Investigations of Peripheral 4-jet Sonic and Supersonic Propulsive Deceleration Jets on a Mars Science Laboratory Aeroshell
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With the launch of Mars Science Laboratory (MSL), scheduled for 2011, Viking technology developed in the 1970’s is reaching its limits for entry, descent and landing (EDL) on Mars, necessitating research and development of other technologies for decelerating high mass Mars entry systems (HMMES), such as propulsive deceleration (PD) jets. In this paper planar laser-induced iodine fluorescence is utilized to obtain qualitative flow visualization images and quantitative PD jet mole fraction images of peripheral sonic and supersonic PD jet models in Mach 12 flow and compared to CFD computations. The models are 0.22% of the MSL frontal area, with Mach 1 and Mach 2.66 jets on the frontal aeroshell of the model, oriented normal to the hypersonic flow. The interactions of PD jets with a Mach 12 freestream flow are visualized with coefficients of thrust (CT) varying from 0.5 to 3.0 in increments of 0.5. It was found that as CT increases the shock stand-off distance increases for both sonic and supersonic cases, with the supersonic distance at a CT = 3.0 being 17% greater than the sonic distance. The jet penetration distance was measured to be 50% greater for the supersonic case at a CT = 3.0. Experimental results were compared with CFD calculations of the sonic 4-jet configuration. Very good comparison was shown in the streamline patterns and jet mole fraction distributions. Using the validated CFD model, preliminary calculations showed that the drag coefficient for the 4-jet peripheral case was 3 times larger than that for the single centerline jet case at a CT of 0.5 and 6 times larger at a CT of 1.5, both with sonic exit conditions and the same total mass flow rate. The preservation of the vehicle drag was attributed to the normal bow shock between the peripheral jets which does not exist in the single centerline jet. The total axial force coefficient (sum of CT and CD) was calculated to be twice as large for the peripheral 4 sonic jets as for the single sonic centerline jet at a CT of 0.5 and 50% larger at a CT of 1.5. This result suggests that, for the same total mass flow rate and sonic exit Mach number, the propulsive deceleration performance of the peripheral 4-jet PD design will be considerably greater relative to the single centerline PD jet. This result is important for the design of PD jet decelerators for EDL for future HMMES missions.

Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Coefficient of Drag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Thrust Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diameter [m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mach Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Mass Flow Rate [kg/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Pressure [N/m²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Dynamic Pressure [N/m²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Aeroshell Frontal Area [m²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Thrust [N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Velocity [m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>Ratio of Specific Heats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Introduction

Entry, descent, and landing (EDL) is one of many challenging aspects of Mars missions. A thin atmospheric density, roughly 1% of Earth’s, causes significant heating, but insufficient deceleration for high mass Mars entry systems (HMMES) [1]. Because of the thin atmosphere, as payload mass increases it becomes a greater challenge to adequately slow the landing vehicle quickly enough to facilitate parachute deployment and enter a landing configuration [1]. Therefore, as human-scale missions are planned – on the scale of orders of magnitude larger than landers to date – it becomes necessary to explore new methods for decelerating landing vehicles.

Retropropulsion, or propulsive deceleration (PD), has recently received renewed interest as an enabling technology for adequately decelerating HMMES at supersonic and hypersonic Mach numbers [2]. Single or multiple PD jets are fired from the aeroshell against the freestream velocity, using the jet thrust to achieve the deceleration. To date there is a dearth of experimental and computational data on multiple PD jets located around the periphery of the aeroshell [3]. The only available data conducted experiments for peripheral 3-jet PD models at freestream Mach numbers up to 6.0 using schlieren/shadowgraphs for visualizations and pressure taps/strain-gages for drag characteristics [4-6]. Previous experiments indicate that aerodynamic drag can be preserved to some extent while thrust force is increased for peripheral multiple jet configurations. Preservation of aerodynamic drag with increasing thrust shows promise for this technology as better enabling HMMES to decelerate. However little is known about the flow properties of the highly complex interaction of a supersonic/hypersonic freestream with sonic/supersonic peripheral PD jets.

This paper will present current work being performed at the University of Virginia to employ a technique known as planar laser-induced iodine fluorescence (PLIIF) to obtain visualization images for sonic and supersonic peripheral 4-jet PD models opposing a rarefied freestream at Mach 12. Experimental visualizations will be compared with computational fluid dynamic (CFD) numerical results obtained by the University of Michigan. Visualization images for multiple cases, as well as a quantitative PD jet mole fraction images, will be presented and discussed.

