pressure, all fuel components cavitate in higher mass quantities due to the higher densities of the fuel at the
537 pressures and temperatures developing in the nozzle orifice. As a result, the mass of the total vapour fuel also increases.

538

539 **Acknowledgements**

540 This project has received funding from the European Union Horizon-2020 Research and Innovation Programme. Grant
541 Agreement No 675528.

542

English symbols

a	blending coefficient	\dot{m}	Mass flow rate [kg/s]
C	Acoustic impedance	m	chain segment number [-]
C_d	Discharge Coefficient	M	Mach number [-]
C_w	LES model constant	M_w	molar weight [g/mol]
c	Speed of sound [m/s]	P/p	Pressure [Pa]
D	diameter	R	universal gas constant [J/(kg K)]
d_{wall}	wall distance	Re	Reynolds number
E	Total energy [J/kg]	S	strain tensor
g_{ij}	abbreviation $\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}$	T	Temperature [K]
h	Enthalpy [J/kg]	t	Time [s]
k_B	Boltzmann constant	\mathbf{u}	Velocity [m/s]
k_{ij}	binary interaction parameter [-]	V	cell volume
k_T	Thermal conductivity [W/(m K)]	x	Vapour mass composition
κ	von Karman constant	z	Total mass composition
L	WALE LES model length scale		

Greek symbols

α_v	Volume vapour fraction	ρ	Mixture density [kg/m ³]
β	function for the hybrid flux	σ	segment diameter [\AA]
λ_g	Taylor length scale	τ	Stress tensor [Pa]
μ	Dynamic viscosity [Pa.s]	θ	Mass vapour fraction [-]

Subscripts

b	Downstream conditions/boiling point	j	Coordinate direction
eff	effective, i.e. laminar plus turbulent	l	Liquid
i	component i /coordinate direction	v	Vapour
inj	At inlet conditions	t	turbulent

Superscripts

$comp$	compressible	L	Left side
inc	incompressible	R	Right side

Abbreviations

CN	Cavitation Number	PC-SAFT	perturbed chain statistical associating fluids theory
EoS	equation of state	VLE	Vapour-Liquid Equilibrium
LES	Large Eddy Simulation	WALE	Wall Adapted Large Eddy
<i>nc</i>	number of components		

544

545

546 **Appendix. PC-SAFT parameters for thermodynamic and thermophysical properties**

547 PC-SAFT parameters

	m (-)	σ (Å)	ϵ/k_B (K)
n-octadecane	7.438	3.948	254.90
n-hexadecane	6.669	3.944	253.59
heptamethylnonane	5.603	4.164	266.46
1-methylnaphthalene	3.422	3.901	337.14
1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene	3.088	3.996	337.46
trans-decalin	3.291	4.067	307.98
n-butylcyclohexane	3.682	4.036	282.41
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	3.610	3.749	284.25

548 **Table A.1.** PC-SAFT parameters used in this study

549 Ideal gas coefficients

	A	B	C	D	ΔH_{ref} [kJ/kg]
n-octadecane	-13.474	1.71384	$-9.554 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.03 \cdot 10^{-7}$	-414.83
n-hexadecane	-11.656	1.52384	$-8.466 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.792 \cdot 10^{-7}$	-373.59
heptamethylnonane	-86.757	1.90728	$-1.3652 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.944 \cdot 10^{-7}$	-405.10
1-methylnaphthalene	-58.16	0.90672	$-6.7548 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.014 \cdot 10^{-7}$	116.94
1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene	-87.11	0.9832	$-7.1356 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.06 \cdot 10^{-7}$	27.63
trans-decalin	-127.17	1.2172	$-7.75 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.868 \cdot 10^{-7}$	-182.42
n-butylcyclohexane	-71.807	1.07592	$-6.012 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.174 \cdot 10^{-7}$	-213.32
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	-10.6	0.66096	$-3.6292 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.16 \cdot 10^{-8}$	-13.94

550 **Table A.2.** Ideal gas parameters used during the calculation of properties

