LBL-10790 c.2
Preprint

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT
DIVISION

Submitted to the American Institute of Aeronautics
and Astronautics

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE FLOW FIELD OF A TWO DIMENSIONAL PREMIXED TURBULENT FLAME

A. R. Ganji and R. F. Sawyer

April 1980

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

This is a Library Circulating Copy which may be borrowed for two weeks. For a personal retention copy, call Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 6782.

RECEIVED
LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY

JUN 20 1980

LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SEC



Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

LBL-10790 c.2

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE FLOW FIELD OF A TWO DIMENSIONAL PREMIXED TURBULENT FLAME*

A. R. Ganji**

R. F. Sawyer***

Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

ABSTRACT

A turbulent reacting shear layer in a premixed propane/air flow has been studied in a two dimensional combustor, with the flame stabilized behind a rearward facing streamlined step. Spark shadowgraphs show that in the range of velocities (7.5 to 22.5 m/sec corresponding to Reynolds numbers of $.5 \times 10^4$ cm^{-1} to 1.5×10^4 cm^{-1}) and equivalence ratios (0.4 to 0.7) studied, the mixing layer is dominated by Brown-Roshko type large coherent structures in both reacting and nonreacting flows. High speed schlieren movies show that these eddies are convected downstream and increase their size and spacing by combustion and coalescence with neighboring eddies. Tracing individual eddies shows, in the reacting shear layer, that, on the average, eddies accelerate as they move downstream with the highest acceleration close to

---

Index categories: combustion and combustor designs; airbreathing propulsim.

*This work supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Lewis Research Center, Grant NSG-3028S1-6, Dr. C. J. Marek, Project Monitor

**Research Assistant

***Professor, AIAA Associate Fellow

the origin of the shear layer. Combustion is confined to these large structures which develop as a result of vortical action of the shear flow. On the average, the reacting eddies have a lower growth rate than nonreacting eddies. A turbulent boundary layer created by means of a tripping wire upstream of the edge of the step virtually eliminates the large coherent structures in the shear layer, while for the case in which the wire could not trigger the transition to turbulence, the large coherent structures dominated the reacting and nonreacting flows.

I. INTRODUCTION

Lean premixed prevaporized (LPP) combustion in aircraft gas turbine engines is one possible approach to reduction of oxides of nitrogen and particulate emissions at higher power and cruise modes of operation and reduction of unburned hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide emissions at the idle mode of operation.[1†] These gains are likely to be obtained only with the introduction of new or increased problems of stability, flashback and autoignition. The advantages and problems for application of LPP combustion to gas turbine combustors have been discussed in detail in Reference 2.

Although there has been extensive and thorough experimental research on turbulent flame propagation and stability in the past (for example References 3 and 4), investigation of these processes in the light of the new findings in turbulent flow research has become of renewed basic interest. Recent experiments on some simple nonreacting turbulent flows, such as free shear layers and jets, have resulted in new views of the structure of these turbulent flows. Laufer[5] has concluded that "these

†Numbers refer to references listed at the end of the paper.

turbulent flows are not as chaotic as have been previously assumed, and that there is some order in their motion with an observable chain of events reoccurring randomly with a statistical definable mean period." The new view suggests, "that with every shear flow is associated an identifiable, characteristic structure and that the development of the flow is controlled by the interactions of these structures with each other."[6] These views of the structure of turbulence have strong experimental support in free shear layers, circular jets, turbulent wakes and boundary layers.[5,7] The basic findings of this research have established the concept of "coherent large scale structures" in turbulent shear flows.

Until recently it was thought that free shear layers consisted of two regions, one turbulent and the other nonturbulent, with the turbulent region being characterized by random, three dimensional motions and the presence of vorticity fluctuations. Viscous forces were continuously propagating these vorticity fluctuations into the nonturbulent region along the interface between the two regions ("entrainment by nibbling"). It is now suggested that large coherent structures have the prime role in the development and growth of free shear layers. For nonreacting free shear layers behind a splitter plate, Brown and Roshko[8] and Winnant and Browand[9] have clearly shown that large eddies are formed in a quasi-orderly fashion, are carried through the mixing layer, and grow through coalescence and engulfment. It is in these processes that the irrotational fluid is ingested and enfolded in the large scale structures. Meanwhile internal mixing is occurring by the action of the small scale turbulence and viscosity, and the new fluid is digested and incorporated into the structures.[6]

