A Study of Gas-Centered Swirl Coaxial Injectors using X-ray Radiography

Gas-centered swirl coaxial injectors, a specific type of airblast atomizer, are of interest in rocket propulsion applications. These applications require good mixing of the liquid and gas to ensure complete combustion within the engine. While strides are being made on the computational front, predictions of the mass distributions achieved with this type of injector remain too costly or too inaccurate for engineering design. There has been, therefore, a reliance on experimental results. Unfortunately, the mass flow rates and the strong gas phase typically encountered in rocket engines create sprays with high optical densities and render the vast majority of optical and laser techniques ineffective. Data has been obtainable through mechanical patternation, but the technique has limitations. Time-gated ballistic imaging has also shown promise in rocket injectors but produces only qualitative information. An x-ray radiographic technique with a high-brilliance x-ray source (Advanced Photon Source) has been applied to these high-optical-density sprays. To achieve this testing a new, mobile flow facility was constructed; this facility simulates the rocket flows using water and nitrogen instead of fuel and oxidizer. The x-ray radiography technique has been able to measure equivalent path length in gas-centered swirl coaxial injectors at a range of typical operating conditions. These results and their implications for gas-centered swirl coaxial injector performance in liquid rocket engines are discussed.
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Motivation

• Quantitative spray data is lacking for liquid-gas rocket injectors, especially in the near-injector region
  — Quantitative data needed to develop scaling laws and validate models
  — Near-injector region is of critical importance since this is typically where combustion occurs

• Most liquid rocket injectors operate at conditions (high flow rates and high pressures) which produce optically dense sprays
  — Laser light is multiply scattered and insufficient useable light exits the spray to allow the use of laser diagnostics in the near-injector region
  — Other measurement techniques can be invasive, qualitative or provide only generalized time-averaged information
    • Examples include mechanical patternation, ballistic imaging and traditional shadowgraphy

• X-ray radiography is currently the only technique that allows quantitative results for mass distribution in the near-injector region and inside of the injector itself
Other Techniques

- Ballistic Imaging can provide quantitative information on the size and shape of intact structures but ignores the droplet field.

- PDPA can be used on these sprays but typically not in the near injector region.

- Mechanical Patterization is the only technique that can directly measure mass distribution but again not in the near injector region.
Previous X-ray Radiography Studies

• To date most of the x-ray radiography studies have focused on diesel and gasoline injectors

• Other studies include:
  – Aerated-liquid jets
  – Impinging jet injectors
  – Swirl-coaxial injector

• First time used in a spray with a strong gas phase
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Gas-Centered Swirl Coaxial Injectors

• Why Gas-Centered Swirl-Coaxial (GCSC) injectors?
  – Interest exists around the world in designing new LOX-Hydrocarbon rocket engines using an OX-rich staged-combustion cycle.
    • Recent papers from Russia, China, South Korea and multiple US groups
  – Successfully used in Russian rocket engines employing a staged-combustion cycle (e.g., RD-170)
  – Such a design and typical mixture ratios result in a high speed gas flow which is available to atomize the liquid hydrocarbon fuel

• Design criteria and scaling laws are needed over a range of conditions and geometries

• Previous work by the authors using cold flow techniques have investigated the effect of numerous geometric variations on the size, shape, and frequency of the wall bounded film and spray
  – Geometric variations include cup radius, step thickness, gas radius at end of sheltered lip, initial film thickness, cup length and swirl
  – Injector-wall and injector-injector interactions have also been explored

• Cold flow techniques include laser sheet imaging of the film, shadowgraphy of the spray, limited PDPA
Gas-Centered Swirl Coaxial Injector

- Tangential liquid inlets create a swirling, annular fluid which is atomized by high-velocity unswirled gas
- Momentum flux ratio (the main scaling parameter) was varied between 60 and 145 with 4 different geometries
  - Geometries represent changing the number of inlets, the inlet size and the inlet area (swirl number)
  - Outlet size also examined, but not presented today

\[
\begin{align*}
& r_g = r_p = 6.35 \text{ mm} \\
& L_c = 33.0 \text{ mm} \\
& r_o = 9.53 \text{ mm} \\
& S = 1.52 \text{ mm} \\
& \tau = 1.65 \text{ mm} \\
& d_{in} = 1.6 \text{ mm, 4H} \\
& \quad = 1.6 \text{ mm, 8HDA} \\
& \quad = 0.989 \text{ mm, 8HSA}
\end{align*}
\]
The relevant nondimensional parameters can be obtained by nondimensionalizing the force balance for a surface disturbance by the liquid inertia \((\rho_l v_l^2 \ddot{y})\) and multiplying by \(\tau^2/A_{dist}\) to eliminate disturbance parameters from the aerodynamic force term.