551

552 Entropy scaling parameters for viscosity

	A^μ	B^μ	C^μ	D^μ
n-octadecane	-0.94240	-4.2086	-0.92723	-0.2241
n-hexadecane	-0.89303	-3.9704	-0.84192	-0.1992
heptamethylnonane	-0.57516	-3.2643	-0.75823	-0.1992
1-methylnaphthalene	-0.59115	-2.7895	-0.58370	-0.1370
1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene	-0.50055	-2.6232	-0.44389	-0.1245
trans-decalin	-0.29640	-2.5604	-0.24863	-0.1245
n-butylcyclohexane	-0.58564	-2.8879	-0.41966	-0.1245
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	-0.72078	-2.6213	-0.56599	-0.1121

553 **Table A.3.** Entropy Scaling parameters used for the calculation of viscosity.

554

555 Entropy scaling parameters for thermal conductivity

	A^λ	B^λ	C^λ	D^λ
n-octadecane	0	-0.40156	1.98005	0
n-hexadecane	0.36701	-0.52738	1.15300	0
heptamethylnonane	0.36701	-0.52738	1.15300	0
1-methylnaphthalene	0.51308	-0.57468	0.67839	-0.06761
1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene	0.51308	-0.57468	0.67839	-0.06761
trans-decalin	0.51308	-0.57468	0.67839	-0.06761
n-butylcyclohexane	0.51308	-0.57468	0.67839	-0.06761
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	0	-0.45935	1.44014	0

556 **Table A.4.** Entropy Scaling parameters used for the calculation of thermal conductivity.

