

Multi-physics modeling of non-equilibrium phenomena in inductively coupled plasma discharges: Part II. Multi-temperature approach

Sanjeev Kumar, Alessandro Munafò, Sung Min Jo, and Marco Panesi[‡]

Center for Hypersonics and Entry Systems Studies (CHESS),
Department of Aerospace Engineering,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

Abstract. This paper provides a comparison between the vibrational-specific state-to-state (StS) model for nitrogen plasma elaborated in Part I of this work and conventional two-temperature (2-T) models for simulating inductively coupled plasma (ICP) discharges under non-Local Thermodynamic Equilibrium (NLTE) conditions. Simulations are performed within the multi-physics computational framework established for ICP in Part I. Based on the findings of Part I, the quasi-steady-state (QSS) assumption is validated in the plasma core, thereby enabling the calculation of global rate coefficients under this assumption. This facilitates the reduction of the StS model to a “consistent” macroscopic 2-T model. Results from the StS model for nitrogen ICP torch exhibit considerable discrepancies when compared against predictions from the widely utilized Park 2-T model. On the contrary, the comparison between the newly proposed 2-T model, consistently derived from the original vibronic StS model, and the full StS results demonstrate excellent agreement in terms of plasma core location, morphology, and peak temperature distributions. This demonstrates the ability of the proposed 2-T model to capture the energy transfer and reactive processes predicted by the comprehensive StS model. Additionally, the study identifies the vibrational-translational (VT) energy transfer term in the 2-T model as the predominant factor in dictating plasma core morphology. This suggests a strong sensitivity of the ICP flow field to heavy-impact vibrational excitations and dissociative events.

1. Introduction

Recent advances in both numerical and physical modeling have improved the accuracy of the predictions of inductively coupled plasmas (ICPs) [1–7]. These advancements have elucidated the intricate details of the thermochemical processes occurring under operating conditions pertinent to aerospace applications [8–11]. This manuscript represents Part II of a broader investigation: While Part I delves into the

[‡] Corresponding author (mpanesi@illinois.edu).

characterization of non-equilibrium effects in ICP plasma tunnels, Part II introduces a computationally efficient model designed to yield accurate results at a reduced computational cost. Traditionally, ICP simulations have relied on the assumption of Local Thermodynamic Equilibrium (LTE). Within this framework, the plasma state at any specific location is determined by its pressure and temperature, given a constant elemental fraction, which is achieved by maximizing the system’s entropy [8, 9, 12–16]. The LTE model’s prevalent use stems from its computational efficiency and its applicability to thermal plasmas close to atmospheric-pressure conditions where LTE is predominantly observed. Yet, emerging research employing non-LTE simulations has demonstrated strong deviations from the equilibrium state for conditions of interest. Furthermore, these studies have also highlighted the profound influence of the chosen kinetic mechanism on the simulation outcomes [4, 8, 11, 17–21].

In Part I of this work, using a coarse-grained vibrational StS model, we demonstrated severe deviations in the distribution from the Boltzmann equilibrium - a finding corroborated by other studies in the literature [10, 22]. Similarly, discrepancies in the population distribution of vibrational levels from the Boltzmann distribution have been observed under comparable conditions in recombining nitrogen plasma experiments conducted at Stanford University’s ICP facility [23, 24]. Notably, this facility was moved to École Centrale Paris, where the scope of research expanded to encompass additional gas mixtures [25–27].

The most accurate modeling of NLTE plasma flows is achieved through the direct solution of the master equation, wherein each fundamental reactive process is distinctly modeled. This approach is known as the State-to-State (StS) method. StS models provide an accurate description of both collisional and radiative interactions across the internal energy levels of every species present in the flow [22, 24, 28–44]. By increasing the order of complexity and computational time, three primary variants of StS models can be defined: electronic [45–47], vibrational [48, 49], and rovibrational state-to-state models [29, 50, 51]. Electronic state-to-state models explicitly resolve the transitions between electronic states, with Boltzmann distributions for the remaining modes. On the other hand, vibrational state-to-state models account for the transitions between a molecule’s vibrational states, defining only a rotational temperature. Both these models demand substantial computational resources, limiting their effective deployment in multidimensional codes. Consequently, most of the applications are constrained to 0-D and 1-D flow solvers. To address the inherent challenges of the StS model, recent innovations by the authors introduced a reduced-order technique. This approach, rooted in the coarse-graining method with the maximum entropy closure, offers a novel solution [50–63]. Here, individual states of atoms and molecules are grouped into macro groups. The governing equations are then obtained by projecting the master equations onto this reduced subspace.

The analysis undertaken in Part I of this work has revealed that except for a narrow shell surrounding the plasma bubble, the overall discharge is in Quasi-Steady-State (QSS). In such conditions, the population of excited states can be deduced by

solving a nonlinear algebraic system of equations. This method, which bypasses the need for time-dependent equations, offers a significant boost in computational efficiency. More importantly, the existence of a QSS distribution allows for the definition of macroscopic kinetic mechanisms that can be used within the framework of the multi-temperature models [64–68]. The 2-T model traditionally assumes equilibrium between the rotational and translational temperatures ($T = T_r$), and between free-electron, electronic and vibrational temperatures ($T_v = T_e$). To calculate these temperatures and the energy exchanged between all the energy modes (i.e., translational, rotational, vibrational, and electronic), conservation equations for the internal energy modes in thermal nonequilibrium are added to the classical set of conservation equations for mass, momentum, and total energy. For the chemical kinetics model, macroscopic rate coefficients are assumed to depend on the different temperatures in the flow. It is important to mention that the values of these rate parameters suffer from large variability that can span orders of magnitude [65, 69–71]. Also, the chemical-kinetic parameters (such as vibrational-translation (VT) coupling, chemistry-vibrational (CV) coupling, and other terms in the electro-vibrational energy equation) in the 2-T model have been found to influence the flow fields obtained from CFD calculations. It has been a common practice, at least in the hypersonics community, to use Park’s chemical-kinetic parameters for the 2-T models in the CFD codes [72–75]. To overcome the inaccuracies of the chemical-kinetic parameters in the 2-T model, it is proposed to modify these chemical-kinetics parameters based on the state-to-state kinetic studies [76–78], which gives more accurate results with 2-T model without resorting to computationally expensive StS models.

Hence, to overcome the limitation of the existing models, our objective is to devise a 2-T model that draws upon databases grounded in quantum mechanical analyses, a methodology previously utilized in Part I of this series. Furthermore, this paper presents a comparative analysis of the ICP results obtained from the nitrogen vibronic StS model (presented in Paper I) against the widely used 2-T models to assess the ability of the 2-T models to reproduce the StS results.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the 2-T NLTE model for non-equilibrium plasma used in the present computational framework to describe the plasma inside the ICP facility. Section 3 discusses the strategy to reduce the vibronic StS model to a consistent 2-T model. Section 4 presents a comparative analysis of the ICP results obtained from the vibronic StS model against the one obtained from the widely used Park 2-T and the consistent 2-T (developed in this work) models. This section also presents a comparison of the ICP torch flow fields obtained from various physico-chemical models for a wide range of operating conditions to assess the applicability of various models given the ICP facility operating conditions. Finally, the conclusions are summarized in Section 5.

2. Physical Modeling

The model for the electromagnetic field within the ICP torch is consistent with what was detailed in Paper I. However, in Paper I, the plasma description primarily revolved around the vibronic state-to-state assumption due to an emphasis on StS simulations. In this paper, we make use of the two-temperature (2-T) NLTE model, which will be utilized to compare with the vibronic StS findings.

