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This report presents the final results of a development program which was conducted by the Directorate of Rocket Propulsion, Edwards Air Force Base, California to determine the altitude simulation produced by various second and third stage rocket engines enclosed in an altitude chamber and fired into a constant cross-sectional area diffuser.

The diffuser and supersonic nozzle configurations were tested utilizing nitrogen gas as the primary fluid; and also with 1000 pound thrust solid propellant rocket engines. The experimental results are in accord with the one dimensional equations describing part of the diffuser performance curve and establish a criteria for comparison with the results obtained from the 1000 pound thrust solid propellant rockets. The resulting data presents a method of diffuser application for captive rocket engine testing at altitudes in excess of 100,000 feet. The minimum altitude chamber pressure produced with a solid propellant 15 degree conical Mach 4 configuration was .008 atmospheres while the minimum altitude chamber pressure produced in the nitrogen tests was .006 atmospheres with a slowly diverging Mach 4 configuration.

Phase II of diffuser development testing was conducted by contractor personnel at the "Rocket Site" using a two dimensional variable area contoured diffuser. The results of an optimum series of Mach 3, 4 and 5 test configurations have been included in this report. More detailed results of these Phase II tests will be available through ASTIA in a report by the Sandberg-Serrell Corporation.
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INTRODUCTION

The results of recent supersonic diffuser tests conducted by the Directorate of Rocket Propulsion have qualitatively indicated the influence of a number of geometrical parameters on diffuser performance. This report has attempted to answer some of the basic questions concerning captive testing of rocket engines at altitude and has been limited to the investigation of the principle factors influencing diffuser performance. New questions are evident if requirements for testing at still higher altitudes are brought forth. In anticipation of these requirements, studies are currently being conducted to determine the feasibility of systems capable of maintaining altitudes in excess of 100,000 feet during rocket engine cut-off and restart.

The diffuser development program was divided into two phases. Phase I testing was limited to straight cylindrical tubes while using nitrogen gas and later solid propellant rockets. Phase II testing was conducted with a two dimensional contoured diffuser with nitrogen gas as the primary fluid. Although Phase II testing was not comprehensive some advantages over the straight cylindrical tube configurations were indicated.

The results contained in this report represent an addendum to AFFTC-TR-60-1. Excerpts from the earlier report have been used to supplement this one.

The diffuser performance curve, referred to frequently in this report, is composed of three distinct types of diffuser flow; flow separation in the nozzle, full flow in the nozzle, and free jet impingement on the diffuser wall. The relation of these three types of diffuser flow are illustrated by regions A, B and C, respectively, of the diffuser performance curve on the next page.
RATIO OF SPECIFIC HEATS OF EXHAUST GAS \( \gamma = 1.28 \)

AREA OF NOZZLE EXIT \( (A_1) = 10.5 \)

AREA OF NOZZLE THROAT \( (A_0) \)

AREA OF DIFFUSER SECTION \( (A_3) = 2.7 \)

LENGTH OF DIFFUSER SECTION \( (L_2) = 72 \) INCHES

DISTANCE OF NOZZLE EXIT TO DIFFUSER ENTRANCE \( Y = 0 \) INCHES

15° 1/2 ANGLE CONICAL NOZZLE

SUBSONIC DIFFUSER NOT USED

DIFFUSER PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE DEFINES MINIMUM ALTITUDE CHAMBER PRESSURE OBTAINABLE FOR THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- ALL \( A_2/A_0 = 1.0 \)
  \( A_0/A_{\infty} = 10.5 \)
  \( \gamma = 1.28 \)

- ALL \( L_2/D_3 = 11.0 \)
  \( Y = 0 \)

15° 1/2 ANGLE CONICAL NOZZLE

REGION A
SEPARATED FLOW IN NOZZLE

REGION B
FULL FLOW IN NOZZLE

REGION C
FREE JET IMPINGEMENT ON DIFFUSER WALL

**DIFFUSER PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE**
DESCRIPTION OF APPARATUS

PHASE I

Nitrogen Gas Test Apparatus:

The test apparatus consisted of an altitude chamber, supersonic nozzle and supersonic diffuser. The cylindrical altitude chamber, seen in the accompanying schematic, had an internal volume of approximately 2.2 cubic feet. During later tests this chamber was substituted for a larger chamber as a means of reducing evacuation time. The Mach 3, 4 and 5 supersonic nozzles were of electroformed nickel and had exit diameters (D1) ranging from 1.06 to 1.37 inches. A group of the nozzles used are seen in the accompanying photo. The supersonic diffusers were of stainless steel tubing having diameters (D3) ranging from 1.40 to 4.06 inches. A detailed list of nozzle and diffuser test articles are given in Table I.

