

**Velocity Measurements and Flow Visualization in Low
Viscosity Jets**

**A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY**

Ian Stanley Wright

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE**

Vinod Srinivasan

August, 2020

Acknowledgements

This work involved the input and contributions of many people. I would first like to give my appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Vinod Srinivasan, for his help and guidance. Special thanks goes to the senior members of our lab, Manish Sachdeva, Ankit Saini, and Sankar Muthukrishnan for their lessons, insight, and encouragement. Further credit is due to undergraduate researchers Joe Kuntz and Peter Rohrbach, for their contributions to data collection and fabrication of the experimental facility. Finally, my sincerest thanks to Zak Kujala for the uncountable hours spent learning and investigating the field of fluid dynamics together.

Abstract

Mixing of a liquid jet into a surrounding fluid is a commonly encountered phenomenon in both natural and engineering systems. Understanding the influence of viscosity ratio on jet stability can help design fluid systems with enhanced or suppressed mixing characteristics. Experiments were conducted with low viscosity axisymmetric liquid jets to characterize the behavior of instabilities as a function of viscosity ratio. In the experiment, viscosity ratios M (ambient-to-jet) from 1 to 50 were imaged in a constant density environment at jet Reynolds numbers ranging from 794 to 2464. Images display a change from axisymmetric jet breakup to a helical mode at high Reynolds numbers and high ambient-to-jet viscosity ratios. Additionally, hot film velocity measurements were taken to characterize the jet profile and quantitatively measure both the mean and fluctuating velocity fields. The spectral data captured singular peaks in the frequency domain, in the range of 6-30 Hz. This peak frequency was further shown to have a dependence on both the jet Reynolds number and the ambient-to-jet viscosity ratio. Images of jet breakup, jet velocity profiles, and velocity instability spectra are shown and discussed.

Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
List of Figures	v
1 Introduction	1
2 Background	3
2.1 Theoretical Background	3
2.1.1 Stability Concept Overview	3
2.1.2 Stability with Viscosity Stratification	7
2.2 Pertinent Experimental Work	11
3 Motivation and Goals	14
4 Apparatus	17
4.1 Fluid Selection	17
4.2 Apparatus Design	18
4.2.1 Nozzle Assembly	20
4.2.2 Reservoir and Flow System	23
4.2.3 Test Section	23
4.2.4 Anemometry System	24
4.2.5 Visualization System	25

5	Experimental Technique	27
5.1	Density Matching	27
5.2	Experimental Setup	27
5.3	Imaging Technique	28
5.4	Anemometry Technique	29
5.5	Error Analysis	31
6	Results and Discussion	32
6.1	Characterization of Jet	32
6.2	Characterization of Test Facility	37
6.3	Flow Visualization	40
6.4	Jet Instability	44
7	Conclusions	55
	References	57
	Appendix A. Hotfilm Calibration Technique	62
	Appendix B. Error Analysis	67

List of Figures

2.1	Mechanical stability diagrams	4
2.2	Convective vs absolute instability impulse response diagram	6
4.1	Experimental apparatus	19
4.2	Nozzle drawing	21
4.3	Diffuser drawing	22
4.4	Schematic of imaging set-up	26
6.1	Base Jet Flow Velocity Profile	33
6.2	Plot of the turbulence intensity of the jet profile	34
6.3	Comparison of jet characterization	35
6.4	Spectral characteristics at jet exit plane	36
6.5	Momentum thickness Reynolds number relation	37
6.6	Normalized mean velocity profiles	38
6.7	Specific gravity and viscosity ratio for PG water mix	39
6.8	Images of jet breakdown, $M=1$	41
6.9	Images of jet breakdown, $M=37$	42
6.10	Images of jet breakdown, $Re=1077$	43
6.11	Development of the unstable mode	45
6.12	Decay of the unstable mode in the jet far field	46
6.13	Preliminary results for testing location determination	47
6.14	Disturbance amplitude by location for $M=27$	48
6.15	Disturbance amplitude by location for $M=1$	49
6.16	Example spectral data plots from the jet centerline and shear layer, $Re = 1682$	49

6.17	Example spectral data plots from the jet centerline and shear layer, $Re = 841$	50
6.18	Specific gravity and viscosity ratio of 10-point tests	51
6.19	Most amplified frequencies for $Re = 841$	52
6.20	Most amplified frequencies for $Re = 1642$	53
6.21	Frequency vs M plot	54
A.1	Calibration curve for the hot film probe	62
A.2	Calibration linear fit using King's law	63
A.3	Schematic of tophat and realistic jet profiles	64
A.4	Application of calibration curve to a jet profile	64
A.5	Calibration profiles showing error in calculated volumes	65
A.6	Calibration profiles showing matched volumes	66

Chapter 1

Introduction

The present work examines the breakdown of an axisymmetric circular free jet under the influence of an ambient-to-jet viscosity ratio. For this experimental investigation, a novel facility is fabricated, consisting of a large quiescent tank into which flows a smooth laminar jet. The overall goal is to demonstrate that the facility and measurement system can generate a viscosity stratified jet and record its behavior, and then to document the observed stability attributes of the system for later comparison to stability theory.

Experimental stability studies have been an important part of fluid dynamics for over a century. In 1923, Taylor famously predicted and then experimentally observed the onset of Taylor vortices in Couette flow. Since then, a large number of stability studies have been performed, reaching into nearly every area of fluid dynamics from aeronautics to geodynamics. Even with all of the disparate applications, at the core there are a number of well-documented canonical flows that serve as a basis for applied problem solving. For example, the simplified study of two parallel horizontal streams of different velocity - Kelvin-Helmholtz instability - has explained observations in cloud formations (Drazin and Reid 1981) and oceanic flow (Woods, 1969). Confined flows such as Taylor-Couette flow and strictly parallel flows such as Kelvin-Helmholtz flow form the foundation of stability theory and introduce widely usable concepts. Many shear flows of interest, however, are of unbounded nature with some evolution in space. These shear flows include often encountered flows such as mixing layers, boundary layers, wakes, and jets. As explained in the following section, much of the foundational theory from basic flows can be leveraged for use in open and quasi-parallel flows. The studies of these open

flows is of particular interest, due to their relevance in natural and engineering systems. As reviewed in the next section, a number of clever studies have well documented the instabilities present in these open flows, yielding important insight for designers seeking to control flow systems. The present undertaking is motivated by the desire to add to this base of knowledge, by including the heretofore neglected influence of viscosity variation in open flows through the study of variable viscosity jet flow stability.

Examples of flows with viscosity stratification abound, existing nearly any time that a composition or temperature difference is present across a flow. The range of viscosity difference depends on the system, but cases with significant variation are commonly found. Examples in nature include glacier, magma, and saltwater - freshwater flows. As for engineering systems, the chemical and food processing industries include countless cases of mixing fluids of dissimilar viscosities. Another engineering example is the plasma industry, where in plasma spray torches a jet is surrounded by a gas of vastly different viscosity. Wastewater management and industrial cooling systems also exhibit viscosity variation, where a fluid is discharged into a large body of another fluid of dissimilar viscosity. In these industry examples, rapid and efficient mixing is often desired to save time, money, and - in the case of the wastewater systems - to decrease environmental impact. Understanding the stability characteristics of flows with viscosity variation will enable more accurate modeling of natural flows, and help with the design of engineering systems with enhanced mixing characteristics.

This thesis begins with a theoretical background introducing stability concepts and explaining the relevance of viscosity variation to such concepts. Following this theory is a review of important experimental work related to the documentation of hydrodynamic stability in open flows. Next, the motivation and goals are stated, before moving on to describe the new experimental apparatus constructed for this study and the technique of experimentation in such an apparatus. The results are then presented with analysis, before a discussion is given and the thesis concluded.

Chapter 2

Background

Linear stability theory forms the basis of the theoretical background to the present study. This work, however, is truly experimental in nature, and so stability theory is presented in this section not as a full account, but instead in such a way to motivate the experimental work and provide a framework for which to understand the experimental design and decisions made. Attempts have been made to keep the explanations intuitive, so that the reader may better understand the reasoning behind the work. In this section, a theoretical introduction is first given to basic stability concepts. Next, the stability concepts are applied further to flows with viscous stratification, showing that such stratification can be influential. Following the theory is a summary of the important prior experimental work relevant to the current study.

2.1 Theoretical Background

2.1.1 Stability Concept Overview

The concept of hydrodynamic stability may be best introduced by an illustration of mechanical stability. Figure 2.1 shows a ball in three separate scenarios. A finite impulse force is imagined to be applied to the ball, and the response of the ball is monitored over time. If the ball returns to its original position, it is considered stable. If instead the ball does not return, it is unstable. Other, nonlinear configurations can be imagined where only impulses of a certain magnitude result in a permanent change

in the ball location.




Figure 2.1: Illustration of stability in a mechanical sense. Figure (a) shows an unstable configuration, where any force on the ball will result in the ball being permanently removed from its present state. Figure (b) shows a stable configuration, as any movement of the ball will be damped, and it will soon return to the same position. Figure (c) is nonlinearly unstable, where a small force may be damped out, but a large enough force will result in the ball moving from its position.

The fluid dynamics, the study of stability concerns itself with the response of a laminar flow to some small amplitude flow disturbance. If the flow returns to its original laminar state, the flow is considered stable. If instead the disturbance grows so that the base laminar flow becomes altered, it is considered unstable.

Mathematically, this concept is facilitated by beginning with a base flow and superimposing an infinitesimal sinusoidal disturbance, here explained following the normal mode method referenced from Kundu (2015). For example, consider a parallel flow along the x -axis with variation in the y -direction:

$$\mathbf{U} = U(y)\hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \quad (2.1)$$

Upon this base flow is superimposed a disturbance of form:

$$u(x, y, z, t) = \hat{u}(y)e^{i(\alpha x + \beta z) + \sigma t} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\hat{u}(y)$ is a complex amplitude, i is the imaginary number $\sqrt{-1}$, where α and β denote the streamwise and spanwise wave numbers, respectively, and σ is the temporal growth rate with both real and imaginary components $\sigma = \sigma_r + i\sigma_i$.

