



# CHORUS

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

## Finite flame thickness effects on Kolmogorov-Petrovsky-Piskunov turbulent burning velocities

Sukruth Somappa, Vishal Acharya, and Tim Lieuwen

Phys. Rev. E **106**, 055107 — Published 18 November 2022

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.106.055107](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.106.055107)

# Finite flame thickness effects on KPP turbulent burning velocities

Sukruth Somappa\*, Vishal Acharya, and Tim Lieuwen  
*Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, United States*

KPP (Kolmogorov-Petrovsky-Piskunov) solutions of the reaction-diffusion equation have application in various physical phenomena occurring in biology, ecology, and reacting flows. In particular, these solutions are commonly used in turbulent combustion to scale turbulent burning velocities. Subject to certain conditions on reaction rate profile through the flame brush and turbulent diffusivity, this theory relates the turbulent burning velocity to the derivative of the reaction rate ( $\tilde{\omega}$ ) at the leading edge of the flame brush ( $d\tilde{\omega}/d\tilde{c}|_{\tilde{c}=0}$ ). Such waves are often referred to as “pulled fronts”. However, turbulent flames never actually satisfy the KPP conditions for a pulled front, as the turbulent flame brush, parameterized here by the thickness  $\delta_t$ , consists of an ensemble of laminar flamelets of thickness  $\delta$ , where  $\epsilon = \delta/\delta_t \ll 1$  is very small, but nonzero, and  $d\tilde{\omega}/d\tilde{c}$  tends to zero at the brush leading edge for high activation energy, combustion-type kinetics. This paper analyzes these effects on KPP wave solutions, parameterized by  $\epsilon = \delta/\delta_t$  and Zeldovich number,  $Ze$ , focusing on whether turbulent flames retain their “pulled front” character and what the correction to the KPP wave speed is. Variational solutions of the reaction-diffusion equation show that the solution, can be expanded in power of  $1/|\ln \epsilon|$ . Both numerical and asymptotic results are presented, showing that the wave still exhibits “pulled front” solutions but with significant corrections to the KPP result. The leading order correction is of the form  $|\ln \epsilon|^{-2}$  and independent of  $Ze$ . Higher order corrections are function of both  $\epsilon$  and  $Ze$ . However, the dominant factor influencing the wave speed correction is due to the finite  $\epsilon$ , with  $Ze$  exhibiting a weaker effect.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Kolmogorov, Petrovsky, and Piskunov first analyzed travelling wave solutions to reaction-diffusion equation, generalizing Fisher’s non-linearity [1], to describe population dynamics [2]. These solutions have subsequently been used to model a host of phenomenon, including applications in biology [3], combustion [4], and plasma physics [5]. In this article, we focus on its application to the turbulent flame speed and Arrhenius modification to the KPP-type non-linearities. Although we present the analysis using turbulent combustion terminology, it can be applied in general where similar functional forms occur for non-linearities.

A fundamental observation of the turbulent burning velocity is that it increases with increasing turbulence intensity in the approach flow, at least over a range of turbulence intensities. Formal mathematical analyses of this problem lead to at least two approaches for addressing this causal relationship. Damköhler’s first hypothesis, which can be thought of as a ‘global’ description, emphasizes the augmentation of flame surface area by turbulent disturbances, leading to a higher turbulent velocity [6]. In contrast, a ‘local’ description follows from the Kolmogorov-Petrovsky-Piskunov (KPP) theorem [2], which relates the turbulent burning velocity to conditions at the leading edge of the turbulent flame brush [7]. These two descriptions have fundamentally different answers to questions around causality. In the global description, flame area increase ‘causes’ the increase in burning velocity, whereas the flame area increase is an ‘effect’ of increasing burning velocity with the local description. Analyses of deterministic solutions of the G-equation have shown that both

descriptions are the formally appropriate ones in different limiting circumstances [8].