High pressure nitrogen gas was regulated by a dome loaded pressure regulator to nozzle stagnation pressures varying from 10 psig to 1000 psig and was supplied at temperatures ranging from 0 degrees F to 50 degrees F. Unheated nitrogen gas was used in all tests.

Pressure sensing devices consisted of variable reluctance type transducers (0 to 20 psid, 0 to 500 and 0 to 1000 psig; Wiancko) and temperature compensated unbonded strain gage transducers (0 to 2 psia; Statham). Static pressures along the diffuser mixing section were calibrated from 0 to 15 psia and were indicated on oscillograph recorders. All other data was recorded on strip charts. Iron-constantan thermocouples were used to sense temperatures of the nitrogen gas supply and altitude chamber interior. Calibration of the absolute pressure transducers were accomplished at the test site with a precision mercury manometer, an electronic absolute pressure reference and a compensated barometer. System accuracy was within ±1 percent of full scale deflection during measurements of nozzle stagnation pressure and altitude chamber pressure while system accuracy for all other parameters was within ±2 percent of full scale recorder deflection.
NITROGEN GAS SUPERSONIC NOZZLES
### TABLE I
NITROGEN GAS TEST ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mach No.</th>
<th>Supersonic Nozzles</th>
<th>Mixing Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throat Diameter-in</td>
<td>$D_1$ - in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 chnical</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>1.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 conical</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II
SOLID PROPELLANT TEST ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mach No.</th>
<th>15 Degree Conical Supersonic Nozzles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixing Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throat Diameter-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Solid Rocket Engine Test Apparatus:

The test apparatus consisted of 1000 pound thrust solid propellant rockets, Mach 3, 3.42, 4 and 5 fifteen degree conical supersonic nozzles, an altitude chamber having an internal volume of 578 cubic feet and supersonic diffuser sections with diameters ($D_3$) varying from 2.77 to 10.0 inches. As shown below, standard JATO nozzles were modified for different Mach numbers. The solid rocket test apparatus is illustrated in the accompanying photographs. The supersonic diffuser sections all had length to diameter ratios ($L_m/D_3$) in excess of 8. Temperatures along the diffuser wall were not recorded. Dimensions of the nozzles and mixing sections are given in Table II.

Instrumentation was the same as used in the nitrogen gas tests.
PHASE II

Nitrogen Gas Test Apparatus:

The nitrogen gas test apparatus as used during Phase II testing is shown in the accompanying schematic. The system is similar to the one used in Phase I nitrogen gas tests with the exception of the mixing section. The two dimensional mixing section is composed of removable contoured blocks. The blocks were adjustable during the tests by means of jack screws.

The instrumentation used in Phase II nitrogen gas tests was the same as that used in Phase I nitrogen gas tests with the exception of the static pressure recordings along the diffuser wall. These pressures were indicated on strip charts instead of recording oscillographs.
TEST RESULTS

PHASE I

Nitrogen Gas Results:

The Phase I tests were conducted with Mach 3, 4 and 5 supersonic nozzles and various cylindrical diffuser configurations (Table I). Bell and conically shaped nozzles were used in the Mach 3 and 4 tests while only bell shaped nozzles were available for the Mach 5 tests. The ratio of diffuser mixing length to diffuser diameter ($l_m/D_3$) ranged between 8 and 11 in the majority of tests while a few tests were conducted with ratios of less than 8.

The results appearing in Appendix I indicate tests with diffuser configurations of mixing length to diffuser diameter ($l_m/D_3$) ratios greater than 8 had steady state experimental points which always fell very close to or just to the right of the analytical line in region B of the diffuser performance curve (page 2). A marked deviation from the analytical line was experienced when diffuser configurations having mixing length to diffuser diameter ($l_m/D_3$) ratios of less than 8 were tested. A performance curve illustrating this effect is shown in Fig. 22, Appendix I. It is of interest to note that regardless of mixing length to diffuser diameter ($l_m/D_3$) ratio the linear portion of the diffuser performance curve, region C, always extrapolated through the origin.