II. Experimental Technique (University of Virginia)

A. Facilities

PD jet experiments are conducted at the University of Virginia using a continuous flow hypersonic wind tunnel, as shown in Figure 1. The wind tunnel uses a continuously evacuated vacuum chamber to provide the low back pressures necessary to produce the hypersonic test section flow. Low chamber back pressures are achieved using three vacuum pumps – Stokes MicroVac pump, Roots Rotary Vane Booster pump, and a Roots Rotary Vane High Pressure pump – maintaining pressures on the order of 300 mtorr even when the main flow is introduced [7]. Three portholes in the wall of the vacuum chamber provide optical access for the collimated laser sheet necessary for PLIIF. A fourth porthole perpendicular to the laser sheet entry provides optical access for a CCD camera.
Figure 1: Hypersonic Wind Tunnel

The test section of the hypersonic wind tunnel is an underexpanded jet exhausting through a 2 mm sonic orifice into the continuously evacuated chamber [7]. As shown in Figure 2, the jet expands from a point source and produces a barrel shock, terminating in a Mach disk, approximately 8 cm downstream of the orifice. The isentropic core of the jet expansion provides a test section capable of Mach numbers from 1 to 16, and Knudsen numbers (ratio of mean free path to jet exit orifice diameter) to nearly 1. The Mach number, M, versus distance from the sonic orifice is calculated using the Ashkenas and Sherman relationship, as shown in equation 1:

\[
M = A \left( \frac{x-x_0}{D} \right)^{y-1} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma-1} \right) \left[ A \left( \frac{x-x_0}{D} \right)^{y-1} \right]^{-1}
\]

where \(x\) is the position along the jet centerline, and \(x_0\) and \(A\) are constants empirically determined by Ashkenas and Sherman for the specific heat ratio corresponding to \(N_2\), the test section gas [8]. MSL models are placed along the centerline of the underexpanded jet at positions corresponding to the desired Mach number calculated with the Ashkenas and Sherman relationship.

Figure 2: Calculation of model of Mach and Knudsen numbers in hypersonic test section [10]
B. PLIIF Experimental Method

PLIIF is an optical non-intrusive, time averaged measurement technique that has been extensively developed and used at the University of Virginia for nearly thirty years [7,9-12]. PLIIF uses I$_2$ as the fluorescing species and is capable of producing planar measurements for flow visualization, and quantitative measurement of mole fraction, velocity, pressure, density, and temperature. It is advantageous over other methods such as schlieren and shadowgraph due to its ability to provide sufficient signal for flowfield imaging even in rarefied regimes [10]. Another benefit of PLIIF is the ability to produce accurate measurements across shocks, unlike other methods such as particle image velocimetry [13].

The experimental set-up for the PLIIF method is pictured in Figure 3. A laser beam from a Spectra-Physics Beamlok 2080A argon ion laser, operating at 514.5 nm, is collimated into a thin laser sheet using a series of optics, pictured in the center right of Figure 1. The laser sheet propagates through the bottom porthole of the vacuum chamber and is incident on the top of the model after reflecting from two mirrors placed inside the chamber. The iodine fluoresces and this signal is captured at 90 degrees to the laser sheet by an Andor iKon-L CCD camera for exposure times from 10-45 seconds. Scattered laser light is blocked with a glass orange Heliopan #22 filter.

C. Model Design

Visualization results for two models will be shown and discussed: a sonic peripheral 4-jet model and a supersonic peripheral 4-jet model. The models are 0.22% scale of the Mars Science Laboratory (MSL) frontal aeroshell. The jets for the sonic and supersonic models are oriented normal to the direction of freestream flow which causes the jet exit orifice to be slightly elliptical. The sonic jet model has a jet exit diameter of 0.5 mm while the supersonic jet model has a jet exit diameter of 0.9 mm, with a throat diameter of 0.5 mm, corresponding to a jet exit Mach number of 2.66. The models are constructed of 316 stainless steel and painted matte black to minimize scattered light reflections from inside the chamber. Nitrogen seeded with iodine is supplied to the PD jets via a sting mounted to the aft body of the model.

