Interactions Between Embedded Vortices and Injectant From Film Cooling Holes with Compound Angle Orientations in a Turbulent Boundary Layer
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ABSTRACT

Experimental results are presented which describe the effects of embedded, longitudinal vortices on heat transfer and film injectant downstream of two staggered rows of film cooling holes with compound angle orientations. Holes are oriented so that their angles with respect to the test surface are 30 degrees in a spanwise/normal plane projection, and 35 degrees in a streamwise/normal plane projection. A blowing ratio of 0.5, non-dimensional injection temperature parameter of about 1.5, and freestream velocity of 10 m/s are employed. Injection hole diameter is 0.945 cm to give a ratio of vortex core diameter to hole diameter of 1.6-1.67 just downstream of the injection holes (x/d=10.2). At the same location, vortex circulation magnitudes range from 0.15 m²/s to 0.18 m²/s. Surveys of streamwise mean velocity, secondary flow vectors, total pressure, and streamwise mean vorticity are also presented which further substantiate these findings.

The most important conclusion is that local heat transfer and injectant distributions are strongly affected by the longitudinal embedded vortices, including their directions of rotation and their spanwise positions with respect to film injection holes. Differences resulting from vortex rotation are due to secondary flow vectors, especially beneath vortex cores, which are in different directions with respect to the spanwise velocity components of injectant after it exits the holes. When secondary flow vectors near the wall are in the same direction as the spanwise components of the injectant velocity (clockwise rotating vortices R0-R4), the film injectant is more readily swept beneath vortex cores and into vortex upwash regions than for the opposite situation in which near-wall secondary flow vectors are opposite to the spanwise components of the injectant velocity (counter-clockwise rotating vortices L0-L4). Consequently, higher St/Sto are present over larger portions of the test surface with vortices R0-R4 than with vortices L0-L4. These disruptions to the injectant and heat transfer from the vortices are different from the disruptions which result when similar vortices interact with injectant from holes with simple angle orientations. Surveys of streamwise mean velocity, secondary flow vectors, total pressure, and streamwise mean vorticity are also presented which further substantiate these findings.

INTRODUCTION

Accounting for the presence of embedded longitudinal vortices is important for the design of cooling schemes for turbine blades and turbine endwalls. This is because embedded vortices are abundant in the passages between turbine blades. In addition, their presence results in significant perturbations to distributions of film coolant along with the accompanying thermal protection. Of importance are the magnitudes of perturbations to wall heat transfer and injectant distributions resulting from the interactions between the vortices and the film coolant, as illustrated by a number of recent studies. These include investigations of the interactions of embedded vortices

NOMENCLATURE

A vortex generator delta wing angle of attack
c average vortex core radius
Cp specific heat
d injection hole diameter
m blowing ratio, $\rho UC_p/\rho_\infty U_c$
S non-dimensional circulation, $F/UC_p$
S1 non-dimensional circulation, $F/UC_p 2c$
St Stanton number with vortex and film injection
Sto baseline Stanton number, no vortex, no film injection
Stf Stanton number with film injection and no vortex
T static temperature
U mean velocity
X streamwise distance
Y distance normal to the surface
Z spanwise distance from test surface centerline
$\bar{X}$ unheated starting length
$\rho$ density
$\theta$ non-dimensional injection temperature, $T_{inj}/(T_{inj} - T_{inj,\infty})$
$F/UC_p$

Subscripts

f injectant at exits of injection holes
r recovery condition
w wall
n normal component
s spanwise component
00 freestream
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with film injection from slots (Blair, 1974), with film injection from rows of holes (Goldstein and Chen, 1985, 1987; Ligrani et al., 1989a, 1991), as well as with film injectant from a single hole (Ligrani and Williams, 1990). According to Ligrani et al. (1991), the complicated nature of these physical situations results because of the dependence of local heat transfer and injection distributions on vortex strength, vortex size, and vortex location relative to a vast array of film cooling injection rates, hole sizes, geometries and configurations. Experimental studies of the interactions of embedded vortices and film cooling are scarce. Of earlier studies, Blair (1974) reports heat transfer distributions measured on an endwall film-cooled using a slot inclined at a 30 degree angle. Another work by Ligrani et al. (1991) describes the effects of an array of film cooling holes embedded in a turbulent boundary layer. In that study, each hole is inclined at an angle of 30 degrees with respect to the test surface, and spaced 3-hole diameters from neighboring holes. Surface heat transfer distributions, mean velocities, and mean temperatures show that film coolant is greatly disturbed and local Stanton numbers are altered significantly by the secondary flows within vortices. To further clarify the interactions between vortices and wall jets, Ligrani and Williams (1990) examined the effects of an embedded vortex on injectant from a single film-cooling hole in a turbulent boundary layer. Attention is focussed on the effect of spanwise position of the vortices with respect to film injection holes. The main conclusion is that injection hole centerlines must be at least 2.9-3.4 vortex core diameters away from the vortex center in the lateral direction to avoid significant alterations to wall heat transfer and distributions of film coolant. Ligrani et al. (1991) then considered the influences of vortex strength on heat transfer and injectant distributions downstream of a single row of holes having the same geometry employed by Ligrani et al. (1989a). In Ligrani et al. (1991), a variety of vortex strengths are considered, with circulations as large as 0.150 m/s. One of the most important conclusions from this study is that magnitudes of perturbations to injectant distributions are dependent upon the ratio of vortex circulation to injection velocity times hole diameter ($S = \Gamma / U_d d$), and the ratio of vortex circulation to injection velocity times vortex core diameter ($S_1 = \Gamma / U_d 2c_0$).