The flow is then analyzed with respect to all possible wavenumbers, and the positive or negative growth rate tells the stability:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_r < 0 & \text{ is a stable flow} \\ \sigma_r = 0 & \text{ is a marginally stable flow} \\ \sigma_r > 0 & \text{ is an unstable flow}\end{aligned}$$

It is important to reiterate that if σ_r is positive for *any* wavenumber, the flow is considered unstable.

Unstable flows are furthermore divided into two classifications: convectively and absolutely unstable. This distinction, first fully explained by plasma physicists Twiss (1951) and Landau & Lifshitz (1959), is illustrated by Figure 2.2. In convective instability, a disturbance grows as it travels downstream. Any single location downstream of the impulse will experience the disturbance, but given a long enough time, the disturbance will pass and the single location will return to its base state. This can be seen in Figure 2.2(a), by following a vertical line up through any point on the positive x-axis. This line corresponds to passing time. The line will intersect the disturbance, but will once again exit the disturbance wedge when sufficient time has passed. Convectively unstable flows can be thought of as amplifiers, which will spatially amplify any small disturbance down the flow. As such, the state of the flow at any given position is dependent on the amplitude and location of the original disturbance. Absolute instability, however, differs in that the disturbance propagates upstream as well as downstream in the flow. This can be seen in Figure 2.2(b), where the disturbance wedge now extends up and out from both sides of the origin. This wedge includes the line above the origin, showing that there is some amplified disturbance that has a group velocity of zero. Because the disturbance now travels in both directions, the original impulse, no matter how small, will grow to consume the entire flow field. This is seen in Figure 2.2 again following a vertical line from any x location in (b), and seeing that the line enters the unstable wedge and never leaves. This means that for absolutely unstable flows, in time an initial disturbance will permanently alter the base flow everywhere. As such, the future state of an absolutely unstable flow, unlike convectively unstable flows, does not depend on the location or magnitude of the original disturbance. Because of this behavior, absolutely unstable flows are called self-excited, as once some small disturbance is introduced, no additional input is needed to sustain the response.




Figure 2.2: Diagram of the convective and absolute instability response to a single traveling wave flow disturbance. Convective instability (a) is shown next to absolute instability (b). Disturbances within the wedge are amplified ($\sigma > 0$) while all outside disturbances are damped ($\sigma < 0$).

It should be noted that linear stability theory disregards the highly nonlinear behavior present in many real flows. However, linear stability theory remains useful in that it predicts the initial growth of disturbances. In unstable flow conditions where disturbances are highly amplified, the infinitesimal disturbance wave that grows first will likely later dominate the flow. For this reason, linear stability theory has enjoyed success even when applied to nonlinear applications, because it still accurately predicts useful information such as the frequency of the dominant unstable mode.

Linear stability analysis includes the additional simplification of assuming that the base flow profile does not change in the streamwise direction. Most engineering or laboratory flows, however, are not parallel and exhibit some change in the velocity profile as the flow develops downstream. Such realistic flows are called spatially developing flows, and include such commonly encountered flows such as mixing layers, jets, wakes, and boundary layers. Yet, even though the velocity profiles change downstream, the profile over some small portion of the flow – such as in the initial region of a jet – is generally sufficiently parallel to be modeled as such. More precisely, if the wavelength of the disturbance is small as compared to the spatial variation in the flow, then the parallel assumption can be used (Huerre and Monkewitz, 1990). In this way, linear stability theory works to predict the onset of nonlinearity, but is not applicable thereafter.

The method of splitting spatially developing flows into quasi-parallel subregions necessitates the introduction of the terms “local” and “global”. A local instability refers to an instability determined from the velocity profile present at a single downstream location. This single velocity profile, when analyzed, can be either convectively or absolutely unstable. Therefore, the stability of this single downstream location is described as “locally convectively unstable” or “locally absolutely unstable”. In contrast, global instability refers to the stability of the entire flow field. The global stability of a flow is influenced by the local stability characteristics of the included local velocity profiles.

Flows transition from convective to absolute instability with changes in velocity profile, or other characteristics including surface tension, density, and viscosity. And with global instabilities come dramatic changes in behavior over the entire flow field. Therefore, a major focus of hydrodynamic stability is predicting and measuring the characteristics of flows which are globally unstable, and determining the controlling parameters that make it so.

2.1.2 Stability with Viscosity Stratification

To illustrate the importance of viscous stratification on stability, the linear stability governing equations are presented here for a basic unidirectional flow. This method presupposes knowledge of some stability theory concepts, and the reader should refer to Schmid and Henningson (2000) for a full background in the analysis. A flow is considered in three dimensions with viscosity gradients in the method of Sahu & Matar (2010). Here, the base and fluctuating quantities are given in the method described previously in equations 2.1 and 2.2 (ex: $U = U(y) + u(x, y, z, t)$). As such, the perturbation equations for flow-normal direction velocity, vorticity, or viscosity are given, as in Govindarajan (2014), by:

$$(\hat{v}, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\mu}) = (v(y), \eta(y), \mu(y))e^{i(\alpha x + \beta z - \omega t)} \quad (2.3)$$

In equation 2.3, α and β are the wavenumbers in the streamwise and spanwise directions, ω is the frequency, and $c = \omega/\alpha$ is the phase speed of the disturbance mode. When the imaginary part of the frequency is greater than zero, $\omega_i > 0$, the flow is unstable.

The Reynolds number for the flow is then defined as:

$$Re \equiv \frac{U_{\text{ref}} H \rho}{\mu_{\text{ref}}} \quad (2.4)$$

where the reference values are typically taken from the maximum values in the flow. The density is ρ and a typical length scale H is chosen in the direction of variation: the y direction in this example. The base flow viscosity $\bar{\mu}(y)$ is nondimensionalized by scaling with the reference viscosity μ_{ref} . Viscosity is generally a function of another quantity, such as temperature or concentration.

The flow quantities are substituted into the linearized Navier Stokes equations, and are then expressed in normal mode form as:

$$\begin{aligned} [v'' - (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)v](U - c) - U''v &= \frac{1}{i\alpha Re} [\bar{\mu}[v'''' - 2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)v'' + (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^2v] \\ &+ 2\bar{\mu}'[v'''' - (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)v'] + \bar{\mu}''[v'' + (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)v] \quad (2.5) \\ &- i\alpha U'[\mu'' + \mu(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)] - 2i\alpha U''\mu' - i\alpha U'''\mu] \end{aligned}$$

$$\eta(U - c) + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} U' \eta = \frac{1}{i\alpha Re} [\bar{\mu}[\eta'' - (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)\eta] + \bar{\mu}'\eta' + i\beta U'\mu' + i\beta U''\mu] \quad (2.6)$$

Equation 2.5 is the Orr-Sommerfeld equation for viscously stratified flow, and equation 2.6 is the corresponding Squire equation. Notice that setting the viscosity to zero in the Orr-Sommerfeld equation reduces it to the Rayleigh equation. If this was done in cylindrical coordinates, we would follow a similar method, and would result in the additional possibility of helical modes.

Most often in stability analysis, the viscosity variation is neglected to simplify the system of equations. However, Govindarajan (2014) demonstrates how the stability characteristics of a flow can be highly dependent on viscosity and viscosity variation. First, viscous effects can be large even for high-momentum flows due to the fact that they have a singular perturbation in the Orr-Sommerfeld equation (Drazin & Reid 1981, Lin 1946, Schmid & Henningson 2000). Viscous terms have an order one effect

somewhere in the flow, regardless of the Reynolds number, and in these regions the viscous effects cannot be accurately neglected. Intuitively, near a wall is of importance due to viscous wall effects affecting the flow profile. However, the critical layer (which is the location where the phase speed of the disturbance is matched to the base flow velocity, i.e. $U \approx c$) can also be an important region, where viscosity variation can be a major factor, demonstrating that viscosity variation may be a factor even in open flows (Craik 1969). In fact, Govindarajan (2004) shows that critical layer effects are order $Re^{-1/3}$, which is higher order than wall effects which are order $Re^{-1/2}$.

Viscous variation effects can also be seen through consideration of the disturbance kinetic energy. Disturbance kinetic energy, is here defined for our three dimensional flow as:

$$\varepsilon \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\hat{u}^2 + \hat{v}^2 + \hat{w}^2) \quad (2.7)$$

The rate of change of the disturbance kinetic energy is the difference between the production and the dissipation, stress transport, and surface tension effects:

$$\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial t} = \mathcal{P} - \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{T} + \mathcal{S} \quad (2.8)$$

Here, $\mathcal{P} = -\langle \hat{u}\hat{v} \rangle U'$ is disturbance kinetic energy production by Reynolds stresses, and $\mathcal{D} = 1/Re \langle \nabla \bar{u} \rangle^2$ is the viscous dissipation. The stress transport \mathcal{T} and surface tension effects \mathcal{S} are:

$$\mathcal{T} = \nabla \cdot \left[-\frac{\langle \bar{u}\hat{p} \rangle}{\rho} + 2\frac{\mu}{Re} \nabla \varepsilon \right] \quad (2.9)$$

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{1}{We} \langle [\hat{v}(\hat{h}_{xx} + (\hat{h})_{zz})]_{y=\hat{h}} \rangle \quad (2.10)$$

The inverse of the Weber number is zero in the case of miscible fluids where there is not surface tension, and therefore \mathcal{S} is zero. The stress transport \mathcal{T} is net zero across y for miscible flows, but is nonzero locally. As the dissipation is inversely related to the Reynolds number, viscosity does contribute to damping of the disturbance kinetic energy (Hu & Joseph 1989). Yet, viscosity can contribute to the disturbance kinetic energy production, sometimes to even a greater respect (Govindarajan 2014). The production is zero when \hat{u} and \hat{v} oscillate out of phase. The locally nonzero stress transport effects \mathcal{T} work to diffuse momentum across the flow, influencing the phase relationship between \hat{u} and \hat{v} , and impacting the disturbance kinetic energy production. Therefore, the disturbance kinetic energy production is another way that viscosity and viscosity variation can have an important role in fluid stability.