D. Thrust Calculations

In order to compare experimental data from other facilities and CFD results, a non-dimensional coefficient of thrust ($C_T$) is used. $C_T$, defined by McGhee as the ratio of jet thrust to the freestream dynamic pressure times the frontal area of the model is as follows [14]:

$$C_T = \frac{T}{q_{\infty}S} = \frac{\dot{m}V_e + (p_e - p_a)A_e}{q_{\infty}S}$$  

(2)
The thrust coefficient in equation 2 was calculated using isentropic equations and the Ashkenas and Sherman (eq. 1) relationship for the freestream conditions.

III. CFD (University of Michigan)

Experimental results will be compared with numerical simulations from the University of Michigan. Numerical simulations are executed using LeMANS, a parallelized CFD code developed at the University of Michigan for simulating hypersonic reacting flows [15-18]. LeMANS solves the laminar three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations on unstructured computational grids, including thermo-chemical nonequilibrium effects. Mixing transport properties can be calculated using several options. For this study mixing transport properties are calculated using Wilke’s semi-empirical mixing with species viscosities calculated using Blottner’s model and species thermal conductivities determined using Eucken’s relation. The finite-volume method applied to unstructured grids is used to solve the set of partial differential equations. Time integration is performed using a point implicit or line implicit method [18].

The flow is modeled assuming that the continuum approximation is valid. Furthermore, for this work, it is assumed that the translational and rotational energy modes of all species can be described by two different temperatures $T_{\text{trans}}$ and $T_{\text{rot}}$, respectively, while the vibrational energy mode and electron energy of all species are frozen at the stagnation value (i.e. 300 K). In order to accurately simulate the flow in the experimental facility, I$_2$-seeded N$_2$ gas is used in the numerical simulations with a seeding ratio of 200 ppm. In the freestream, the rotational temperature is assumed to be equal to the translational temperature. Also, the Ashkenas and Sherman boundary conditions are used as flow conditions input to LeMANS at the upstream boundary. The solution results in the flowfield shown in Figure 4 for a $C_T$ of 0.5 and 1.5. The main flowfield features to be studied are demonstrated in Figure 4. The computation results in Figure 4 are for the sonic model with a $C_T$ of 0.5 and 1.5. Freestream flow is from left to right, the bow shock, PD jet flow structure and PD shock are as indicated.

![Figure 4: CFD computation of sonic 4-jet PD model, log scale](image)

IV. Results

A. Experimental Visualizations

Figures 5 and 6 are experimental PLIIF visualizations of the sonic and supersonic peripheral 4-jet PD models, respectively, at $C_T$ from 0.5 to 3.0 in increments of 0.5. Freestream flow is from the top of the images to the bottom. The forebody of the model MSL aeroshell is placed at the Mach 12 location in the hypersonic underexpanded jet test flowfield. The model is superimposed in the images to better orient the reader with the geometry of the image. In these images only two of the four jets are visible since the laser sheet passes through the center of two jets only. Furthermore, the flowfields are symmetric, so the images are mirrored about the model centerline to remove the Doppler shift effect which is otherwise observed in the fluorescence images [12].
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The sonic PD jets (Figure 5) are underexpanded jets much like the hypersonic test flowfield. The PD jets exit the orifice at Mach 1 and freely expand until they terminate in the jet shock. The PD jets cause the MSL bow shock to be pushed away from the model forebody. The bow shock location above the centerline of the model between the jets increases from a location which is approximately 15% of the frontal model diameter at a C_T of 0.5 to roughly 50% at a C_T of 3.0. The significance of this bow shock will be discussed later. For smaller C_T values, 0.5 to 1.5, there is fluorescence around the shoulder of the model from the aeroshell forebody which is not present at larger C_T values.

Figure 5: Sonic peripheral 4-jet PD model, M_\textit{jet} = 1.0, for range of C_T from 0.5 (a) to 3.0 (f).
Figure 6 is the supersonic peripheral 4-jet PD model and has a jet exit Mach number of 2.66, based on the nozzle area ratio. It is seen that the supersonic PD jets push up the bow shock further from the aeroshell than the sonic jets. The sonic PD jets have a larger jet turning angle than the supersonic case and a jet boundary that is broader. The shock stand-off distance, SSD, directly above the model centerline, normalized to the model frontal diameter, is shown in Figure 7 versus $C_T$. The stand-off distance for the supersonic case is approximately the same as the sonic case until a $C_T$ of 1.5. For $C_T$ of 3.0 the shock stand-off distance is about 17% greater for the supersonic case. Like the sonic case, the supersonic case also has fluorescence around the shoulder of the model for small values of $C_T$. The non-distinct boundaries of the shock above the supersonic jets for a $C_T$ of 3.0 could indicate unsteady flow.