There has been far less evidence, experimental work, and even effort in the application of these concepts to reacting flows such as combustion. In their pioneering work on bluff body flame stabilization based on the similarity between nonreacting and reacting flows behind bluff bodies, Nicholson and Field[10] suggested that "some sort of eddies or vortices or at least curvilinear flow patterns do exist in the burning regions" and also "that mixing can be accomplished solely by the well-ordered quasi-streamlined flow in the vortex trail." Only recently have there been efforts to apply the concept of "coherent large scale structures" and some related quantitative results of non-reacting shear flows to reacting shear layers. Konrad[11] has applied measured probability density functions in nonreacting flows to predict reaction rates for similar fast reacting flows. Marble and Broadwell[12] have predicted the fuel consumption rate for diffusion flames in the mixing region between two streams and also for turbulent fuel jets. Experimental evidence of the existence of large coherent structures in reacting flows and the effect of combustion on these structures has not been reported. Recently published work by Chigier and Yule[13] confirms the existence of coherent large structures in the transition region of a turbulent jet diffusion flame.

We have undertaken an experimental study to observe the importance of large scale, coherent structures in a shear flow both without and with combustion. A two dimensional combustion tunnel was constructed for the study of premixed, prevaporized, turbulent flames stabilized behind a rearward facing streamlined step. The mixing layer in which combustion occurs, while not a free shear layer, possesses

many characteristics of a free sheer layer. Flow visualization has been used to study the structure of this shear layer for both reacting and nonreacting flows. Inlet velocity, inlet temperature, and equivalence ratio were experimental variables. Geometry, pressure (one atmosphere), and reactants (premixed propane/air) were held constant for all experiments.

II. EXPERIMENTAL APPARATUS AND PROCEDURES

The cross section of the experimental apparatus is shown in Figure 1. Air and fuel mix in three venturi nozzles which are attached to the approximately one meter long premixing chamber. The premixing chamber has a rectangular cross section 51 mm high and 173 mm wide. It is equipped with a photodiode flame detector and an adjustable over pressure detector which activate the fuel shutoff. A 1.5 mm square cell ceramic flow straightener 64 mm long with 31% blockage has been used to smooth any large flow discontinuities and to prevent flame propagation into the mixing section.

The test section entrance is equipped with a step which is streamlined in the upstream direction and has a blockage ratio of .5. The step designed according to the method introduced in Reference 14, delivers a uniform entrance velocity and also stabilizes the flame. Optical access to the test section is provided by two 12.7 mm thick fused quartz windows on the sides of the test section. Important factors in the design of this system are. Thorough mixing of propane and air before entering the test section and a uniform velocity flow field at the entrance to the test section..
The first criterion was met through choice of the mixers and mixing

section length (about 1 m). The extent of mixing was tested by injecting CO_2 (which has the same molecular weight as propane) at the mixing venturi and measuring the composition of CO_2 at the entrance to the test section. Over the entrance cross section the deviation between maximum and minimum CO_2 volume percentage is less than 2% for all cases. Flow velocity was measured by a pitot-static tube and a water micromanometer. The deviation between the maximum and minimum velocity is less than 8%, neglecting wall effects. Turbulence intensity measured by hot wire anemometry is about 3% and uniform over the entrance to the test section except near the upper wall where higher levels indicate the effects of a turbulent boundary layer.[15] Conditions at the upper wall do not affect the combustion zone.

Schlieren and shadowgraph optical techniques were used for visualization of reacting flows and the schlieren system for nonreacting flows. The stop used was a variable slit with knife edges on both sides.

III. FLOW VISUALIZATION RESULTS

Schlieren and shadowgraph flow visualization techniques have been found to be particularly useful and informative for two dimensional shear layers[9] and two dimensional flames.[10] In the present investigation these techniques were used for: 1) taking long exposure (20 msec) photographs of the flame, 2) taking very short exposure (spark, < 1 μsec) photographs of the reacting and nonreacting flows inside the combustor, and 3) taking high speed movies (up to 7500 frames/sec) of the flame and of the nonreacting flow. Figure 2 contains three schlieren photographs, the first two of the flame (reacting shear layer behind the

step) and the last of the corresponding nonreacting shear layer. Figure 2a is a long exposure time (20 msec) photograph of the flame which shows the extent of the spread of the flame averaged in a manner similar to what is observed by the eye.[16] The well defined region behind the step is conventionally called the recirculation zone and the well defined bright region is conventionally called the flame zone.[17] Figure 2b shows the spark schlieren (exposure time < 1 μsec) of the flame with the same conditions as in 2a, but with strikingly different features now visible. A laminar, unstable shear layer leaves the step, expands at a short distance (compared to the length of the test section) from the step (eddy formation position, x_o) and is transformed into a series of roll up eddies which grow to the size of the test section. The interesting features of these eddies are their shape, their growth as they move downstream, and the apparent zone of reaction at the boundary between the eddy and reactant flow. Figure 2c shows the flow at the same conditions but without combustion. Obviously the flow field (which is visible because the step is hot) is not as clear as in the reacting case. This is because the schlieren effect which is based on refractive index gradient fades away downstream of the step. Despite its haziness it clearly shows that the large eddies are formed behind the step and they grow downstream of the step.