The objective of this study is to analyze KPP wave solutions [2], specifically the steady state wave speeds of a reaction diffusion equation. We specifically consider a statistically stationary, one-dimensional front [9,10], given by:

$$v d\tilde{c}/d\zeta = d^2\tilde{c}/d\zeta^2 + \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\tilde{c}$  and  $\tilde{\omega}$  are the Favre-averaged progress variable and reaction rate respectively and  $v$  is the wave speed. Note that, we absorb  $D_T$  (turbulent diffusion coefficient) into the definition of the spatial coordinate by defining  $\zeta - \zeta_0 = \int_{x_0}^x 1/(\bar{\rho}D_T(x')) dx'$ ,  $v = \bar{\rho}S_T$ , (where  $S_T$  is the turbulent flame speed, and  $\bar{\rho}$  is the average unburned gas density) and  $\tilde{\omega} = \bar{\rho}^2 D_T W$  (where  $W$  is the reaction rate. Note that  $\tilde{c} = 0$  and  $\tilde{c} = 1$  represent unburned and burned gases respectively. Reaction rates are assumed to be zero at both the limits, i.e.,  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c} = 0) = \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c} = 1) = 0$ ).

Our interest in this paper is particularly around the dependence of the solution upon the functional nature of the reaction rate term. The reader is referred to work from Lipatnikov and Sabelnikov [11-13] on solution characteristics with various diffusivity forms, including countergradient diffusion, where  $D_T < 0$  in part of the flame. Consequently, we assume that  $D_T > 0$  for this analysis. Two limiting forms of solution exist to this equation (which turn out to closely approximate that found in a laminar and turbulent flame) depending upon whether  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c})$  is concave or not. If  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c})$  is not concave, the solution asymptotes to the following equation which, as first shown by Zeldovich and Frank-Kamenetskii [7,14], is valid when

\* ssomappa3@gatech.edu

the reaction rate is negligible except near ( $\tilde{c} \rightarrow 1$ ), a profile that approximates laminar premixed flames with high activation rate kinetics [7,15]:

$$v = \sqrt{2 \int_0^1 \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}) d\tilde{c}}. \quad (2)$$

In this case, note that  $v$  is controlled by the integral of the reaction rate profile and is independent of any particular local values. These are sometimes referred to as “pushed fronts”.

A completely different solution form exists when the reaction rate profile is concave in  $[0,1]$  or more precisely:

$$\tilde{\omega}(0 \leq \tilde{c} \leq 1) \geq 0, \quad (3a)$$

$$d\tilde{\omega}/d\tilde{c}|_{\tilde{c} \rightarrow 0} > \max d\tilde{\omega}/d\tilde{c}|_{0 < \tilde{c} \leq 1}, \quad (3b)$$

then the reaction diffusion equation admits a family of uniformly travelling wave solutions for all flame speeds ( $v$ ) greater than a minimum speed,  $v_{KPP}$  given by [2]:

$$v \geq v_{KPP} = 2\sqrt{(d\tilde{\omega}/d\tilde{c})|_{\tilde{c} \rightarrow 0}}. \quad (4)$$

The equality holds for sufficiently localized initial conditions and for initial condition such that  $\tilde{c}(x < 0, t = 0) = 0$  and  $\tilde{c}(x \geq 0, t = 0) = 1$  [2,16]. These fronts are referred to as “pulled fronts” since the flame speed depends only on the leading edge of the turbulent flame brush ( $\tilde{c} \rightarrow 0$ ).

Most turbulent flame reaction rate closure models in literature satisfy KPP constraints given by Eq. (3) [10]; e.g., the Eddy Break Up model [17], Magnussen model [18], and Bray-Moss-Libby model [19]. For example, the Bray-Moss-Libby model in conjunction with the flamelet crossing model [20] uses a reaction rate term of the form  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}) \sim \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c})$ , plotted in Fig. 2. For this reason, it is common in turbulent combustion studies to use the KPP solution to approximate the turbulent flame speed [4,21-23].