557

558

- 561 1. UNEP *The Emissions Gap Report. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, page XIV and XV*; 2018.
- 562 2. ExxonMobil *OUTLOOK FOR ENERGY: A PERSPECTIVE TO 2040*; 2019.
- 563 3. Lemaire, R.; Faccinetto, A.; Therssen, E.; Ziskind, M.; Focsa, C.; Desgroux, P., Experimental comparison of soot
564 formation in turbulent flames of Diesel and surrogate Diesel fuels. *Proceedings of the Combustion Institute* **2009**, *32*, 737-
565 744.
- 566 4. Ribeiro, N. M.; Pinto, A. C.; Quintella, C. M.; Rocha, G. O.; Teixeira, L. S. G.; Guarieiro, L. I. L. N.; Carmo Rangel,
567 M.; Veloso, M. C. C.; Rezende, M. J. C.; Cruz, R. S.; Oliveira, A. M.; Torres, E. A.; Andrade, J. B., The Role of Additives for
568 Diesel and Diesel Blended (Ethanol or Biodiesel) Fuels: A Review. *Energy & Fuels* **2007**, *21*, 2433-2445.
- 569 5. Han, Z.; Uludogan, A.; Hampson, G. J.; Reitz, R. D. In *Mechanism of Soot and NOx Emission Reduction Using*
570 *Multiple-injection in a Diesel Engine*, SAE Technical Paper Series, SAE International: 1996.
- 571 6. Pickett, L. M.; Siebers, D. L., Soot in diesel fuel jets: effects of ambient temperature, ambient density, and injection
572 pressure. *Combustion and Flame* **2004**, *138*, 114-135.
- 573 7. Vera-Tudela, W.; Haefeli, R.; Barro, C.; Schneider, B.; Boulouchos, K., An experimental study of a very high-pressure
574 diesel injector (up to 5000 bar) by means of optical diagnostics. *Fuel* **2020**, *275*, 117933.
- 575 8. Gavaises, M., Flow in valve covered orifice nozzles with cylindrical and tapered holes and link to cavitation erosion
576 and engine exhaust emissions. *International Journal of Engine Research* **2008**, *9*, 435-447.
- 577 9. Payri, R.; Salvador, F. J.; Gimeno, J.; Zapata, L. D., Diesel nozzle geometry influence on spray liquid-phase fuel
578 penetration in evaporative conditions. *Fuel* **2008**, *87* (7), 1165-1176.
- 579 10. Schmidt, D. P.; Corradini, M. L., The internal flow of diesel fuel injector nozzles: A review. *International Journal of*
580 *Engine Research* **2001**, *2*, 1-22.
- 581 11. Manin, J.; Bardi, M.; Pickett, L. M.; Payri, R., Boundary condition and fuel composition effects on injection processes
582 of high-pressure sprays at the microscopic level. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* **2016**, *83*, 267-278.
- 583 12. Yuan, W.; Schnerr, G. H., Numerical Simulation of Two-Phase Flow in Injection Nozzles: Interaction of Cavitation
584 and External Jet Formation. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **2003**, *125*, 963.
- 585 13. Sou, A.; Hosokawa, S.; Tomiyama, A., Effects of cavitation in a nozzle on liquid jet atomization. *International Journal*
586 *of Heat and Mass Transfer* **2007**, *50*, 3575-3582.
- 587 14. Gavaises, M., Modeling of diesel fuel injection processes. *Ph. D. thesis, Imperial College, University of London* **1997**,
588 76-80.
- 589 15. Payri, R.; Molina, S.; Salvador, F. J.; Gimeno, J., A study of the relation between nozzle geometry, internal flow and
590 sprays characteristics in diesel fuel injection systems. *KSME International Journal* **2004**, *18*, 1222-1235.
- 591 16. Payri, R.; Salvador, F. J.; García, A.; Gil, A., Combination of visualization techniques for the analysis of evaporating
592 diesel sprays. *Energy and Fuels* **2012**, *26* (9), 5481-5490.
- 593 17. Reid, B.; Gavaises, M.; Mitroglou, N.; Hargrave, G.; Garner, C.; Long, E.; McDavid, R., On the formation of string
594 cavitation inside fuel injectors. *Experiments in fluids* **2014**, *55* (1), 1662.
- 595 18. Fitzgerald, R. P.; Vecchia, G.; Peraza, J. E.; Martin, G. C. In *Features of Internal Flow and Spray for a Multi-Hole*
596 *Transparent Diesel Fuel Injector Tip*, 29th Conference on Liquid Atomization and Spray Systems, ILASS Paris: 2019.
- 597 19. Yuan, W., Modeling and computation of unsteady cavitation flows in injection nozzles. *MÁcanique & Industries*
598 **2001**, *2*, 383-394.
- 599 20. Battistoni, M.; Som, S.; Longman, D. E., Comparison of Mixture and Multifluid Models for In-Nozzle Cavitation
600 Prediction. *Journal of Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power* **2014**, *136*, 061506.
- 601 21. Habchi, C.; Dumont, N.; Simonin, O., Multidimensional Simulation of Cavitating Flows in Diesel Injectors by a
602 Homogeneous Mixture Modeling Approach. *Atomization and Sprays* **2008**, *18*, 129-162.
- 603 22. Lindau, J. W.; Kunz, R. F.; Boger, D. A.; Stinebring, D. R.; Gibeling, H. J., High Reynolds Number, Unsteady,
604 Multiphase CFD Modeling of Cavitating Flows. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **2002**, *124*, 607.
- 605 23. Singhal, A. K.; Athavale, M. M.; Li, H.; Jiang, Y., Mathematical Basis and Validation of the Full Cavitation Model.
606 *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **2002**, *124*, 617.
- 607 24. Karrholm, F. P.; Weller, H.; Nordin, N. In *Modelling Injector Flow Including Cavitation Effects for Diesel Applications*,
608 Volume 2: Fora, Parts A and B, ASME: 2007.
- 609 25. Strotos, G.; Koukouvinis, P.; Theodorakakos, A.; Gavaises, M.; Bergeles, G., Transient heating effects in high
610 pressure Diesel injector nozzles. *International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow* **2015**, *51*, 257-267.
- 611 26. Theodorakakos, A.; Strotos, G.; Mitroglou, N.; Atkin, C.; Gavaises, M., Friction-induced heating in nozzle hole
612 micro-channels under extreme fuel pressurisation. *Fuel* **2014**, *123* (x), 143-150.
- 613 27. Cristofaro, M.; Edelbauer, W.; Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M., Influence of Diesel Fuel Viscosity on Cavitating Throttle
614 Flow Simulations under Erosive Operation Conditions. *ACS omega* **2020**, *5* (13), 7182-7192.
- 615 28. Liu, H.; Ma, J.; Dong, F.; Yang, Y.; Liu, X.; Ma, G.; Zheng, Z.; Yao, M., Experimental investigation of the effects of
616 diesel fuel properties on combustion and emissions on a multi-cylinder heavy-duty diesel engine. *Energy Conversion and*
617 *Management* **2018**, *171*, 1787-1800.
- 618 29. Örley, F.; Hickel, S.; Schmidt, S. J.; Adams, N. A., Large-Eddy Simulation of turbulent, cavitating fuel flow inside a 9-
619 hole Diesel injector including needle movement. *International Journal of Engine Research* **2017**, *18* (3), 195-211.
- 620 30. Kolev, N., *Multiphase Flow Dynamics 3: Turbulence, Gas Absorption and Release, Diesel Fuel Properties*. Springer
621 Verlag Berlin Heidelberg: 2002.
- 622 31. Lemmon, E. W.; Huber, M. L.; McLinden, M. O., NIST Standard Reference Database 23: Reference Fluid
623 Thermodynamic and Transport Properties-REFPROP. 9.0. *NIST* **2010**.
- 624 32. Park, S. H.; Suh, H. K.; Lee, C. S., Effect of Bioethanol-Biodiesel Blending Ratio on Fuel Spray Behavior and
625 Atomization Characteristics. *Energy & Fuels* **2009**, *23*, 4092-4098.