Assuming worst case scenario for disturbance size and that all constants are of order 1:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Phi &= \frac{p_g v_g^2}{\rho_l v_l^2} \\
F_r &= \frac{1}{\text{Re}_l} \frac{v_g}{v_l} \\
F_{rc} &= \left( \frac{v_{Tan}}{v_{Total}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\tau}{\rho_l} \right) \\
F_s &= \frac{1}{We}
\end{align*}
\]

Example with the 8H-ONPNTN Geometry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Aerodynamic</th>
<th>Liquid Phase</th>
<th>Centripetal</th>
<th>Surface Tension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GCSC injectors operate in a regime where aerodynamic forces are dominant.
Momentum Flux Ratio

\[ \Phi_{\text{Total}} = \frac{\rho_g v_g^2}{\rho_l v_l^2} \]

- Swirl alters the shear between the liquid and gas phase which must be taken into account in \( \Phi \)
- Difficult to define due to complex compressible flow field
- Use of single velocity to describe flow field questionable
- Best collapse of film lengths found using total liquid velocity and a calculated gas phase velocity and static density
- Total liquid velocity calculated using measured mass flow rate and assuming conservation of momentum between the tangential liquid injector holes and liquid cup exit
- Using the measured mass flow rate, total temperature and static pressure in the gas plenum static density was calculated assuming 1D flow and a calorically perfect gas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>( r_o ) (mm)</th>
<th>( \tau ) (mm)</th>
<th>( r_p ) (mm)</th>
<th>( s ) (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODHNTN</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONPNTN</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUGHUTD</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mobile Flow Laboratory

- **Self contained mobile system capable of delivering up to one kg/s of H$_2$O & GN$_2$ at pressures in excess of 200 atm**
  - Requires only power, LN$_2$, and exhaust from host facility.
  - System fully rated to 408 atm (Allows more GN$_2$ storage)
  - Dedicated Allen-Bradley control & Pacific Instruments data acquisition systems
  - Fully remote operation
  - High speed abort system on all data channels for added pressure safety
  - System is on wheels and can be assembled in under 2 days
  - Ran almost continuously (24 hours/day) for two weeks
X-Ray Radiography Details

• Experiments performed at the 7-BM beamline of the Advanced Photon Source

• Synchrotron bending magnet to produce polychromatic (white beam) which is made into a monochromatic beam
  — Monochromator is tunable between 5.1 keV to 12 keV
  — 10 keV used for the present study based on the absorption of the anticipated test conditions
  — Beam is small and has a FWHM of 5 x 6 microns
  — X-ray flux of 2.5x10^{11} photons/s/mm²

• Both time-averaged and time-resolved measurements can be made
  — The system was not optimized for time-resolved measurements as only time-averaged ones were originally planned.

• Beer’s law is used to convert these measurements into an equivalent path length of water (EPL)
  — Path length is the average across each measurement, 4 seconds for time-averaged results and 1 microsecond for time-resolved.
**Test Setup & Matrix**

- **Normalization by the intensity of incident light performed in two steps**
  - Titanium foil: beam intensity variations during a scan
  - Zero absorption case: average signal level from the 5 points in the scan with the highest transmission (Outside the spray-accounts for gas absorption)

### Near Injector Optics Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>(m_g) (g/s)</th>
<th>(m_i) (g/s)</th>
<th>(\phi_{total})</th>
<th>(R_A)</th>
<th>(Re_g)</th>
<th>(Re_i)</th>
<th>(We)</th>
<th>(Fr_c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4H-60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H-90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H-120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H-145</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HSA-60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HSA-90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HSA-110</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HSA-120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HDA-60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HDA-90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HDA-120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HDA-130</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8HDA-145</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equivalent Pathlength

- EPL is the pathlength-integral of the amount of water in the beam
- EPL is a function of velocity, droplet size and mass flux distribution
- Simulations of EPL were run to understand the effect of the velocity and mass distribution on the EPL profile
  - Simulation assumes axisymmetric mass & velocity profiles & divides the spray into a grid
  - Droplet size is assumed uniform across the spray
  - Vertical spacing between droplets in each cell is set to achieve correct mass flux and velocity