Experimental studies of the interactions of embedded longitudinal vortices on film cooling from a single row of film cooling holes in a turbulent boundary layer. In that study, each hole is inclined at an angle of 30 degrees with respect to the test surface, and spaced 3-hole diameters from neighboring holes. Surface heat transfer distributions, mean velocities, and mean temperatures show that film coolant is greatly disturbed and local Stanton numbers are altered significantly by the secondary flows within vortices. To further clarify the interactions between vortices and wall jets, Ligrani and Williams (1990) examined the effects of an embedded vortex on injectant from a single film-cooling hole in a turbulent boundary layer. Attention is focussed on the effect of spanwise position of the vortices with respect to film injection holes. The main conclusion is that injection hole centerlines must be at least 2.9-3.4 vortex core diameters away from the vortex center in the lateral direction to avoid significant alterations to wall heat transfer and distributions of film coolant. Ligrani et al. (1991) then considered the influences of vortex strength on heat transfer and injectant distributions downstream of a single row of holes having the same geometry employed by Ligrani et al. (1989a). In Ligrani et al. (1991), a variety of vortex strengths are considered, with circulations as large as 0.150 m/s. One of the most important conclusions from this study is that magnitudes of perturbations to injectant distributions are dependent upon the ratio of vortex circulation to injection velocity times hole diameter ($S = \Gamma / U_d d$), and the ratio of vortex circulation to injection velocity times vortex core diameter ($S_1 = \Gamma / U_d 2c_0$).

EXPERIMENTAL APPARATUS AND PROCEDURES

Wind tunnel and coordinate system. The wind tunnel is the same one used in the experiments of Ligrani et al. (1989a, 1991). The facility is open-circuit, subsonic, and located in the laboratories of the Department of Mechanical Engineering of the Naval Postgraduate School. A centrifugal blower is located at the upstream end, followed by a diffuser, a header containing three separate streams, and then a 16 to 1 contraction ratio nozzle. The nozzle leads to the test section which is a rectangular duct 3.05 m long and 0.61 m wide, with a topwall having adjustable height to permit changes in the streamwise pressure gradient. A schematic showing the test section and coordinate system is presented in Fig. 1. The vortex generator base plate is shown to be located 0.48 m downstream of the boundary layer trip. The left edge of this base plate (looking downstream) is the base edge referred to in Table 1 as a location reference line. The downstream edge of the injection holes is then 0.684 m further downstream of this base plate. The surface used for heat transfer measurements is then located a short distance farther downstream. With this surface at elevated temperature, an unheated starting length of 1.077 m exists, and the direction of heat transfer is then from the wall to the gas. Thermocouple row locations along the test surface are also labelled in Fig. 1. In regard to the coordinate system, Z is the spanwise coordinate measured from the test section centerline, X is measured from the upstream edge of the boundary layer trip, and Y is measured normal to the test surface. x is measured from the downstream edge of the injection holes and generally presented as x/d.

Injection system. The injection system is described by Ligrani, et al (1989a, 1991). Air for the injection system originates in a 1.5 horsepower DR513 Roton Blower capable of producing 30 cfm at 2.5 psig. From the blower, air flows through a regulating valve, a Fisher and Porter rotometer, a diffuser, and finally into the injection heat exchanger and plenum chamber. The exchanger provides means to heat the injectant above ambient temperature. With this system and test plate heating, the non-dimensional injection temperature parameter $\theta$ was maintained at about 1.5 for all tests to maintain conditions similar to ones existing in gas turbine components. The plenum connects to thirteen plexiglass tubes, each 8 cm long with a length/diameter ratio of 8.4. With no vortex present, boundary layer displacement thickness at the injection location is 0.28d.
Injection system performance was checked by measuring discharge coefficients which compared favorably with earlier measurements. Procedures to measure discharge coefficients and blowing ratios are described by Ligrani et al. (1989a).

**Experimental approach.**

In order to isolate the interactions between film injectant and the vortices embedded in turbulent boundary layers, measurements are made on a flat plate in a zero pressure gradient. Wind tunnel speed is 10 m/s, and temperature differences are maintained at levels less than 30 degrees Centigrade so that viscous dissipation is negligible and fluid properties are maintained approximately constant. With this approach, many of the other effects present in high-temperature engines are not present (curvature, high free-stream turbulence, variable properties, stator/blade wake interactions, shock waves, compressibility, rotation, etc.) since these may obscure and complicate the interaction of interest.

Detailed measurements are made on a flat plate in a zero pressure gradient. Wind tunnel speed is 10 m/s, and temperature differences are maintained at levels less than 30 degrees Centigrade so that viscous dissipation is negligible and fluid properties are maintained approximately constant. With this approach, many of the other effects present in high-temperature engines are not present (curvature, high free-stream turbulence, variable properties, stator/blade wake interactions, shock waves, compressibility, rotation, etc.) since these may obscure and complicate the interaction of interest.

Detailed measurements are made on a flat plate in a zero pressure gradient. Wind tunnel speed is 10 m/s, and temperature differences are maintained at levels less than 30 degrees Centigrade so that viscous dissipation is negligible and fluid properties are maintained approximately constant. With this approach, many of the other effects present in high-temperature engines are not present (curvature, high free-stream turbulence, variable properties, stator/blade wake interactions, shock waves, compressibility, rotation, etc.) since these may obscure and complicate the interaction of interest.