Stability analyses most often show that viscosity stratification leads to enhanced destabilization, as reviewed for bounded flows in Govindarajan (2014). Unidirectional immiscible two-fluid wall-bounded flows of constant shear stress have neutral stability, but with the introduction of viscosity stratification, they become unstable at any Reynolds number (Yih 1967). The predicted viscosity-dependent stability nature of such planar flows has been experimentally observed, first in an oil-water experiment by Kao & Park (1972). The destabilizing effect of viscosity stratification has also been documented for immiscible core-annular pipe flow using theory (Hu & Joseph 1989), experimentation (Aul & Olbricht 1990) and simulation (Kouris & Tsamopoulos (2002)). Similar flows have been studied with miscible fluids as well. Ranganathan & Govindarajan (2001) studied miscible core-annular channel flows, and determined that viscosity stratification within the critical layer has a large stability response. Core-annular miscible pipe flow has also received significant attention, with viscosity stratification resulting in either stabilizing and destabilizing effects depending on the precise viscosity field (Selvam et al. 2007), which was further confirmed through visualization by Cao et al. (2003).

Yet, the vast majority of flow situations with viscosity variation have not yet been studied. In particular, the above experiments were all performed on wall-bounded flows, which form only a small subset of common laboratory and engineering flows. No study has so far systematically investigated the effect of viscosity stratification in open flows, a topic which is started by this work with the study of a variable viscosity jet flow.

2.2 Pertinent Experimental Work

As stated in Section 2.1.1, flows can transition from convective to absolute instability with changes in velocity profile or other fluid characteristics. For spatially developing flows, this can mean transition into a globally unstable system. A number of important experiments have demonstrated such transitions in open flows.

Experiments first clearly documented this transition in wake flows. Mathis et al. (1984) and Strykowski (1986) experimentally demonstrated that the von Karman vortex street results from a global instability. The transition was triggered by carefully raising the Reynolds number above a certain critical value, after which the flow dramatically transitions into the self-sustaining vortex shedding mode. This was documented by transiently observing the magnitude of the velocity fluctuations growing exponentially upon a step increase to the Reynolds number, corresponding to the previously stable flow transitioning into the cyclical von Karman street. This transition was shown to be controllable through additional parameters such as heating (Noto et al. 1985, Mori et al. 1986, Strykowski 1986, Strykowski & Sreenivasan 1990, Lecordier et al. 1988), the presence of a small cylinder located near the wake region (Strykowski 1986, Strykowski & Sreenivasan 1990), and through mechanical oscillations (Berger & Schumm 1967).

The presence of global modes in jets has also been well documented. Monkewitz & Sohn (1988) calculated that homogeneous incompressible axisymmetric jets are convectively unstable everywhere. However, they additionally showed that local regions of absolute instability exist for jets with low jet-to ambient density ratios (ρ_j/ρ_∞). The breakdown of low density jets has since been studied in a number of separate ways. Kyle (1988) used helium-nitrogen mixtures to obtain variable-density jets, a method that was built upon by Sreenivasan et al. (1989) who observed an unstable global mode for sufficiently low-density round jets obtained by mixing helium and air to specific ratios. Monkewitz et al. (1990) used heated gas to create low-density jets, and found the same global mode as Sreenivasan et al., and furthermore discovered another unstable mode at a higher critical density ratio. Other than the density ratio, additional parameters have been shown to influence the stability of jets. Kyle and Sreenivasan (1993) also included jet shear layer momentum thickness as a contributing factor for unstable modes. Additionally, they observed an apparent shutoff of the unstable mode at high Reynolds

numbers that was not explained with inviscid linear stability theory. This shutoff may stem from a number of reasons, including misalignment of density and velocity shear layers at high Reynolds number, but a possible reason is that viscosity plays a role in jet stability. In a study of low-density nitrogen-helium jets, Hallberg & Strykowski (2006) used variable-length extension pieces on the end of a nozzle to allow manipulation of the jet boundary layer thickness independent of the Reynolds number. They concluded that the density ratio, Reynolds number, and jet diameter to momentum boundary layer thickness ratio are all independent variables for the onset of unstable global modes. In their investigation, they included a viscous timescale, yet did not consider diffusion and viscosity variation within the jet ($Sc = 1$).

The onset of global modes in variable density round jets were found through the experiments of Sreenivasan (1989) and Hallberg & Strykowski (2006) to match with linear stability theory. Yet, the observation of global mode shut-off at high Reynolds number cannot be explained by inviscid stability theory. Calculations by Srinivasan et al. (2010) include a constant viscosity, and do perform better, yet they still do not fully explain the observed shut-off. Therefore, it is conjectured that effects such as transverse diffusion alter the viscosity profiles in the jet. The viscosity gradients may then stabilize or destabilize the jet as described in the previous section. No study has yet systematically studied the effect of viscosity ratio on jet stability in an effort to investigate this.

As far as the experimental technique is concerned, the above experiments demonstrated that having an initially laminar jet shear layer and a very low-noise facility are important. The experimental signposts for global instabilities include amplitude changes in velocity fluctuation, highly peaked velocity fluctuation spectral plots, and changes in behavior observed by jet visualization. Therefore, this study focuses on these three areas for the investigation of the influence of viscosity ratio on round jets.

In this background, it was first shown that viscosity stratification has an important role in linear stability theory, even at high Reynolds number flows. Then, studies from wall-bounded flows demonstrated how these viscous terms have been documented to have major stability-altering effects in laboratory flows. Finally, experimental work with spatially developing flows has given an idea on how global modes are seen in open flows and upon which parameters they are expected to depend. This background

information is leveraged in the following Motivation and Goals section, where the scope of the present work is given.

Chapter 3

Motivation and Goals

The present study seeks to add viscosity effects to the understanding of axisymmetric jet breakup. To do this, the variables of interest are defined, a measurement plan is developed, and a new experimental facility is created. The overall objectives of the study are then given.

The breakdown of an axisymmetric jet has been shown in the previous section to be dependent on density ratio, Reynolds number, and momentum thickness. This study adds the additional independent variable of viscosity ratio. In order to keep the study within control, several simplifications are made. The density ratio is eliminated through use of density-matched jet and ambient fluids. Only a single nozzle is used, so that the momentum thickness simply becomes a function of the Reynolds number. Miscible fluids are chosen so that no surface tension effects are present. Therefore, the only controllable variables are the jet Reynolds number and the jet-to-ambient viscosity ratio. The jet Reynolds number is defined on a flowrate basis of the fluid exiting the nozzle, and the viscosity ratio - denoted by M - is defined as the ratio between the viscosity of the far-field ambient fluid to the viscosity of the jet centerline.

A measurement plan is chosen to enable acquisition of measurements that can be compared with stability calculations, while also allowing independent observation of jet breakdown. To fulfill these requirements, the two techniques of hotfilm anemometry and flow visualization are selected. Anemometry is capable of measuring velocities over very small time intervals, allowing accurate acquisition of velocity fluctuations. These fluctuations allow direct comparison with unstable modes predicted through linear

stability theory. No predictions presently exist, but they are currently being worked out in the same lab as this work under the direction of Dr. Srinivasan. As such, the goal of the anemometry measurements is to accurately document the velocity fluctuations for later comparison with theory. Secondly, flow visualization is applied for the qualitative evaluation of the jet. As mentioned in the background, jets have exhibited dramatic changes in form due to unstable modes created by density differences. The visualization here attempts to capture the form of the jet in order to discern if a viscosity ratio can impact jet breakdown in a similar fashion.

The creation of a facility capable of producing such a jet flow and taking such measurements is of paramount importance to this study. The requirements of the facility are that it must introduce a laminar jet into a quiescent ambient region, this jet must be initially free of environmental disturbances, and that it must allow visualization and hotfilm anemometry measurements to be taken in a precise and repeatable manner.

In order to cover a suitable parameter space in this study, the jet is operated over a sizable Reynolds number and viscosity ratio range. The Reynolds number is defined for the jet as:

$$Re \equiv \frac{U_{ave} D \rho}{\mu_c} \quad (3.1)$$

where U_{ave} is the average jet velocity at the jet exit plane, D is the diameter of the nozzle tip, ρ is the density of the jet fluid, and μ_c is the centerline jet viscosity. In this work, the Reynolds number is varied from 500 to 2000. This range was limited on the low end due to anemometry measurement difficulty at lower jet velocities and at the high end by the requirement that the jet is initially laminar. The jet-to-ambient viscosity ratio M :

$$M = \frac{\mu_{ambient}}{\mu_{jet}} \quad (3.2)$$

is varied between 1 and 50, and is limited on the high side by the base viscosities of suitable density-matched experimental fluids, and is limited to be above unity by practical

experimental concerns of keeping the fluid passages separate to avoid contamination, as well as the difficulty in generating higher Reynolds number jets with a highly viscous fluid. Full information on the reasoning behind these both of these parameter decisions is given in the following sections.

In short, the objectives of the present study are to:

- Design and characterize an experimental apparatus capable of generating a viscosity stratified circular free jet
- Measure velocity in both spatial and spectral dimensions for Reynolds numbers of 500 to 2000, for viscosity ratios $M = 1$ to 50
- Visualize the jet to observe breakup modes for Reynolds numbers of 500 to 2000 and viscosity ratios $M = 1$ to 50

Chapter 4

Apparatus

A custom experimental apparatus was fabricated for the purposes of the present study. The design creates a smooth laminar jet which flows into a quiescent ambient fluid, while allowing for anemometry measurements and visualization.