Under the assumptions listed in Part I, for a 2-T NLTE simulation, the plasma hydrodynamics are governed by the set of mass continuity, global momentum and energy, and vibronic energy equations [66, 79, 80]:

$$\frac{\partial \rho_s}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot [\rho_s (\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{U}_s)] = \dot{\omega}_s, \quad s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v} + p \mathbf{l}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} + \mathbf{J} \times \mathbf{B}, \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho E}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot (\rho H \mathbf{v}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\tau} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{q}) + \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}', \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho e_{ve}}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot (\rho e_{ve} \mathbf{v}) = -\nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{q}_{ve} - p_e \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \Omega_{ve}^c + \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{E}', \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{S} denotes the set of species, and the *ve* lower-script denotes the contributions for the sole *vibronic* degrees of freedom. The various symbols in the governing equations Eqs. (1) to (4) have their usual meaning: t denotes time, \mathbf{r} the position; ρ and \mathbf{v} the mass density and mass-averaged velocity, respectively; ρ_s and \mathbf{U}_s the partial density and diffusion velocity of species s ; p_e the pressure of free-electrons; e and H the total energy and enthalpy per unit-mass, respectively; $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ the stress tensor; \mathbf{q} the heat flux vector; $\dot{\omega}_s$ the mass production rates due to collisional processes; the Ω^c term the energy exchange terms due to collisional processes; \mathbf{J} the conduction current density; \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} the electric field and the magnetic induction, respectively; $\mathbf{E}' = \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$ the electric field in the hydrodynamic frame (non-relativistic approximation). It is to be noted that the main difference in the plasma governing equations between Paper I and II lies in Eq. (4) which now represents the contribution from free-electron, electronic and vibrational modes instead of only free-electrons in Paper I. This leads to additional terms in the volumetric energy source term, Ω_{ve}^c .

The source term Ω_{ve}^c in the electro-vibrational energy equation represents the energy exchange by elastic, inelastic and reactive collisional processes and is given by:

$$\Omega_{ve}^c = \Omega^{VT} + \Omega^{TE} + \Omega^{DE} + \Omega^{IE} + \Omega^{CV} + \Omega^{CEL} \quad (5)$$

Ω^{VT} term denotes the inelastic vibrational energy exchange in atom-molecule and molecule-molecule collisions and is modeled based on the Landau-Teller model [81]:

$$\Omega^{VT} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_m} \rho_s \frac{e_s^V(T_h) - e_s^V(T_e)}{\tau_s^{VT}} \quad (6)$$

The molecular VT relaxation times τ_S^{VT} are computed as a frequency average of the atom-molecule and molecule-molecule VT relaxation times [64,66] which are computed based on Millikan and White's formula [82] with Park's high-temperature correction [65] as:

$$\tau_{sr}^{\text{VT}} = \frac{101325}{p} \exp \left[A_{sr} \left(T_{tr}^{-1/3} - B_{sr} \right) - 18.42 \right] \quad (7)$$

where, p is the pressure in Pascals and T_{tr} is the trans-rotational temperature. The high-temperature correction is given as:

$$\tau_{c,sr}^{\text{VT}} = \left(n_s \sigma_{v,sr} \sqrt{\frac{8k_B T_{tr}}{\pi m_{r,sr}}} \right)^{-1} \quad (8)$$

where n_s is the number density of species s , and $\sigma_{v,sr}$ and $m_{r,sr}$ are the collision limiting cross-section and reduced mass between the species s and r , respectively.

Ω^{CV} denotes the volumetric rate of change of vibrational energy due to chemical reactions and is modeled by the non-preferential dissociation model [83]:

$$\Omega^{\text{CV}} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_m} \omega_s e_s^v(T_e) \quad (9)$$

where, $e_s^v(T_e)$ denotes the average vibrational energy of species s at temperature T_e computed using harmonic-oscillator assumption.

Ω^{CEL} denotes the volumetric rate of change of electronic energy due to chemical reactions and is modeled by the non-preferential dissociation model:

$$\Omega^{\text{CEL}} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_m} \omega_s e_s^{\text{el}}(T_e) \quad (10)$$

where, $e_s^{\text{el}}(T_e)$ denotes the average electronic energy of species s at temperature T_e .

Definitions of Ω^{TE} , Ω^{DE} and Ω^{IE} have already been discussed in paper I.

The computation of the thermodynamic and transport properties remains the same as in Paper I.

3. Reduction of the StS model to a consistent 2-T model

The flow field of the ICP is significantly influenced by the choice of reaction rates [84]. Furthermore, different kinetic mechanisms, such as Park and Dunn-Kang, may possess different reaction sets and even for the same reactions, the rates can depart significantly in magnitude. This work aims to derive a reduced-order kinetic mechanism that is consistent with the StS model discussed in Part I. This allows us to assess the impact that the assumptions on the model form have on the results. Numerical integration of vibronic master equations is accomplished using the PLATO [85] library, applied across different bath temperatures. Global rate coefficients can subsequently be determined

from the detailed state-specific rate coefficients combined with the vibronic state populations. The foundation for the global rates derives from earlier research [29,86,87], with the rates pertinent to the QSS region being selected for every reaction category. Table 1 presents the Arrhenius fit coefficients for the macroscopic rates, derived from the scaled-down vibronic StS kinetics rates. The formula for the Arrhenius form is as follows:

$$K = AT^B \exp\left(-\frac{C}{T}\right) \quad (11)$$

where, A , B and C are the rate coefficients given in Table 1 and the units of K are $m^3/mol.s$.

Table 1: Arrhenius fit coefficients A , B and C for the macroscopic rates obtained by reducing the vibronic StS kinetics rates

Reaction	$A[m^3/mol.s]$	B	$C[K]$
Heavy-impact dissociation			
$N_2 + M = N + N + M; M \in \{N, N^+\}$	1.43×10^8	0.285	1.07×10^5
$N_2 + M = N + N + M; M \in \{N_2, N_2^+\}$	1.68×10^5	0.817	9.61×10^4
$N_2^+ + M = N + N^+ + M; M \in \{N, N^+\}$	2.70×10^8	0.233	9.56×10^4
$N_2^+ + M = N + N^+ + M; M \in \{N_2, N_2^+\}$	1.55×10^{10}	-0.246	9.85×10^4
Electron-impact dissociation			
$N_2 + e^- = N + N + e^-$	9.61×10^{12}	-0.719	1.13×10^5
Electron-impact ionization			
$N + e^- = N^+ + e^- + e^-$	1.50×10^{16}	-0.980	1.53×10^5
$N_2 + e^- = N_2^+ + e^- + e^-$	1.05×10^3	1.556	1.75×10^5
Dissociative recombination			
$N_2^+ + e^- = N + N$	1.26×10^{17}	-1.70	2.46×10^3
Charge exchange			
$N_2 + N^+ = N + N_2^+$	3.99×10^{-3}	2.190	2.10×10^3
Heavy-impact ionization			
$N + N = N^+ + N + e^-$	1.28×10^{21}	-2.593	1.96×10^5
$N + N_2 = N^+ + N_2 + e^-$	4.48×10^{20}	-2.516	1.93×10^5

