

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.				
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) December 2014		2. REPORT TYPE Briefing Chart		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) December 2014- January 2015
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Comparison of a Structured-LES and an Unstructured-DES Code for Predicting Combustion Instabilities in a Longitudinal Mode Rocket			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER In-House	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Matt Harvazinski, Doug Talley, Venke Sankaran			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER Q0A1	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/RQRC 10 E. Saturn Blvd. Edwards AFB, CA 93524-7680			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/RQR 5 Pollux Drive. Edwards AFB CA 93524-7048			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) AFRL-RQ-ED-VG-2014-376	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Briefing Charts presented at AIAA 2015 SciTech, Kissimmee, FL, 8 Jan 2015. PA#15023				
14. ABSTRACT N/A				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 28
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified		19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Doug Talley
				19b. TELEPHONE NO (include area code) 661-275-6174



Comparison of a Structured-LES and an Unstructured-DES Code for Predicting Combustion Instabilities in a Longitudinal Mode Rocket

Matt Harvazinski, Doug Tally, & Venke Sankaran
Air Force Research Laboratory
Edwards AFB, CA



Distribution A: approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



Outline



- **Introduction**
- **Results – Unstable operating point**
- **Results – Stable operating point**
- **Summary and Conclusions**



History



Combustion instability is an organized, oscillatory motion in a combustion chamber sustained by combustion.

CI caused a four year delay in the development of the F-1 engine used in the Apollo program

- > 2000 full scale tests
- > \$400 million for propellants alone (2010 prices)

Irreparable damage can occur in less than 1 second.



Damaged engine injector faceplate caused by combustion instability


“Combustion instabilities have been observed in almost every engine development effort, including even the most recent development programs”

– JANNAF Stability Panel Draft (2010)



Longitudinal Experiment

Continuously Varying Resonance Chamber




Yu et al. 2013




Experimental Results

Unsteady pressure for a translating test



PSD power for the first mode




Harvazinski et al. 2013



Instability Mechanism

Unstable: Cyclic Fuel Disruption and Heat Release

Marginally Stable: Continuous Heat Release





Complementary Codes

Exercised Code Options:


LESLIE	GEMS
Structured	Unstructured
Explicit MacCormack	Implicit Dual-Time
LES	DES
Laminar Combustion Closure	
Second Order Accurate in Time & Space	

Choked inlet slots have been ignored

2-Step reduced mechanism

LES: 7.3/7.6M

DES: 3.6/4M



Distribution A: approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



DES Turbulence Model

Modified Wilcox k - ω

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \bar{\rho} k}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \bar{\rho} \tilde{u}_j k}{\partial x_j} &= \tilde{\tau}_{ij} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_i}{\partial x_j} - \boxed{\beta^* \bar{\rho} \omega k} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[\left(\mu + \sigma_k \frac{\bar{\rho} k}{\omega} \right) \frac{\partial k}{\partial x_j} \right] \\ \frac{\partial \bar{\rho} \omega}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \bar{\rho} \tilde{u}_j \omega}{\partial x_j} &= \frac{\gamma \omega}{k} \tilde{\tau}_{ij} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_j}{\partial x_j} - \beta \bar{\rho} \omega^2 + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[\left(\mu + \sigma_\omega \frac{\bar{\rho} k}{\omega} \right) \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x_j} \right]\end{aligned}$$

The eddy viscosity is reduced by modifying the turbulent length scale

$$L_T = \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\beta^* \omega} \quad \boxed{\beta^* k \omega} = \frac{k^{3/2}}{L_T^*} \quad L_T^* = \min(L_T, C_{DES} \Delta)$$



LES Turbulence Model

Solve a transport equation of the sub-grid kinetic energy

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\rho} k^{\text{sgs}}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \bar{\rho} \tilde{u}_i k^{\text{sgs}}}{\partial x_i} = -\tau_{ij}^{\text{sgs}} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_i}{\partial x_j} - C_\epsilon \bar{\rho} \frac{(k^{\text{sgs}})^{3/2}}{\Delta} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[\left(\frac{\bar{\rho} \nu_T}{\sigma_k} + \mu \right) \frac{\partial k^{\text{sgs}}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\bar{\rho} \nu_T R}{\text{Pr}_T} \frac{\partial \tilde{T}}{\partial x_i} \right]$$

Eddy viscosity is found using a constant model

$$\nu_T = C_\nu \Delta \sqrt{k^{\text{sgs}}}$$


Standard gradient diffusion hypothesis closures

$$\tau_{ij}^{\text{sgs}} = \bar{\rho} \nu_T \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{u}_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_k}{\partial x_k} \delta_{ij} \right) + \frac{2}{3} k^{\text{sgs}} \delta_{ij}$$