4.1 Fluid Selection

The isolation of viscosity effects relies on the ability to create a viscosity gradient while holding density uniform. This is because, as seen in the background, density ratios have strong influences on jet stability that would obscure the effect of viscosity. The majority of previous jet stability studies were performed using gaseous fluids. However, gasses do not typically show wide ranges in viscosity, and in order to set up a sizable viscosity difference between jet and surrounding, dramatic changes in temperature or obscure fluids would need to be used. The wide range in temperature would create large density differences, while the obscure fluids would be experimentally unrealistic. The author has not found any two gaseous fluids that have reasonable viscosity differences while being of the same density. Using liquids, however, readily allows for large viscosity ratios while opening up additional density matching techniques. Liquids can be doped with solutes that change their overall density, allowing for precise density control.

For this study, propylene glycol and water are used as the two fluids. Propylene glycol in its pure form has a viscosity of 0.042 Pa·s, which is over 40 times that of water, and has a density of 1.036 g/cm³, which is only a few percent above the density of water.

Industrial propylene glycol formulations, such as is used in this work, may have an even higher viscosity. Water is then doped with sodium chloride salt in order to match the density of propylene glycol to within a tenth of a percent. The two fluids have additional qualities of experimental performance. Propylene glycol and water are readily miscible, which eliminates surface tension effects. Furthermore, propylene glycol and water are both optically clear, which allows for straightforward flow visualization techniques. Finally, both fluids are relatively inexpensive and available in large quantities. Liters of working fluid are used for a single experiment, upon which the fluids are irreversibly mixed. Therefore, economics becomes important in a general experimental feasibility sense. In summary, propylene glycol and water are chosen for their large viscosity ratio (>40), small initial density difference ($\approx 3\%$), ability to be density matched, miscibility, optical clarity, and low-cost availability.

The particular propylene glycol formulation used is DowfrostTM Propylene Glycol Heat Transfer Fluid purchased from Duragard Oil. This propylene glycol formulation is of industrial purity and contains additives for corrosion and rust inhibiting. As such, the density and viscosity varies from batch to batch. Therefore, the densities and viscosities are measured individually before each experiment, a technique that is elaborated on in chapter 5. Water is obtained from the lab tap supply. The fluids are both used at room temperature.

4.2 Apparatus Design

The designed apparatus is shown in Figure 4.1. It consists of a nozzle to form a round jet, a clear ambient tank test section into which the jet exhausts, a fluid reservoir for the purpose of supplying fluid to the jet, and a set of flow lines and valves to direct the flow through the system. Surrounding the clear tank are the anemometry and imaging systems. A full description of each subsystem is given in the following subsections.




Figure 4.1: Experimental Apparatus.

4.2.1 Nozzle Assembly

The purpose of the nozzle assembly is to create a smooth laminar jet. Apart from the nozzle, the assembly also includes a diffuser and a flow straightener.

A drawing of the nozzle is shown in Figure 4.2. It is a fifth-order polynomial nozzle with an area contraction of 87 to 1. The polynomial was chosen to have zero slope and curvature at both the entrance and exit. The entrance diameter is 5.6 cm and the exit diameter is 6 mm. The nozzle is 55 mm long, which was found through iteration to be the length resulting in the minimal boundary layer thickness and a uniform core velocity profile. The nozzle was created using 3D printing. At the exit of the nozzle, the wall thickness is the smallest achievable by available 3D printers, which is 0.5mm. The actual nozzle diameter was verified by gauge pins, and was found to be 5.97 ± 0.03 mm after fabrication. We define the coordinate z to begin at the nozzle exit plane and measure distance downstream, where the coordinate r measures the radial distance out from the jet centerline.

Located before the nozzle is a flow straightener. The purpose of the flow straightener is to break up any large scale structures in the flow. It is designed as a hollow cylinder measuring 12 cm long and 5.6 cm in diameter, with the inside volume filled with straws of diameter 0.6 cm. The straightener was machined from aluminum. It is attached to both the nozzle and the diffuser using flange connections sealed with gaskets.

A diffuser is located before the flow straightener and nozzle, and is used to expand the flow from the tube diameter to the flow straightener diameter. The diffuser is 25.2 cm long, diverging from a 1.9 cm inlet to a 5.6 cm outlet, so that the angle of divergence is 6 degrees. The diffuser was fabricated using 3D printing. At the entrance of the diffuser is a perforated plug, which serves to break up the developed tube velocity profile of the incoming fluid. The diffuser is shown in Figure 4.3.




Figure 4.2: Section view of the nozzle used to generate the round jet. The z coordinate is measured downstream from the exit plane of the nozzle, and the r coordinate is measured radially outwards from the centerline of the nozzle.




Figure 4.3: Drawing of the diffuser, showing a section view with dimensions (left), an outer view (center), and the perforated plug (right). All dimensions are in mm. Flow enters at the bottom and decelerates before flowing up into the flow straightener.

4.2.2 Reservoir and Flow System

A large 20 liter reservoir contains the fluid for the jet. It is located 1.5 meters above the top of the tank and thus provides the pressure required to force the flow. A pressure driven flow is desirable, in that it does not introduce vibrations into the flow as would a pump. The use of pressure does, however, introduce an additional experimental complication, in that changes in the height of the fluid in the reservoir augment the available pressure, which in turn influences the flowrate of the jet. Therefore, the tank is chosen to have a much larger cross sectional area than the jet ($\approx D \cdot 1000$) so that over the duration of each experimental run the change in pressure head is negligible.

The reservoir is connected to the nozzle assembly through 1/2" tygon tubing with an intermediary flowmeter and cutoff valve. From the bottom of the reservoir, the tubing first runs down to a table-mounted variable-area flow meter. Use of a variable-area flowmeter allows for control of the flowrate using a knob. The flow meter measurement range is from 40 to 660 ccm with an accuracy of $\pm 3\%$. This flow range corresponds to saltwater jet Reynolds numbers of 130-2200. After the flowmeter, a short run of tubing connects to a ball valve, which is used as the primary on/off control for the jet. Additional tubing then connects the the valve to the bottom of the diffuser.

4.2.3 Test Section

The test section is an ambient tank that holds quiescent fluid into which the jet exhausts. The walls of the rectangular tank are 20 jet diameters radially from the jet, and the height of the fluid in the tank reaches 65 jet diameters from the nozzle exit. The tank holds 25 liters of fluid. The large size of the tank allows an infinite medium approximation to be applied to the ambient fluid. The walls of the tank are made from clear acrylic to enable visualization. Furthermore, the top of the tank is open to allow direct mounting of an anemometry system. There are two exit ports near the top of the tank on opposing walls to allow symmetric overflow from the tank, so that a constant fluid height is maintained in the tank even with fluid input from the nozzle. The tank bottom is machined from aluminum, and includes a large central hole allowing the entrance of the nozzle, as well as a smaller side hole for an exit drain so that the tank can be emptied after the conclusion of each experiment. Four evenly spaced bolts

secure the nozzle to the tank bottom, with a gasket ring providing sealing. Additionally, sealing washers are used on the bolts to prevent the bolt-hole leak path.

The jet enters the tank vertically in order to limit the influence of possible density differences. If the jet were to enter the tank horizontally, small errors in density matching would result in the jet deflecting upwards or downwards. By orienting the jet vertically, the linearity of the jet centerline is ensured.

4.2.4 Anemometry System

A hotfilm anemometry system is used to take jet velocity measurements. The anemometry system is composed of a probe, a stem, a traverse assembly, the associated anemometer and multimeter electronics, and a computer program for control and data logging.

The probe used is a TSI hotfilm probe model 1260A-10W. A hotfilm probe is used instead of a hotwire probe due to the robustness needed for use in a liquid flow. Use of hot film probes in liquids can cause a voltage difference to build up between the probe and the liquid, due to electric charges in the flowing liquid. This voltage difference can break down the quartz coating of the probe and cause premature failure. As a preventative measure the aluminum bottom of the tank and the metal flow straightener are wired to building ground.

The probe attaches to a straight stem, which is held above the tank by a 3-axis traverse system. The probe stem is oriented parallel to the jet flow direction. Flow visualization confirmed that the probe oriented in such way provides minimal disturbance to the jet. A straight stem is chosen to allow the stem to exit at the open top of the tank, where it attaches via a custom clamp to the three axis traverse system (Velmex XSlide Linear Stages). Frequency analysis shows that the stem and clamping system eliminate vibrations in the stem that could introduce erroneous fluctuations in the velocity measurements. The traverse system is bolted to the top of the tank walls in order to keep it in a fixed location at all times. Each linear traverse has 76 μm straight line accuracy, which is $\sim 1\%$ of the jet diameter. The traverse system is controlled by a motor control box (Velmex VMX Stepping Motor Controller) and responds to computer input.

A constant temperature anemometer (TSI IFA 100) is used to control the probe and to obtain the desired voltage data. The voltages are then passed to a digital multimeter

(Agilent 34411A). Voltage measurements are read from the digital multimeter into a computer.

A single custom Python script is used to simultaneously run both the traverse system and to record the output of the digital multimeter.

4.2.5 Visualization System

Fluorescent dye imaging is used for flow visualization. The fluorescent dye used is Rhodamine B. Through experimentation it is determined that 0.1 g of Rhodamine B is sufficient to dye the 20 liter reservoir. Insufficient dye concentration will not enable viewing of the jet, while too much dye will cause build up of residual dye in the ambient tank and obscure the jet in future trials. Rhodamine B dye absorbs light at wavelengths near 550 nm (green), and will fluoresce at 630 nm (orange). An LED (ILA GmbH) is used to generate green light. The LED is used both openly and as directed into a light sheet. The camera used is a Canon EOS Rebel T2i. The camera is typically placed at a right angle to the LED so that the full cross section of the jet is observed. The imaging is done under darkness in the room, so that the only light incident on the camera is the light emitted from the dye. Images are post-processed with the software ImageJ, in order to increase contrast between the jet and the dark background. Figure 4.4 shows the orientation of the LED and camera.