**8HSA-120**
(5mm Downstream)
- $D_d=75 \, \mu m$
- $\dot{m}_L=35 \, g/s$
- $V_{ma}=11.6 m/s$
EPL Simulation

- The center valley in EPL can not be explained by a mass deficit alone
- The EPL deficient in the spray center is largely caused by high center line gas post velocity
  - 300 m/s gas velocity at gas post exit
  - Droplet diameter ($D_d$) assumed 50 $\mu$m for both Cases
Average EPL Profiles
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Mass Weighted Velocity

- Droplets across the entire spray are undergoing acceleration in the near injector region
  - Acceleration can be quantified by the mass-weighted velocity ($V_{ma}$)
  - $V_{ma}$ obtained by dividing $m_l$ with the integral of the average projected liquid density profile
  - Between initial gas-liquid contact and 3 mm downstream acceleration is on the order of 1,000 m/s$^2$
  - Between 3 mm and 10 mm acceleration is on the order of 10,000 m/s$^2$
180° Radial Profiles

- Due to space constraints at beamline, testing was conducted with the spray flowing horizontal
- Two scans with 180° rotation to investigate potential gravity effects
  - 180° flipped about r=0 for comparison

![Graphs showing 180° Radial Profiles](image)

5mm downstream

8HSA-90

8HSA-120
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Momentum Flux

- Uniformity improves with increasing momentum flux ratio ($\Phi$) up to a point
  - Decrease in EPL profile as $\Phi$ increases is due to the decrease in the liquid mass flow rate
  - Expected from earlier work / views downstream

4H-ONPNTN, 5mm downstream
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Swirl

0° orientation, 5 mm downstream

$R_A = 0.299, \ 4H-120$

$R_A = 0.261, \ 8HSA-120$

$R_A = 0.406, \ 8HDA-120$
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Spray Symmetry & $\dot{m}_L$ 

5mm downstream

$\dot{m}_L=26\text{ g/s}$
$4H, V_{gp} = 295\text{ m/s}$
$8HSA, V_{gp} = 309\text{ m/s}$
$8HDA, V_{gp} = 250\text{ m/s}$
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Time Resolved: A Single Droplet

- Can the x-ray radiography provide spray statistics?
  - Prior radiography results have not extracted droplet information

- Consider the simplest case of a single droplet moving through the beam
  - The peak of the path length corresponds to the droplet diameter
  - The elapsed time of departure from 0 path length relates to the velocity

- A simple approach is taken to get droplet size and velocity from the data even where multiple droplets are in the beam
  - Each peak in the data is a droplet
  - Its diameter is the offset from the bounding valleys (minimum)
  - Its velocity is related to the time between bounding valleys
  - This produces known biases, but demonstrates power of measurement
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Improving Injector Understanding

- Even with multiple droplets in the beam, sizes and velocities can be extracted
  - There are known biases in the technique and they have been investigated and an improved method is in the works

- While these biases mean that the current assessments are only semi-quantitative, some useful results exist
  - Droplet distributions appear to be log-normal which is somewhat unexpected and likely a result of noise level in the data and biasing
  - Changing the liquid inlet size has little or no effect on the atomization and droplet-size distribution
  - However, changing the liquid inlet area (swirl) has a large effect on droplet-size distribution
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X-Ray Conclusions

• X-ray radiography was used to quantitatively examine the near injector region of GCSC injectors
  • Time-averaged measurements quantified a significant level of asymmetry not previously observed in these sprays
    – However, the mass and velocity remain coupled and interpretation can be a challenge
    – Indicates that engines using GCSC injectors must be able to tolerate some level of asymmetry
  • EPL deficits in the spray center were shown to be caused by high velocities in the middle of the spray
  • Mass averaged velocities show high acceleration in the near injector region as far as 20 mm downstream
  • Spray width is unaffected by ϕ but does decrease with increasing swirl level
  • Time-resolved radiography might be able to help decouple mass & velocity by providing droplet size and velocity distributions
    – A simple approach demonstrates the utility of the technique
    – Improvements have been identified and implemented for future testing to improve fidelity
  • X-ray radiography is enabling spray insight not achievable with other available diagnostics
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• Can the x-ray radiography provide spray statistics?
  – No spray statistics possible in near injector region with conventional diagnostics and these dense sprays
  – Prior radiography results have not extracted droplet information