To make the 2-T model fully consistent with the vibronic StS model, the vibrational relaxation time τ_s^{VT} in Eq. (6) should be computed based on the vibronic StS kinetics itself as recent state-to-state kinetic calculations of the atmospheric gas species found that Park's high-temperature corrected vibrational relaxation time does not agree with the one calculated using the state-to-state kinetics [50, 51, 76–78, 88–90]. Fig. 1 shows

a comparison of the vibrational relaxation times obtained from rovibrational state-to-state kinetics with the one obtained using MW + high-temperature correction formula for N₂-N system [29], depicting at least an order of magnitude difference. Hence, it is important to use vibrational relaxation times consistent with the state-to-state kinetics in order to get a good agreement with StS results. In the present work, the vibrational relaxation times for each electronic level of the molecules are evaluated based on the e-folding method [91]. The global relaxation time for a given molecule is then computed by taking a Boltzmann weighted sum of the relaxation times of all the electronic states as

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{global}}(T, p_A)} = \frac{1}{\sum_l Q_l} \sum_n \left(\frac{Q_n}{\tau_n(T, p_A)} \right), l, n \in I_{\text{El}} \quad (12)$$

where $I_{\text{El}} = [0, 1, 2, \dots]$ represents the set of electronic levels of the molecule and Q_l denotes the electronic partition function. The global vibrational relaxation times are then fitted into the default MW + high-temperature correction expression as tabulated in Table 2. For the N₂⁺ – M systems, same fits as N₂ – M systems have been used in this work.




Figure 1: Comparison of relaxation times obtained from state-to-state kinetics against Millikan-White correlation formula for N₂-N system (image taken from [29] with permission).

Next, to make the 2-T model even more consistent with the vibronic StS model, the preferential dissociation model [65, 71, 92] is used to describe the volumetric change of vibrational energy due to chemical reactions instead of the non-preferential dissociation model used with the Park 2-T model in this work. With the preferential dissociation model, Ω^{CV} term in the electro-vibrational energy can be written as:

$$\Omega^{CV} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_m} \dot{\omega}_s \psi_s^D E_s^D \quad (13)$$

Table 2: Consistent parameters A_{sr} , B_{sr} and σ_{sr} for the vibrational relaxation times

Type of collision	A_{sr}	B_{sr}	σ_{sr}
N_2+N	184.44	0.0389	$1.0 \times 10^{-22} T_{tr}^{0.52}$
N_2+N^+	184.44	0.0389	$1.0 \times 10^{-22} T_{tr}^{0.52}$
N_2+N_2	221.53	0.0290	$1.7 \times 10^{-23} T_{tr}^{0.55}$
$N_2+N_2^+$	221.53	0.0290	$1.7 \times 10^{-23} T_{tr}^{0.55}$
N_2^++N	184.44	0.0389	$1.0 \times 10^{-22} T_{tr}^{0.52}$
$N_2^++N^+$	184.44	0.0389	$1.0 \times 10^{-22} T_{tr}^{0.52}$
$N_2^++N_2$	221.53	0.0290	$1.7 \times 10^{-23} T_{tr}^{0.55}$
$N_2^++N_2^+$	221.53	0.0290	$1.7 \times 10^{-23} T_{tr}^{0.55}$

where ψ_s^D and E_s^D are vibrational energy loss ratio and average dissociation energy of a given molecule. The definition of vibrational energy loss ratio is taken from Panesi et al [29]. To compute ψ_s^D , the vibronic master equations are again numerically integrated in time for a 0D isochoric reactor for various fixed bath temperatures and the values corresponding to the QSS region are selected as most of the energy transfer takes place in that region. Fig. 2 shows the variation of ψ_s^D with temperature for all the interactions, which is different from a constant value of 0.3 as proposed by Park *et al* [65, 71]. The vibrational energy loss ratio is then fitted as a function [77]:

$$\psi_s^D = \exp(K_1/T + K_2 + K_3 \ln(T) + K_4 T + K_5 T^2) \quad (14)$$

Table 3 tabulates the parameters K_1 to K_5 for the vibrational energy loss ratio obtained from state-to-state kinetics.

The vibronic StS reduced 2-T model with consistent τ_{VT} and ψ_s^D will be referred to as ‘‘consistent 2-T model’’ in this paper to differentiate from the Park 2-T model.

Table 3: Parameters K_1 to K_5 for the vibrational energy loss ratio

Reaction	K_1	K_2	K_3	K_4	K_5	Min	Max
N_2+N	1.04E+04	-2.39E+01	2.68E+00	-2.54E-04	3.20E-09	0.486	0.813
N_2+N^+	1.04E+04	-2.39E+01	2.68E+00	-2.54E-04	3.20E-09	0.486	0.813
N_2+N_2	3.29E+03	-7.77E+00	8.59E-01	-1.05E-04	1.39E-09	0.503	0.754
$N_2+N_2^+$	3.29E+03	-7.77E+00	8.59E-01	-1.05E-04	1.39E-09	0.503	0.754
N_2^++N	-4.62E+03	7.71E+00	-8.39E-01	-4.99E-06	7.17E-10	0.526	0.696
$N_2^++N^+$	-4.62E+03	7.71E+00	-8.39E-01	-4.99E-06	7.17E-10	0.526	0.696
$N_2^++N_2$	-8.50E+03	1.83E+01	-2.06E+00	1.10E-04	-7.48E-10	0.534	0.654
$N_2^++N_2^+$	-8.50E+03	1.83E+01	-2.06E+00	1.10E-04	-7.48E-10	0.534	0.654




Figure 2: Vibrational energy removal ratio obtained from the vibrational StS kinetics

4. Results

4.1. Problem description

2D axi-symmetric simulations of the ICP torch have been performed in this work for the same torch geometry as used in Paper I and is again shown in Fig. 3. Description of the grid, boundary conditions, and ambient conditions remain the same as used in Paper I. The frequency of the coils is again fixed to be 0.45 MHz for all the simulations presented in this paper. The numerical framework for ICP simulations used in this work remains the same as in Paper I.

4.2. Plasma bubble morphology inside the ICP torch: vibronic StS versus 2T models

This section presents a comparison of the plasma flow fields obtained from the vibronic StS simulations against those obtained from the conventional 2-T NLTE models. In a conventional 2-T NLTE model, each internal energy mode for all species follows a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution at a specific temperature (translational and rotational modes at a single temperature T_h , while free-electron, electronic and vibrational modes at a single temperature T_{ev}). In vibronic StS simulations as discussed in Paper I, the electronic and vibrational states are treated as separate pseudo-species whose populations are determined by solving the vibronic Master equations fully coupled with the flow equations. The rotational modes are assumed to be in equilibrium with the




Figure 3: (a) Schematic of the ICP torch used for simulations (credits: Von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics [9]).

translational modes at T_h .




Figure 4: Comparison of the plasma flow fields obtained from the vibronic StS and Park 2-T models: (a) heavy-species temperature, (b) electron temperature, (c) electron mole-fraction, and (d) Joule heating. Top: Park 2-T, Bottom: vibronic StS. Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.

4.2.1. Vibronic StS versus Park 2-T ICP torch Simulations were conducted under the following operating conditions: mass flow 6 g/s, pressure 1000 Pa, and power 50 kW. The widely accepted Park 2-T model [71] was employed, which is the most widespread model for hypersonic applications. It is therefore instructive to compare the results from

the new vibronic StS model against the conventional Park 2-T standard. In the case of the Park 2-T model, the default MW + Park’s high-temperature correction formula is used for the vibrational relaxation times τ_s^{VT} along with the non-preferential dissociation model for Ω^{CV} term.