A hydrogen bubble imaging system was also created and used. However, an advantage of dye imaging is that the dye does not introduce any disturbance into the flow, so that the true nature of the flow is recorded. Furthermore, the hydrogen bubble method was difficult to use repeatably, as the extremely fine platinum wire ($25\mu\text{m}$) broke easily.




Figure 4.4: Flow visualization camera and LED position

Chapter 5

Experimental Technique

Each experiment requires the preparation of density matched fluids, the apparatus setup and operation, acquisition of either hotfilm anemometry data or visualization images, and testing of the fluid properties. Each of these steps is expanded upon in the following sections.

5.1 Density Matching

In order to eliminate density ratio effects, the density of water is matched to the density of propylene glycol by the addition of salt. First, the specific gravity of propylene glycol is measured using a hydrometer (accuracy ± 0.0005). The density of propylene glycol is near 1.043 g/cm^3 but can vary slightly depending on the batch. The reservoir is then filled with water, and salt added. A paint mixer (HDX 5 gallon Helix Paint Mixer) connected to a hand drill is used to rapidly mix the salt into the water. Sufficient time must be given for the air bubbles to escape and the correct specific gravity to be measured by the hydrometer. Density adjustment by adding salt or water continues until the saltwater matches the propylene glycol within ± 0.001 for specific gravity.

5.2 Experimental Setup

Experimental setup includes connection of the flow lines, introduction of the fluids, and initialization of the anemometry or visualization systems. First, the density-matched

saltwater reservoir is placed above the apparatus. The tubing is then connected between the reservoir and the flowmeter, between the flowmeter and the shutoff valve, and from the shutoff valve to the bottom of the diffuser. The shutoff valve is then opened and the saltwater is run through the lines until it reaches the nozzle exit plane, at which point the shutoff valve is closed. Propylene glycol is then added to the ambient tank. The tank filling is best performed with the aid of a siphon, so that bubbles are not created in the tank due to air entrapment during pouring. At this point, the jet is ready to operate, by opening the shutoff valve and setting the flowmeter to the required value. The anemometry or visualization systems are then setup and run in the methods described in the following sections.

5.3 Imaging Technique

The imaging experiments begin with density-matching the fluids and preparing experimental setup. Additionally, 0.1g of Rhodamine B dye is added to the jet fluid reservoir. The light source and camera are then positioned and turned on. Typically the camera is set at a 90° angle from the light source, so that a light sheet can be used to illuminate a cross section of the jet. The camera shutter speed is set to be sufficiently fast so that it freezes the motion of the jet. The shutter speed is typically set to 1/250th of a second. The experimental trials are then performed by turning the shut-off valve to open to start the flow of the jet, waiting five seconds for the starting vortex to convect away and for the jet to reach steady state, and then taking picture bursts for the desired amount of time. After each trial, the fluid in the tank is mixed thoroughly before a density measurement is taken and a viscosity sample is obtained for later testing. An additional complexity in the visualization experiments is that dye builds up in the tank over time, reducing the relative visibility of the jet. Low viscosity ratios are therefore achieved by mixing additional un-dyed, density-matched saltwater directly into the tank in between trials.

5.4 Anemometry Technique

The overall purpose of the anemometry experiments are to document flow velocities and fluctuations as dependent on jet Reynolds number and the viscosity ratio. Hotfilm anemometry measurements are dependent upon orientation of the probe in the flow. As stated in Section 4.2.4, the probe stem is oriented parallel to the x-direction. This means that any flow in the radial direction is not measured, which is an allowable simplification due to the near-nozzle jet flow being essentially unidirectional. Anemometry technique involves both calibration, and the taking of velocity measurements in the jet at various jet Reynolds numbers and jet-to-ambient viscosity ratios.

In order to account for exact experimental conditions, the probe is calibrated immediately prior to every experiment. The calibration is performed using the generalized King's Law, which relates measured voltage to a known velocity.

$$E^2 = A + BU^{1/n} \quad (5.1)$$

In Equation 5.1, E is the voltage from the anemometer, U is the flow velocity, and A , B , and n are coefficients fit to best linearize the voltage data.

Hotfilm calibration is performed directly in the experimental apparatus using the flowmeter and nozzle. The known flowrate going through the flowmeter is equal to the flowrate through the nozzle exit. Therefore, the average velocity through the nozzle exit can be calculated from the flowrate, and used as the velocity reference for the calibration. However, the jet velocity profile is not uniform, as there exists a sizable boundary layer. This boundary layer would cause underestimation of the true centerline velocity if a uniform velocity approximation was used. As a way to decrease error, the calibration is augmented using a volume-matching technique, where coefficient B in Equation 5.1 is tweaked until the volumetric flowrate calculated from measurements of the jet profile matches the flowrate determined from the flowmeter. The full details of the calibration technique is given in Appendix A.

All parameters involved in running the anemometry system are controlled in a Python program. Important parameters include measurement frequency, duration of

measurement at each location, and the probe measurement locations as determined by the traverse system. The measurement frequency is typically set to 1000 Hz, which is more than an order of magnitude higher than the velocity fluctuation frequencies of interest. The duration of measurement time at each location is at least one second, so that low frequencies are adequately captured. The probe locations are set using commands to the traverse system. In trials where the probe travels to a number of positions in succession, at least two seconds of delay are added between the probe reaching a new location and the measurements beginning, so that disturbances in the flow created by the movement of the probe have time to convect away.

Each experimental trial is begun by turning on the jet using the ball valve and immediately starting the computer program. The program has an initial five second delay to allow the jet to reach steady state and to allow the starting vortex to convect away. During this delay, the anemometer is switched from standby mode to on. The computer program will then automatically control the movements of the probe and perform data collection. At the conclusion of the trial, the ball valve is closed and the anemometer is turned to standby mode, to prevent probe overheat in the still fluid. The tank now contains the propylene glycol viscous fluid and the saltwater that was just exhausted into the tank. These fluids are mixed together using the drill-operated paint mixer for one minute. A measurement of the tank fluid density is then taken using a hydrometer. Also, a 15 mL sample of the tank fluid is collected for later viscosity testing. The tank is given sufficient time to come to rest before the start of the next trial. In this way, experiments progress from high viscosity ratios to low viscosity ratios, due to the tank viscosity lowering through the growing ratio of saltwater to propylene glycol. The particular viscosity ratios tested are a result of the volume of jet flow exhausted into the tank during each trial. Target viscosity ratios are achieved by allowing the jet to run at a particular flowrate for a specified amount of time in order to hit a particular desired saltwater concentration.

After each experiment, the tank fluid samples and a jet saltwater sample are tested in a TA Instruments AR-G2 rheometer for determination of viscosities. Additionally, after each experiment the hotfilm probe is cleaned. This is necessary as the quartz coating of the probe accumulates calcium carbonate and other mineral deposits over time which can change the sensitivity and accuracy of the probe. Therefore a camel

hair brush dipped in DI water is used to carefully brush away deposits.

5.5 Error Analysis

The primary measurements taken are the jet flowrate, the hotfilm voltage and frequency, and the specific gravity of both the jet and the ambient fluid. These base measurements are then used to calculate jet velocities, and the frequency of the most unstable mode. The flowrate was measured using a Brooks 40 to 660 ccm variable area mechanical flowmeter (Model 2520A4L52SVVT), which has an error of $\pm 3\%$ full scale. The Agilent 34411A multimeter used to measure the hotfilm voltage has an uncertainty of 0.003% of reading and 0.0005% of range. As a minimum of 1024 voltage values are taken at a single measurement point, this corresponds to an overall voltage uncertainty of $6.32\text{E-}4$ V. The specific gravities are measured using a hydrometer with a resolution of ± 0.001 , and the saltwater solution was prepared so that its specific gravity matched the propylene glycol within ± 0.001 . From these measurements, the corresponding error in the jet velocity is $\pm 7\%$, and the frequency of the most amplified instability has a resolution of ± 0.5 Hz. The derivation of these quantities, as well as a discussion of other possible sources of uncertainty, is given in Appendix B. By far the largest source of error is the uncertainty in the flowmeter, and as such the use of a higher resolution flowmeter is recommended for subsequent experiments.

Chapter 6

Results and Discussion

6.1 Characterization of Jet

The experimental apparatus is designed to produce a circular axisymmetric free laminar jet. Here we investigate the properties of the jet to confirm these attributes and determine the base flow characteristics for use in subsequent stability analysis.

A typical mean velocity profile is shown in Figure 6.1, as measured through hot-film anemometry. This profile is shown starting from the jet centerline outwards, at a downstream location immediately after the exit of the nozzle ($z = 0.01D$).




Figure 6.1: Typical velocity profile of the base ($M=1$) jet, obtained at $z/D = 0.04$ and $Re = 2000$.

A typical turbulence intensity plot is shown next in Figure 6.2, over the same profile as the previously shown velocity profile. The core of the jet has an extremely low turbulence intensity of 0.1%, while a spike in turbulence intensity exists at the shear layer equal to 5% of the jet centerline velocity. The turbulence profile spike in the shear layer is as expected for jets. The non-zero turbulence intensity outside of the jet indicates that the some turbulence generated in the shear layer extends out into the ambient fluid.




Figure 6.2: Turbulence intensity of the base jet ($M=1$) profile over the radial extent, obtained at $z/D = 0.04$ and $Re = 2000$

The trends shown in these profiles are consistent with those presented in similar work with fifth order polynomial nozzles, such as Drubka and Nagib (1981) and Niccum (1990). The profiles are shown in Figure 6.3 alongside profiles measured by Todde et al. (2009) in their work on low Reynolds number free jets ($Re = 2700$). It can be seen that the velocity profile closely matches, and the turbulence intensity profile has a comparable trend, although the current work has much lower centerline turbulence intensity. This speaks to the benefit of having a gravity-fed jet, free from any disturbances downstream from pumps or fans.