This study is motivated by the fact that no real turbulent flame (with flame brush thickness  $\delta_t$ ), which is composed of finite thickness flamelets of thickness  $\delta$  satisfies the constraint given by Eq. (3). First, due to Arrhenius kinetics, in the region  $O(\delta/\delta_t)$  close to the leading edge, i.e., near  $\tilde{c} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $d\tilde{\omega}/d\tilde{c} \rightarrow 0$  [24-27]: this is sketched in Fig. 1. Second, it is possible for the leading edge of the laminar flamelet to be slightly endothermic, due to fuel decomposition. This leads to the following asymptotic problem –

“What are the nature of the solutions in the limit of  $\delta/\delta_t \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c})$  does not formally satisfy Eq. (3), even while being asymptotically close to it (e.g., see Fig. 2)?”

For such source functions, it is not clear whether the front is still a “pulled front”, perhaps with a small correction, or exhibits completely different characteristics altogether.

Some insight into this question was developed by Brunet and Derrida [28] in the context of a Fisher-Kolmogorov equation. In particular, they looked at finite size effects of

microscopic stochastic model of directed polymers. They similarly considered a small deviation to the  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c})$  function, in a small region close to the leading edge ( $\tilde{c} \rightarrow 0$ ) by multiplying a leading-edge function  $\Theta(\epsilon)$  such that,

$$\Theta = 1 \quad \text{if } \tilde{c} \geq \epsilon, \quad (5a)$$

$$\Theta = 0 \quad \text{if } \tilde{c} < \epsilon, \quad (5b)$$

where,  $\epsilon \ll 1$  is a small parameter. They showed that this deviation introduces a shift in the velocity of the front given by

$$v \approx v_{KPP}^* - \pi^2/|\ln \epsilon|^2, \quad (6)$$

where,  $v_{KPP}^* = 2$  is the KPP wave speed for  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}) = \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c})$  profile used.

Two key conclusions fall out of this expression – first, the basic KPP wave speed scaling still holds, *even though* the  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c})$  function does not satisfy Eq. (3). Second, the wave speed has a correction which is very strong even for very small  $\epsilon$ , being in the form of a logarithm. Furthermore, while this result was developed for a Heaviside leading edge function, it turns out to be independent of the functional nature of  $\Theta(\epsilon)$  to this order, as shown by Dumortier et al. [29] and Benguria et al. [30].

Consider next the effects of slight endothermicity of the leading edge of the flamelet, conceivable under certain conditions where the fuel decomposes into intermediates. The simplest of these source functions have been studied in literature in the context of response of a biological neuron when excited by an external stimulus [31,32] and are termed Fitzhugh-Nagumo source terms given by  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}) = \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c})(\tilde{c} - \gamma)$ , where the parameter  $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$  determines the inflection point. There are fundamental differences in the nature of the travelling wave solutions to reaction diffusion equations with Fitzhugh-Nagumo source terms and the KPP source terms satisfying Eq. (3). KPP source term results in a velocity spectrum with a lower bound [see Eq. (4)] above which uniformly travelling wave solutions exist. On the other hand, Fitzhugh-Nagumo model results in a unique travelling wave solution with the velocity uniquely given by [33]

$$v_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} - \gamma\sqrt{2}. \quad (7)$$

Note that this correction reduces the wave speed, but in a manner that is linearly dependent upon  $\gamma$ , as opposed to the quadratic and logarithmic correction to the leading-edge function in Eq. (6). Fitzhugh-Nagumo source functions, with leading edge correction functions of the form used in Eq. (5), have also been studied [34,35]. This deviation was shown to introduce a shift in the velocity of the font given by [34]

$$v \approx v_0 + K(\gamma)\epsilon^{1+2\gamma}, \quad (8)$$

where,  $K(\gamma) = \frac{\Gamma(4)}{\Gamma(1+2\gamma)\Gamma(3-2\gamma)} \frac{\sqrt{2}\gamma}{(1+2\gamma)^{2\gamma}}$  is a positive constant. Note that as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the above equation limits to the solution given by Eq. (7). However, as  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ , this does not

limit to Eq. (6) since the two source functions are different; i.e.,  $\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c})$  and  $\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c})(\tilde{c} - \gamma)$ , respectively.