Fig. 4 compares the plasma flow field obtained from the Park 2-T model with the one obtained from the vibronic StS model. It can be seen that the plasma flow field obtained from the two models is significantly different. In the Park 2-T simulation, Joule heating spans a more extensive volume, thus warming a larger plasma section. Given that the total power dissipated in the plasma is held constant, this results in a cooler overall plasma core. Contrarily, in the vibronic StS scenario, the electron concentration and thus the Joule heating is more localized within the coil region. This localization causes a downstream shift of the plasma core compared to the Park 2-T model’s plasma core position. With heating concentrated in a smaller plasma section, the core’s temperature is notably elevated due to the equivalent power dissipation in both cases. This substantial variability in plasma flow field confirms previous results from existing literature which suggests that ICP flow fields are highly sensitive to kinetic mechanisms [84]. Given that the reaction rates exhibit differences across distinct kinetic databases, the observed differences are to be expected. Moreover, inconsistent V-T relaxation times and the non-preferential dissociation model used in Park 2-T model could be another factor leading to this discrepancy. Hence, pinpointing the primary cause of this flow field deviation - be it the non-Boltzmann effect or differences in the kinetic database or parameters remains elusive.




Figure 5: Comparison of the plasma flow fields obtained from the vibronic StS and the consistent 2-T model (with inconsistent τ_{VT} and ψ_s^D): (a) heavy-species temperature, (b) electron temperature, (c) electron mole-fraction and (d) Joule heating. Top: 2-T, Bottom: vibronic StS. Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.




Figure 6: Comparison of the plasma flow fields obtained from the vibronic StS and the consistent 2-T model (with consistent τ_{VT} but inconsistent ψ_s^D): (a) heavy-species temperature, (b) electron temperature, (c) electron mole-fraction and (d) Joule heating. Top: 2-T, Bottom: vibronic StS. Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.




Figure 7: Comparison of plasma the flow fields obtained from the vibronic StS and the consistent 2-T model (with consistent τ_{VT} and ψ_s^D): (a) heavy-species temperature, (b) electron temperature, (c) electron mole-fraction and (d) Joule heating. Top: 2-T, Bottom: vibronic StS. Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.

4.2.2. *Vibronic StS versus consistent 2-T* Subsequent simulations were carried out employing the consistent 2-T model, derived from the vibronic StS model, as detailed

in Section 3. Initially, only the consistent chemical reaction rates were incorporated into the 2-T simulation. The τ_s^{VT} and Ω^{CV} terms, however, were retained as per the Park 2-T model. This approach was chosen to specifically examine the influence of modified reaction rates on the plasma flow field. Fig. 5 offers a comparative analysis that contrasts the plasma flow field resulting from the consistent 2-T model with that derived from the vibronic StS simulation. Even though the flow field from the consistent 2-T model diverges slightly from the Park 2-T flow field due to the updated reaction rate parameters, it remains significantly different from the vibronic StS flow field. The qualitative flow characteristics yielded by the consistent 2-T model align more closely with those from the Park 2-T model than with the vibronic StS model. The macroscopic rates for pivotal reactions in ICP (such as heavy-impact dissociation and electron-impact ionization [84]) obtained by refining the vibronic StS kinetics are remarkably akin to Park’s macroscopic rates (for details, refer to Appendix A). This underlines that the pronounced disparities in plasma core morphology between the vibronic StS and the 2-T simulations are not predominantly ascribed to variations in reaction rates.

Subsequently, consistent τ_s^{VT} expressions, as outlined in Table 2, were integrated into the 2-T model. This was done instead of the default MW plus high-temperature correction expressions. Meanwhile, the Ω^{CV} term remained modeled by the non-preferential dissociation model. Fig. 6 offers a comparative view of the plasma flow field within the torch, showcasing the results from the reduced 2-T model (with consistent τ_s^{VT}) against those from the vibronic StS model. Interestingly, by merely adjusting the τ_s^{VT} parameter, the plasma core is shifted downstream, making the plasma flow field more reminiscent of the vibronic StS flow field. This pivotal observation underscores that the plasma core’s position can be modulated by a single term - the vibrational relaxation time. This further highlights the crucial role of modeling this term, drawing on accurate state-to-state kinetic calculations.

Next, the preferential dissociation model for Ω^{CV} delineated in Section 3 is integrated into the 2-T model. For this paper, the 2-T model, encompassing consistent rates derived from the vibronic StS model coupled with the consistent τ_s^{VT} and Ω^{CV} terms, will be denoted as the “consistent 2-T model”. Fig. 7 compares the plasma flow field derived from the consistent 2-T model, with that from the vibronic StS model. The consistent 2-T model is observed to produce a flow field that aligns qualitatively with the vibronic StS model, especially in terms of plasma core location, shape, and peak temperature. This demonstrates that the consistent 2-T model can efficiently capture the non-equilibrium effects computed by the StS model but with a significantly reduced computational burden. That said, as shown in Fig. 7 (c), there remains a pronounced discrepancy in electron concentration between the 2-T and vibronic StS simulations. This disparity stems from the non-QSS effect as well as the limitations of the present 2-T model in accounting for phenomena like non-preferential ionization, electron-impact electronic excitation, dissociation, and others. While including consistent energy transfer terms into the energy equation of the 2-T model allows one to obtain agreement with the StS model for the temperature

fields, it's important to note that a 2-T model cannot accurately capture the non-Boltzmann distribution of internal states. Hence, for operating conditions where there might be a significant non-Boltzmann and non-QSS effect inside the ICP facility, a fully coupled state-to-state approach is still needed if accurate prediction of internal state populations is required (such as for reconstructing the spectra obtained from optical emission spectroscopy data from experiments, radiation coupling, *etc.*).

Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 show the plasma temperature profiles obtained from various models (i.e. vibronic StS, Park 2-T, and consistent 2-T model) re-affirming that the consistent 2-T model is able to reproduce the vibronic StS gas temperature profiles, while there are small differences in the electron temperature profiles. Fig. 10 (a) shows the radial electron concentration profiles at the mid-torch location depicting that while neither Park nor the consistent 2-T model matches the concentration profiles exactly, the consistent 2-T model still gives much better agreement with the StS profiles. Fig. 10 (b) shows the Joule heating profiles at the mid-torch location showing significantly lower peak value in case of Park 2-T which is a result of distribution of the Joule heating over a larger plasma volume, unlike the case of vibronic StS and the consistent 2-T where the Joule heating distribution is localized to a smaller region and hence has much larger peak values to have the same dissipated power.

Finally, this section further suggests that the heavy-impact vibrational excitation and dissociation of N_2 has the first-order effect on the plasma core in terms of its location, shape and peak temperatures, as these kinetics are the ones used in modeling the Ω^{VT} and Ω^{CV} energy transfer terms in the internal energy equation of the 2-T model.




Figure 8: Heavy-species temperature profiles at: (a) $x = 0.3$ m (mid-torch location) and (b) $x = 0.485$ m (torch outlet). Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.




Figure 9: Electro-vibrational/free-electron temperature profiles at: (a) $x = 0.3$ m (mid-torch location) and (b) $x = 0.485$ m (torch outlet). Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.




Figure 10: (a) Electron mole-fraction and (b) Joule heating profiles at $x = 0.3$ m (mid-torch location). Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.

4.3. Comparative study of the plasma flow fields obtained from various physico-chemical models

This subsection presents a comparative study of the plasma flow field inside the ICP torch obtained using different physico-chemical models. To test the ability of the

vibronic StS model to provide physically consistent results for a wide range of operating conditions, simulations were conducted for two extreme operating conditions: a high-pressure case (10 000 Pa, 50 kW) and a high power case (1000 Pa, 250 kW) apart from the low pressure and low power base case (1000 Pa, 50 kW) already discussed in the previous subsection. The mass flow (6 g/s) remains the same as before for all the simulations. The internal temperatures of various components denoted as T_{N_2} , $T_{N_2^+}$, T_N and T_{N^+} in the figures have been computed using the populations of vibronic (for molecules) and electronic (for atoms) states as defined in Paper I.