Figure 6.4 further investigates the initial disturbance level in the jet, by showing the spectral characteristics of the voltage signal as taken at the center point of the exit point of the nozzle ($z=0, r=0$). It is seen that no discrete peaks are present, which is an important attribute to avoid unwanted forcing inputs that could influence the flow stability.




Figure 6.3: Velocity profile and normalized turbulence intensity of the base jet ($M=1$) profile over the radial extent, obtained at $z/D = 0.04$ and $Re = 2000$, compared to the values presented in Todde et al. (2009) for a similar $M=1$, $Re = 2700$ free jet flow.




Figure 6.4: Spectral characteristics at the base jet ($M=1$) exit plane, obtained at $z = 0$, $r = 0$, and $Re = 2000$

Next, the boundary layer of the jet is investigated to characterize the particular nozzle and to determine whether the boundary layer exhibits behavior typical of a laminar jet. The boundary layer thickness is characterized using the momentum thickness, θ , which is defined for a standard jet mixing layer as:

$$\theta = \int_{Y_1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{u}{U}\right)\left(1 - \frac{u}{U}\right)dy \quad (6.1)$$

Because hot film anemometry cannot accurately measure flow at low speeds, Y_1 is used as the lower limit of the momentum thickness integral. Y_1 is defined as the location where $u/U_1 = 0.1$.

For laminar boundary layers, we expect the momentum thickness to grow with the square root of the jet velocity. Figure 6.5 shows the relationship between the nondimensionalized boundary layer thickness with the square root of the Reynolds number.




Figure 6.5: Momentum thicknesses nondimensionalized by the jet diameter over $Re = 40-2400$ at axial location $z = 0.1D$, with best fit line shown.

When normalized by the momentum thickness, the jet exhibits self-similar behavior as shown in Figure 6.6.

$$u = \frac{1 + \tanh\left(\frac{D}{4\theta}\left(\frac{1}{r} - r\right)\right)}{2} \quad (6.2)$$

It can be seen in Figure 6.6, that at downstream locations very close to the nozzle tip, the profile is distorted due to tip wake effects. It is at the position of $z/D = 0.208$ where the jet has first become self-similar. This position is taken to be the origin of our mixing layer.

6.2 Characterization of Test Facility

The previous section pertained to the characterization of the base jet, as defined by a water jet entering a water-filled tank. In order to generate a viscosity gradient, propylene glycol is instead used in the tank. The characterization of the facility related to the water jet issuing into the propylene glycol environment is discussed in this section.

First, density effects are investigated. At the beginning of each experiment, the saltwater is density matched to the propylene glycol, as discussed in the technique section. However, propylene glycol-water mixtures do not maintain the same density




Figure 6.6: Normalized mean velocity profiles for the base jet ($M=1$) mixing layer at positions downstream. Obtained at $Re = 2000$.

as the base fluids due to molecular effects. These density changes are measured in order to quantify their effect on the present study. The density-matched saltwater jet is exhausted into a pure propylene glycol environment in one minute increments. After each minute, the jet is stopped, and the tank is mixed thoroughly before the specific gravity is measured and a sample is taken for later viscosity analysis. Figure 6.7 shows the results for this test.

As figure 6.7 displays, the density of the bulk PG water mixture in the tank is dependent on the water concentration. The specific gravity varies between the 1.036 of pure propylene glycol to a maximum of 1.051. One way to quantify the effect of this density difference is through the Richardson number, a dimensionless number corresponding to the ratio of buoyancy to shear:

$$Ri = \frac{g\Delta\rho D}{\rho V^2} \quad (6.3)$$




Figure 6.7: Specific gravity and viscosity ratio (M) measured in the well-mixed tank after a series of jet flow trials, each lasting about a minute.

In Equation 6.2, g is acceleration due to gravity, $\Delta\rho$ is the density difference between the tank fluid and the incoming jet fluid, D is a characteristic length, for which we use the jet diameter, and V is the velocity of the jet. For the worst case condition, the lowest Reynolds number (670) is used for the largest density difference:

$$Ri = \frac{9.81m/s^2 * (1.051 - 1.036) * 0.006m}{1.036 * (0.12m/s)^2} = 0.06 \quad (6.4)$$

The Richardson number of 0.06 means that the buoyancy effects are 6% as important as shear effects for this worst case condition. For the higher, $Re = 1700$ case the Richardson number is 0.03 at the worst case density difference. Therefore, we conclude that - although the density difference will have an effect - it is small enough to exclude from the analysis.

Figure 6.7 also shows the ambient-to-jet viscosity ratio out the outset of each trial. Although it is measured in discrete points between trials, the viscosity condition apparent at the jet boundary is also continuously changing with time as the jet issues into the tank during each trial. A way to quantify the level of this change is to calculate the diffusion length over the length of the trial. The diffusion length is calculated by:

$$\text{Diffusion length} = \sqrt{\mathcal{D}t}$$

where \mathcal{D} is the mass diffusivity of propylene glycol into water ($0.001123\text{mm}^2/\text{s}$), and t is the time of the trial. For a one minute trial, the diffusion length is:

$$\text{Diffusion length} = \sqrt{\mathcal{D}t} = \sqrt{0.001123\text{mm}^2/\text{s} * 60\text{s}} = 0.01 \text{ jet diameters}$$

Because this length is only 1% a jet diameter, it is seen that changes to the viscosity condition due to diffusion effects over a trial are small compared to the jet size.

Another way of looking at the viscosity condition change is through the Schmidt number, which is a ratio between the momentum diffusivity and mass diffusivity:

$$\text{Schmidt number} = \frac{\nu}{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1.05e-6\text{m}^2/\text{s}}{1.23e-9\text{m}^2/\text{s}} = 853$$

The high Schmidt number of 853 shows that the mass diffusion is effectively minimized when compared to the momentum effects.

6.3 Flow Visualization

Visualization of the jet across Reynolds numbers and viscosity ratios is presented in this section for qualitative insight into the breakdown behavior of the jet.

Images of the jet breakdown for $M = 1$ are presented in Figure 6.8. These images show classic jet breakdown, with the axisymmetric Kelvin-Helmholtz cells forming in the shear layer, which grow and eventually break up the jet core. The jet breaks up more rapidly at higher Reynolds number, as expected.




Figure 6.8: Images of jet breakdown for a range of Reynolds number. $M=1$.

In Figure 6.9, the breakdown of the jet is presented for a high viscosity ratio of $M = 47$. Note how an entirely new breakdown mode is observed. The breakdown displays a helical mode at high Reynolds numbers.




Figure 6.9: Images of jet breakdown for a range of Reynolds number. $M=47$.

Next, the jet images are shown in 6.10 for a range of viscosity variations for a single Reynolds number of 1077. The transition to a helical mode is again observed, this time for high viscosity ratios.




Figure 6.10: Images of jet breakdown for a range of viscosity ratios. $Re=1077$.

6.4 Jet Instability

In this section, the overall instability trends are first explored, before the spectral data are presented and discussed.

The development of the most unstable mode is first investigated. The hotfilm probe is placed at the jet centerline, and moved in increments of $z/D = 1/6$ from the jet exit plane until $z = D$. The results are displayed in Figure 6.11. Note how in the locations nearest to the jet exit, no unstable mode is clearly observable. At $z=1/2D$, a peak at a frequency of about 30 Hz is observed. This peak grows in amplitude in the further downstream locations. A digital high-pass filter is used on the spectral data, so that apparent long-wavelength disturbances do not obscure the trends.




Figure 6.11: The spectral data from the early jet development. $M=11$, $Re = 1682$.

Next, the far downstream locations of jet are investigated to observe the decay of the unstable mode. The probe is positioned again on the centerline of the jet, but now at further downstream locations. The locations and spectral results are shown in Figure 6.12. Note how the spectral data clearly displays a peak at the first location, before gradually becoming more broadband further downstream. The decay of the single oscillatory mode and the rise of broadband turbulence is as expected for a jet descending into turbulence.




Figure 6.12: The spectral data from the later jet development. $M=15$, $Re = 1682$.

In order to further investigate the nature of the observed instability, the relative amplitude of the disturbance is next determined as related to jet location. Figure 6.13 shows the amplitude of the disturbance in the jet centerline and shear layer, at locations downstream of the jet exit plane. Note the rapid increase in the disturbance amplitude in the shear layer at the location $z/D = 1.5$. In Figure 6.13, the measurement resolution is one measurement every $1/6D$. This measurement density results in an unacceptably long trial time of three minutes total, due to the two seconds measuring period at each location and two seconds of traverse time between locations. In order to cut the trial times to under a minute - as desired based on the viscosity diffusion arguments made in the previous section - it was decided that a total of ten measurements (five downstream locations, measuring in both the centerline and shear layers) were the optimal number of locations in a single test. These axial positions of these five measurements were chosen carefully in order to still capture the full physics of the instability development. One point is tested before the observed development of the unstable mode ($z = 1/6D$), another location directly before the observed increase ($z = 1D$), one point in the middle of the increase ($z = 8/6D$), one point downstream of the increase ($z = 2-1/6D$), and one point far downstream ($z = 4-1/6D$). Black bars denoting these locations are shown in Figure 6.13, with the exception of the furthest downstream location which exceeds the bounds of the plot.




Figure 6.13: The amplitude of the disturbance is presented against the testing location downstream of the jet exit plane. $M=11$. The locations picked for additional frequency testing are marked with a black line. One additional location, at $z/D = 4-1/6D$, is not shown in this figure.

These five locations are next investigated to demonstrated that they capture the instability pre-development region, the rise of the disturbance, and the saturation of the observed disturbance. Such a plot is shown for a high viscosity ratio case, $M=27$, in Figure 6.14. The rapid rise in disturbance amplitude is once again observed in the shear layer. The trend exhibited in Figure 6.14 is consistent in overall behaviour with observations for all high viscosity ratio cases.




