

Water jet interaction with free supersonic air jet

Hansen Jones and Shyam Menon Louisiana State University



APS – 71st Annual DFD meeting, Nov 18-20, 2018, Atlanta, GA Research supported by: LaSPACE & LSU Board of Regents



Motivation

• Traditional Jet-In-Crossflow (JICF) has been studied extensively for subsonic and supersonic flows











Motivation

• Jet injection into













 We seek to examine the key differences in breakup behavior between liquid injection into a continuous supersonic flow and injection into a discontinuous flow.

Liu, H., Guo, Y., & Lin, W. (2016). Numerical simulations of transverse liquid jet to a supersonic crossflow using a pure two-fluid model. Advances in Mechanical Engineering, 8(1), 1687814016629341.





Noise Reduction in Free Jets





Focused on minimizing noise production in mixing layer between free jet and ambient

Norum, T. D. (n.d.). Reductions in Multi-component Jet Noise by Water Injection. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics.



No liquid injection

With liquid injection

 Focused on minimizing noise production by breaking up internal shock structure and locating sound source locations

Zaman, K., & Podboy, G. (2010, June). Effect of microjet injection on supersonic jet noise. In 16th AIAA/CEAS Aeroacoustics Conference (p. 4022).

Previous work lacks examination of primary breakup regime and liquid penetration distance, <u>that is the focus</u> <u>of the current work</u>



Introduction to Supersonic Jets





Aerospaceweb. Available online: http://www.aerospaceweb.org/question/ propulsion/q0224.shtml; (accessed on 14 August 2015).





7

Liquid Jet Primary Breakup in JICF













Madabhushi, R. K., Leong, M. Y., & Arienti, M. (2006, May). ON THE BREAKUP REGIME MAP OF LIQUID JET IN CROSSFLOW. Paper presented at 19th Annual Conference on Liquid Atomization and Spray Systems, Toronto, Canada.











Stand Configuration and Measurement





• After ambient conditions are entered, data for each run is stored during operation and immediately stored.













Nozzle Design





- Air is supplied to the chamber at a constant flow rate of 54SCFM at a static pressure of 73psig measured in a 3/8" SCH40 pipe section for all test cases
- Water back pressure is varied from 20-100psig and nozzle diameters of 0.06", 0.04", and 0.03" are examined



LOVE PURPLE



Focusing Color Schlieren (FCS)





Schoegl, I., Pisano, AJ, & Sedky, G. (2016). Development of a compact focusing
color schlieren technique. In 54th AIAA aerospace sciences meeting, San Diego, CA, USA, AIAA (Vol. 1765).

Fillingham, Patrick & Murali, Harikrishnan & Novosselov, Igor. (2017). Non-Dimensional Parameter for Characterization of Wall Shear Stress from Underexpanded Axisymmetric Impinging Jets. Journal of Fluids Engineering. 139. 10.1115/1.4037035.





Volume Illuminated High-Speed Video



LOVE PURPLE



 500W halogen bulb placed ~5m away at ~10° angle provides diffuse indirect light source



- Photron SA3 high-speed camera
- 60-200,000fps
 - 20,000fps used for primary breakup imaging
 - 2,000fps used for penetration imaging
- 54mm lens @ f/1.4





Gas Phase Characterization





- Good agreement between CFD and experiment for shock structure and inlet conditions
- Threshold of 5mins combined run time for each tank was set to keep tank pressure deviation <5%





Liquid Phase Characterization



	W/ (126	01 0022	1			1	1			1
Nozzle I	We=6138	Oh=.0032								
D=.06"										
Injection	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
Pressure										
[psig]										
Measured	0.4753	0.593	0.693	0.791	0.865	0.918	1.00	1.05	1.12	
Flowrate										
[GPM]										
Measured	16.44	20.51	23.97	27.35	29.91	31.75	34.58	36.31	38.73	
Velocity										
[m/s]										
Calculated	16.63	20.37	23.52	26.30	28.81	31.12	33.26	35.28	37.19	<u>.</u>
Velocity										
[m/s]										
% Error	1.18	-0.67	-1.86	-3.87	-3.70	-1.99	-3.82	-2.84	-3.99	
q	0.624	0.937	1.249	1.561	1.873	2.185	2.497	2.810	3.122	
Re _D	24064	29472	34032	38049	41680	45020	48128	51048	53810	

 $= \frac{C_D}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}} \sqrt{\frac{2\Delta P}{\rho}}$ Shape factor

 Flow tests were completed on nozzle 1 to confirm velocity measurements, these were used on all other nozzles





Shock Structure







LOVE PURPLE



Shock Structure





 Shock structure differs from traditional jet in crossflow due to presence of internal Mach diamonds



Nozzle 1, q=1.873



Shock Structure







Nozzle 1, q=0.624 (top), q=0.937 (bottom)



Yates, C. (1971). Liquid injection into supersonic airstreams. In 7th Propulsion Joint Specialist Conference (p. 724).

- No presence of separation region or shock interaction
- Visible signs of flow turning









Nozzle 1, q=3.122 (top), q=0.624 (bottom)





Primary Liquid Breakup





 Low momentum ratio characterized by strong shearing of coherent liquid jet, no long ligaments of fluid extend to secondary breakup section



 High momentum ratio characterized by surface stripping/tearing. This allows for extension of fluid ligaments prior to secondary breakup



Spray Edge Penetration/Detection





 Edge location is important indicator of dominant flow phase, is an important parameter of study for CFD validation

 More prominent edge variation at higher momentum ratios

LOVE PURPLE





- Clear strong dependence on diameter ratio
 - Appearance of region of sudden vapor phase expansion, more prevalent at lower momentum ratios and smaller diameter ratio



No







 Less variation at smaller diameter ratio









 More variation at smaller diameter ratio, can better be compared with existing empirical correlations







 More variation at smaller diameter ratio, can better be compared with existing empirical correlations







Conclusions and Future Work





Conclusions



- Successfully constructed cold flowing test stand capable of steady operation
 - Characterized gas and liquid phases
- Showed qualitative characteristics for gas phase shockwave structure at varied injection locations
 - Lack of separation shockwave and locations of subsonic flow not present in traditional JICF
- Examined primary breakup region in context of traditional JICF regime diagram, extended to higher Weber number
 - Used POD to extract primary modes which agree with literature









Conclusions



- Spray edge detection yielded results for spray penetration globally and locally in projected gas phase boundary
 - Global results vary heavily from correlations for traditional JICF
 - Strong Dependence on jet diameter ratio is shown



- Centerline data showed large deviation from expected gas phase velocity. This is likely due to large expected droplet size and turning of the gas flow.
- Preliminary CFD work shows significant flow weakening and turning downstream of liquid injection.





CFD results courtesy of Daniel Allgood, NASA SSC





250 200 150 100 50 0 -50 x-distance (mm)







Future Work



- Further explore the dependency on •
 diameter ratio
 - Development of a new correlation or physical parameter for momentum ratio should be determined
- Expand PDPA measurements to two components and map spray behavior in 2D
 - Will allow for better identification of mean spray path after gas phase flow turning and facilitate CFD validation
- Test and characterize hybrid rocket to supply combusting gas flow
 - Will allow for better matching of physical properties to those at SSC
 - Many of the diagnostics used already can again be applied