626 33. Park, S. H.; Kim, S. H.; Lee, C. S., Mixing Stability and Spray Behavior Characteristics of Diesel-Ethanol-Methyl Ester
627 Blended Fuels in a Common-Rail Diesel Injection System. *Energy & Fuels* **2009**, *23*, 5228-5235.

628 34. Yang, S.; Yi, P.; Habchi, C., Real-fluid injection modeling and LES simulation of the ECN Spray A injector using a fully
629 compressible two-phase flow approach. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* **2020**, *122*, 103145.

630 35. Toth, S. L., Experimental study of droplet vaporization and combustion of diesel, biodiesel and their blends in a
631 turbulent environment at elevated pressure and temperature conditions. **2014**.

632 36. Zhang, L.; Kong, S. C., High-pressure vaporization modeling of multi-component petroleum-biofuel mixtures under
633 engine conditions. *Combustion and Flame* **2011**, *158* (9), 1705-1717.

634 37. Strotos, G.; Gavaises, M.; Theodorakakos, A.; Bergeles, G., Numerical investigation of the evaporation of two-
635 component droplets. *Fuel* **2011**, *90* (4), 1492-1507.

636 38. Abianeh, O. S.; Chen, C., A discrete multicomponent fuel evaporation model with liquid turbulence effects.
637 *International journal of heat and mass transfer* **2012**, *55* (23-24), 6897-6907.

638 39. Strotos, G.; Gavaises, M.; Theodorakakos, A.; Bergeles, G., Influence of species concentration on the evaporation
639 of suspended multicomponent droplets. *ILASS 2008* **2008**.

640 40. Gross, J.; Sadowski, G., Perturbed-chain SAFT: An equation of state based on a perturbation theory for chain
641 molecules. *Industrial & engineering chemistry research* **2001**, *40*, 1244-1260.

642 41. Wertheim, M. S., Fluids with highly directional attractive forces. I. Statistical thermodynamics. *Journal of statistical*
643 *physics* **1984**, *35*, 19-34.

644 42. Wertheim, M. S., Fluids with highly directional attractive forces. II. Thermodynamic perturbation theory and integral
645 equations. *Journal of statistical physics* **1984**, *35*, 35-47.

646 43. Wertheim, M. S., Fluids with highly directional attractive forces. III. Multiple attraction sites. *Journal of statistical*
647 *physics* **1986**, *42*, 459-476.

648 44. Wertheim, M. S., Fluids with highly directional attractive forces. IV. Equilibrium polymerization. *Journal of statistical*
649 *physics* **1986**, *42*, 477-492.