Unstable Operating Point

DES



Mean Pressure – 1.5 MPa


LES



Mean Pressure – 1.7 MPa



Fluctuating Pressure




Comparable
amplitude and
frequency

DES reaches a
limit cycle faster




Phase Difference

DES



LES



The phase difference between the head end and the downstream end is captured



Integrated PSD Data

Mode	Experiment		DES		LES	
	f , Hz	p'_{ptp} , kPa	f , Hz	p'_{ptp} , kPa	f , Hz	p'_{ptp} , kPa
1	1324	387.15	1500	316.748	1500	382.547
2	2655	89.29	3050	86.677	3050	119.221
3	3979	46.37	4550	50.525	4550	70.507
4	7940	41.97	5700	17.583	6100	16.879
Σ		564.78		471.533		589.154

Similar frequency predictions, both high relative to the experiment

Mode 4 is under predicted for both codes

Higher amplitude for LES for modes 1-3



Unsteady Flowfield – High Pressure




DES



CH₄ Mass Fraction



Density, kg/m³




Temperature, K



LES


CH₄ Mass Fraction



Density, kg/m³



Temperature, K



Distribution A: approved for public release; distribution unlimited.




Unsteady Flowfield – Low Pressure

DES


CH₄ Mass Fraction
0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0



Density, kg/m³
0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5 4.5 5.5 6.5 7.5 8.5 9.5 10.5 11.5




Temperature, K
400.0 700.0 1000.0 1300.0 1600.0 1900.0 2200.0 2500.0 2800.0 3100.0 3400.0




LES


CH₄ Mass Fraction
0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0



Density, kg/m³
0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5 4.5 5.5 6.5 7.5 8.5 9.5 10.5 11.5



Temperature, K
400.0 700.0 1000.0 1300.0 1600.0 1900.0 2200.0 2500.0 2800.0 3100.0 3400.0




Distribution A: approved for public release; distribution unlimited.




Heat Release Cycle – Part I



DES







Start



LES




30 %






Heat Release Cycle – Part II



DES






60 %



LES




90 %








Fuel Cut Off Event

DES



LES



Distribution A: approved for public release; distribution unlimited.





Reignition Event

LES

Qualitative agreement with reignition behavior

Accumulated methane in the shear layer in both cases






Marginally Stable Operating Point




DES



Mean Pressure – 1.5 MPa


LES



Mean Pressure – 1.7 MPa



Fluctuating Pressure



Comparable
amplitude and
frequency

LES shows more
variability



Integrated PSD Data

Mode	Experiment		DES		LES	
	f , Hz	p'_{ptp} , kPa	f , Hz	p'_{ptp} , kPa	f , Hz	p'_{ptp} , kPa
1	1379	121.17	1600	93.527	1500	141.330
2	3881	5.86	3250	23.726	3000	43.698
3	6475	16.03	4050	13.573	4200	9.623
Σ		143.06		130.826		194.651

LES Over predicts total
amplitude

Both cases severely over
predict the second
mode amplitude

Frequency differences



Unsteady Flowfield – High Pressure




DES



CH₄ Mass Fraction



Density, kg/m³



Temperature, K




LES


CH₄ Mass Fraction



Density, kg/m³



Temperature, K



Distribution A: approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



Unsteady Flowfield – Low Pressure

DES

CH₄ Mass Fraction




0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0



Density, kg/m³




0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5 4.5 5.5 6.5 7.5 8.5 9.5 10.5 11.5



Temperature, K




400.0 700.0 1000.0 1300.0 1600.0 1900.0 2200.0 2500.0 2800.0 3100.0 3400.0




LES

CH₄ Mass Fraction




0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0



Density, kg/m³




0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5 4.5 5.5 6.5 7.5 8.5 9.5 10.5 11.5



Temperature, K



400.0 700.0 1000.0 1300.0 1600.0 1900.0 2200.0 2500.0 2800.0 3100.0 3400.0




Distribution A: approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



Heat Release Cycle – Part I

DES





Start

Heat Release MW/m³



LES




Heat Release MW/m³



30 %


Heat Release MW/m³






Heat Release Cycle – Part II




DES






60 %



LES



90 %





Summary & Conclusions

Both LES and DES are capable of simulating self-excited combustion instability

Agreement between the simulations and experiments for the unstable case was good

Cyclic Heat release was captured

LES had a delayed reignition, likely responsible for the higher amplitudes

Cyclic Heat release was captured along with reignition event

Some differences in predictions are due to differences in the grids

The marginally stable case proved more difficult

No apparent winner, both approaches have strengths and weaknesses