Detailed measurements are made on a flat plate in a zero pressure gradient. Wind tunnel speed is 10 m/s, and temperature differences are maintained at levels less than 30 degrees Centigrade so that viscous dissipation is negligible and fluid properties are maintained approximately constant. With this approach, many of the other effects present in high-temperature engines are not present (curvature, high free-stream turbulence, variable properties, stator/blade wake interactions, shock waves, compressibility, rotation, etc.) since these may obscure and complicate the interaction of interest.

**Mean velocity components.**

Three mean velocity components were measured using a five-hole pressure probe with a conical tip manufactured by United Sensors Corporation. Celeseco transducers and Carrier Demodulators are used to sense pressures when connected to probe output ports. Following Ligrani et al. (1989b), corrections were made to account for spatial resolution and downwash velocity effects. The same automated traverse used for injectant surveys was used to obtain surveys of secondary flow vectors, from which, mean streamwise vorticity contours were calculated. These devices, measurement procedures employed, as well as data acquisition equipment and procedures used are further detailed by Ligrani et al. (1989a, 1989c).

**Stanton number measurements.**

Details on measurement of local Stanton numbers are given by Ortiz (1987), Bishop (1990), and Ligrani et al. (1989a, 1991). An overview of these procedures is repeated here for completeness.

The heat transfer surface is designed to provide a constant heat flux over its area. The surface next to the airstream is stainless steel foil painted flat black. Immediately beneath this is a liner containing 126 thermocouples, which is just above an Electrotif Corp. etched foil heater rated at 120 volts and 1500 watts. Located below the heater are several layers of insulating materials including Lexan sheets, foam insulation, styrofoam and balsa wood. Surface temperature levels and convective heat transfer rates are controlled by adjusting power into the heater using a Standard Electric Co. Variac, type 3000B. To determine the heat loss by conduction, an energy balance was performed. Radiation losses from the top of the test surface were analytically estimated. The thermal contact resistance between thermocouples and the foil top surface was estimated on the basis of outputs of the thermocouples and measurements from calibrated liquid crystals on the surface of the foil. This difference was then correlated as a function of heat flux through the foil. The convective heat flux q and surface temperature T_w are then used to determine Stanton numbers using St=q/(T_w − Tr∞) P_m U_m Cp.

After the surface was completed, a variety of qualification tests were conducted to check its performance. These are described in detail by Ortiz (1987).

**Mean temperature measurements.**

Copper-constantan thermocouples were used to measure temperatures along the surface of the test plate, the freestream temperature, as well as temperature distributions which are correlated to injection distributions. For the distributions, a thermocouple was traversed over spanwise/normal planes (800 probe locations) using an automated two-dimensional traversing system which could be placed at different streamwise locations. Ligrani et al. (1989a, 1991) give additional details including procedures used for calibration.

**Baseline data checks.**

Baseline data with no film injection already exist for similar test conditions (Ligrani et al., 1989a). Figure 2 shows that repeated measurements of spanwise-averaged Stanton numbers show good agreement (maximum deviation is 5 percent) with the correlation from Kays and Crawford (1980) for turbulent heat transfer to a flat plate with unheated starting length and constant heat flux boundary condition. Also included on this figure are results from Bishop (1990), which also show good agreement with the correlation of Kays and Crawford (1980). Local and spanwise-averaged Stanton numbers with injection at a blowing ratio of 0.5 (and no vortex) also show agreement with earlier results (Ligrani et al., 1989a).
These data are also consistent with other results in the literature and include:

- Freestream recovery temperature and wall temperature are 18.0 and 40.0 degrees Centigrade, with respective uncertainties of 0.13 and 0.21 degrees Centigrade. The freestream density, freestream velocity, and specific heat uncertainties are 0.009 kg/m\(^3\), 0.009 m/s (1.05 m/s), and 1 J/kg\(\cdot\)K (106 J/kg\(\cdot\)K), where typical nominal values are given in parentheses. For convective heat transfer, heat transfer coefficient, and heat transfer area, uncertainties are 0.000086 (0.00196), 0.058 (1.05), 0.025 (0.50), and 0.36 (41.9).

- In percentages, uncertainties of these quantities are as follows: freestream recovery temperature: 0.7, wall temperature: 0.5, freestream density: 0.7, freestream velocity: 0.6, specific heat: 0.1, convective heat transfer: 3.9, heat transfer coefficient: 4.3, heat transfer area: 1.2, St: 4.4, St/Sto: 5.5, m: 5.0, and x/d: 0.9.

### INJECTION HOLE ARRANGEMENT

A schematic showing the compound angle film hole geometry along the test surface is shown in figure 3. Here, holes are arranged in two rows which are staggered with respect to each other, with spanwise spacings between adjacent holes of 3.9d. This spanwise spacing was chosen to allow sufficient space between adjacent injection holes as the spanwise locations of vortices are changed. The distance between two adjacent holes in the same row (7.8d) is equivalent to 4.7-4.9 vortex core diameters (as measured at x/d=10.2). Determination of vortex core sizes are discussed in the next section. Figure 3 also shows that centerlines of holes in separate rows are separated by 5.2d in the streamwise direction. Each row of holes contains five injection cooling holes with a nominal inside diameter of 0.945 cm. The centerline of the middle hole of the downstream row is located on the spanwise centerline (Z=-3.05\(\cdot\)d) of the test surface. The compound angle holes are employed with \(\Omega\)=35 degrees and \(\beta\)=30 degrees, where \(\Omega\) is the angle of the injection holes with respect to the test surface as projected into the streamwise/normal plane, and \(\beta\) is the angle of the injection holes with respect to the test surface as projected into the spanwise/normal plane. The plane of each injection hole is angled at 50.5 degrees from the streamwise/normal (X-Y) plane. Within the plane of each hole, hole centerlines are oriented at angles of 24 degrees from the plane of the test surface (X-Z).