Reacting Flows

The effect of Reynolds number on these large eddies and overall flow pattern is shown in Figure 3. These Reynolds numbers are based on entrance velocities, viscosity of air at entrance conditions, and one centimeter characteristic distance. The equivalence ratio has been

kept roughly constant (within 3%) so that variations in the chemistry of the flames is minimal. The Reynolds number increase is only by a factor of 2.44 which is not enough to show any drastic effect on the flame or flow structure. Over the range examined, the effect of increase in Reynolds number seems to be reduction in the stability of the initial layer, a shortening of the distance of the eddy formation position with respect to the step edge, and an increase in the small scale turbulence inside the large eddies. The main features do not change with increase in Reynolds number: the large scale structures exist, are coherent, and grow as they move downstream. Spark schlieren shadowgraphs of the flame at different equivalence ratios also show that the generation and growth of large eddies towards downstream is largely unchanged. A calculation of the Reynolds number along the mixing layer for reacting and nonreacting flows[18] and other evidence, such as the rate of the flame propagations, suggest that the layer becomes turbulent.

For a better understanding of the process of development of these large scale structures a series of schlieren movies of the flow were taken. Figure 4 shows a sequence of ten frames from one of the high speed schlieren movies of the reacting flow behind the step. This sequence clearly shows that the large eddies start to form as a result of instability of the laminar shear layer[9] and that they roll up and grow as they are carried downstream through the mixing layer. The propagation of the flame is controlled by the growth of these eddies as they move downstream.

The formation of any observable eddy corresponds to bulging of laminar shear layer behind the step. This is an inviscid phenomenon

which is commonly observed in free shear layers. The positions of occurrence of this bulge, which is identified as the eddy formation position, (x_o), has been reduced from the high speed movies. The histogram of this position is observed to be Gaussian.[18] Corresponding histograms have been constructed for different values of initial velocities, equivalence ratios, and entrance temperatures and the results for average values of x_o are summarized in Table 1. The position of the eddy formation moves towards the step with increasing flow velocity, does not change with equivalence ratio and moves away from the step with increase in temperature. The latter is considered to be due to the reduction of Reynolds number with increase in inlet temperature. The period of formation of eddies is another interesting feature of these structures, Table 2. The time between eddies decreases with increasing flow velocity and does not show any definite trend with increasing equivalence ratio. Schlieren and shadowgraph records of the flame show that the large eddies contain the reaction zone of the flame and that roll up of each eddy corresponds to engulfment of hot products from the recirculation zone into the layer of fresh reactants in which the reaction front propagates.

An interesting phenomenon first observed by Winnant and Browand[9] to be the cause of the growth of the free shear layer in a water tunnel, and later confirmed by Brown and Roshko[8] in their high Reynolds number experiment of a free shear layer between two gas flows, is amalgamation or coalescence of eddies, which simply means that one eddy takes over the one ahead of it and they form one larger eddy. This process is also called eddy pairing. According to Roshko[6] this phenomenon is partially responsible for the growth of the large eddies and consequently the shear layer.

TABLE 1. Effect of velocity (V_o), equivalence ratio (ϕ), and inlet temperature (T_o) on eddy formation position.

a. T_o = 295 K, ϕ = 0.60

V_o (m/sec)	9.2	13.4	22.5
$\bar{x}_o$ (cm)	1.7	1.3	0.9

b. T_o = 295 K, V_o = 9.2 m/sec

ϕ	0.52	0.58	0.63
$\bar{x}_o$ (cm)	1.7	1.7	1.7

c. V_o = 13.3 m/sec

T_o (K)	295	454
ϕ	0.55	0.53
$\bar{x}_o$ (cm)	1.3	1.6

d. T_o = 295 K, ϕ = 0 (nonreacting flow)

V_o (m/sec)	8.8	13.0	18.8
$\bar{x}_o$ (cm)	1.6	1.4	1.2

TABLE 2. Effect of velocity (V_o), equivalence ratio (ϕ), and inlet temperature (T_o), on eddy shedding period.