650 45. De Villiers, A.; Schwarz, C.; Burger, A.; Kontogeorgis, G., Evaluation of the PC-SAFT, SAFT and CPA equations of
651 state in predicting derivative properties of selected non-polar and hydrogen-bonding compounds. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* **2013**,
652 *338*, 1-15.

653 46. Leekumjorn, S.; Krejbjerg, K., Phase behavior of reservoir fluids: Comparisons of PC-SAFT and cubic EOS simulations.
654 *Fluid Phase Equilibria* **2013**, *359*, 17-23.

655 47. Peng, D.-Y.; Robinson, D. B., A new two-constant equation of state. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry*
656 *Fundamentals* **1976**, *15*, 59-64.

657 48. Soave, G., Equilibrium constants from a modified Redlich-Kwong equation of state. *Chemical Engineering Science*
658 **1972**, *27*, 1197-1203.

659 49. Yan, W.; Varzandeh, F.; Stenby, E. H., PVT modeling of reservoir fluids using PC-SAFT EoS and Soave-BWR EoS. *Fluid*
660 *Phase Equilibria* **2015**, *386*, 96-124.

661 50. Burgess, W. A.; Tapriyal, D.; Morreale, B. D.; Soong, Y.; Baled, H. O.; Enick, R. M.; Wu, Y.; Bamgbade, B. A.;
662 McHugh, M. A., Volume-translated cubic EoS and PC-SAFT density models and a free volume-based viscosity model for
663 hydrocarbons at extreme temperature and pressure conditions. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* **2013**, *359*, 38-44.

664 51. Schou Pedersen, K.; Hasdbjerg, C. In *PC-SAFT equation of state applied to petroleum reservoir fluids*, SPE Annual
665 Technical Conference and Exhibition, 2007.

666 52. Gord, M. F.; Roozbahani, M.; Rahbari, H. R.; Hosseini, S. J. H., Modeling thermodynamic properties of natural gas
667 mixtures using perturbed-chain statistical associating fluid theory. *Russian Journal of Applied Chemistry* **2013**, *86*, 867-878.

668 53. Mueller, C. J.; Cannella, W. J.; Bays, J. T.; Bruno, T. J.; DeFabio, K.; Dettman, H. D.; Gieleciak, R. M.; Huber, M. L.;
669 Kweon, C.-B.; McConnell, S. S.; Pitz, W. J.; Ratcliff, M. A., Diesel Surrogate Fuels for Engine Testing and Chemical-Kinetic
670 Modeling: Compositions and Properties. *Energy & Fuels* **2016**, *30*, 1445-1461.

671 54. Vidal, A.; Rodriguez, C.; Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M.; McHugh, M. A., Modelling of Diesel fuel properties through
672 its surrogates using Perturbed-Chain, Statistical Associating Fluid Theory. *International Journal of Engine Research* **2019**.

673 55. *OpenFOAM*, v2.4.

674 56. Payri, R.; Tormos, B.; Gimeno, J.; Bracho, G., The potential of Large Eddy Simulation (LES) code for the modeling of
675 flow in diesel injectors. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* **2010**, *52* (7-8), 1151-1160.

676 57. Koukouvinis, P.; Naseri, H.; Gavaises, M., Performance of turbulence and cavitation models in prediction of incipient
677 and developed cavitation. *International Journal of Engine Research* **2017**, *18* (4), 333-350.

678 58. Nicoud, F.; Ducros, F., Subgrid-scale stress modelling based on the square of the velocity gradient tensor. *Flow,*
679 *turbulence and Combustion* **1999**, *62* (3), 183-200.

680 59. Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M.; Li, J.; Wang, L., Large Eddy Simulation of Diesel injector including cavitation effects
681 and correlation to erosion damage. *Fuel* **2016**, *175*, 26-39.

682 60. Liu, F. *A Thorough Description Of How Wall Functions Are Implemented In OpenFOAM*; 2016; pp 1-30.

683 61. Gross, J.; Sadowski, G., Perturbed-Chain SAFT: An Equation of State Based on a Perturbation Theory for Chain
684 Molecules. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* **2001**, *40* (4), 1244-1260.