4.3.1. Base case (1000 Pa, 50 kW) This operating condition as discussed in previous sub-sections is characterized by highly non-equilibrium and non-Boltzmann conditions which necessitates the use of state-of-the-art NLTE models to accurately capture the NLTE effects. The vibronic StS model works quite well for this condition giving physically consistent plasma flow field as discussed in Paper I. However, for the sake of completeness, the base case flow fields have been presented for all the physico-chemical models in this subsection. Fig. 11 shows the plasma temperature contours inside the ICP torch obtained from various physico-chemical models. The differences between Park 2-T and consistent 2-T flow fields have already been discussed in the previous subsection, while the comparison between LTE and vibronic StS flow fields was discussed in Paper I. Fig. 12 shows the radial temperature profiles inside the ICP torch obtained from various models. It is interesting to observe that at the torch outlet (*i.e.* far from coils), park 2-T temperature profiles still show significant non-equilibrium between the translational and the electro-vibrational modes, whereas the vibronic StS and consistent 2-T models are close to thermal equilibrium between various modes. This observation agrees with the fact that the V-T relaxation time for $N_2 - N$ system as shown in Fig. 1 used in Park 2-T model is much higher than the one obtained from state-to-state kinetics and hence Park 2-T simulations take much longer to reach equilibrium.

4.3.2. High pressure case (10 000 Pa, 50 kW) As the pressure inside the ICP torch increases, higher collision frequency allows thermal equilibrium between the electrons and heavy-species. As a result, LTE conditions start to prevail even in the coil region of the torch and hence simulations performed using LTE assumption give reasonably accurate plasma flow field. Moreover, simulations performed using NLTE models should give LTE flow fields at high operating pressures. Fig. 13 shows the plasma temperature contours inside the torch which are qualitatively similar for all the physico-chemical models, with LTE contour slightly different from the NLTE contours. Fig. 14 shows that all the NLTE models (*i.e.* Park 2-T, consistent 2-T and vibronic StS) show thermal equilibrium between the translational and the electro-vibrational modes in both the coil region as well as away from the coils (*i.e.* at the outlet). However, the temperature profiles given by different models although very close, do not overlap exactly with one another and with the LTE temperature profile, especially in the coil region. This indicates that complete LTE conditions do not prevail in the coil region




Figure 11: Plasma heavy-species temperature contours: (a) LTE, (b) Park 2-T, (c) consistent 2-T, and (d) vibronic StS. Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.




Figure 12: Radial temperature profiles at: (a) $x = 0.3$ m (mid-torch location) and (b) $x = 0.485$ m (torch outlet). Solid blue line: T (LTE), solid magenta line: T_h (Park 2-T), dashed magenta line: T_{ev} (Park 2-T), solid red line: T_h (consistent 2-T), dashed red line: T_{ev} (consistent 2-T), solid black line: T_h (vibronic StS), dashed black line: T_e (vibronic StS), dashed-dot black line: T_N (vibronic StS), dashed-dot blue line: T_{N_2} (vibronic StS), dashed blue line: T_{N^+} (vibronic StS), and dashed-dot red line: $T_{N_2^+}$ (vibronic StS). Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.

even at this pressure for nitrogen plasma. However, at the torch outlet, the temperature

profiles obtained from various NLTE models are close to that of LTE. This indicates that the use of the LTE model above this pressure should be able to give reasonably accurate results in the chamber region of the ICP facility, although pressures above 30 kPa is better suited for LTE model as concluded in Part I of this work. For vibronic StS simulation, the vibronic temperature profiles of all the components (N, N^+, N_2, N_2^+) collapse with free-electron temperature indicating negligible non-Boltzmann effect. This observation is physically consistent with the fact that at higher pressures, there will be smaller non-equilibrium and non-Boltzmann effect.




Figure 13: Plasma heavy-species temperature contours: (a) LTE, (b) Park 2-T, (c) consistent 2-T, and (d) vibronic StS. Operating conditions: 10 000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.

4.3.3. High power case (1000 Pa, 250 kW) Fig. 15 shows the plasma temperature contours for very high power cases which leads to high temperatures very close to the top (cold) wall. Since the pressure is quite low, the NLTE flow field is very different from the LTE flow field as seen in the contours. Fig. 16 (a) shows significant non-equilibrium between the translational and the electro-vibrational modes especially at around $r = 0.07$ m which is much closer to the top wall as compared to the base case where the peak non-equilibrium was seen at around $r = 0.05$ m. This shifting of the peak non-equilibrium region towards the top wall occurs due to the concentration of Joule heating closer to the wall in case of high power conditions since the inductive heating from the coils is the source of the NLTE effect in the torch. It can be seen that the temperature profiles obtained from Park 2-T are close to vibronic StS near the axis but start deviating as we move closer to the cold wall where a large non-equilibrium effect is seen. The consistent 2-T profiles, however, are close to the vibronic StS profiles, affirming that the consistent 2-T model can reproduce StS results even in this operating




Figure 14: Radial temperature profiles at: (a) $x = 0.3$ m (mid-torch location) and (b) $x = 0.485$ m (torch outlet). Solid blue line: T (LTE), solid magenta line: T_h (Park 2-T), dashed magenta line: T_{ev} (Park 2-T), solid red line: T_h (consistent 2-T), dashed red line: T_{ev} (consistent 2-T), solid black line: T_h (vibronic StS), dashed black line: T_e (vibronic StS), dashed-dot black line: T_N (vibronic StS), dashed-dot blue line: T_{N_2} (vibronic StS), dashed blue line: T_{N^+} (vibronic StS), and dashed-dot red line: $T_{N_2^+}$. Operating conditions: 10 000 Pa, 50 kW and 6 g/s.

condition. The vibronic temperatures of various components (N, N^+, N_2, N_2^+) show a large deviation from electron temperature confirming significant non-Boltzmann effect.

5. Conclusions

This paper presents a comparative study of various physico-chemical models used for inductively coupled plasma simulations. NLTE ICP simulations using the vibronic StS model described in Part I of this work have been compared against the most widely used Park 2-T model simulations, showing large discrepancies in the plasma flow field. Further, a consistent 2-T model has been developed by reducing the vibronic StS model under QSS assumption, which can reproduce the qualitative characteristics (plasma core location and temperatures) of the StS plasma flow field with much lower computational cost. It was also found that the vibrational relaxation time is a key parameter that controls the plasma core morphology (location and temperature). However, the consistent 2-T model still gives slight discrepancies in terms of electron concentrations and electron temperature as a result of the 2-T model's inadequacy in accurately modeling phenomena like non-preferential ionization, electron-impact electronic excitation, dissociation, and others. Further, simulations are presented for a range of operating conditions using various models (LTE, 2-T, and vibronic StS) to




Figure 15: Plasma heavy-species temperature contours: (a) LTE, (b) Park 2-T, (c) consistent 2-T, and (d) vibronic StS. Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 250 kW and 6 g/s.




