

Convective heat flux determination using surface temperature history measurements and an inverse calculation method

J. Jurie Bezuidenhout

Committee Chairman: J.A. Schetz.

Aerospace and Ocean Engineering Department.

(ABSTRACT)

Effective gages and methods to measure heat transfer have been established over decades. The combined measurement of skin friction and heat flux using one single gage on the other hand, presents unique opportunities and, with them, unique technical problems. One of the most important criteria in designing such a sensor is the physical size of the gage to minimize both the interference of the flow and the mass of these devices. In most cases the mass is an important criteria, because these devices are installed in aircraft. The mass also influences the time response of these devices.

The overall objective of this study is, therefore, to develop a small, accurate and cost-effective gage that can be used to measure heat flux and can also be combined with a skin friction sensor. The method proposed in this study is a coaxial surface thermocouple. By using the temperature history and a computer program, the heat flux through the surface can be obtained through an iterative inverse method, making use of regularization and the introduction of bias. To ensure that the heat flux through the gage is the same as the heat flux through the rest of the surface, the gage is manufactured from a material very similar to the rest of the surface. A one-dimensional approach was followed, and a look at some two-dimensional effects was necessary to verify any shortcomings of the one-dimensional assumption.

Walker developed a computer program based on an inverse approach capable of predicting the heat flux through a surface from the measured surface temperature history. The biggest advantages of this method are its stability and the small amount of noise induced into the system. The drawback of the program as originally written by Walker, is its limitation to semi-infinite objects, or objects with a fixed temperature at the interior boundary. To remove this limitation for surfaces with a finite thickness, a second thermocouple was installed into the system some distance below the first thermocouple. By extending the computer program, these two unsteady temperatures can be used to predict the heat flux through a surface of finite thickness. As part of this study, the effect of noise induced by the Cook-Felderman technique found in the literature was investigated in detail, and it was concluded that the method proposed in this study is superior to the Cook-Felderman method.

Heat flux measurements with the current method compared well with measurements recorded with a commercially-available layered heat flux gage for a test case of a model turbine blade in a linear cascade. The model was aluminum and a special aluminum/constantan thermocouple was used. In all cases evaluated, the difference was less than 20%. This agreement is deemed acceptable since the conventional layered heat flux gage is subject to measurement uncertainties. Conventional layered heat flux gages on their own can measure surface heat flux accurately for specific applications. These gages are, however, too large and expensive to install in a skin-friction gage. The results from the method introduced in this study are somewhat noisier than those from the heat flux gages, but the size of the current gage is much smaller when using a coaxial thermocouple to measure the surface temperature history. A coaxial thermocouple gage is also much more robust, cheaper and simpler to manufacture than the other types of heat flux sensors. Finally, it is important to note that no calibration of the current gage is required.

Acknowledgements

Soli Due Gloria

Thanks to Dr Joseph Schetz, my advisor, for all his advice and patience during my time of study. Thanks also for every thing else that you've done. From the first day I arrived in Blacksburg, to the very last day, I will never forget the short American guy, who is crazy about hunting. Prof. Jan Visser is also at the top of the list for his financial and mental support throughout the past two years. If it weren't for him I would not have done any graduate studying.

A special thanks goes to Greg Walker for helping me with understanding of the inverse method of heat flux determination and for allowing me to use his Fortran codes as a starting point for what I tried to accomplish.

Thanks to Lance Jacobsen for helping me run the tunnel and for the setup of a Lab-View program to obtain all the data I needed. Dwight Smith, thanks also to you for the data you helped to take. Thanks also to all the other members of the research groups I worked with.

Thanks to Bruce, Kent and Bill, as well as the other shop guys for all your help during the year.

Last, but not at all the least, I would like to thank my family and friends (In South Africa and at Tech) for their tremendous support during the past two years. I think that if it weren't for you I would have never made it this far.

“Love y'all.”

Thanks !!

Contents

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER 1 CONVECTIVE HEAT TRANSFER: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE	
.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	2
1.2 Literature.....	3
1.3 Data reduction.....	10
1.4 Application and motivation for this study.....	18
1.5 Objective	19
CHAPTER 2 TRIAL APPLICATION OF THE COOK-FELDERMAN TECHNIQUE.....	21
2.1 Implementation of the Cook-Felderman technique	22
2.2 Theoretical studies	22
2.2 Experimental set-up	27
CHAPTER 3 WALKER’S INVERSE METHOD.....	32
3.1 Walker’s approach to the inverse method	33
CHAPTER 4 AN EXTENSION OF THE WALKER CODE AND TRIAL APPLICATION...	
.....	38
4.1 Extending the Walker code.....	39

4.2 Noise decrease	40
4.2 Experimental test case	44
4.3 Experimental set-up	44
4.4 Conclusion.....	55
CHAPTER 5 INVESTIGATION OF 2-D EFFECTS.....	56
5.1 The effect of 2-D heat flow	57
5.2 The estimation of 2-D effects	57
CHAPTER 6 ACCURACY INVESTIGATION.	62
6.1 Comparison of results	63
6.2 Possible errors in the process of converting from voltage to heat flux	65
6.3 Residuals	71
CHAPTER 7 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS.....	74
7.1 Summary.....	75
7.2 Conclusions.....	76
7.3 Recommendations	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	78
APPENDIXES.....	82
Appendix A Grid independence and time step convergence	82
Appendix B Thermocouples	84
Appendix C Resistor-capacitor low-pass filters.....	86
Appendix D The supersonic/cascade wind tunnel.....	88
Appendix E The code	91
VITA.....	102

List of Tables

- 1)..Table 4.1 Comparison of properties between the model blade and the thermocouple48
- 2) Table 5.1 The six heat flux values at 4 seconds.59
- 3) Table 6.1 Comparing the physical properties of the blade and the thermocouple69