685 62. Vidal, A.; Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M., Vapor-liquid equilibrium calculations at specified composition, density and
686 temperature with the perturbed chain statistical associating fluid theory (PC-SAFT) equation of state. *Fluid Phase Equilibria*
687 **2020**, 112661.

688 63. Saurel, R.; Petitpas, F.; Abgrall, R., Modelling phase transition in metastable liquids: application to cavitating and
689 flashing flows. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **2008**, *607*, 313-350.

690 64. Lötgering-Lin, O.; Gross, J., Group Contribution Method for Viscosities Based on Entropy Scaling Using the
691 Perturbed-Chain Polar Statistical Associating Fluid Theory. *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Research* **2015**, *54* (32), 7942-
692 7952.

- 693 65. Beattie, D.; Whalley, P., A simple two-phase frictional pressure drop calculation method. *International Journal of*
694 *Multiphase Flow* **1982**, *8* (1), 83-87.
- 695 66. Hopp, M.; Gross, J., Thermal Conductivity of Real Substances from Excess Entropy Scaling Using PCP-SAFT. *Industrial*
696 *and Engineering Chemistry Research* **2017**, *56* (15), 4527-4538.
- 697 67. Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M. In *Simulation of throttle flow with two phase and single phase homogenous*
698 *equilibrium model*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, IOP Publishing: 2015; p 012086.
- 699 68. Karathanassis, I.; Trickett, K.; Koukouvinis, P.; Wang, J.; Barbour, R.; Gavaises, M., Illustrating the effect of
700 viscoelastic additives on cavitation and turbulence with X-ray imaging. *Scientific reports* **2018**, *8* (1), 1-15.
- 701 69. Karathanassis, I. K.; Koukouvinis, P.; Kontolatis, E.; Lee, Z.; Wang, J.; Mitroglou, N.; Gavaises, M., High-speed
702 visualization of vortical cavitation using synchrotron radiation. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **2018**, *838*, 148-164.
- 703 70. Papoutsakis, A.; Theodorakakos, A.; Giannadakis, E.; Papoulias, D.; Gavaises, M. *LES predictions of the vortical flow*
704 *structures in diesel injector nozzles*; 0148-7191; SAE Technical Paper: 2009.
- 705 71. Reid, B. A.; Hargrave, G. K.; Garner, C. P.; Wigley, G., An investigation of string cavitation in a true-scale fuel injector
706 flow geometry at high pressure. *Physics of Fluids* **2010**, *22* (3), 031703.
- 707 72. Brunhart, M.; Soteriou, C.; Daveau, C.; Gavaises, M.; Koukouvinis, P.; Winterbourn, M., Cavitation erosion risk
708 indicators for a thin gap within a diesel fuel pump. *Wear* **2020**, *442*, 203024.
- 709 73. Theodorakakos, A.; Mitroglou, N.; Gavaises, M., Simulation of heating effects caused by fuel pressurisation at
710 3000bar in Diesel fuel injectors. *11th Engine Combustion Processes, Germany* **2013**.
- 711 74. Theodorakakos, A.; Strotos, G.; Gavaises, M.; Koukouvinis, P., Quantification of Friction-induced Heating in tapered
712 Diesel orifices. *SIA International Conference on Diesel Powertrains, France* **2014**.
- 713 75. Strotos, G.; Theodorakakos, A.; Gavaises, M.; Koukouvinis, P.; Wang, L.; Li, J.; McDavid, R. M., Fuel heating in high
714 pressure diesel nozzles. *Conference on Thermo- and Fluid-Dynamic Processes in Diesel Engines, Spain* **2014**.
- 715 76. Salemi, R.; Koukouvinis, P.; Strotos, G.; McDavid, R.; Wang, L.; Li, J.; Marengo, M.; Gavaises, M. In *Evaluation of*
716 *friction heating in cavitating high pressure Diesel injector nozzles*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, IOP Publishing: 2015;
717 p 012083.
- 718 77. Salemi, R.; McDavid, R.; Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M.; Marengo, M. In *Steady State and Transient, Non-isothermal*
719 *Modeling of Cavitation in Diesel Fuel Injectors*, Proceedings of ILASS Americas 27th Annual Conference on Liquid Atomization