Given how strong these finite flame thickness corrections can be to the KPP wave speed, the objective of this study was to study the nature of this correction for leading edge functions,  $\Theta(\epsilon)$ , representative of those encountered in high activation energy flames. While the leading order result in Eq. (6) is independent of the functional form of  $\Theta(\epsilon)$ , the general form of the higher order correction terms are not addressed in the literature, or their dependencies upon key combustion parameters, such as activation energy. Addressing these corrections is the focus of this paper.

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND METHODOLOGY

### A. Problem Formulation




FIG. 1. Schematic of 1D statistically stationary flame indicating progress variable and boundary conditions

Consider the balance equation for a Favre averaged progress variable  $\tilde{c}$  for a 1D statistically stationary flame given by Eq. (1). Fig. 1 shows the schematic of such a flame with the corresponding boundary conditions, given by,

$$\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c} \rightarrow 0) = \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c} \rightarrow 1) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Following the asymptotic analysis of Williams [36], Buckmaster [37] and the simplified source function analyzed by Clavin et al. [38], we consider source functions of the form,

$$\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}) = A(Ze, \epsilon) \begin{cases} \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c})e^{-Ze(1-\tilde{c}/\epsilon)} & \tilde{c} < \epsilon \\ \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c}) & \tilde{c} \geq \epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where  $A(Ze, \epsilon)$  is a normalizing factor such that  $\int_0^1 \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}) d\tilde{c} = 1$ ,  $Ze$  is the Zeldovich number defined as  $Ze = E_A/R(T_B - T_U)$ ,  $E_A$  is the activation energy,  $R$  is the gas constant and  $T_U$  and  $T_B$  are the unburned and burnt gas temperatures. Note that the above source function satisfies Eq. (3a); i.e.,  $\tilde{\omega} \geq 0$ . Endothermicity effects at the brush leading edge, suggested to be a much weaker effect from the analysis presented in the previous section, will be briefly discussed in Section III.




FIG. 2. Reaction rate function,  $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c})$ , showing leading edge correction for increasing values of  $Ze$  for  $\epsilon = 0.1$

Fig. 2 shows the variation of the resulting source function [Eq. (10)] with increasing values of  $Ze$  for  $\epsilon = 0.1$ . Notice that as  $Ze \rightarrow \infty$  the leading edge function limits to the Heaviside step function discussed in the context of Eq. (5), analyzed by Brunet and Derrida [28].

### B. Computational methodology

Denoting  $p = -d\tilde{c}/d\zeta$ , Eq. (1) becomes,

$$dp/d\tilde{c} = (vp - \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}))/p, \quad (11)$$

and the boundary conditions are given by

$$p(\tilde{c} = 0) = p(\tilde{c} = 1) = 0. \quad (12)$$

Note that the singular points of Eq. (11) are  $(\tilde{c} = 0, p = 0)$  and  $(\tilde{c} = 1, p = 0)$ . Thus, in phase space  $(\tilde{c}, p)$ , the solution to Eq. (11) is a heteroclinic trajectory joining the two singular points. The numerical solution for the equation is obtained using shooting method in phase space [39,40]. Fig. 3 shows illustration of such solution trajectories for two different values of wave speed. There exists a minimum value of wave speed above which the solution is restricted to the physically meaningful region of  $0 \leq \tilde{c} \leq 1$  [2,16]. This computed minimum wave speed is discussed further in the next sections.




FIG. 3. Illustration of solution trajectory to Eq. (11) in phase space  $(\tilde{c}, p)$  for two different values of wave speed

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Numerical solution – KPP case

Fig. 4 plots the dependence of the wave speed upon dimensionless flame thickness,  $\epsilon$ , for several values of  $Ze$ . Also plotted on the figure is the asymptotic result, Eq. (6). Starting with the large  $Ze$  limit, notice that there is a

significant correction introduced from the KPP result even for small values of  $\epsilon$  ( $\sim 10^{-3}$ ). Insights into this large sensitivity to small, but nonzero flame thickness is provided by Eq. (6), which shows that the correction is of  $O(1/|\ln \epsilon|^2)$