a. T_o = 295 K, ϕ = 0.60

V_o (m/sec)	9.2	13.4	22.5
$\bar{\tau}$ (msec)	2.9	1.7	1.2

b. T_o = 295 K, V_o = 9.2 m/sec

ϕ	0.52	0.58	0.63
$\bar{\tau}$ (msec)	2.8	2.9	2.5

c. V_o = 13.3 m/sec

T_o (K)	295	454
ϕ	1.9	0.8
$\bar{\tau}$ (msec)	0.55	0.53

d. T_o = 295 K, ϕ = 0 (nonreacting flow)

V_o (m/sec)	8.8	13.0	18.8
$\bar{\tau}$ (msec)	2.5	1.9	1.5

In the flow under consideration this pairing process is clearly seen in Figure 4. If the first two eddies "A" and "B" in the first frame are followed in the subsequent frames, it can be seen that as the eddy ahead moves forward it is pushed down and the next eddy moves forward and up. At the same time they rotate around each other and finally become one identity (at least optically) as shown in the frame number 7. This phenomenon is more clearly shown in Reference 9, where the camera has followed the eddies at the average speed of the two flows. This phenomenon can be characterized by calculating the percent of the eddies which survive as they move downstream. This will be discussed in the "Eddy Coherence" section. The coalescence of eddies observed on the schlieren movies may be by the action of fluid dynamics, observed by Winnant and Browand,[9] or by chemical reaction. By the latter it is meant that because of chemical reaction, the observable interface between two eddies might disappear and the two be identified as one while fluid dynamically they might be two different structures. This problem cannot be resolved for data reduced from the schlieren or shadowgraph movies.

Non-reacting Flows

Observation of flow field without reaction was made possible by using the residual temperature gradient existing in the thermal boundary layer on the surface of the step and the temperature difference between the incoming flow and the air in the recirculation zone immediately following fuel shut-off and flame extinction. This effect would persist for only a few seconds following fuel shut-off. A sequence of frames from such a schlieren high speed movie is shown in Figure 5. Development of the vortices in the initial stages of the mixing layer is quite clear

and they appear similar to the vortices of the reacting flow of Figure 4, although not as clearly defined since the refractive index gradients are weaker. As for the reacting flow, the process of coalescence of eddies can also be clearly seen, Figure 5. The disappearance of eddies here is purely a fluid dynamical process. These observations suggest that heat release which results in expansion and increase in kinematic viscosity of the gas mixture in the mixing layer does not considerably affect the vortex shedding behind the step.

Eddy Coherence

The vortices shown in Figures 2 through 5 can be followed frame by frame on high speed schlieren movies and the movement of these eddies in the mixing layer plotted against time on an x-t diagram. Such a diagram was first introduced by Brown and Roshko[8] to show the coherence and lifetime of eddies in their free mixing layer experiment. An x-t diagram for 100 consecutive eddies in the present reacting shear layer is shown in Figure 6. Time has been calculated starting from an arbitrary frame of the film of the motion picture, knowing how the framing rate is changing with frame number since the framing rate is not constant. The curves have been plotted using a second order polynomial curve fit. Each curve corresponds to the trajectory of a vortex. The trajectories are nearly parallel to each other showing that the vortices nearly move with the same convective velocity at each point in space and a general trend of increasing velocities as they move downstream. Because this is a reacting flow with energy release and expansion, the observed acceleration is expected. Nonreacting flows behave similarly but with less acceleration of the vortices.[18]

Coalescence or vortex pairing is shown by dashed lines in Figure 6. After each pairing a new vortex is formed which arbitrarily has been assumed to be the continuation of the second vortex. This assumption is based on the observation of this process on schlieren and shadowgraph movies, see Figures 4 and 5. From Figure 6, the percent of eddies which survive as they move downstream can be determined.[18] An exponential decay in the number of eddies as they move downstream, qualitatively in agreement with the findings of Roshko[6], is observed. In high speed schlieren and shadowgraph movies of the flame, a periodic intrusion of large eddies into the recirculation zone was observed. It was noted that each of these intrusions corresponds to coalescence of a series of eddies usually close to the step edge. Four of these intrusions are identified by a "C" on Figure 6. A picture of this intrusion is shown in Figure 7 which shows two portions of the same schlieren high speed movie. Part (a) shows a normal mode of formation of vortices behind the step with occurrence of one pairing, while part (b) shows the amalgamation of a series of consecutive vortices leading to a gross mass flow into the recirculation zone. It was observed that the intrusion was more frequent in leaner flames while in nonreacting flows it could not be identified.