The test results of the program have verified prior assumptions of the principle factors governing diffuser performance. The principle factors being area ratio of diffuser area to nozzle exit area ($A_3/A_1$), nozzle Mach number ($M$), nozzle shape, total nozzle pressure and specific heat ratio of the exhaust gas.

During the tests, the position of the nozzle was maintained at the plane of the mixing section entrance or just inside. A few tests were run with the nozzle just outside of the mixing section entrance; i.e., $y$ equal to a positive increment. It was noted that diffuser performance suffered to an extent. Further testing was not conducted with this configuration because it was desirable to have the jet exiting from the nozzle impinge on the inside diameter of the mixing section or supersonic diffuser wall.

Altitude chamber pressure ($P_{2o}$) was at ambient conditions immediately prior to the majority of tests. A few tests were accomplished with small initial values of altitude chamber pressure ($P_{2o}$) just prior to the test. The objective of these particular tests was to simulate diffuser "starting" at altitude and to determine if hysteresis of the diffuser performance curve existed. Hysteresis was not noted in diffuser performance provided the diffuser section was of adequate length.
Results of Solid Propellant Tests:

Tests were conducted with 21 diffuser configurations during the solid propellant tests. The rocket motor used during all testing was the 14-DS-1000 JATO unit. The nozzle for this unit was modified to permit testing at Mach numbers of 3, 3.42, 4 and 5.

One set of data points for each test was taken under steady state conditions and plotted as functional values of the altitude chamber pressure for a particular rocket motor chamber pressure. The slope of this line in region C was determined by a straight line through the steady state data point and the origin. The intersection of this line with the analytical solution of region B established the cut-off point or "knee" of the diffuser performance curve. The envelopes in Figs. 10, 11, 12 and 13, Appendix I, define the minimum altitude chamber pressures obtainable for a family of diffuser performance curves.

The results of these tests concur with the results obtained during the nitrogen gas tests; i.e., Mach number, area ratio and specific heat ratio are the principle factors governing diffuser performance. Only conical nozzles were used and therefore, the effect of nozzle shape upon diffuser performance could not be determined during this series of tests.

Solid propellant motor tests were conducted with initial altitude chamber pressures at ambient conditions.

PHASE II

Results of Two-Dimensional Variable Area Tests:

A series of tests using a variable area two-dimensional contoured diffuser was conducted at AFFTC by Sandberg-Serrell Corporation personnel. The diffuser is shown in the accompanying photograph. Mach 3, 4 and 5 nozzles having exit diameters of 1.229 inches were used in conjunction with the diffuser blocks as shown on page 9.

A series of tests with each nozzle was conducted to determine "starting" conditions and conditions necessary to obtain maximum altitude simulation. Diffuser performance envelopes, analogous to constant area diffuser performance envelopes, are presented in Fig. 25, Appendix I, for comparison purposes.
The test results of this program have verified prior assumptions governing diffuser performance in region B. The test results, as indicated earlier, have shown the principle factors in determining region B are: Mach number; specific heat ratio of the exhaust gases; nozzle shape; and area ratio of diffuser area to nozzle exit area \((A_3/A_1)\). The one dimensional equations (Appendix I) assume however, that adequate mixing length \((l_m)\) exists. It has been shown in the results, (Fig. 22, Appendix I) that diffuser performance can be extensively altered. An indication of necessary mixing length to diffuser diameter \((l_m/D_3)\) ratio as a function of Mach number has been included in Fig. 21, Appendix I. One dimensional equations agree quite well with experimental results of diffuser performance in region B to the point where increasing \(P_{T_1}\) produces choking of secondary flow in the mixing section. At this point a transition occurs to region C and in this region diffuser performance can no longer be predicted by elementary treatments. A plot of region C slopes, altitude pressure to nozzle total pressure \((P_2/P_{T_1})_c\) as a function of area ratio \((A_3/A_1)\), Mach number, nozzle shape, and specific heat ratio \((\gamma)\) is shown in Appendix I (Figs. 14 through 20).