Figure 6: Supersonic periphery 4-jet PD model, $M_{jet} = 2.66$, for $C_T$ from 0.5 (a) to 3.0 (f).
The maximum PD jet penetration distance, normalized to the model aeroshell diameter, versus $C_T$, is shown in Figure 8. The graph reflects the trends seen in the images: the supersonic jets extend further into the freestream than the sonic jets for all $C_T$ tested, even for small $C_T$ where the shock stand-off is roughly the same. The penetration distance for the supersonic case is 50% greater than the sonic case at $C_T = 3.0$.

Quantitative mole fraction images were also obtained using PLIIF. By taking the ratio of a jet-only seeded image to a full flow seeded image (Figure 9(a) divided by 9(b)) and normalizing the ratio by the value in the PD core where the jet mole fraction is unity, a jet mole fraction image results [19]. The fluorescence above the center of the model, between the PD jets, is only visible in the full flow seeded case (Figure 9(b)) which indicates the fluid in this region of the image is solely from compressed fluid behind the bow shock from the freestream flow. The significance of the bow shock seen in Figure 9(b) will be discussed later. The results of the mole fraction images are shown in Figure 10 for the sonic and supersonic PD jet models for a $C_T$ of 1.5. The color contours give spatially-resolved quantitative values of the local jet mole fraction which are due to the PD jet mixing with the Mach 12 freestream. These quantitative images provide the opportunity to validate CFD results, as will be shown in the next section of this paper.
Figure 9: Supersonic peripheral 4-jet PD model, $M_{\text{jet}} = 2.66$, for two iodine seeding cases

(a) $C_T = 1.5$, jet only seeded  
(b) $C_T = 1.5$, full flow seeded

Figure 10: Experimental 4-jet PD mole fraction images, $C_T = 1.5$

(a) Sonic peripheral 4-jet PD model, $M_{\text{jet}} = 1.0$

(b) Supersonic peripheral 4-jet PD model, $M_{\text{jet}} = 2.66$
B. Numerical Simulation Comparisons

CFD calculated streamlines overlay the experimental visualizations of the sonic model for \( C_T \) of 0.5 and 1.5 in Figure 11. Overall there is very good agreement between the CFD calculated streamlines and the shock structure and jet mixing as seen in the visualizations. The CFD calculations begin in the PD jet plenum and calculate the flow through the jet nozzle. It is seen that the PD jet freely expands from the nozzle exit until the bow shock, at which point the flow is swept out away from the model and downstream. Between the PD jets the freestream flow compresses in a shock and the streamlines continue down to the model surface, at which point they reverse direction and follow the PD jet flow out from the model and downstream.

Comparisons between CFD and experimental mole fraction for the sonic model are shown in Figure 12 for a \( C_T \) of 1.5. Overall there is good agreement between the CFD calculations and the quantitative experimental results. Discrepancies arise after the shoulder of the model in part due to two factors. First, physical constrains limit the experimental aft body model angle to 35 degrees whereas the CFD utilizes a model with a 50 degree aft body angle. Secondly, CFD does not yet take into account the model sting. Both of these factors could contribute to the greater expansion that is observed in the CFD relative to the experiment downstream of the model shoulder; however since the pressure is very low on the vehicle aft body, it is expected that this discrepancy will not have a significant impact on the calculation of the vehicle drag coefficient. Experimental results do not resolve any jet fluid mixing downstream of the model near the sting. Figure 13 plots the jet mole fraction versus the distance \( L \), normalized by the model diameter \( D \), for the CFD calculations and PLIIF results along the lines A and B as seen in Figure 12. Profile A, through the jet core, corresponds to the nozzle exit at \( L/D_{\text{model}} = 0 \) and increases away from the nozzle exit. The sharp drop in jet mole fraction across the jet boundary and shock is clearly visible. Profile B, a cross sectional cut in the jet core, is centered at \( L/D_{\text{model}} = 0 \) which corresponds to the intersection of lines A and B in Figure 12. \( L/D_{\text{model}} \) increasing indicates moving toward the shoulder of the model, as shown in Figure 12.

![Figure 11: Numerical calculation of streamlines with experimental visualization, sonic PD model \( M_{\text{jet}} = 1.0 \)](image)

(a) \( C_T = 0.5 \)

(b) \( C_T = 1.5 \)
again the jet mole fraction drops off sharply across the jet boundaries. Very good agreement is seen between the quantitative PLIIF mole fraction profiles and the CFD predictions.

