

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

THE BEHAVIOUR OF A ‘DISSECTED’ POOL FIRE

J.C. Jones

School of Engineering, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 3UE, Scotland, UK

(Received 16 August 2012)

In a recent paper in this journal [1] Chow et al. show from photographic evidence, having ‘cut a pool fire in half’ by means of a glass partition, that inside the envelope of a propanol pool fire there is ‘no flame’. They attribute that to there being too little oxygen in that part of the envelope. A point they might have considered is that radiation from a flame need not be in the visible region, yet there is reliance solely on visual observation in drawing the conclusions in [1]. Had the authors measured the wavelength spectrum from the visible ‘flame’ shown in the photographs, it would almost certainly have extended above and below the range to which the human eye responds. By the same token, radiation outside the visible range might

well have been emitted from the part of the pool fire to which the authors have assigned ‘no flame’. On the criterion applied in [1] the distinction between ‘flame’ and ‘no flame’ is at best arbitrary, and a fundamental distinction needs to account for emissions outside the visible region. I appeal to Chow et al. to consider this point.

REFERENCE

1. W.K. Chow, C.S. Leung and Angus C.K. Cheng, “Inside the flame of a pool fire”, *International Journal on Engineering Performance-Based Fire Codes*, Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 20 (2012).

RESPONSE FROM AUTHOR

W.K. Chow

Department of Building Services Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China

(Received 17 August 2012)

Thanks for the comment. The pictures were just taken for preliminary studies, entirely from visual observation. Future works will include what Dr Jones suggested.