The results have shown a marked performance difference in region C as related to nozzle shape when all other geometric considerations are constant. The performance curves obtained with the bell shaped nozzle always show a lower slope in region C, hence, improved performance while region B appears to remain constant regardless of nozzle shape.

Consideration of nozzle shapes indicate that the flow angle at the nozzle exit must be greater, in the case of bell nozzle, to cause impingement on the diffuser wall since the flow just inside the bell nozzle is parallel to the nozzle axis. The larger angle necessary for impingement is produced at the expense of increasing \(P_{T_1}\) in region B and thereby causes a decrease in the value of \(P_2\).

The effect of specific heat ratio \((\gamma)\) in region B can be readily determined from the one dimensional equations describing diffuser flow. The effect of specific heat ratio \((\gamma)\) in region C has been shown in the slope plots that for values of decreasing specific heat ratio \((\gamma)\) the slope of region C diminishes when considering all other parameters constant so that in fact better altitude simulation is possible at the expense of increased primary stagnation pressure. Information from this and other reports, mentioned in the Reference section, Appendix I, should be of assistance in empirically predicting diffuser performance in region C.
As an illustration of the above discussion, an example for designing a diffuser is presented.

**Given:**

- Specific heat ratio of exhaust gases, ($\gamma$) = 1.26
- 15 degree conical nozzle, Mach number = 4.00
- Combustion chamber pressure, $P_{T1}$ = 400 psia
- Nozzle exit area, $A_1$ = 86.6 sq in.
- Corrected barometric reading, $P_a$ = 13.20 psia

**Find:**

1. Diffuser area to nozzle exit area ($A_3/A_1$)
2. Altitude pressure to atmospheric pressure ($P_2/P_a$), opt

**Solution:** Referring to the performance envelope, Fig. 12, Appendix I, the ordinate at $P_{T1}/P_a = 30.3$ intersects at $P_2/P_a = 0.010$. The slope of region C is determined since the linear portion of the performance curve extrapolates through the origin. In this case the slope $P_2/P_{T1} = 0.010/30.3 = 0.00033$. Referring to the corresponding slope plot (Fig. 19, Appendix I) the area ratio is found to be 2.2. It is desirable to operate in region C to the right of the cut-off point or "knee" of the performance curve so that in practice a slightly smaller area ratio ($A_3/A_1$) is chosen to insure operation in region C. In this case an area ratio of 2.0 is arbitrarily chosen. Therefore, $A_3 = 2.0 \times 86.6 = 173.2$ inches$^2$. Referring to Fig. 19, Appendix I, it is seen that the slope of region C at an area ratio of 2.0 = 0.00039. The desired $A_3/A_1 = 2.0$ and $P_2/P_{T1} = 0.00039$. Then $P_2/P_a = 0.0118$ which is equivalent to an altitude of approximately 100,000 feet.
REFERENCES


NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>cross-sectional area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_f$</td>
<td>dimensionless friction factor ($\frac{f}{\frac{1}{2} \rho V^2}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_p$</td>
<td>specific heat at constant pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_v$</td>
<td>specific heat at constant volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>diameter, inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>length, inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mach number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>static pressure, absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_T$</td>
<td>stagnation or total pressure, absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>axial distance along diffuser from the constant area mixing section inlet to the nozzle exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>ratio of specific heats, $C_p/C_v$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>half angle of subsonic diffuser outlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>mass density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_w$</td>
<td>friction force per unit area at the wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscripts

1. primary flow conditions (flow conditions in the exit of the supersonic nozzle)
2. secondary flow conditions or altitude chamber conditions
3. conditions in the diffuser mixing section
4. conditions in the subsonic diffuser exit
a. atmospheric or ambient conditions
c. region C of the performance curve (see page 2)
d. subsonic diffuser outlet
m. constant cross-sectional area: mixing section
0. initial conditions
T. stagnation or total state
x. direction along diffuser wall
bell. bell shaped nozzle
con. conical nozzle
DIFFUSER FLOW EQUATIONS

Continuity Equation:

\[ \frac{M_3^*}{(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \frac{M_3^*}{M_1^*})} = \frac{P_{T1} A_1 M_1^*}{P_3 A_3} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \frac{M_1^*}{M_3^*} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \]

First law of thermodynamics

\[ T_{T1} = T_{T3} \]