720 and Spray Systems, Raleigh, NC, May, 2015.
- 721 78. Vidal, A.; Rodriguez, C.; Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M.; McHugh, M. A., Modelling of Diesel fuel properties through
722 its surrogates using Perturbed-Chain, Statistical Associating Fluid Theory. *International Journal of Engine Research* **2018**,
723 146808741880171.
- 724 79. Rowane, A. J.; Mahesh Babu, V.; Rokni, H. B.; Moore, J. D.; Gavaises, M.; Wensing, M.; Gupta, A.; McHugh, M.
725 A., Effect of Composition, Temperature, and Pressure on the Viscosities and Densities of Three Diesel Fuels. *Journal of*
726 *Chemical & Engineering Data* **2019**, *64* (12), 5529-5547.
- 727 80. Rokni, H. B.; Moore, J. D.; Gupta, A.; McHugh, M. A.; Mallepally, R. R.; Gavaises, M., General method for prediction
728 of thermal conductivity for well-characterized hydrocarbon mixtures and fuels up to extreme conditions using entropy scaling.
729 *Fuel* **2019**, *245*, 594-604.
- 730 81. Rokni, H. B.; Gupta, A.; Moore, J. D.; McHugh, M. A.; Bamgbade, B. A.; Gavaises, M., Purely predictive method for
731 density, compressibility, and expansivity for hydrocarbon mixtures and diesel and jet fuels up to high temperatures and
732 pressures. *Fuel* **2019**, *236*, 1377-1390.
- 733 82. Cristofaro, M.; Edelbauer, W.; Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M., A numerical study on the effect of cavitation erosion
734 in a diesel injector. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* **2020**, *78*, 200-216.
- 735 83. Cristofaro, M.; Edelbauer, W.; Gavaises, M.; Koukouvinis, P. In *Numerical simulation of compressible cavitating*
736 *two-phase flows with a pressure-based solver*, 28TH CONFERENCE ON LIQUID ATOMIZATION AND SPRAY SYSTEMS, ILASS-
737 EUROPE 2017, 2017.
- 738 84. Caupin, F.; Stroock, A. D., The stability limit and other open questions on water at negative pressure. *Liquid*
739 *Polymorphism: Advances in Chemical Physics* **2013**, *152*, 51-80.
- 740 85. Trevena, D., Cavitation and the generation of tension in liquids. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* **1984**, *17* (11),
741 2139.
- 742 86. Schnerr, G. H.; Sauer, J., Physical and Numerical Modeling of Unsteady Cavitation Dynamics. *Fourth International*
743 *Conference on Multiphase Flow* **2001**, (May 2001), 1-12.
- 744 87. Singhal, A. K.; Athavale, M. M.; Li, H.; Jiang, Y., Mathematical Basis and Validation of the Full Cavitation Model.
745 *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **2002**, *124* (3), 617-617.
- 746 88. Zwart, P. J.; Gerber, A. G.; Belamri, T. In *A two-phase flow model for predicting cavitation dynamics*, Fifth
747 international conference on multiphase flow, Yokohama, Japan, 2004.
- 748 89. Naseri, H.; Trickett, K.; Mitroglou, N.; Karathanassis, I.; Koukouvinis, P.; Gavaises, M.; Barbour, R.; Diamond, D.;
749 Rogers, S. E.; Santini, M., Turbulence and Cavitation Suppression by Quaternary Ammonium Salt Additives. *Scientific reports*
750 **2018**, *8* (1), 1-15.
- 751 90. Dumond, J.; Magagnato, F.; Class, A., Stochastic-field cavitation model. *Physics of Fluids* **2013**, *25* (7), 073302.
- 752 91. Giannadakis, E.; Gavaises, M.; Arcoumanis, C., Modelling of cavitation in diesel injector nozzles. *Journal of Fluid*
753 *Mechanics* **2008**, *616*, 153-193.
- 754 92. Arabnejad, M. H.; Amini, A.; Farhat, M.; Bensow, R. E., Numerical and experimental investigation of shedding
755 mechanisms from leading-edge cavitation. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* **2019**, *119*, 123-143.
- 756 93. Ghahramani, E.; Arabnejad, M. H.; Bensow, R. E., A comparative study between numerical methods in simulation
757 of cavitating bubbles. *International Journal of Multiphase Flow* **2019**, *111*, 339-359.