List of Figures

1) Figure 1.1 Basic concept of a layered gage.	4
2) Figure 1.2 A wire wound gage. Constantan wire on the one side is plated with copper.	5
3) Figure 1.3 Temperature measurements at two different locations.	5
4) Figure 1.4 Principle of the slug calorimeter.	7
5) Figure 1.5 Null-point calorimeter concept sketch.	7
6) Figure 1.6 Coaxial thermocouple.	9
7) Figure 1.7 Illustrating the Cook-Felderman technique.	12
8) Figure 1.8 Illustration of grid spacing problems that might occur	16
9) Figure 2.1 Theoretical surface temperature curve calculated from a constant flux of 10 MW/m ²	23
10) Figure 2.2 The heat flux deduced from the temperature curve in figure 2.1, using Cook- Felderman.	23
11) Figure 2.3 Temperature curve calculated from a known flux of 10 MW/m ² , but this time with superimposed noise	24
12) Figure 2.4 Cook-Felderman predicted heat flux using noisy temperature input	24
13) Figure 2.5 Temperature curve calculated from a known flux of 10 MW/m ² , but this time with lower frequency noise superimposed.	25
14) Figure 2.6. Predicted heat flux using Cook-Felderman with the temperature in figure 2.5 as input	25
15) Figure 2.7 Created temperature signal with superimposed random noise	26
16) Figure 2.8 The flux for the temperature in figure 2.7 using Cook-Felderman.....	26
17) Figure 2.9 Experimental set-up for tests conducted in the supersonic windtunnel.	27
18) Figure 2.10 Temperature measured on the supersonic windtunnel wall.	28
19) Figure 2.11 Predicted heat flux from the temperature in figure 2.2 calculated with the Cook-Felderman technique	28
20) Figure 2.12 Temperature signal after filtering was done	29
21) Figure 2.13 Predicted heat flux from the temperature in figure 2.12 calculated with the Cook-Felderman technique	29

22) Figure 2.14 Average of the temperature profile in figure 2.12.....30

23) Figure 2.15 Predicted heat flux from the temperature in figure 2.14 calculated with
the Cook-Felderman technique.30

24) Figure 3.1 True inverse approach with the temperature measured a distance X_1 below
the surface.33

25) Figure 3.2 Schematic inverse approach after one step.35

26) Figure 3.3 Schematic inverse approach after a subsequent step.....35

27) Figure 3.4 Flowchart showing the logic behind the inverse approach.36

28) Figure 4.1 Input temperature signal with superimposed noise with frequency 16 kHz40

29) Figure 4.2 Predicted heat flux using the Cook-Felderman technique and the
temperature in figure 4.1 as input.41

30) Figure 4.3 Predicted heat flux using the inverse method and the temperature in
figure 4.1 as input42

31) Figure 4.4 Created temperature signal with superimposed random noise42

32) Figure 4.5 The flux for the temperature in figure 4.4 using Cook-Felderman.43

33) Figure 4.6 The flux for the temperature in figure 4.4 using the inverse approach.....43

34) Figure 4.7 Virginia Tech cascade tunnel.44

35) Figure 4.8 Instrumented blades in the cascade tunnel.45

36) Figure 4.9 The blades in the tunnel with the film-cooling-air pipe.46

37) Figure 4.10 A 3-D view of the blade.46

38) Figure 4.11 The blade with the two thermocouple positions.....47

39) Figure 4.12 Al-Constantan thermocouple.....48

40) Figure 4.13 Experimental set-up.....49

41) Figure 4.14 Measured surface and internal temperature..50

42) Figure 4.15 Difference between the measured and calculated temperature, using the
original code that assumes semi-infinite body.50

43) Figure 4.16 RTS surface temperature.51

44) Figure 4.17 Comparison of the RTS and coaxial surface temperatures..52

45) Figure 4.18 HFS heat flux..52

46) Figure 4.19 Heat flux predicted with a simple implicit finite difference (Class 2) technique	53
47) Figure 4.20 Predicted heat flux from the extended inverse code	54
48) Figure 4.21 Same flux as in figure 4.20 but with the Cook-Felderman technique	54
49) Figure 5.1 Illustrating the origin of the slab	58
50) Figure 5.2 The slab used for 1-D verification.....	58
51) Figure 5.3 The six heat flux values measure on the blade	59
52) Figure 5.4 FlowTherm calculation of the temperature profiles the slab after 1s.....	60
53) Figure 5.5 FlowTherm calculation of the temperature profiles the slab after 4s.....	60
54) Figure 6.1 Comparison of the two heat fluxes from the HFS gage and the extended inverse code, using the temperature from the coaxial thermocouple	63
55) Figure 6.2 The difference in the flux measured by two methods.	64
56) Figure 6.3 Layout of the experimental set-up.....	66
57) Figure 6.4 Physical ice-bath	66
58) Figure 6.5 The Al/Constantan thermocouple calibration curve.....	67
59) Figure 6.6 Heat flux for a calibration factor of $40.7 \mu\text{V}/^\circ\text{C}$	68
60) Figure 6.7 Predicted heat flux with thermal conductivity of 155 W/mK from the temperature in figure 4.14.....	69
61) Figure 6.8 Predicted heat flux with thermal conductivity of 180 W/mK from the temperature in figure 4.14.....	70
62) Figure 6.9 Percentage difference in the temperatures calculated with Cook-Felderman. ..	71
63) Figure 6.10 Residuals calculated for the inverse method.	72
64) Figure 6.11 Residuals calculated for the HFS heat flux gage	72
65) Figure 6.12 The measured temperature and the temperatures calculated with Duhamel's method for the three different case	73