The resemblance of the forms of vortices observed in spark photographs and high speed movies, their quasi-orderly formation downstream of the step, and their motion in the mixing layer with fairly consistent velocity in space suggest that, in both reacting and nonreacting flows, the large structures formed as a result of the instability of the originial laminar separated layer are coherent. They grow and increase their spacing[18] as they move in the mixing layer downstream of the step.

Effect of combustion on the shear layer

There is close resemblance in the development of eddies in the reacting and nonreacting shear layers under investigation. Because of the increase in viscosity with reaction, there is an order of magnitude reduction in the Reynolds number[18]. Schlieren and shadowgraph records of the mixing layer suggest that there is a reduction in small scale turbulence due to heat release in the layer. The rate of formation and formation position of eddies in the reacting and nonreacting layers are comparable, Tables 1 and 2. This result is in sharp contrast with the observation by Chigier and Yule[13] in an unconfined jet diffusion flame. This is attributed to the reverse flow in the recirculation zone and acoustics of the chamber and upstream flow channel[18].

Growth of the shear layer was calculated for reacting and nonreacting cases employing the data from the high speed schlieren movies of the flow field in the test section. The averaging was done for 40 nonreacting and 100 reacting eddies. Because of the slight dependence of spreading rate on equivalence ratio[4] spreading rate for only one equivalence ratio was calculated. Figure 8 presents the average rate of growth of a reacting and a nonreacting mixing layer at nearly equal reference velocities. On the average, the growth of the reacting layer is up to 30% lower than the spreading rate of the nonreacting shear layer. The main factors that should be considered in explaining the above phenomenon are: increase in viscosity, dilation effect of the combustion, and increase in average velocity of the gas flow in the layer.

The effect of density variation on the spreading rate of the free shear layers has been experimentally investigated by Brown and Roshko[8]. They conclude that reducing the density in the lower velocity side

reduces the spreading rate of the layer. This reduction will depend on the density and velocity ratios of the two mixing streams. For the case of density ratio of 1/7 in a half jet (similar to the present experiment), the spreading rate is reduced by close to 30%. Considering the dilation effect of combustion in this system, and neglecting the effect of increase in velocity, about a 20% reduction in the spreading rate should be expected, somewhat less than what is observed. We believe that the additional reduction in the spreading rate due to combustion should be attributed to acceleration of products of combustion in the free shear layer in the confined flow of these experiments. Despite the first impression that flame propagation might increase the visible spread of the shear layer, the results presented here show that fluid dynamic effects of the heat release (dilation and resulting acceleration) supercede the propagation effect of the flame and reduce the visible growth of the free shear layer behind the step.

Boundary Layer Effect on Formation of Vortices

The boundary layer just upstream of the free shear layer is suspected to have a considerable effect on the growth of the layer through affecting the growth of the large scale structures in the layer. Batt[19] concluded that tripping the boundary layer upstream of the free shear layer, even if does not trigger the transition to turbulence thickens the boundary layer, increases the spreading rate and turbulent intensity of the free shear layer. Recently, Browand and Latigo[20] have carried out an experimental study of the effect of upstream boundary layer on a nonreacting free shear layer. From their hot wire anemometry results, and without direct observation, they conclude that the introduction of small scale

turbulence has obstructed the large scale interactions in the initial stages of the mixing layer. This has resulted in lower growth rate, but eventually the shear layer relaxes towards the higher growth rate which is observed for a shear layer with a laminar initial layer. By this argument, they conclude that at this later stage the important role of the large scale structures is reestablished.

To establish the effect of the upstream boundary layer on the large scale structures in the present reacting and nonreacting shear layers, the boundary layer was tripped by laying a wire on the top of the step. Wire sizes and their positions with respect to the edge of the step are shown in Table 3. Approximate values for the size of the wire and its position to ensure the transition before the trailing edge can be calculated following Schlichting[21]. The diameters of both wires were larger than the critical diameter for tripping the boundary layer. The boundary layer thicknesses at the edge of the step, based on the flat plate and uniformly converging nozzle for reference velocity of 13.5 m/sec, 2 mm and 1.2 mm respectively. Based on the above explanations, it is expected that 0.5 mm

TABLE 3. Wire size and location for boundary layer trip tests.

Case	Wire Diameter, mm	Wire Location, mm
1	0.5	11
2	0.5	2
3	1.1	11
4	1.1	2

wire will just disturb the boundary layer without any serious change in the layer, and the 1.1 mm wire at 11 mm upstream will trip the boundary layer in the sense that it causes transition to turbulence in the boundary layer.