758 94. Giannadakis, E.; Papoulias, D.; Theodorakakos, A.; Gavaises, M., Simulation of cavitation in outward-opening piezo-
759 type pintle injector nozzles. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering*
760 **2008**, 222 (10), 1895-1910.

761 95. Kedrinskiy, V. K., *Hydrodynamics of Explosion: experiments and models*. Springer Science & Business Media: 2006.

762 96. Wang, C.; Moro, A.; Xue, F.; Wu, X.; Luo, F., The influence of eccentric needle movement on internal flow and
763 injection characteristics of a multi-hole diesel nozzle. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* **2018**, 117, 818-834.

764 97. Nurick, W. H., Orifice Cavitation and Its Effect on Spray Mixing. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **1976**, 98, 681.

765 98. Gavaises, M.; Andriotis, A.; Papoulias, D.; Mitroglou, N.; Theodorakakos, A., Characterization of string cavitation
766 in large-scale Diesel nozzles with tapered holes. *Physics of Fluids* **2009**, 21, 052107.

767 99. Mitroglou, N.; McLorn, M.; Gavaises, M.; Soteriou, C.; Winterbourne, M., Instantaneous and ensemble average
768 cavitation structures in Diesel micro-channel flow orifices. *Fuel* **2014**, 116, 736-742.

769 100. Mitroglou, N.; Gavaises, M., Mapping of cavitating flow regimes in injectors for medium-/heavy-duty diesel engines.
770 *International Journal of Engine Research* **2013**, 14 (6), 590-605.

771 101. Mitroglou, N.; Gavaises, M., Cavitation inside Real-Size Fully Transparent Fuel Injector Nozzles and Its Effect on
772 Near-Nozzle Spray Formation. *Proc. of Workshop on Droplet Impact Phenomena and Spray Investigations (DIPSI), University*
773 *of Bergamo, Italy* **2011**.

774 102. Santos, E. G.; Shi, J.; Gavaises, M.; Soteriou, C.; Winterbourn, M.; Bauer, W., Investigation of cavitation and air
775 entrainment during pilot injection in real-size multi-hole diesel nozzles. *Fuel* **2020**, 263, 116746.

776 103. Gold, M.; Pearson, R.; Turner, J.; Sykes, D.; Stetsyuk, V.; De Sercey, G.; Crua, C.; Koukouvinis, F.; Gavaises, M.,
777 Simulation and Measurement of Transient Fluid Phenomena within Diesel Injection. *SAE Technical Papers* **2019**, 2019, 0066.

778 104. Zhang, L.; He, Z.; Guan, W.; Wang, Q.; Som, S., Simulations on the cavitating flow and corresponding risk of erosion
779 in diesel injector nozzles with double array holes. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* **2018**, 124, 900-911.

780 105. Mueller, C. J.; Cannella, W. J.; Bays, J. T.; Bruno, T. J.; Defabio, K.; Dettman, H. D.; Gieleciak, R. M.; Huber, M. L.;
781 Kweon, C.-B. B.; McConnell, S. S.; Pitz, W. J.; Ratcliff, M. A., Diesel Surrogate Fuels for Engine Testing and Chemical-Kinetic
782 Modeling: Compositions and Properties. *Energy and Fuels* **2016**, 30 (2), 1445-1461.

783 106. Fortes Patella, R.; Choffat, T.; Reboud, J. L.; Archer, A., Mass loss simulation in cavitation erosion: Fatigue criterion
784 approach. *Wear* **2013**, 300 (1-2), 205-215.

785 107. Brennen, C. E., *Cavitation and bubble dynamics*. 2013; p 1-249.

786