FIG. 4. Numerically computed minimum wave speed (normalized by KPP wave speed) dependence upon  $\epsilon$ , as well as the  $O(|\ln \epsilon|^{-2})$  correction from Eq. (6)

Fig. 5 plots these same results as a function of  $Ze$  for different values of  $\epsilon$ . Several observations are evident. The wave speed decreases with increasing values of  $Ze$  for any value of  $\epsilon$ . This intuitively makes sense, because, as shown in Fig. 2, increase in  $Ze$  pulls the wave profile farther and farther from its baseline. The rate of decrease, however, increases with increasing  $\epsilon$ . Further, as  $Ze \rightarrow \infty$ , the value of wave speed saturates and the saturated wave speed decreases with increasing  $\epsilon$ . We will address these limiting values further in the next section.




FIG. 5. Variation of wave speed (normalized by KPP wave speed) with parameter  $Ze$  for different values of  $\epsilon$

### B. Asymptotic result for $Ze \gg 1$ cases

This section derives higher order corrections to the KPP wave speed, generalizing the result from Benguria et al. [41]. In the  $Ze \rightarrow \infty$  limit, the leading-edge function hence is given by

$$\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \tilde{c} < \epsilon \\ \tilde{c}(1 - \tilde{c}) & \text{if } \tilde{c} \geq \epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Following Benguria et al., [41], we can develop the following expression for the wave speed from a variational principle to arrive at:

$$v^2 \geq \sup_{\phi(s)} \left( \frac{F(1) + \int_0^{s_0} \frac{F(\phi(s))}{s^2} ds}{\int_0^{s_0} \left(\frac{d\phi}{ds}\right)^2 ds} \right), \quad (14)$$

where,  $F(\phi) = \int_0^\phi \tilde{\omega}(q) dq$ ,  $s_0$  is an arbitrary parameter and the supremum is taken over all the positive increasing functions  $\phi(s)$  such that  $\phi(0) = 0$  and  $\phi(s_0) = 1$  and for which all the integrals in the above variational principle are finite [41].

The maximizing function  $\hat{\phi}(s)$  is given by the solution of Euler-Lagrange equation [41]:

$$\frac{d^2 \hat{\phi}}{ds^2} + \lambda \frac{\tilde{\omega}(\hat{\phi})}{s^2} = 0. \quad (15)$$

such that  $\hat{\phi}(0) = 0$ ,  $\hat{\phi}(s_0) = 1$  and  $\hat{\phi}'(s_0) = 0$ . Note that the variational principle computes a lower bound with any ‘trial function’ chosen as  $\phi(s)$ .

For the considered leading function, the analytical solution to Eq. (15) is not tractable, so we use a linear approximation for the source function  $[\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{c} \ll 1) \sim \tilde{c}]$  to understand the functional form of the higher order corrections. The resulting trial function for the variational principle is given by:

$$\frac{d^2 \hat{\phi}}{ds^2} = 0 \quad 0 \leq \hat{\phi} < \epsilon, \quad (16a)$$

$$\frac{d^2 \hat{\phi}}{ds^2} + \lambda \frac{\hat{\phi}}{s^2} = 0 \quad \epsilon \leq \hat{\phi} \leq 1. \quad (16b)$$

The solution to the above ODE which maximizes the variational principle is given by [41]

$$\hat{\phi}(s) = \begin{cases} s & 0 \leq \hat{\phi} < \epsilon \\ \alpha \sqrt{s} \cos\left(\frac{1}{2} \cot(\phi_*) \ln\left(\frac{s}{\epsilon}\right) - \phi_*\right) & \epsilon < \hat{\phi} \leq s_0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where  $\alpha = \sqrt{\epsilon} \sec \phi_*$ ,  $s_0 = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  and  $\phi_*$  is the first positive solution of the equation  $\phi_* \tan \phi_* = \frac{1}{2} |\ln \epsilon|$ .