Figure 16: Radial temperature profiles at: (a) $x = 0.3$ m (mid-torch location) and (b) $x = 0.485$ m (torch outlet). Solid blue line: T (LTE), solid magenta line: T_h (Park 2-T), dashed magenta line: T_{ev} (Park 2-T), solid red line: T_h (consistent 2-T), dashed red line: T_{ev} (consistent 2-T), solid black line: T_h (vibronic StS), dashed black line: T_e (vibronic StS), dashed-dot black line: T_N (vibronic StS), dashed-dot blue line: T_{N_2} (vibronic StS), dashed blue line: T_{N^+} (vibronic StS), and dashed-dot red line: $T_{N_2^+}$ (vibronic StS). Operating conditions: 1000 Pa, 250 kW and 6 g/s.

assess the applicability of various models given the ICP facility operating conditions.

Future work will focus on improving the state-to-state as well as the consistent 2-T model by comparison against experiments.

Acknowledgments

This work is funded by the Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship OUSD(RE) Grant No: N00014-21-1-295 with M. Panesi as the Principal Investigator.

Competing interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

Appendix

A. Macroscopic reaction rates: Park 2-T versus consistent 2-T model (developed in the present work)

This section presents a comparison of the macroscopic rates obtained by reducing the vibronic StS kinetics against Park's macroscopic rates as shown in Fig. A1.




Figure A1: Macroscopic reaction rates: (a) $N_2 + N = 3N$, (b) $N_2 + N_2 = 2N + N_2$, (c) $N + e = N^+ + 2e$, (d) $N_2 + e = 2N + e$, and (e) $N_2 + N^+ = N_2^+ + N$.

References

- [1] Boulos, M. I., "Flow and temperature fields in the fire-ball of an inductively coupled plasma," *IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci.*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1976, pp. 28–39.
- [2] Mostaghimi, J., Proulx, P., and Boulos, M. I., "Parametric study of the flow and temperature fields in an inductively coupled rf plasma torch," *Plasma chemistry and plasma processing*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1984, pp. 199–217.
- [3] Mostaghimi, J., Proulx, P., and Boulos, M. I., "An analysis of the computer modeling of the flow and temperature fields in an inductively coupled plasma," *Numerical Heat Transfer*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1985, pp. 187–201.
- [4] Mostaghimi, J., Proulx, P., and Boulos, M. I., "A two-temperature model of the inductively coupled rf plasma," *Journal of applied physics*, Vol. 61, No. 5, 1987, pp. 1753–1760.
- [5] Proulx, P., Mostaghimi, J., and Boulos, M. I., "Heating of powders in an rf inductively coupled plasma under dense loading conditions," *Plasma Chemistry and Plasma Processing*, Vol. 7, 1987, pp. 29–52.
- [6] Mostaghimi, J. and Boulos, M. I., "Effect of frequency on local thermodynamic equilibrium conditions in an inductively coupled argon plasma at atmospheric pressure," *Journal of applied physics*, Vol. 68, No. 6, 1990, pp. 2643–2648.
- [7] Chen, X. and Pfender, E., "Modeling of RF plasma torch with a metallic tube inserted for reactant injection," *Plasma chemistry and plasma processing*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1991, pp. 103–128.

- [8] Panesi, M., Rini, P., Degrez, G., and Chazot, O., “Analysis of chemical nonequilibrium and elemental demixing in plasmatron facility,” *Journal of thermophysics and heat transfer*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2007, pp. 57–66.
- [9] Abeele, D. V. and Degrez, G., “Efficient computational model for inductive plasma flows,” *AIAA journal*, Vol. 38, No. 2, 2000, pp. 234–242.
- [10] Kumar, S., Munafò, A., Jo, S. M., and Panesi, M., “Electronic-state-resolved non-equilibrium analysis of ICP discharges,” *Proc. of the 32nd Int. Symposium on Rarefied Gas Dynamics*, 2022, In press.
- [11] Munafò, A., Kumar, S., and Panesi, M., “Self-consistent modeling of ICP discharges,” *Proceedings of the 32nd Int. Symposium on Rarefied Gas Dynamics*, 2022, In press.
- [12] Reed, T. B., “Induction-coupled plasma torch,” *Journal of Applied Physics*, Vol. 32, No. 5, 1961, pp. 821–824.
- [13] Boulos, M., “Flow and temperature fields in the fire-ball of an inductively coupled plasma,” *IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1976, pp. 28–39.
- [14] Utyuzhnikov, S., Konyukhov, A., Rudenko, D., Vasil’evskii, S., Kolesnikov, A., and Chazot, O., “Simulation of subsonic and supersonic flows in inductive plasmatrons,” *AIAA journal*, Vol. 42, No. 9, 2004, pp. 1871–1877.
- [15] Colombo, V., Ghedini, E., and Sanibondi, P., “A three-dimensional investigation of the effects of excitation frequency and sheath gas mixing in an atmospheric-pressure inductively coupled plasma system,” *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, Vol. 43, No. 10, 2010, pp. 105202.
- [16] Shigeta, M., “Time-dependent 3D simulation of an argon RF inductively coupled thermal plasma,” *Plasma Sources Sci. Technol.*, Vol. 21, No. 5, 2012, pp. 055029.
- [17] Mostaghimi, J. and Boulos, M. I., “Two-dimensional electromagnetic field effects in induction plasma modeling,” *Plasma Chem. Plasma Process.*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1989, pp. 25–44.
- [18] Kumar, S., Munafò, A., Le Maout, V., Mansour, N., and Panesi, M., “Self-consistent magneto-hydrodynamic modeling of ICP discharges,” *AIAA SCITECH 2022 Forum*, 2022, p. 1619.
- [19] Kumar, S., Munafò, A., Jo, S. M., Mansour, N. N., and Panesi, M., “High-fidelity simulation of RF inductively coupled plasma discharges,” *AIAA AVIATION 2022 Forum*, 2022, p. 3362.
- [20] Munafò, A., Chiodi, R., Kumar, S., Le Maout, V., Stephani, K. A., Panerai, F., Bodony, D. J., and Panesi, M., “A Multi-Physics Modeling Framework for Inductively Coupled Plasma Wind Tunnels,” *AIAA SCITECH 2022 Forum*, 2022, p. 1011.
- [21] El Morsli, M. and Proulx, P., “Two-temperature chemically non-equilibrium modelling of an air supersonic ICP,” *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, Vol. 40, No. 16, 2007, pp. 4810.
- [22] Munafò, A., Alfuhaid, S., Cambier, J.-L., and Panesi, M., “A tightly coupled non-equilibrium model for inductively coupled radio-frequency plasmas,” *J. Appl. Physics*, Vol. 118, No. 13, 2015, pp. 133303.
- [23] Gessman, R., Laux, C., Kruger, C., Gessman, R., Laux, C., and Kruger, C., “Experimental study of kinetic mechanisms of recombining atmospheric pressure air plasmas,” *28th Plasmadynamics and Lasers Conference*, 1997, p. 2364.
- [24] Laux, C. O., Pierrot, L., and Gessman, R. J., “State-to-state modeling of a recombining nitrogen plasma experiment,” *Chemical Physics*, Vol. 398, 2012, pp. 46–55.
- [25] McGuire, S., Jacobs, C., Mariotto, P., Grimaldi, C., and Laux, C. O., “Measurements and Modeling of high temperature air emission,” *AIAA SCITECH 2022 Forum*, 2022, p. 2397.
- [26] McGuire, S. D., Tibere-Inglesse, A. C., Mariotto, P. B., Cruden, B. A., and Laux, C. O., “Measurements and modeling of CO 4th positive (A–X) radiation,” *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, Vol. 245, 2020, pp. 106855.
- [27] MacDonald, M. E., Jacobs, C. M., Laux, C. O., Zander, F., and Morgan, R. G., “Measurements of air plasma/ablator interactions in an inductively coupled plasma torch,” *Journal of Thermophysics and Heat transfer*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 2015, pp. 12–23.
- [28] Bultel, A. and Annaloro, J., “Elaboration of collisional–radiative models for flows related to planetary entries into the Earth and Mars atmospheres,” *Plasma Sources Science and*