### Table 1. Spanwise positions of the vortices and vortex generators. * Determined from vorticity survey measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vortex label</th>
<th>Spanwise location of the vortex generator baseplate</th>
<th>Centerline injection hole location with respect to the vortices</th>
<th>Vortex center z location with spanwise locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Beneath downwash -3.05 (-3.05(\cdot)d)</td>
<td>Beneath downwash -3.05 (-3.05(\cdot)d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Beneath downwash &amp; core -1.25</td>
<td>Beneath downwash &amp; core -1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Beneath upwash &amp; core 0.55</td>
<td>Beneath upwash &amp; core 0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Beneath upwash 2.35</td>
<td>Beneath upwash 2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Beneath side of upwash 4.15 (4.06(\cdot)d)</td>
<td>Beneath side of upwash 4.15 (4.06(\cdot)d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Beneath downwash -3.05 (-3.05(\cdot)d)</td>
<td>Beneath downwash -3.05 (-3.05(\cdot)d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>Beneath downwash &amp; core -1.25</td>
<td>Beneath downwash &amp; core -1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>Beneath upwash &amp; core 0.55</td>
<td>Beneath upwash &amp; core 0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>Beneath upwash 2.35</td>
<td>Beneath upwash 2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>Beneath side of upwash 4.15 (4.06(\cdot)d)</td>
<td>Beneath side of upwash 4.15 (4.06(\cdot)d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The devices used to generate the vortices are shown in Fig. 4. In the present study, vortices are generated which rotate clockwise and counter-clockwise when viewed in spanwise/normal planes. In each case, each vortex generator is a half-delta wing with 3.2 cm height and 7.8 cm base. Each wing is attached to a base plate which is moved in the streamwise direction to produce vortices with different spanwise locations with respect to the film cooling holes. Delta wing arrangements used to produce clockwise-rotating vortices R0-R4, and counter-clockwise rotating vortices L0-L4 are shown in Fig. 4. The differences in the direction of vortex rotation result due to different delta wing placement on the baseplates relative to the mainstream flow direction.

With half-delta wing generators, vortices are produced with secondary flow vectors such as the ones shown in Figs. 5a and 5b. In the first of these figures, the positions of the clockwise rotating vortices R0-R4 are shown with respect to the film cooling hole locations. In the second figure, the positions of the counter-clockwise rotating vortices L0-L4 are shown with respect to the film cooling hole locations. Large arrows denote the spanwise locations of holes in the downstream row and small arrows denote the spanwise locations of holes in the upstream row. The centerline of the central injection hole (hereafter referred to as the central hole) in the downstream row is located at Z=0.0 cm. Secondary flow vectors in Figs. 5a and 5b were measured within vortices R0 and L0, respectively, just downstream of the injection holes at x/d=10.2. The horizontal axis is then shifted in these figures so that the centerline of the central hole is appropriately oriented with respect to the plane of the test surface (X-Z).
to vortex centers for all vortices.

Table 1 provides a tabulation of the spanwise positions of vortices R0-R4 and vortex generator baseplates, and the locations of the central hole with respect to the vortices. The spanwise spacing between vortices R0 and R1 (as well as between vortices R1 and R2, R2 and R3, L0 and L1, L1 and L2, etc.) is 1.8 cm or 24 percent of the spacing between two adjacent holes in the same row (2s=7.8d). This is 1.14-1.18 times 2c, or just greater than the size of one vortex core diameter, where vortex core radius is denoted c. The spanwise spacing between vortices R0 and R4 and between vortices L0 and L4 are both 0.98 times 2c, or just less than the spanwise spacing between two injection holes in the same row. Table 1 also includes estimated vortex center spanwise locations. These locations were also measured (at the locations of peak streamwise vorticity) for vortices R0, R4, L0, and L4. Good agreement between measured and estimated positions is evident for all four cases, with maximum deviation of 0.42 cm for vortex L4.

At x/d=10.2, vortex core radii, c, of vortices R0-R4 and vortex generator baseplates and vortex generator delta wing.

In Fig. 5a and Table 1, with vortex R0, the central hole is located beneath the vortex downwash. With vortex R1, the central hole is located beneath the vortex core near the downwash. Upwash regions of vortices R2 and R3 are located above the central hole, where vortex R4 passes location such that the vortex core lies in the side of the upwash. Vortices R0 and R4 are displaced a spanwise distance from each other which about equals the spanwise spacing between two injection holes in the upstream row (7.8d). Thus, even though these two vortices are at different positions with respect to the central hole, they are at the same positions relative to the hole plane. In the upstream and downstream rows because of the spanwise periodicity of the injection hole locations. Consequently, spanwise variations of local heat transfer distributions are expected to be about the same for vortices R0 and R4 except for spanwise displacement of 7.8d or 7.37 cm.