Schlieren movies of reacting and nonreacting flow fields in the test section with trip wires of Table 3 were taken. Figure 9 shows two series of still pictures from two schlieren movies of the flame with 0.5 mm boundary layer trips at 11 and 2 mm upstream of the edge of the step. It is evident that the basic features of large scale structures remain unchanged. In both cases, large scale vortices clearly dominate the reaction zone. In Figure 9, the eddies almost lose their identity far downstream in the test section, while in Figure 9, the eddies clearly retain their identity all the way through the test section. Figure 10 shows the effect of 1.1 mm trip wire on the flow field inside the test section. Figure 10a (trip wire 11 mm upstream of step edges) shows almost no organized structures in the layer, while in Figure 10b (trip wire 2 mm upstream of the step edge), the large coherent structures are distinct vortices and preserve their identity all the way through the test section. Comparison of these figures shows the effect of the position of the trip wire. It is believed that the boundary layer has become turbulent in the case of Figure 10a (1.1 mm trip wire, 11 mm upstream of the edge), while in the other three cases the wire is buried in the laminar boundary layer acting as a disturbance to the layer. The large scale structures are not completely absent from the flow, but regular and identifiable structures with distinct braids and eyes are no longer visible. Examination of the schlieren movies corresponding to Figure 10 reveals that large eddies appear more frequently far downstream rather than close to the edge of the step and

that the recirculation zone is lengthened. Higher grain level in the schlieren records shows a higher level of mixedness and a smaller scale turbulence in the flow.

In the three cases in which the layer is dominated by large scale structures, in contrast to the untripped case, the initial layer has a higher growth rate, the eddies are further separated (large eddy distances) and there is higher small scale turbulence inside the large vortices. The coalescence of vortices was clearly observed in all of the above three cases. In similar nonreacting flows, the same trends were observed.

The results of these experiments explain the difference between the observations of Brown and Roshko[8] and the conclusions of Browand and Latigo[20]. Brown and Roshko[8] observed that placing wire trips just upstream of the trailing edge of the splitter plate did not disrupt the visible large structures a few boundary-layer thicknesses downstream, while Browand and Latigo[20] placed the wire trips further upstream to insure transition in the layer and concluded that the effect of the trips was to obstruct the interaction of large scale structures in the early stages of the formation of the mixing layer. From our experiments, we conclude that formation and interaction of the large coherent structures and the resulting sheer layer growth depends on the size and location of the disturbances in the upstream boundary layer.

Analysis of the schlieren movies for average eddy formation position and period shows that upstream disturbance of the boundary layer delays the formation of the vortices in the layer[18]. This is due to the thickening of the initial vorticity layer which makes it less susceptible to flow disturbances. We conclude that large coherent structures can form and play the major role in the development of the free shear layer

if the initial layer is laminar, otherwise, the formation and interaction of the large coherent structures is not observed.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In our laboratory combustor in which the flow is predominantly two dimensional, we have been able to demonstrate that both nonreacting and reacting flows are dominated by large scale, coherent vortex structures. The flame region is dominated by the fluid dynamics of the vortices, the sizer of which define the thickness of the apparent shear or mixing layer. The growth of the vortices and propagation of the flame are intimately linked. On the average the reacting eddies have a lower growth rate, are more closely distributed in space and have a slightly smaller rate of coalescence than nonreacting eddies. The dynamics of vortex pairing, observed by Winnant and Browand[9] in nonreacting flows is definitely one of the mechanisms for introduction of fresh reactant into the shear layer. The frequency of this pairing decreases as the flow moves downstream, probably due to the wall effect on the vertical motion of the vortices. The number of vortices decays exponentially downstream. The segments of fresh reactants, from the top of the flow, and also fully reacted products from the recirculation zone, which are entrained in the mixing layer are enveloped and strained before their disappearance in the eddies. This is similar to the process of entrainment observed in wakes. Entrainment of reactants by the action of small scale eddies and also growth of the large eddies. Tripping the boundary layer changes the structure of the eddies both in reacting and nonreacting shear layers and, consequently, is expected to change the structure of the

shear layer. Where the trip wire triggered the turbulent transition in the boundary layer, the coherent large scale structures could not be distinguished in the layer. Otherwise, the tripping just disturbs the boundary layer and delays the formation of coherent structures in the layer.