Momentum Equation:

\[ \frac{P_{T1} A_1}{P_3 A_3} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \frac{M_1^*}{M_3^*} \right) \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} = \frac{P_2 A_2}{P_3 A_3} \left( 1 + \frac{M_1^*}{M_3^*} \right) + \frac{F_x}{P_3 A_3} \]

where

\[ \frac{F_x}{P_3 A_3} = 4C_f \frac{1}{D_3} \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \frac{M_3^*}{1 - \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} M_3^*} \]
Figure 1  Diffuser Design Curve
MACH 3 SLOWLY DIVERGENT BELL NOZZLE-DIFFUSER
PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE FOR CYLINDER DIFFUSERS
WITH AND WITHOUT SUBSONIC DIFFUSERS

Figure 2  Diffuser Design Curve
MACH 3 CONICAL 15° NOZZLE-DIFFUSER
PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE FOR CYLINDER DIFFUSERS
WITHOUT SUBSONIC DIFFUSERS
Figure 3  Diffuser Design Curve

MACH 4 CONICAL 15° NOZZLE - DIFFUSER
PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE FOR CYLINDERICAL
DIFFUSERS WITHOUT SUBSONIC DIFFUSERS

\[
\frac{p}{p_a} = 1.40 \\
\frac{p}{p_a} = 4 \\
\frac{p}{p_a} = 8.2 - 11.4 \\
\frac{p}{p_a} = 0 \\
\text{Theoretical for } \frac{A_2}{A_1} = 1.0
\]
Figure 4 Diffuser Design Curve

MACH 4 SLOWLY DIVERGENT BELL NOZZLE - DIFFUSER
PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE FOR CYLINDRICAL DIFFUSERS
WITHOUT SUBSONIC DIFFUSERS

\[ \frac{\gamma}{k \text{ bell}} = 4 \]
\[ \frac{L_2}{D_3} = 8.2 \quad 11.4 \]
\[ \frac{L_d}{D_3} = 0 \]

△ Theoretical for \( \frac{A_2}{A_1} = 1.0 \)
Figure 5 Diffuser Design Curve

MACH 5 SLOWLY DIVERGENT HELL NOZZLE - DIFFUSER PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE FOR CYLINDRICAL DIFFUSERS WITHOUT SUBSONIC DIFFUSERS

\[ \gamma = 1.4, \quad M_{\text{bell}} = 5, \quad \frac{l_w}{D_3} = 8.2 - 11.4, \quad \frac{l_d}{h_3} = 0 \]

△ Theoretical for \( A_2/A_1 = 1.0 \)
Figure 6
ANALYTICAL SOLUTION OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL STEADY FLOW CONSTANT CROSS SECTIONAL AREA DIFFUSER EQUATIONS

\begin{align*}
\gamma &= 1.26 \\
M_{\text{con}} &= 3 \\
1_d/b_3 &= 0
\end{align*}
Figure 7

ANALYTICAL SOLUTION OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL STEADY FLOW CONSTANT CROSS SECTIONAL AREA DIFFUSER EQUATIONS

\( \gamma = 1.26 \)
\( M_{\text{con}} = 3.42 \)
\( \frac{l_d}{D_3} = 0 \)
Figure 8

ANALYTICAL SOLUTION OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL STEADY FLOW CONSTANT CROSS SECTIONAL AREA DIFFUSER EQUATIONS

\[ \gamma = 1.26 \]
\[ M_{\text{con}} = 4 \]
\[ \Delta_{d/d_2} = 0 \]

\[ \frac{P_t}{P_a} \]

Altitude chamber pressure

Total nozzle pressure

Ambient pressure
Figure 9

ANALYTICAL SOLUTION OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL STEADY FLOW CONSTANT CROSS SECTIONAL AREA DIFFUSER EQUATIONS

\[ \frac{\gamma}{M_{\text{con}}} = 5 \]

\[ \frac{1_{d}/D_3}{0} \]
Figure 10  Diffuser Design Curve
MACH 3 CONICAL 15° NOZZLE - DIFFUSER
PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE FOR CYLINDRICAL DIFFUSERS

\[ \frac{p_2}{p_a} \]

\[ \gamma = 1.26 \]
\[ M_{con} = 3 \]
\[ \frac{l_m}{D_3} = 8.1 - 16 \]
\[ \frac{l_d}{D_3} = \bigcirc - 0 \]
\[ \square - 5.2 \]