In Fig. 5b, it is evident that vortex L0 is located so that its downwash passes above the the central hole as it passes x/d=0.0. With vortex L1, the central hole is located beneath the vortex core near the downwash. Upwash regions of vortices L2 and L3 are located above the central hole, whereas vortex L4 passes location such that the central hole lies to the side of the upwash. Compared to vortices R0-R4, vortices L0-L4 from a mirror image with respect to the Z axis. Just as for vortices R0 and R4, vortices L0 and L4 are displaced a spanwise distance from each other which about equals the spanwise spacing between two injection holes in the upstream row (7.8d). Thus, even though vortices L0 and L4 are at different positions with respect to the central hole, they are at the same positions relative to the hole placement pattern. Consequently, local heat transfer distributions are expected to be about the same for vortex L0 and L4 except for spanwise displacement of 7.8d or 7.37 cm.

Vortex core radii, c, of vortices R0-R4 and vortex generator delta wing.

In the discussion which follows, results with vortices R0-R4 are presented in Figs. 6-9, and results with vortices L0-L4 are presented in Figs. 10-11. Information on the streamwise development of local Stanton numbers with m=0.5 film cooling are presented in Fig. 12 for vortex R0 and in Fig. 13 for vortex L0.

HEAT TRANSFER AND INJECTANT DISTRIBUTIONS

In the discussion which follows, results with vortices R0-R4 are presented in Figs. 6-9, and results with vortices L0-L4 are presented in Figs. 10-11. Information on the streamwise development of local Stanton numbers with m=0.5 film cooling are presented in Fig. 12 for vortex R0 and in Fig. 13 for vortex L0.

Heat transfer and injectant distributions with vortices R0-R4.

Distributions of St/St0 as dependent upon spanwise coordinate Z.
Figure 5. Film cooling injection locations with respect to vortex center and secondary flow vectors (x/d=10.2) (a) for vortices RO-R4, and (b) for vortices L0-L4. Each horizontal scale corresponds to a different vortex and different spanwise vortex position where Z=0 corresponds to the centerline of the injection hole located on the wind tunnel centerline.

are presented in Fig. 6. These data were measured at x/d=33.1 (X=1.377 m) with film injection from both rows of holes at a blowing ratio m of 0.5 both with and without longitudinal vortices R0-R4 embedded in the turbulent boundary layer.

In the top portion of Fig. 6, St/Sto distributions are presented for vortices RO and R4 along with Stf/Sto data obtained when no vortices are present in the flow. Of the features on this portion of Fig. 6, most apparent are the disturbances to local St/Sto distributions which result from the vortices. This is apparent where St/Sto > Stf/Sto, which occurs for Z > -7 cm for vortex RO and for Z > 0 cm for vortex R4 as a consequence of the proximity of vortex downwash regions to these parts of the test surface. Here, St/Sto values are as high as 1.05 compared to Stf/Sto values from 0.80 to 0.85, where the latter are measured when no vortices are present. Test surface locations beneath vortex upwash regions correspond to Z < -7 cm for vortex R0 and to Z < 0 cm for vortex R4. Here, St/Sto values are generally lower than the Stf/Sto distribution.

The spanwise variations of local heat transfer are about the same for vortices RO and R4 except for spanwise displacement with respect to each other a distance of about 7.2 cm. This validates the measurement apparatus and procedures employed to obtain local heat transfer distributions. The small quantitative differences between the two curves which occur locally result because of the strong dependence of local heat transfer distributions on the positions of the embedded longitudinal vortices as they pass the injection holes, and the fact that the spanwise displacement between the two vortices is slightly less than 2s, the spanwise spacing between two adjacent holes in the downstream row. In this case the vortices are displaced from each other a distance of 7.2 cm or 98 percent of 2s (Table 1).

St/Sto distributions with vortices RO, R1, R2 and R3 are presented in the bottom portion of Fig. 6. Here, significant quantitative and qualitative variations are seen as the spanwise locations of the vortices are changed. When the St/Sto distributions are compared to each other, significant changes to the shapes of local maxima as well as to surrounding heat transfer distributions are apparent. Such variations evidence complicated interactions as the vortices interact simultaneously with injectant from several injection holes. One important similarity caused by all four vortices is the sharp spanwise gradient of St/Sto which apparent at Z from -5 cm to 2 cm. As expected, this gradient moves in the +Z direction as the spanwise locations of the vortices move in the +Z direction. Away from this gradient, St/Sto values approach Stf/Sto both as large Z and at small Z at locations where the influences of the embedded vortices become less important. The highest local St/Sto value occurs with vortex R2 which convects downstream so that its core and upwash region pass over the central injection hole at Z=0.

Figure 6. Spanwise variations of local Stanton number ratios at x/d = 33.1 with m=0.5 film cooling both with and without clockwise rotating vortices R0-R4. Freestream velocity = 10 m/s. Vortex spanwise positions and locations with respect to film injection holes are given in Table 1.
Figure 7. Mean temperature field showing distributions of film injectant with secondary flow vectors at x/d = 45.8, with m=0.5 film cooling and a freestream velocity of 10 m/s. Data are given for clockwise rotating vortices R0-R4. Vortex spanwise positions and locations with respect to film injection holes are given in Table 1.

This situation is similar to one observed by Ligrani et al. (1989a) for injection from holes with simple angle orientations. In that study, the greatest disturbances to injectant occur when the vortex core passes over a film cooling hole, compared to situations in which the vortex core passes between two injection locations (i.e., vortices R1 and R3). According to Ligrani and Williams (1990), significant perturbations to injectant distributions (from simple angle holes) result when vortex cores pass within 1.67 core diameters on the downwash side, and 0.87 core diameters on the upwash side. The only vortices which meet this criteria with respect to the central hole are R1 and R2. However, the Ligrani and Williams (1990) criteria is expected to be somewhat different when compound angle injection is employed.