Just how truly two dimensional our flow is has not been fully established. The incoming flow is one dimensional, except at the walls which should not have an effect on the bulk of the flow in the combustion region. Time averaged probe measurements of composition and temperature indicate that the flow rate is time averaged two dimensional within ten percent over the transverse direction, except at the walls. The schlieren visibility of the vortices argues that they are predominantly two dimensional structures and uniform along the optical path and that the mixing layer is uniform across the combustor. The decreased definition of the flow structures in the downstream region of the combustor could be evidence of an increased three dimensionality of the flow or it could be the result of the fading of the optical density gradients in the other two dimensions. We did not check the form of the vortices in the third dimension as could be accomplished by observing the flame from the top of the combustor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The participation of Professor J. W. Daily and Professor A. K. Oppenheim and their students in closely related studies in this same apparatus was critical to the success of our work. K. Hom, H. Stewart, R. Jensen, V. Locke, and A. Shaw made essential contributions in the design, construction, and operation of the combustor facility and its associated instrumentation. We particularly appreciate the interaction and assistance we have had from other graduate students associated with this project, especially Bob Pitz, Lisa Parker, Chris Hostetter, and Steve Young.

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract W-7405-ENG-48.

REFERENCES

1. R. E. Jones, "Gas Turbine Engine Emissions, Problems, Progress and Future," Progress in Energy and Combustion Science, 4, 2, 73-113, (1978).

2. A. H. Lefebvre (Editor), "Lean Premixed/Prevaporized Combustion," NASA CP-2016, (1977).

3. G. C. Williams, H. C. Hottel and A. C. Scurlock, "Flame Stabilization and Propagation in High Velocity Gas Streams," Third Symposium (International) on Combustion, 21-40, Williams and Wilkins, (1949).

4. F. H. Wright and E. E. Zukoski, "Flame Spreading from Bluff Body Flame Holders," Eighth Symposium (International) on Combustion, 933-943, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, (1962).

5. J. Laufer, "New Trends in Experimental Turbulent Research," Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics, 7, 307-326, (1975).

6. A. Roshko, "Structure of Turbulent Shear Flows: A New Look," AIAA Journal, 14, 10, 1349-1357, (1976).

7. P. O. A. L. Davies and A. J. Yule, "Coherent Structures in Turbulence," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 69, 3, 513-537, (1975).

8. G. L. Brown and A. Roshko, "On Density Effects and Large Structures in Turbulent Mixing Layers," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 64, 775-816, (1974).

9. C. D. Winnant and F. K. Browand, "Vortex Pairing: The Mechanism of Turbulent Mixing Layer Growth at Moderate Reynolds Numbers," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 63, 2, 237-255, (1974).

10. H. M. Nicholson and J. P. Field, "Some Experimental Techniques for the Investigation of the Mechanism of Flame Stabilization in the Wakes of Bluff Bodies," Third Symposium (International) on Combustion, 44-68, Williams and Wilkins, (1949).

11. J. H. Konrad, "An Experimental Investigation of Mixing in Two Dimensonal Turbulent Shear Flows with Application to Diffusion Limited Chemical Reactions," Project SQUID, Technical Report CIT-8-PU, Purdue University, (December 1976).

12. F. E. Marble and J. E. Broadwell, "The Coherent Flame Model for Turbulent Chemical Reactions," Project SQUID, Report 29314-6001-RU-00, (1977).

13. N. A. Chigier and A. J. Yule, "The Physical Structure of Turbulent Flames," AIAA Paper No. 79-0217, 17th Aerospace Sciences Meeting, New Orleans, La., January 15-17.

14. P. A. Libby and H. R. Reiss, "The Design of Two Dimensional Contraction Sections," Quarterly of Applied Mathematics, 10, 95-98, (1951).

15. C. K. Hostetter, "Effect of Free Stream Turbulence on a Step-Stabilized Flame," M. S. Thesis, Department of Mechnical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley (1978).

16. K. Wohl, et al., "On Structure of Turbulent Flames," Sixth Symposium (International) on Combustion, 333-340, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, (1975).

17. E. E. Zukoski and F. E. Marble, "Experiments Concerning the Mechanism of Flame Blow Off From Bluff Bodies," Proceedings of Gas Dynamics Symposium on Aerothermochemistry, 205-210, Northwestern University (1955).

18. A. R. Ganji, "Combustion and Stability Characteristics of a Premixed Vortex Dominated Two Dimensional Flow," Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, (1979).

19. H. W. Liepmann and J. Laufer, "Investigation of Free Turbulent Mixing," NACA-TN-1257 (1947).

20. R. G. Batt, "Some Measurements of the Effect of Tripping the Two Dimensional Shear Layer," AIAA Journal, 13, 2, 245-246, (1975).