△ Theoretical for \( \frac{A_3}{A_1} = 1.0 \)

\( \frac{p_{2,1}}{p_a} \)

Total nozzle pressure
Ambient pressure

Altitude chamber pressure
Ambient pressure
Figure 11  Diffuser Design Curve

MACH 3.42 CONICAL 15° NOZZLE - DIFFUSER
PERFORMANCE ENVELOPE FOR CYLINDRICAL DIFFUSERS

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma &= 1.26 \\
N_{con} &= 3.42 \\
L_m/D_3 &= 9.7 - 16 \\
L_d/D_3 &= 0 - 0 \quad \square - 4.3
\end{align*}
\]

\* Theoretical for \( A_3/A_1 = 1.0 \)
Figure 13  Diffuser Design Curve

5 each 15° conical nozzle - DIFFUSER

Performance envelope for cylindrical diffusers

\[ \frac{P_2}{P_a} \]

\[ \gamma = 1.26 \]

\[ M_{con} = 5 \]

\[ \frac{L_m}{D_3} = 8.9 - 16.0 \]

\[ \frac{L_d}{D_3} = 0 \]

\[ \square 5.1 \]

\[ \Delta \text{Theoretical for } \frac{A_3}{A_1} = 1.0 \]

\[ \frac{A_3}{A_1} = 1.20 \]

\[ 1.94 \]

Total nozzle pressure
Ambient pressure

\[ \frac{P_t}{P_a} \]
Figure 14 - Diffuser Design Curve

The slope of region C as a function of mixing section to nozzle exit area ratio for Mach 3 nozzles.

- Mach 3 isentropic ratio of nozzle exit static pressure to total pressure
- Experimental points:
  - Bell shaped nozzle
  - 15° conical nozzle

\[
y = 0 \\
y = 1.4
\]
Figure 15  Diffuser Design Curve

The slope of Region C as a function of diffuser to nozzle exit area ratio for Mach 4 nozzles.

\[ \Delta \text{Mach 4 Isentropic Ratio of Nozzle Static Exit Pressure to Total Pressure} \]

Experimental Points:
- ○ Ball Shaped Nozzle
- □ 15° Conical Nozzle

\[ y = 0 \]
\[ y = 1.40 \]
Figure 16  Diffuser Design Curve

The slope of region C as a function of diffuser to nozzle exit area ratio for Mach 5 nozzles.

Mach 5 Isentropic Ratio of Nozzle Static Exit Pressure to Total Pressure

Experimental Points

\( y = 0 \)
\( y = 1.40 \)
Figure 18 Diffuser Design Curve

THE SLOPE OF REGION C AS A FUNCTION OF DIFFUSER TO NOZZLE EXIT AREA RATIO FOR MACH 3.42 CONICAL 15° NOZZLES

\( \Delta \) Mach 3.42 Isentropic Ratio of Nozzle Static Exit Pressure to Total Pressure

- Experimental Points

\[ y = 0 \]
\[ \gamma = 1.26 \]
Figure 19 Diffuser Design Curve

The slope of Region C as a function of diffuser to nozzle exit area ratio for Mach 4 conical 15° nozzles.

- Mach 4 isentropic ratio of nozzle static exit pressure to total pressure
- Experimental points
  \( \gamma = 0 \)
  \( \gamma = 1.26 \)

Altitude chamber pressure

Total nozzle pressure

\[ \frac{P_2}{P_{r1}} \]
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EXPERIMENTAL AND THEORETICAL COMPARISON
OF REGION B OF THE DIFFUSER PERFORMANCE CURVE
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Experimental and Theoretical Comparison of Region B of the Diffuser Performance Curve
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Figure 24
Experimental and analytical comparison of Region B of the diffuser performance curve

Cf = 0.0075
Figure 25
Two Dimensional Variable Cross-Sectional Area Diffuser Performance Curves
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diffuser. The diffuser and supersonic nozzle configurations were tested utilizing nitrogen gas as the primary fluid; and also with 1000 pound thrust solid propellant rocket engines. The resulting data presents a method of diffuser application for captive rocket engine testing at altitudes in excess of 100,000 feet.
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