Fig. 7 quantifies the distortion and rearrangement of injectant by vortices R0-R3. These data are given for a blowing ratio m of 0.5 at x/d=45.8. As mentioned earlier, the spanwise locations of vortices R0-R3 with respect to the film cooling holes are given in Fig. 5a and Table 1. From these two sources, it is evident that either downwash regions (vortices R0 and R1), core regions (vortices R1 and R2), or upwash regions (vortices R2 and R3) pass over the central injection hole as the vortices are convected downstream.

Figure 8. Photographs of flow along the test surface which show distributions of injectant contaminated by fog fluid in streamwise/spanwise planes. The bulk flow (or streamwise direction) is down the page, and the spanwise direction is across the page. (a) No vortex and m=0.5 film cooling. (b) Vortex R1 and m=0.5 film cooling.

Figure 9. Distributions of (a) secondary flow vectors, (b) streamwise vorticity, (c) streamwise mean velocity, and (d) total pressure with vortex R1 and film cooling at m=0.5 as measured at x/d=45.8 with a freestream velocity of 10 m/s.
Measured secondary flow vectors are superimposed on each part of Fig. 7 to illustrate how their magnitudes and distributions relate to the reorganization of injectant by the different vortices. The same scaling for secondary flow vectors is used throughout all parts of Fig. 7. Procedures to determine injectant distributions were developed by Ligrani, et al (1989a) and later also used by Ligrani and Williams (1990). In these studies and the present one, injectant distributions are qualitatively correlated to mean temperature distributions. To do this, injectant is heated to 50 degrees Centigrade without providing any heat to the test plate. Thus, because the injectant is the only source of thermal energy (relative to freestream flow), higher temperatures (relative to freestream temperature) generally indicate greater amounts of injectant. The temperature field is therefore given as (T-Tm), and as such, shows how injectant accumulates and is rearranged mostly as a result of convective processes from the boundary layer and vortex secondary flows. Diffusion of injectant heat accounts for some of the temperature variations observed between injection hole exits and measuring stations, but compared to convection, this is of secondary importance.

If no vortex is present, concentrations of injectant are present in the boundary layer near the wall spaced about 3.7 cm apart in the spanwise direction at the same interval as the injection hole spacing. In Fig. 7, it is evident that all four vortices R0-R3 result in significant differences to the distributions shown are different from the ones which would exist if no vortices are present. In each case, injectant is swept beneath the vortex centers in the negative Z direction, then into vortex upwash regions, and finally above the vortex cores. The spanwise locations of the centers of vortices R0, R1, R2 and R3 at x/d=45.6 are at Z equal to 4.06 cm, -2.54 cm, -0.51 cm, and 1.52 cm, respectively. The Y coordinate of vortex centers is 2.5-2.6 cm. Centers are located at the point of maximum streamwise vorticity and are apparent in Fig. 7 at locations ahead of vortex primary flows. Except for spanwise displacement, overall injectant distributions for vortices R0-R3 in Fig. 7 show some qualitative similarity. This is partially a result of the small spacing between holes in the spanwise direction which results in abundant amounts of injectant at locations just ahead of the vortex cores. However, differences between the different injectant distributions result as different portions of different vortices interact with injectant from different film cooling holes as the vortices pass x/d=0. Important injectant deficits are present in Fig. 7 beneath vortex cores, and near vortex cores within downwash regions because of the influences of vortex secondary flows. These deficits correspond to locally higher St/Sto values in Fig. 6 at the same Z locations. Injectant deficits are most severe for vortices R1 and R3 at respective Z locations of -4.0 cm to 0.0 cm, and 0.0 cm to 4.0 cm. The corresponding local maxima in Fig. 6 are large and broad and cover the same ranges of Z.

The redistribution of injectant by vortex R1 is further illustrated by the two photographs in Fig. 8. Each shows a plan view of the test surface (i.e., a streamwise/spanwise plane view) such that the streamwise direction is down the page, and the spanwise direction is across the page. Vertical white lines along the test surface in each photograph are spaced 2.54 cm apart in the spanwise direction, with the line along the spanwise centerline labelled accordingly. Horizontal lines are apparent at x/d of 6.7, 17.2, and 33.1. The injectant, which is contaminated with fog fluid, is clearly apparent in each photograph as it is convected downstream. For both cases, the injectant emerges from the two staggered rows of holes at a blowing ratio m of 0.5.

The top photograph of Fig. 8 shows flow along the test surface when no vortex is present, and the bottom one shows how the injectant is rearranged and distorted as vortex R1 is convected downstream. In the top photograph, injectant from each hole is immediately adjacent to injectant from neighboring holes across the span of the view shown. Slight spanwise components of injectant velocity are apparent near x/d=6.7. As the smoke convects farther downstream, slight turning into the streamwise direction is apparent. However, the smoke continues to move at a slight angle with respect to the streamwise direction at x/d even as large as 33.1, as shown in the bottom portion of the photograph.