Figure 12: Experimental PD jet mole fraction compared to CFD, sonic model, $M_{jet} = 1.0$, $C_T = 1.5$

Figure 13: Experiment jet mole fraction and CFD comparison along lines A and B in Figure 12
Calculated coefficient of drag ($C_D$) and total axial force (sum of $C_D$ and $C_T$) for the sonic peripheral 4-jet configuration and sonic single centerline (Central) jet configuration are shown in Figure 14. As shown in this figure, $C_D$ decreases when the peripheral jets are turned on for $C_T = 0.5$ and 1.5; however, the decrease is considerably less than the previous reported [18] single centerline jet case also shown in this figure. The total axial force in the 4-jet peripheral case increases, even for $C_T = 0.5$, unlike the single centerline (Central) sonic case, which can be seen to decrease for low $C_T$. The $C_D$ is approximately 3 times greater for the peripheral case than for the single centerline case for a $C_T$ of 0.5 and 6 times greater for a $C_T$ of 1.5. The total axial force coefficient is 2 times greater for the peripheral case at a $C_T$ of 0.5 and 1.5 times greater at a $C_T$ of 1.5. This implies that the propulsive deceleration with 4 peripheral jets will be twice that of a single centerline jet (both with sonic orifices and the same total mass flow rate) for a $C_T = 0.5$ and 50% greater for $C_T = 1.5$. It is likely that this vehicle drag preservation by the peripheral jets is caused by the presence of the normal bow shock between the jets (as seen in Figures 4, 5, 6, 9(b) and 11), unlike the single centerline jet which reduces the strength of the vehicle bow shock wave.

![Figure 14: Drag and total axial force coefficients for sonic centerline (Central) and sonic 4-jet peripheral (Peripheral) models](image)

V. Conclusion

Experimental qualitative PLIIF flow visualizations and quantitative mole fraction images have been presented and discussed for multiple sonic and supersonic peripheral jets on a MSL frontal aeroshell at Mach 12. Experimental results for the range of $C_T$ from 0.5 to 3.0, in increments of 0.5, have demonstrated that as $C_T$ increases shock standoff distance also increases, with a 17% greater value for the supersonic jets relative to the sonic 4-jet PD model at a $C_T$ of 3.0. The jet penetration for the supersonic case was measured to be approximately 50% greater than the sonic case at a $C_T$ of 3.0. Further differences in the flow fields were observed, including a greater PD jet turning angle and broader jet boundary in the sonic case and possible flow unsteadiness in the supersonic case at the highest $C_T$, as demonstrated by the non-distinct bow shock structure in the image.

CFD appears to capture the major flow characteristics as shown by the experimental results. Overall there is good agreement between shock structure and calculated CFD streamlines for the sonic PD model at $C_T$ of 0.5 and 1.5.
Mole fraction calculations are in good agreement with the experimental results, however there is some difference around the model shoulder, where CFD predicts more flow expansion. This difference could be due to the slightly different aft body angle of the experimental model and influence of the mounting sting.

Using the validated CFD model, preliminary calculations have shown that for the peripheral jet case versus the centerline jet case (both with sonic exit flow and same total mass flow rate), the peripheral 4-jet case versus the single centerline has 3 times greater $C_D$ at $C_T = 0.5$ and 6 times greater at $C_T = 1.5$. This is likely due to the normal bow shock that exists between the peripheral jets which preserves the vehicle drag relative to the single centerline jet case which weakens the vehicle bow shock. The total axial force coefficient (sum of $C_D$ and $C_T$) was calculated to be 2 times greater for the peripheral jets for $C_T = 0.5$ and 50% greater for $C_T = 1.5$. This implies that the propulsive deceleration with 4 peripheral jets will be significantly greater than with a single centerline jet. This result is important to the design of PD jet systems for EDL for future HMMES missions.

VI. Future Work

Future CFD work will include calculations with the same physical model geometry as the experiment, as well as an inclusion of the model sting in these calculations. The CFD calculations will also be done for $C_T = 1.0$, 2.0, and 2.5 in order to more completely characterize the results shown in Figure 14 above. Future experimental work will produce quantitative measurements of flowfield temperature, pressure, density and velocity for selected $C_T$ values at the University of Virginia. These additional quantitative results will again be compared with computed results from the University of Michigan.
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