21. F. K. Browand and B. O. Latigo, "The Growth of the Two Dimensional Mixing Layer from a Turbulent and Nonturbulent Boundary Layer," Project SQUID, Technical Report USC-1-PU, (1978).

22. H. Schlichting, "Boundary Layer Theory," McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Two dimensional combustor test section. Dimensions in mm.

Figure 2. Schlieren photographs of the flow field inside the combustor test section. Velocity 13.5 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8800 cm^{-1}, T_o = 295 K. Flow from left to right.

a. Flame, long exposure time (20 msec), ϕ = 0.52.

b. Flame, short exposure time (spark, < 1 msec), ϕ = 0.57.

c. Nonreacting flow, short exposure time (spark, < 1 sec), ϕ = 0.00.

Figure 3. Spark shadowgraphs of the flame behind the step for different reactant inlet velocities and Reynolds numbers. T_o = 295 K, exposure time < 1 μsec. Flow from left to right.

a. Velocity 9.1 m/sec, N_{Re} = 5900 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.60.

b. Velocity 13.3 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8600 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.60.

c. Velocity 22.2 m/sec, N_{Re} = 14400 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.58.

Figure 4. Sequential series of the frames from a high speed schlieren movie of the flame. The time interval between the frames is 0.67 msec. V_o = 13.3 m/sec, N_{Re} = 3900 cm^{-1}, ϕ = .53, T_o = 454 K. Flow from right to left.

Figure 5. Sequential series of the frames from a high speed schlieren movie of the nonreacting flow in the test section. The time interval between the frames is 1.13 msec. V_o = 13.0 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8474 cm^{-1}, T_o = 295 K. Flow from right to left.

Figure 6. Eddy trajectories fro a flame stabilized behind a step. V_o = 13.6 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8800 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.57, T_o = 295 K.

Figure 7. Two sequential series of the same high speed schlieren movie of a flame stabilized behind the step. V_o = 13.6 m/sec. N_{Re} = 8800 cm^{-1}, ϕ = .57, T_o = 295 K. Flow from right to left.

a. Normal formation and development of eddies in the mixing layer. Time interval between the frames is 1.16 msec.

b. Coalescence of a sequence of eddies and process of intrusion into the recirculation zone. Time interval between the frames is 1.22 msec.

Figure 8. Mixing layer spread in the test section, ● reacting layer, V_o = 13.6 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8800 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.57, T_o = 295 K; o nonreacting layer, V_o = 13.0 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8474 cm^{-1}, T_o = 295K.

Figure 9. Sequential series of frames from high speed schlieren movies of the flame with a tripped upstream boundary layer. V_o = 13.6 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8800 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.57, T_o = 295 K. Flow from right to left.

a. 0.5 mm trip wire located 11 mm upstream of the edge. Time interval between frames is 1.6 msec.

b. 0.5 mm trip wire located 2 mm upstream of the edge. Time interval between frames is 1.8 msec.

Figure 10. Sequential series of frames from high speed schlieren movies of the flame with a tripped upstream boundary layer. V_o = 13.6 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8800 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.57, T_o = 295 K. Flow from right to left.

a. 1.1 mm trip wire located 11 mm upstream of the edge. Time interval between frames is 1.46 msec.

b. 1.1 mm trip wire located 2 mm upstream of the edge. Time interval between frames is 1.3 msec.



EXPERIMENTAL APPARATUS

XBL 805-9533

Fig. 1



a. Flame, long exposure time (20 msec), ϕ = 0.52.



b. Flame, short exposure time (< 1 μsec), ϕ = 0.57.



c. Nonreacting flow, short exposure time (< 1 μsec), ϕ = 0.00.

Fig. 2

XBB 805-5523



a. Velocity 9.1 m/sec, N_{Re} = 5900 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.60

b. Velocity 13.3 m/sec, N_{Re} = 8600 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.60.



c. Velocity 22.2 m/sec, N_{Re} = 14400 cm^{-1}, ϕ = 0.58.

Fig. 3 Spark shadowgraphs of the flame behind the step for different reactant inlet velocities and Reynolds numbers. T_o = 295 K, exposure time < 1 μsec.

XBB 805-5524



Fig. 4

XBB 805-5525



Fig. 5

XBB 805-5526



XBL 805-9534

Fig. 6



Fig. 7

XBB 805-5527



XBL 805-9535

Fig. 8



Fig. 9

XBB 805-5528



Fig.10

XBB 805-5529