Substituting the trial function [Eq. (17)] into the variational principle [Eq. (14)], we obtain:

$$v_\epsilon / v_{kpp}^* \geq 1 - \frac{\pi^2}{|\ln \epsilon|^2} + \frac{7\pi^2}{4} \frac{1}{|\ln \epsilon|^3} + O(|\ln \epsilon|^{-4}). \quad (18)$$




FIG. 6. Coefficients  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  vs  $Ze$  as defined in Eq. (19) obtained using least squares curve fit numerically. Overlaid in dotted line is the value of  $C_1$  obtained from variational principle for Heaviside cut-off function explained in Section III. B.

This higher order correction can also be used as a function to fit the finite  $Ze$  results from the computations in order to render the results as functions of  $Ze$  only; i.e., we determine the dependence of the coefficients  $C_1(Ze)$  and  $C_2(Ze)$  upon  $Ze$  in the expression from the computations:

$$v_\epsilon = v_{KPP}^* (1 - \pi^2 (1/2 |\ln \epsilon|^2 + C_1(Ze)/|\ln \epsilon|^3 + C_2(Ze)/|\ln \epsilon|^4)). \quad (19)$$

These values of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  results are plotted in Fig. 6 as functions of  $Ze$ . For reference, the limiting value of  $C_1 = 7/4$  in the  $Ze \rightarrow \infty$  from Eq. (18) is also shown. The figure shows that  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are both functions of  $Ze$ , but that the dependence is rather weak, varying by about 25% and 15% over the entire  $Ze$  range for  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . *In other words, the dominant factor influencing the correction of the KPP flame speed is flame thickness, with the details of the reaction rate profile as parameterized by  $Ze$ , exhibiting a nonzero, but weaker effect.* This also indicates that similar results should

be observed for a range of related leading-edge functions. The figure also shows both the  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  values saturating for large  $Ze$ , with the  $C_1$  value converging to the dashed line (Eq. 18).

Consider next the effects of weak endothermicity at the flame brush leading edge. We analyzed corrections to the leading-edge function of the Fitzhugh-Nagumo form. Although the wave speed was a function of the parameter  $\gamma$ , the effect was negligible for  $\gamma \ll 1$  and so not plotted here. This result was expected due to the linear nature of the correction of the wave speed, presented in Sec. I.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study has considered the effects of a laminar flame-type source function introduced to the Favre averaged progress variable equation to account for the deviation in the reaction rate from a concave shape. This deviation is attributed to the Arrhenius kinetics coupled with the finite flamelet thickness. Without this deviation, the flame speed can be computed from KPP theory and depends only on the leading edge of the flame (“pulled fronts”). With the deviation however, there is a significant correction introduced to the KPP pulled front wave speed. This correction is of the form  $|\ln \epsilon|^{-n}$  and is computed numerically. In the limit of high Zeldovich number, the Arrhenius term is shown to behave as a Heaviside step function and the corresponding coefficient of the  $O(|\ln \epsilon|^{-3})$  is shown to be predicted by variational principle [41].

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was partially supported by the University Turbine Systems Research program, contract #DE-FE0031285 (contract monitor Dr. Mark Freeman), and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-20-1-0215 (contract monitor Dr. Chipping Li).