- Technology*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 2013, pp. 025008.
- [29] Panesi, M., Jaffe, R. L., Schwenke, D. W., and Magin, T. E., “Rovibrational internal energy transfer and dissociation of $N_2(1\Sigma_g^+) - N(4S_u)$ system in hypersonic flows,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 138, No. 4, 2013.
- [30] Colonna, G., Laporta, V., Celiberto, R., Capitelli, M., and Tennyson, J., “Non-equilibrium vibrational and electron energy distributions functions in atmospheric nitrogen ns pulsed discharges and μs post-discharges: the role of electron molecule vibrational excitation scaling-laws,” *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, Vol. 24, No. 3, 2015, pp. 035004.
- [31] Heritier, K., Jaffe, R., Laporta, V., and Panesi, M., “Energy transfer models in nitrogen plasmas: Analysis of $N_2(X^1\Sigma_g^+) - N(4S_u) - e^-N_2(X^1\Sigma_g^+) - N(4S_u) - e^-$ interaction,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 141, No. 18, 2014.
- [32] Laporta, V. and Bruno, D., “Electron-vibration energy exchange models in nitrogen-containing plasma flows,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 138, No. 10, 2013.
- [33] Laporta, V., Heritier, K., and Panesi, M., “Electron-vibration relaxation in oxygen plasmas,” *Chemical Physics*, Vol. 472, 2016, pp. 44–49.
- [34] Capitelli, M., Ferreira, C. M., Gordiets, B. F., and Osipov, A. I., *Plasma kinetics in atmospheric gases*, Vol. 31, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [35] Bultel, A., van Ootegem, B., Bourdon, A., and Vervisch, P., “Influence of Ar 2+ in an argon collisional-radiative model,” *Physical review E*, Vol. 65, No. 4, 2002, pp. 046406.
- [36] Laux, C., “Nonequilibrium radiative heat flux modeling for the Huygens entry probe,” *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*, Vol. 111, No. E7, 2006.
- [37] Capitelli, M., Armenise, I., Bruno, D., Cacciatore, M., Celiberto, R., Colonna, G., De Pascale, O., Diomede, P., Esposito, F., Gorse, C., et al., “Non-equilibrium plasma kinetics: a state-to-state approach,” *Plasma Sources Science and Technology*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2007, pp. S30.
- [38] Pietanza, L., Colonna, G., De Giacomo, A., and Capitelli, M., “Kinetic processes for laser induced plasma diagnostic: A collisional-radiative model approach,” *Spectrochimica Acta Part B: Atomic Spectroscopy*, Vol. 65, No. 8, 2010, pp. 616–626.
- [39] Munafo, A., Panesi, M., Jaffe, R. L., Colonna, G., Bourdon, A., and Magin, T. E., “QCT-based vibrational collisional models applied to nonequilibrium nozzle flows,” *The European Physical Journal D*, Vol. 66, 2012, pp. 1–11.
- [40] Munafo, A., Lani, A., Bultel, A., and Panesi, M., “Modeling of non-equilibrium phenomena in expanding flows by means of a collisional-radiative model,” *Physics of Plasmas*, Vol. 20, No. 7, 2013.
- [41] Venturi, S., Jaffe, R., and Panesi, M., “Bayesian machine learning approach to the quantification of uncertainties on ab initio potential energy surfaces,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, Vol. 124, No. 25, 2020, pp. 5129–5146.
- [42] Priyadarshini, M. S., Jo, S. M., Venturi, S., Schwenke, D. W., Jaffe, R. L., and Panesi, M., “Comprehensive study of HCN: Potential energy surfaces, state-to-state kinetics, and master equation analysis,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, Vol. 126, No. 44, 2022, pp. 8249–8265.
- [43] Esposito, F. and Capitelli, M., “Quasiclassical molecular dynamic calculations of vibrationally and rotationally state selected dissociation cross-sections: $N + N_2(v, j) \rightarrow 3N$,” *Chemical physics letters*, Vol. 302, No. 1-2, 1999, pp. 49–54.
- [44] Kustova, E. V. and Kremer, G. M., “Chemical reaction rates and non-equilibrium pressure of reacting gas mixtures in the state-to-state approach,” *Chemical Physics*, Vol. 445, 2014, pp. 82–94.
- [45] Jo, S. M., Kwon, O. J., and Kim, J. G., “Electronic-state-resolved analysis of high-enthalpy air plasma flows,” *Physical Review E*, Vol. 100, No. 3, 2019, pp. 033203.
- [46] Panesi, M., Magin, T., Bourdon, A., Bultel, A., and Chazot, O., “Fire II flight experiment analysis by means of a collisional-radiative model,” *Journal of thermophysics and heat transfer*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2009, pp. 236–248.

- [47] Magin, T., “Electronic excitation of atoms and molecules for the FIRE II flight experiment,” *Journal of Thermophysics and Heat Transfer*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 2011, pp. 361–374.
- [48] Pereira, E. C., *High-temperature kinetic and thermodynamic models for nitrogen plasmas*, Ph.D. thesis, Técnico Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal.
- [49] Pereira, É., Loureiro, J., and da Silva, M. L., “Vibronic State-Specific Modelling of High-Speed Nitrogen Shocked Flows. Part I: Kinetic Database,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05144*, 2023.
- [50] Macdonald, R., Jaffe, R., Schwenke, D., and Panesi, M., “Construction of a coarse-grain quasi-classical trajectory method. I. Theory and application to $N_2 - N_2$ system,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 148, No. 5, 2018, pp. 054309.
- [51] Macdonald, R., Grover, M., Schwartzentruber, T., and Panesi, M., “Construction of a coarse-grain quasi-classical trajectory method. II. Comparison against the direct molecular simulation method,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 148, No. 5, 2018, pp. 054310.
- [52] Johnston, C. O. and Panesi, M., “Impact of state-specific flowfield modeling on atomic nitrogen radiation,” *Physical Review Fluids*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2018, pp. 013402.
- [53] Sahai, A., Lopez, B., Johnston, C., and Panesi, M., “Adaptive coarse graining method for energy transfer and dissociation kinetics of polyatomic species,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 147, No. 5, 2017, pp. 054107.
- [54] Munafo, A., Panesi, M., and Magin, T., “Boltzmann rovibrational collisional coarse-grained model for internal energy excitation and dissociation in hypersonic flows,” *Physical Review E*, Vol. 89, No. 2, 2014, pp. 023001.
- [55] Liu, Y., Panesi, M., Sahai, A., and Vinokur, M., “General multi-group macroscopic modeling for thermo-chemical non-equilibrium gas mixtures,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 142, No. 13, 2015, pp. 134109.
- [56] Panesi, M. and Lani, A., “Collisional radiative coarse-grain model for ionization in air,” *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 25, No. 5, 2013, pp. 057101.
- [57] Venturi, S., Sharma, M. P., Lopez, B., and Panesi, M., “Data-inspired and physics-driven model reduction for dissociation: Application to the $O_2 + O$ system,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, Vol. 124, No. 41, 2020, pp. 8359–8372.
- [58] Sahai, A., Johnston, C. O., Lopez, B., and Panesi, M., “Flow-radiation coupling in CO₂ hypersonic wakes using reduced-order non-Boltzmann models,” *Physical Review Fluids*, Vol. 4, No. 9, 2019, pp. 093401.
- [59] Magin, T. E., Panesi, M., Bourdon, A., Jaffe, R. L., and Schwenke, D. W., “Coarse-grain model for internal energy excitation and dissociation of molecular nitrogen,” *Chemical Physics*, Vol. 398, 2012, pp. 90–95.
- [60] Sharma, M. P., Liu, Y., and Panesi, M., “Coarse-grained modeling of thermochemical nonequilibrium using the multigroup maximum entropy quadratic formulation,” *Physical Review E*, Vol. 101, No. 1, 2020, pp. 013307.
- [61] Kosareva, A., Kunova, O., Kustova, E., and Nagnibeda, E., “Four-temperature kinetic model for CO₂ vibrational relaxation,” *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2021.
- [62] Zanardi, I., Venturi, S., and Panesi, M., “Adaptive physics-informed neural operator for coarse-grained non-equilibrium flows,” *Scientific Reports*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2023, pp. 15497.
- [63] Kuppa, M., Singh, N., Rostkowski, P., Ghanem, R., and Panesi, M., “Uncertainty Analysis Employing Reduced Order Models for Non-Equilibrium Flows,” *AIAA AVIATION 2023 Forum*, 2023, p. 3331.
- [64] Park, C., “Nonequilibrium hypersonic aerothermodynamics,” 1989.
- [65] Park, C., “Review of chemical-kinetic problems of future NASA missions. I-Earth entries,” *J. Thermophys. Heat transfer*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1993, pp. 385–398.
- [66] Gnoffo, P. A., *Conservation equations and physical models for hypersonic air flows in thermal and chemical nonequilibrium*, Vol. 2867, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Office of Management . . . , 1989.
- [67] Yu, L., Pierrot, L., Laux, C. O., and Kruger, C. H., “Effects of vibrational nonequilibrium on the