• Consider the simplest case of a single droplet moving thru the beam
  – The peak of the path length corresponds to the droplet diameter
  – The elapsed time of departure from 0 path length relates to the velocity

• A simple approach is taken to get droplet size and velocity from the data even where multiple droplets are in the beam
  – Each peak in the data is a droplet
  – Its diameter is the offset from the bounding valleys (minimum)
  – Its velocity is related to the time between bounding valleys
  – This produces known biases, but demonstrates power of measurement
Droplet Statistics

- Multiple droplets are in the beam at any given time
- Even so, droplet sizes and velocities can be extracted
  - There are known biases in the technique and they have been investigated
  - An improved technique using curve-fitting is in the works
- Droplet distributions currently appear to be log-normal which is unexpected and likely a result of noise level in the data and some biasing
- Velocities are a Log-Normal distribution, but this is more typical
Comparison to Time-Averaged

- Time-averaged results can be related to droplet diameters extracted from time-resolved data
  - Correlation is not exact because periods of no droplets are included in the time-averaging
  - For a single droplet, the mean path length would be $\pi D/4$
- Mean diameter is LARGER which indicates it is being overestimated by the simple procedure
  - Could be a result of upward diameter bias
  - Most likely the result of not measuring very small droplets (noise and resolution)
  - Both will be improved upon with the new DAQ at APS and new data processing here at AFRL
There is a strong correlation between droplet diameter and velocity in these results.

At least some of this is artificial and a result of the current experimental set-up:

- Velocity as a function of diameter does not change with axial (downstream) distance.
- Larger droplets are faster and have a wider range of velocities, which is not what would be expected for a shear-driven spray.
- Happens because droplets must be in beam 10 microseconds to be measured as an independent droplet in the current simple assessment.
• While biases mean that the current assessments are only semi-quantitative, some useful results exist
• Changing the liquid inlet size has little or no effect on the atomization and droplet-size distribution
• However, changing the liquid inlet area (swirl) has a large effect on droplet-size distribution
Simple Procedure

- Automated Matlab process was developed to find peaks and troughs and translates them to droplet diameter and velocity

- Other assumptions include
  - Droplets are spherical and travel so that their centers are captured by the beam
  - Droplets have only axial velocities

- Signal-to-noise ratio not optimized here, so a running-average is taken to smooth data
  - Lower x-ray energy will be used in the future to improve the signal-to-noise and hopefully remove the need for filtering
Biases

• Obviously, there are multiple droplets in the beam at one time (troughs are not 0), so simple procedure introduces biases
  – If 2 droplets are same velocity and size and enter simultaneously, the procedure finds 1 droplet of double size and velocity
  – If 2 droplets are the same but entry is offset then an “extra” droplet is found and there is a bias to underestimate diameter
  – If 2 droplets are same size and entry time but different speeds then the faster droplet appears too large and fast and the slower droplet has an overestimated velocity

• Improvements could be made using a curve-fitting procedure similar to in spectroscopy
  – However, this is complex and time consuming (therefore, it is currently incomplete)
Noise Level

- The automated procedure finds “droplets” in the case where no water is flowing
  - Mean diameter is 23 microns and 95th percentile diameter is 35 microns
- Droplets are also found outside of the main spray
  - Spray edge is difficult to determine precisely
  - These values are larger than with no water, 95th percentile is 44-60 microns depending on the test
  - Mist does recirculate in the exhaust area; this can be mollified by improved exhaust
Inlet Size

• As long as the swirl number remains nearly constant, the inlet size and number should not effect the spray
  — The initial shelter should allow the film to fully develop and have no “memory” of the inlet

• A slight increase in mean droplet diameter is observed for geometries with larger liquid inlets
  — Difference is small, and the uncertainty in the results is not fully understood, so it is not clear if it is significant
  — Swirl is very slightly different between the two which may add to the difference

• General droplet distributions are very similar suggesting similar atomization behavior
Shadowgraphy shows sprays with lower swirl number have larger droplets on the periphery.

Mean droplet diameter is increased at lower swirl number (in most locations) and symmetry is greatly improved.

The droplet distribution also changes suggesting a difference in atomization quality and behavior.