Similar behavior is evident in the bottom photograph of Fig. 8 except for significant disruptions of injectant by vortex R1. These are most apparent just to the left of the spanwise centerline for x/d from 6.7 to 17.2, and along the spanwise centerline for x/d from 17.2 to 33.1. At these locations, the scarcity of fog fluid evidences little injectant along the test surface. Such regions correspond to vortex downwash regions and regions beneath vortex cores, where St/Sto distributions like the ones in Fig. 6 show locally higher values compared to nearby magnitudes. Just to the right of the injectant deficits (i.e. at streamwise x/d=33.1), extra accumulations of injectant are apparent in Fig. 8 as a consequence of convection by secondary flows within upwash regions of vortex R1. In some cases, such extra accumulations of injectant result in local increases of film protection where values of St/Sto are locally lower than values of St/Sto which would exist if no vortex were present. At x/d=33.1, the injectant in the bottom photograph of Fig. 8 is deficit at Z from -2.5 cm to 2.5 cm, with extra accumulations at Z from -7.6 cm to -2.5 cm. These values are consistent with injectant distributions in Fig. 7 for vortex R1 at x/d=45.8 considering the negative spanwise convection of the vortex between the boundary upwash and downwash locations. In the latter case, deficits of injectant are apparent along the wall at Z from -3.5 cm to 1.5 cm, and extra accumulations are apparent along the wall at Z from -8.5 cm to -3.5 cm.

Examples of flow properties measured in streamwise/normal planes at x/d=45.8 with vortex R1 and m=0.5 film cooling are presented in Fig. 9. These include secondary flow vectors, streamwise vorticity magnitudes, streamwise mean velocity, and deficits of mean total pressure. In part b, the rotation of the clockwise vortex is clearly apparent about the vortex core located at Y=2.48 cm and Z=2.54 cm. The center corresponds to the location of maximum streamwise vorticity which is clearly apparent in part b. The contours of streamwise vorticity which surround this center are approximately circular in shape with a region of negative vorticity located near the wall at Z from -4.0 cm to -6.0 cm (i.e. just to the left of the main vortex).

Streamwise vorticity magnitudes are determined from secondary flow vector magnitudes using a finite difference form of the equation used by Ligrani (1989c). The streamwise vorticity is defined as

\[ \omega_x = \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \]

where $v$ is the streamwise velocity and $u$ and $v$ are the normal components of the velocity. The streamwise vorticity is a measure of the rotation of the vortex core. The streamwise vorticity is positive (clockwise) in the region of the vortex core and negative (counterclockwise) outside the vortex core.

The streamwise vorticity magnitudes are measured from secondary flow vectors using a finite difference form of the equation used by Ligrani (1989c). The streamwise vorticity is defined as

\[ \omega_x = \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \]

where $v$ is the streamwise velocity and $u$ and $v$ are the normal components of the velocity. The streamwise vorticity is a measure of the rotation of the vortex core. The streamwise vorticity is positive (clockwise) in the region of the vortex core and negative (counterclockwise) outside the vortex core.

In Fig. 7, it is evident that all four vortices R0-R3 result in similar flow properties as those measured in Fig. 9. For both cases, the streamwise vorticity is positive (clockwise) in the region of the vortex core and negative (counterclockwise) outside the vortex core. The streamwise vorticity is determined from secondary flow vectors using a finite difference form of the equation used by Ligrani (1989c). The streamwise vorticity is defined as

\[ \omega_x = \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \]

where $v$ is the streamwise velocity and $u$ and $v$ are the normal components of the velocity. The streamwise vorticity is a measure of the rotation of the vortex core. The streamwise vorticity is positive (clockwise) in the region of the vortex core and negative (counterclockwise) outside the vortex core. The streamwise vorticity is determined from secondary flow vectors using a finite difference form of the equation used by Ligrani (1989c). The streamwise vorticity is defined as

\[ \omega_x = \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \]

where $v$ is the streamwise velocity and $u$ and $v$ are the normal components of the velocity. The streamwise vorticity is a measure of the rotation of the vortex core. The streamwise vorticity is positive (clockwise) in the region of the vortex core and negative (counterclockwise) outside the vortex core.
downwash regions and beneath vortex cores first sweep injectant in the spanwise direction along the wall and then into upwash regions. Deficits of injectant then result beneath downwash regions which give decreased protection, and increased St/Sto relative to Stf/Sto. The top portion of Fig. 10 also shows that St/Sto values for each vortex are generally lower than the Stf/Sto distribution for Z larger than 4 cm for vortex L0 and for Z larger than -4 cm for vortex L4. These locations correspond to regions beneath vortex upwash regions where extra injectant accumulates resulting in local increases of protection by the film.

The spanwise variations of local heat transfer are about the same for vortices L0 and L4 except for spanwise displacement with respect to each other a distance of about 7.2 cm, which is equivalent to 98 percent of 2s (Table 1). This provides validation of the measurement apparatus and procedures employed to obtain local heat transfer distributions in addition to that given by results in the top of Fig. 6. The small quantitative differences between the curves for vortices L0 and L4 in the top of Fig. 10 occur locally for the same reasons that data for vortices R0 and R4 in the top of Fig. 6 are locally different.

St/Sto distributions with vortices L0, L1, L2 and L3 are presented in the bottom portion of Fig. 10. Here, significant quantitative and qualitative variations are seen as the spanwise locations of the vortices are changed. When the St/Sto distributions are compared to each other, significant changes to the shapes of local maxima as well as to surrounding heat transfer distributions are apparent. Just like the results in Fig. 6, such variations evidence complicated interactions as the vortices interact simultaneously with injectant from several injection holes. In addition, vortices L0-L4 also result in sharp spanwise gradients of St/Sto. In Fig. 10, these gradients are apparent at Z from -2 cm to 4 cm, and move in the -Z direction as the spanwise locations of the vortices move in the -Z direction. The highest local St/Sto value just to the left of one such gradient (ie. at smaller Z) occurs with vortex L2. This particular vortex convects downstream so that its core and upwash region pass over the central injection hole at Z=0 cm (ie. Fig. 5b and Table 1).