- 
- [1] R. A. Fisher, *Annals of Eugenics* **7**, 355 (1937).
  - [2] A. N. Kolmogorov, I. Petrovskii, and N. Piskunov, *Moscow University Bulletin of Mathematics* **1**, 1 (1937).
  - [3] J. A. Sherratt, J. D. Murray, and B. C. Clarke, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **241**, 29 (1990).
  - [4] B. Hakberg and A. D. Gosman, *Symposium (International) on Combustion* **20**, 225 (1985).
  - [5] S. T. da Silva and R. L. Viana, *Brazilian Journal of Physics* **50**, 780 (2020).
  - [6] G. Damköhler, *Zeitschrift Electrochem* **46**, 601 (1940).
  - [7] Y. B. Zeldovich and D. Frank-Kamenetskii, *Acta physiochimica URSS* **9**, 341 (1938).
  - [8] A. Amato and T. C. Lieuwen, *Combustion and Flame* **161**, 1337 (2014).
  - [9] U. Ebert and W. van Saarloos, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **146**, 1 (2000).
  - [10] A. N. Lipatnikov and J. Chomiak, *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science* **28**, 1 (2002).
  - [11] V. A. Sabelnikov and A. N. Lipatnikov, *Combustion Theory and Modelling* **17**, 1154 (2013).
  - [12] V. Sabelnikov and A. Lipatnikov, *Combust. Flame* **162**, 2893 (2015).
  - [13] V. Sabelnikov and A. Lipatnikov, *Physical Review E* **90**, 033004 (2014).
  - [14] D. A. Frank-Kamenetskii, in *Doklady Acad. Nauk SSSR* (1938), pp. 411.
  - [15] Y. B. Zeldovich and G. Barenblatt, *Combustion and flame* **3**, 61 (1959).
  - [16] D. G. Aronson and H. F. Weinberger, in *Partial differential equations and related topics* (Springer, 1975), pp. 5.
  - [17] D. B. Spalding, *Symposium (International) on Combustion* **13**, 649 (1971).
  - [18] B. F. Magnussen and B. H. Hjertager, *Symposium (International) on Combustion* **16**, 719 (1977).

- [19] P. A. Libby and K. Bray, *Combustion and Flame* **39**, 33 (1980).
- [20] K. N. C. Bray, P. A. Libby, and J. B. Moss, *Combustion Science and Technology* **41**, 143 (1984).
- [21] C. A. Catlin and R. P. Lindstedt, *Combustion and Flame* **85**, 427 (1991).
- [22] J. M. Duclos, D. Veynante, and T. Poinso, *Combustion and Flame* **95**, 101 (1993).
- [23] H. Kolla, J. W. Rogerson, and N. Swaminathan, *Combustion Science and Technology* **182**, 284 (2010).
- [24] A. N. Lipatnikov and J. Chomiak, *SAE Transactions* **106**, 2441 (1997).
- [25] A. N. Lipatnikov, S. Nishiki, and T. Hasegawa, *Combustion Theory and Modelling* **19**, 309 (2015).
- [26] A. Amato, M. Day, R. K. Cheng, J. Bell, D. Dasgupta, and T. Liewwen, *Combustion and Flame* **162**, 4553 (2015).
- [27] A. J. Aspden, M. S. Day, and J. B. Bell, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **680**, 287 (2011).
- [28] E. Brunet and B. Derrida, *Physical Review E* **56**, 2597 (1997).
- [29] F. Dumortier, N. Popović, and T. J. Kaper, *Nonlinearity* **20**, 855 (2007).
- [30] R. Benguria, M. Depassier, and M. Loss, arXiv preprint arXiv:0706.3671 (2007).
- [31] R. FitzHugh, *Biophysical Journal* **1**, 445 (1961).
- [32] J. Nagumo, S. Arimoto, and S. Yoshizawa, *Proceedings of the IRE* **50**, 2061 (1962).
- [33] J. D. Murray, *Mathematical Biology I. An Introduction* (Springer, 2002).
- [34] F. Dumortier, N. Popović, and T. J. Kaper, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **239**, 1984 (2010).
- [35] V. Méndez, D. Campos, and E. P. Zemskov, *Physical review. E, Statistical, nonlinear, and soft matter physics* **72**, 056113 (2005).
- [36] F. A. Williams, *Combustion Theory* (Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Menlo Park, 1985), 2nd edn., *Combustion Science and Engineering Series*.
- [37] J. Buckmaster, P. Clavin, A. Linan, M. Matalon, N. Peters, G. Sivashinsky, and F. Williams, *Proceedings of the Combustion Institute* **30**, 1 (2005).
- [38] P. Clavin and A. Liñán, in *Nonequilibrium Cooperative Phenomena in Physics and Related Fields* (Springer, 1984), pp. 291.
- [39] F. Sánchez-Garduño and P. K. Maini, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **33**, 163 (1994).
- [40] F. Sánchez-Garduño, P. K. Maini, and M. E. Kappos, *Ima Journal of Applied Mathematics* **57**, 211 (1996).
- [41] R. D. Benguria and M. C. Depassier, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **175**, 221 (1996).