Figure 6.14: The magnitude of the measured hotfilm voltage disturbance is presented against the five chosen axial locations. $M=26$, $Re = 1682$.

The rapid rise in the shear layer disturbance amplitude observed in such high-viscosity ratio cases is contrasted with the disturbance amplitudes of a trial without a viscosity ratio ($M=1$) in Figure 6.15. While the disturbance amplitude is still higher in the shear layer than on the jet centerline, the rapid increase in disturbance amplitude is not observed in this case.




Figure 6.15: The amplitude of the disturbance is presented against the five chosen axial locations. $M=1$, $Re = 1682$.

The spectral nature for each of these ten points is also investigated for observations of single-frequency peaks. Figure 6.16 shows FFTs for the ten points for a case when $M = 26$ and $Re = 1682$. A clear peak is seen in the plots, especially in the three middle locations.




Figure 6.16: Schematic of the locations tested, and spectral data collected in those locations, $M = 26$, $Re = 1682$

The spectral nature of the jet in these same ten locations is also presented for a case with a lower Reynolds number of 841, as shown in Figure 6.17. It is readily apparent that the frequency of the most unstable mode is lower for this case.




Figure 6.17: Schematic of the locations tested, and spectral data collected in those locations, $M = 26$, $Re = 841$

The jet disturbance frequencies are next examined systematically over the ten locations and the two Reynolds numbers ($Re = 841, 1682$) for six different viscosity ratios. These tests are the ones carried out - as stated in the methods section - by beginning with a tank of pure propylene glycol into which the saltwater jet issues. In between trials, the jet is turned on for a period of time until the overall tank viscosity reaches the next desired value. The tank is mixed, and a viscosity and specific gravity measurement is taken at the new set point. This tank "viscosity dilution" is carried on until the six trials are completed. The trials are repeated twice and are done for both a slow ($Re = 841$) and fast ($Re = 1682$) case. The measured specific gravities and viscosity ratios of these trials are shown in Figure 6.18.




Figure 6.18: The specific gravity and viscosity ratio values tested in the 10-point tests.

The most amplified frequency for each of the 10 positions is recorded at each viscosity ratio, for both of the two Reynolds number cases. The most amplified frequencies are then compared across locations and viscosity ratios. Plots of the most amplified frequencies, for both the centerline and shear layer locations are shown in Figure 6.19.




Figure 6.19: The most amplified frequencies are presented for the 6 viscosity ratio cases for five centerline locations (left) and five shear layer locations (right). $Re = 841$.

Note how the viscosity ratio appears to have an influence on the most amplified frequency. While there is significant scatter in the data, the negative correlation between viscosity ratio and frequency is clearly seen. The data for the centerline is cleaner than the data in the shear layer. However, there is no clear difference in most amplified frequency between the centerline and shear layer.

These results are presented as well for the $Re = 1682$ case in Figure 6.20. The data for this higher velocity case has much more scatter. However, the negative correlation between viscosity ratio and most amplified frequency is still observed. Overall, much higher frequencies are found in this higher Reynolds number case.




Figure 6.20: The most amplified frequencies are presented for the 6 viscosity ratio cases for five centerline locations (left) and five shear layer locations (right). $Re = 1682$.

Figure 6.21 compares the most amplified frequency with the viscosity ratio across trials. This plot uses the frequency data from a single location, by taking the frequency from the location with the most clearly defined peak, as measured by the ratio of the peak amplitude to the next highest amplitude. The negative correlation between the viscosity ratio and most amplified frequency is clearly seen.




Figure 6.21: The most amplified frequencies are plotted against the 6 viscosity ratio cases for the $Re = 841$ and $Re = 1682$ cases, including both the centerline and shear layer measurements.

Overall, the jet is shown to have a frequency spectra with a defined peak. The peak frequency is shown to have dependence on the jet Reynolds number and the viscosity ratio. However, a clear shift in the peak velocity across a certain viscosity ratio threshold is not observed, nor any other dramatic shift in behavior that is a clear marker of a global instability. More work will need to be done in order to determine whether such a shift in behavior indicative of a global mode may be captured in this facility as triggered by a viscosity ratio.

Chapter 7

Conclusions

An experimental facility was created to investigate the breakup of a round laminar jet with a jet-to-ambient viscosity ratio. The measurements taken in this facility have been documented. The key takeaways for this study are the following:

- The facility is successful in creating a laminar jet issuing into a quiescent media with matched density and variable viscosity. The chosen fluids of saltwater and propylene glycol allow for negligible density and surface tension effects, while creating ambient-to-jet viscosity ratios from $M=1-50$. The flowrate of the jet can be controlled to attain jet Reynolds numbers from $Re = 400-2000$. The jet is quiet and the is observed to contain very low levels of disturbance at the jet exit plane.
- The jet is observed to contain typical laminar jet characteristics of a turbulence intensity profile peaked in the boundary layer, a momentum thickness which scales with the square root of the Reynolds number, and a profile which can be described by a hyperbolic tangent.
- The technique of fluorescent dye imaging effectively visualizes the breakup of the jet. Both an axisymmetric and a helical breakup mode are observed. The mode of jet breakup appears to be dependent on both the jet Reynolds number and the jet-to-ambient viscosity ratio.
- The measurement technique of hotfilm anemometry effectively captures spectral aspects of the jet behavior. A narrow peak in the frequency spectrum is observed

for certain locations and jet conditions. The peak is not observed at the exit plane of the jet, becomes clearly observable above all other frequencies, and is lost among other frequencies at far downstream locations. The amplitude of the disturbance is higher in the shear layers, which is consistent with visualization observations of the axisymmetric and helical breakup modes.

- The most amplified frequency appears to be dependent on the jet Reynolds number and ambient-to-jet viscosity ratio. In this study, the most amplified frequency is negatively correlated with the ambient-to-jet viscosity ratio and positively correlated with the jet Reynolds number.

Future work should be carried out in order to further determine the existence of a global mode. One possible method is to perform forcing experiments, where a steady periodic frequency is applied to the test section, as discussed in Huerre and Monkewitz (1990). This forcing frequency is swept past suspected global-mode frequencies, and the corresponding "lock-in" of the jet is observed. Another method would be development of a counterflow nozzle, as discussed in Stykowski and Niccum (1991) so that higher shear levels can be achieved in the jet shear layer. Both of these methods could readily be implemented in the existing form of this experimental facility.

References

- [Aul and Olbricht1990] Aul, R. and Olbricht, W. (1990). “Stability of a thin annular film in pressure-driven, low-reynolds-number flow through a capillary.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 215, 585–599.
- [Berger1967] Berger, E. (1967). “Suppression of vortex shedding and turbulence behind oscillating cylinders.” *The Physics of Fluids*, 10(9), S191–S193.
- [Cao et al.2003] Cao, Q., Ventresca, A. L., Sreenivas, K., and Prasad, A. K. (2003). “Instability due to viscosity stratification downstream of a centerline injector.” *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 81(5), 913–922.
- [Craik1969] Craik, A. D. (1969). “The stability of plane couette flow with viscosity stratification.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 36(4), 685–693.
- [Drazin and Reid1981] Drazin, P. and Reid, W. (1981). *Hydrodynamic stability*.
- [Drubka and Nagib1981] Drubka, R. E. and Nagib, H. M. (1981). “Instabilities in near field of turbulent jets and their dependence on initial conditions and reynolds number.” *Report no.*, ILLINOIS INST OF TECH CHICAGO DEPT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING.
- [Govindarajan2004] Govindarajan, R. (2004). “Effect of miscibility on the linear instability of two-fluid channel flow.” *International Journal of Multiphase Flow*, 30(10), 1177–1192.
- [Govindarajan and Sahu2014] Govindarajan, R. and Sahu, K. C. (2014). “Instabilities in viscosity-stratified flow.” *Annual review of fluid mechanics*, 46, 331–353.

- [Hallberg and Strykowski2006] Hallberg, M. and Strykowski, P. (2006). “On the universality of global modes in low-density axisymmetric jets.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 569, 493–507.
- [Hu and Joseph1989] Hu, H. H. and Joseph, D. D. (1989). “Lubricated pipelining: stability of core-annular flow. part 2.” *Journal of fluid mechanics*, 205, 359–396.
- [Huerre and Monkewitz1990] Huerre, P. and Monkewitz, P. A. (1990). “Local and global instabilities in spatially developing flows.” *Annual review of fluid mechanics*, 22(1), 473–537.
- [Jendoubi and Strykowski1994] Jendoubi, S. and Strykowski, P. (1994). “Absolute and convective instability of axisymmetric jets with external flow.” *Physics of Fluids*, 6(9), 3000–3009.
- [Kao and Park1972] Kao, T. W. and Park, C. (1972). “Experimental investigations of the stability of channel flows. part 2. two-layered co-current flow in a rectangular channel.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 52(3), 401–423.
- [Kouris and Tsamopoulos2001] Kouris, C. and Tsamopoulos, J. (2001). “Dynamics of axisymmetric core-annular flow in a straight tube. i. the more viscous fluid in the core, bamboo waves.” *Physics of Fluids*, 13(4), 841–858.
- [Kundu et al.2015] Kundu, P. K., Dowling, D. R., Tryggvason, G., and Cohen, I. M. (2015). “Fluid mechanics.
- [Kyle1988] Kyle, D. (1988). “Lif images of he/n2 jets.” *Dept. Mech. Engng Rep. FM88DK1. Yale University*.
- [Kyle and Sreenivasan1993] Kyle, D. and Sreenivasan, K. (1993). “The instability and breakdown of a round variable-density jet.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 249, 619–664.
- [Landau et al.2013] Landau, L. D., Bell, J., Kearsley, M., Pitaevskii, L., Lifshitz, E., and Sykes, J. (2013). *Electrodynamics of continuous media*, Vol. 8. elsevier.
- [Lecordier et al.1991] Lecordier, J.-C., Hamma, L., and Paranthoen, P. (1991). “The control of vortex shedding behind heated circular cylinders at low reynolds numbers.” *Experiments in Fluids*, 10(4), 224–229.