- chemistry of two-temperature nitrogen plasmas,” *Plasma Chemistry and Plasma Processing*, Vol. 21, 2001, pp. 483–503.
- [68] Da Silva, M. L., Guerra, V., and Loureiro, J., “Two-temperature models for nitrogen dissociation,” *Chemical Physics*, Vol. 342, No. 1-3, 2007, pp. 275–287.
- [69] Dunn, M. G. and Kang, S., “Theoretical and experimental studies of reentry plasmas,” Tech. rep., NASA, 1973.
- [70] Gupta, R., Yos, J., Thompson, R., and Lee, K.-P., *A Review of Reaction Rates and Thermodynamic and Transport Properties for an 11-Species Air Model for Chemical and Thermal Nonequilibrium Calculations to 30,000 K*, NASA-RP-1232, NASA Langley Research Center, 1990.
- [71] Park, C., Jaffe, R. L., and Partridge, H., “Chemical-kinetic parameters of hyperbolic earth entry,” *Journal of Thermophysics and Heat transfer*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 2001, pp. 76–90.
- [72] Wright, M. J., White, T., and Mangini, N., “Data Parallel Line Relaxation (DPLR) Code User Manual: Acadia-Version 4.01. 1,” Tech. rep., 2009.
- [73] Mazaheri, A., Gnoffo, P. A., Johnston, C. O., and Kleb, B., “LAURA Users Manual: 5.3-48528,” Tech. rep., 2010.
- [74] Biedron, R., Carlson, J., Derlaga, J., Gnoffo, P., Hammond, D., Jones, W., Kleb, B., Lee-Rausch, E., Nielsen, E., and Park, M., “FUN3D Manual: 12.9, NASA Langley Research Center,” Tech. rep., NASA/TM-2016-219012, Hampton, VA, Feb. 1, 2016.
- [75] Scalabrin, L. C., *Numerical simulation of weakly ionized hypersonic flow over reentry capsules*, Ph.D. thesis, Citeseer, 2007.
- [76] Kim, J. G. and Park, G., “Thermochemical nonequilibrium parameter modification of oxygen for a two-temperature model,” *Physics of Fluids*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 2018, pp. 016101.
- [77] Kim, J. G., Kang, S. H., and Park, S. H., “Thermochemical nonequilibrium modeling of oxygen in hypersonic air flows,” *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, Vol. 148, 2020, pp. 119059.
- [78] Kim, J. G. and Jo, S. M., “Modification of chemical-kinetic parameters for 11-air species in re-entry flows,” *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, Vol. 169, 2021, pp. 120950.
- [79] Munafò, A., Alberti, A., Pantano, C., Freund, J. B., and Panesi, M., “A computational model for nanosecond pulse laser-plasma interactions,” *J. Comput. Phys.*, Vol. 406, 2020, pp. 109190.
- [80] Mitchner, M. and Kruger, C. H., *Partially Ionized Gases*, John Wiley & Sons, 1973.
- [81] Landau, L. and Teller, E., “Zur theorie der schalldispersion,” *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1936, pp. 34.
- [82] Millikan, R. C. and White, D. R., “Systematics of vibrational relaxation,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 39, No. 12, 1963, pp. 3209–3213.
- [83] Candler, G. V. and MacCormack, R. W., “Computation of weakly ionized hypersonic flows in thermochemical nonequilibrium,” *Journal of Thermophysics and heat transfer*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 1991, pp. 266–273.
- [84] Zhang, W., Lani, A., and Panesi, M., “Analysis of non-equilibrium phenomena in inductively coupled plasma generators,” *Phys. Plasmas*, Vol. 23, No. 7, 2016, pp. 073512.
- [85] Munafò, A. and Panesi, M., “Plato: a high-fidelity tool for multi-component plasmas,” *AIAA AVIATION 2023 Forum*, 2023, p. Submitted.
- [86] Jo, S. M., Venturi, S., Sharma, M. P., Munafò, A., and Panesi, M., “Rovibrational-Specific QCT and Master Equation Study on $N_2(X^1\Sigma_g^+)+O(3P)$ and $NO(X^2\Pi)+N(4S)$ Systems in High-Energy Collisions,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, Vol. 126, No. 21, 2022, pp. 3273–3290.
- [87] Colonna, G., Armenise, I., Bruno, D., and Capitelli, M., “Reduction of state-to-state kinetics to macroscopic models in hypersonic flows,” *Journal of thermophysics and heat transfer*, Vol. 20, No. 3, 2006, pp. 477–486.
- [88] Kim, J. G. and Boyd, I. D., “State-resolved master equation analysis of thermochemical nonequilibrium of nitrogen,” *Chemical Physics*, Vol. 415, 2013, pp. 237–246.
- [89] Andrienko, D. A. and Boyd, I. D., “Vibrational energy transfer and dissociation in O_2-N_2 collisions at hyperthermal temperatures,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, Vol. 148, No. 8,

- 2018, pp. 084309.
- [90] Grover, M. S., Schwartzentruber, T. E., Varga, Z., and Truhlar, D. G., “Vibrational energy transfer and collision-induced dissociation in $O^+ O_2$ collisions,” *Journal of Thermophysics and Heat Transfer*, Vol. 33, No. 3, 2019, pp. 797–807.
- [91] Park, C., “Rotational relaxation of N_2 behind a strong shock wave,” *Journal of Thermophysics and Heat Transfer*, Vol. 18, No. 4, 2004, pp. 527–533.
- [92] Park, C., “Assessment of two-temperature kinetic model for ionizing air,” *Journal of thermophysics and heat transfer*, Vol. 3, No. 3, 1989, pp. 233–244.