- [Lin1946] Lin, C. (1946). “On the stability of two-dimensional parallel flows: Part iii.stability in a viscous fluid.” *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, 3(4), 277–301.
- [Mathis et al.1984] Mathis, C., Provansal, M., and Boyer, L. (1984). “The bernard-von karman instability: an experimental study near the threshold.” *Journal de Physique Lettres*, 45(10), 483–491.
- [Monkewitz1988] Monkewitz, P. A. (1988). “The absolute and convective nature of instability in two-dimensional wakes at low reynolds numbers.” *The Physics of fluids*, 31(5), 999–1006.
- [Monkewitz et al.1990] Monkewitz, P. A., Bechert, D. W., Barsikow, B., and Lehmann, B. (1990). “Self-excited oscillations and mixing in a heated round jet.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 213, 611–639.
- [Niccum1990] Niccum, D. (1990). “The influence of velocity ratio on a counterflowing circular jet.” M.S. thesis, University of Minnesota, University of Minnesota.
- [Noto et al.1985] Noto, K., Ishida, H., and Matsumoto, R. (1985). “A breakdown of the karman vortex street due to the natural convection.” *Flow Visualization*, 3, 348–354.
- [Ranganathan and Govindarajan2001] Ranganathan, B. T. and Govindarajan, R. (2001). “Stabilization and destabilization of channel flow by location of viscosity-stratified fluid layer.” *Physics of Fluids*, 13(1), 1–3.
- [Sahu and Matar2010] Sahu, K. C. and Matar, O. (2010). “Three-dimensional linear instability in pressure-driven two-layer channel flow of a newtonian and a herschel–bulkeley fluid.” *Physics of Fluids*, 22(11), 112103.
- [Schmid and Henningson2000] Schmid, P. and Henningson, D. (2000). *Stability and Transition in Shear Flows*. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer New York, <<https://books.google.com/books?id=5eNoy2VdXo8C>>.
- [Selvam et al.2007] Selvam, B., Merk, S., Govindarajan, R., and Meiburg, E. (2007). “Stability of miscible core–annular flows with viscosity stratification.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 592, 23–49.

- [Sreenivasan et al.1989] Sreenivasan, K., Raghu, S., and Kyle, D. (1989). “Absolute instability in variable density round jets.” *Experiments in Fluids*, 7(5), 309–317.
- [Sreenivasan et al.1987] Sreenivasan, K., Strykowski, P., and Olinger, D. (1987). “Hopf bifurcation, landau equation, and vortex shedding behind circular cylinders.” *Forum on unsteady flow separation*, Vol. 1, ASME New York, 1–13.
- [Srinivasan et al.2010] Srinivasan, V., Hallberg, M., and Strykowski, P. J. (2010). “Viscous linear stability of axisymmetric low-density jets: parameters influencing absolute instability.” *Physics of Fluids*, 22(2), 024103.
- [Strykowski and Niccum1991] Strykowski, P. and Niccum, D. (1991). “The stability of countercurrent mixing layers in circular jets.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 227, 309–343.
- [Strykowski and Sreenivasan1990] Strykowski, P. and Sreenivasan, K. (1990). “On the formation and suppression of vortex shedding at low reynolds numbers.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 218, 71–107.
- [Strykowski1986] Strykowski, P. J. (1986). “The control of absolutely and convectively unstable shear flows.” Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, Yale University.
- [Todde et al.2009] Todde, V., Spazzini, P. G., and Sandberg, M. (2009). “Experimental analysis of low-reynolds number free jets.” *Experiments in fluids*, 47(2), 279–294.
- [Twiss1951] Twiss, R. (1951). “On oscillations in electron streams.” *Proceedings of the Physical Society. Section B*, 64(8), 654.
- [Woods1969] Woods, J. (1969). “On richardson’s number as a criterion for laminar-turbulent-laminar transition in the ocean and atmosphere.” *Radio Science*, 4(12), 1289–1298.
- [Yasuo et al.1986] Yasuo, M., Kunio, H., and Takayoshi, N. (1986). “A fundamental study of symmetrical vortex generation behind a cylinder by wake heating or by splitter plate or mesh.” *International journal of heat and mass transfer*, 29(8), 1193–1201.

[Yih1967] Yih, C.-S. (1967). “Instability due to viscosity stratification.” *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 27(2), 337–352.

[Monkewitz et al.1990] [Strykowski and Niccum1991] [Govindarajan and Sahu2014]
[Jendoubi and Strykowski1994] [Kyle and Sreenivasan1993] [Srinivasan et al.2010]
[Schmid and Henningson2000] [Huerre and Monkewitz1990] [Drazin and Reid1981]
[Woods1969] [Kundu et al.2015] [Twiss1951]
[Landau et al.2013] [Sahu and Matar2010] [Lin1946]
[Craik1969] [Govindarajan2004] [Hu and Joseph1989]
[Yih1967] [Kao and Park1972] [Aul and Olbricht1990]
[Kouris and Tsamopoulos2001] [Ranganathan and Govindarajan2001] [Selvam et al.2007]
[Cao et al.2003] [Mathis et al.1984] [Strykowski1986]
[Noto et al.1985] [Yasuo et al.1986] [Strykowski and Sreenivasan1990]
[Lecordier et al.1991] [Berger1967] [Monkewitz1988]
[Kyle1988] [Sreenivasan et al.1987] [Hallberg and Strykowski2006]
[Sreenivasan et al.1989] [Todde et al.2009] [Drubka and Nagib1981]
[Niccum1990]

Appendix A

Hotfilm Calibration Technique

First, the jet is run for 7 different flowrates and the resulting anemometer voltages are recorded. An example plot of this is shown in Figure A.1.




Figure A.1: Example calibration curve for the hot film probe

The velocity values on the x-axis of Figure A.1 are calculated using the measured flowrate from the flowmeter and the diameter of the jet. Using this velocity estimate, a

linearized calibration curve is generated using the generalized Kings Law:

$$E^2 = A + BU^{1/n} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In Equation A.1, E is the voltage from the anemometer, U is the flow velocity, and A , B , and n are coefficients fit to best linearize the data. The linear fit is shown on top of the data points in Figure A.2.




Figure A.2: Example of a calibration fit using King's law

This fit assumes a perfect tophat profile coming from the nozzle. However, the true profile includes a boundary layer of decreased velocity, as shown in Figure A.3.




Figure A.3: Schematic of tophat and realistic jet profiles.

As a way to decrease error, the calibration is augmented using a volume-matching technique. First, high-fidelity radial jet profiles are taken at 0.5mm from the jet exit plane for each calibration flowrate. The calibration fit is then applied to each of these profiles to convert the voltages to velocities, as shown in Figure A.4.




Figure A.4: Example of a jet profile being converted from voltages (left) to velocities (right) using the calibration curve.

The flowrate through the nozzle exit, given the current jet profile, can be found by spinning the jet profile around the jet centerline. This spun volume is then compared to the volume of an ideal tophat jet. This is done for each of the seven flowrate profiles.

As seen in the Figure A.5, the jet profile volumes initially do not match up with the true volumes.




Figure A.5: Plot of volumes calculated for ideal tophat profile jets (orange) and calculated from measured jet profiles (blue).

In order to make the two volumes match, the coefficient B is tweaked in King's Law Equation A.1. This is the equivalent of stretching or compressing the profiles. Figure A.6 shows how the volumes match well when B is multiplied by 0.905:




Figure A.6: Plot of volumes calculated for ideal tophat profile jets (orange) and calculated from measured jet profiles (blue) after applying an adjustment to King's law coefficient B.

The King's law calibration with the new value of coefficient B is now used for subsequent voltage to velocity conversions.

Appendix B

Error Analysis

The total uncertainty in the velocity measurements is a result of uncertainty from the voltage measurement by the multimeter, the uncertainty of the calibration regression, and the systematic uncertainty from the flowrate measured through the flowmeter.

$$\Delta U = \sqrt{\Delta U_{flowmeter}^2 + \Delta U_{voltage}^2 + \Delta U_{regression}^2} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The uncertainty of the flowmeter is $\pm 3\%$, which corresponds to a flowrate uncertainty of ± 5 ccm. This, converted to the base, average velocity value used in the calibration, corresponds to a velocity uncertainty of ± 0.009 m/s.

To find the uncertainty in the regression fit, we first find the uncertainty of ΔE^2 , and propagate it through to find the corresponding $\Delta U_{regression}^2$:

$$\Delta U = \frac{dU}{dE^2} \Delta E^2 = \frac{1}{n} \frac{E^2 - A^{\frac{1}{n}-1}}{B^2} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For the worst case (highest) velocity trials, this comes out to a value of $4.22\text{E-}4$ m/s,

The multimeter used (Agilent 34411A) has an uncertainty of 0.003% of reading and 0.0005% of range. Each velocity point corresponds to a minimum of 1024 measurements taken. The uncertainty from the multimeter is therefore taken to be $6.32\text{E-}4$ V.

The total velocity uncertainty is therefore calculated to be:

$$\Delta U = 0.01m/s \tag{B.3}$$

which comes primarily from the uncertainty in the flowmeter. This uncertainty corresponds to an uncertainty range of 3.5-10% of reading over the Reynolds number range presented.

The frequency resolution for the FFt is F_s/N , where F_s is the sample frequency and N is the number of sample points used in the FFt. For the worst case sample trials of 1024 data points in 1 second, the corresponding frequency resolution is 1 Hz. For the frequency results presented, where a sampling frequency of 1024 Hz was used for 2 seconds, the resolution is 0.5 Hz. As for the error in the magnitude of the disturbance at the peak frequency, the plots and analysis presented are treated qualitatively, and no arguments are based on the statistical analysis of the magnitudes. For this reason, no uncertainty values are computed in this case.