Vortices L0-L4 are different from vortices R0-R4 because of different directions of rotation (counter-clockwise versus clockwise) when viewed looking downstream in spanwise/normal planes. This is important because secondary flow vectors, especially beneath vortex cores, are in different directions with respect to the spanwise coordinate Z as well as with respect to spanwise velocity components of injectant. Fig. 3, which shows the orientations of the film cooling holes with respect to streamwise and spanwise coordinate directions, indicates the latter to be in the -Z direction. In Fig. 5a, secondary flow vectors near the wall for vortices R0-R4 are then in the same direction as the spanwise components of the injectant velocity. The opposite is true in Fig. 5b, where the near-wall secondary flow vectors for vortices L0-L4 have directions which are opposite to the direction of the spanwise components of the injectant velocity.

These differences between vortices R0-R4 and vortices L0-L4 are important because they result in significantly different local

Figure 10. Spanwise variations of local Stanton number ratios at x/d = 33.1 with m=0.5 film cooling both with and without counter-clockwise rotating vortices L0-L4. Freestream velocity = 10 m/s. Vortex spanwise positions and locations with respect to film injection holes are given in Table 1.

Figure 11. Mean temperature field showing distributions of film injectant with secondary flow vectors at x/d = 45.8, with m=0.5 film cooling and a freestream velocity of 10 m/s. Data are given for counter-clockwise rotating vortices L0-L4. Vortex spanwise positions and locations with respect to film injection holes are given in Table 1.
St/Sto distributions as the vortices interact with the film injectant. This is evident if St/Sto for vortices R0-R4 in Fig. 6 are compared to ones in Fig. 10 for vortices L0-L4. This comparison can be made for the same locations of vortex centers with respect to the central film injection hole with the only changes due to the direction of rotation of the vortices. It is evident from Figs. 5a and 5b and Table 1 that this is done by comparing results for vortices having the same number in their name labels (i.e., comparing results for vortex R0 with results for vortex L0, comparing results for vortex R1 with results for vortex L1, R2 with L2, etc.). Because they are the same in all parts of Figs. 6 and 10, St/Sto distributions (with film injection and no vortices) are appropriate to use in reference to distributions measured with vortices R0-R4 and L0-L4.

With each comparison, the same overall qualitative difference between the clockwise and counter-clockwise vortices is evident. St/Sto distributions with the clockwise rotating vortices R0-R4 show higher local maxima and maxima peaks which are broader and spread over greater areas compared to St/Sto measured beneath vortices L0-L4. Such differences evidence different interactions between injectant and the two types of vortices. Higher St/Sto are present with vortices R0-R4 because the injectant is swept away from the wall (which results in decreased protection) more efficiently than with vortices L0-L4. The more efficient decimation of the injectant occurs since near-wall vortex secondary flows are in the same direction as the spanwise velocity components of the injectant. With vortices L0-L4, the opposite situation is present. Here, near-wall vortex secondary flows oppose the spanwise components of the injectant resulting in greater resistance to injectant rearrangement by the vortices.

Like the results presented in Fig. 7, the injectant distributions in Fig. 11 show that all four vortices L0-L3 produce significant disturbances to the injectant relative to the case if no vortices are present. Individual distributions in Fig. 11 are qualitatively similar to each other, except for variations due to spanwise displacement of the vortices with respect to the film injection holes. They also show some qualitatively similarity to the ones in Fig. 7. The most important differences result because of different directions of vortex rotation. With vortices L0-L4, this causes much more injectant to be present next to the wall near the vortices, which is apparent if regions just to the right of vortex downwash regions in Figs. 7 are compared to regions just to the left of vortex downwash regions in Fig. 11. Such differences are particularly evident if the injection distribution for vortex L0 is compared to the one for vortex R0.

In Fig. 11, injectant is swept beneath the vortex centers in the positive Z direction, then into vortex upwash regions, and finally above the vortex centers. The spanwise locations of the centers of vortices L0, L1, L2 and L3 are at Z equal to 3.05 cm, 1.52 cm, -0.51 cm, and -1.52 cm, respectively. The Y coordinate of vortex centers in Fig. 11 vary from 2.9 cm to 3.5 cm. In each case, injectant deficits are present near the wall in Fig. 11 located beneath vortex cores and near vortex cores beneath downwash regions. Of these, the most severe are located beneath vortices L0 and L2 at respective Z locations of 0.0 cm to 4.0 cm, and -4.0 cm to 0.0 cm. Corresponding St/Sto distributions in Fig. 10 show broad local maxima over nearly the same ranges of Z.

In examining results on Figs. 12 and 13, it is apparent that the disturbances caused by the vortices persist to the end of the test plate. This is evident since St/Sto values are higher than Stf/Sto at X=1.98 m or x/d=96.6. In fact, differences between St/Sto and Stf/Sto generally become greater with streamwise development, behavior which illustrates the coherence of the vortices as they are convected downstream. Differences are quite small just downstream of the injection holes at X=1.13 m or x/d=6.7, which indicates that the film, rather than the vortices, are most affecting local heat transfer behavior at this location. According to Ligrani et al. (1989a), such behavior probably results because the vortices are lifted off of the test surface by the film injectant. In addition, vortex secondary flows have not had enough time to rearrange the injectant at this streamwise station since it is just downstream of film hole exit locations, where the vortices initially interact with the
Comparing results in Fig. 12 to ones in Fig. 13 reveals important differences for vortices R0 and L0. In Fig. 12, regions where St/St0 are higher than St/St0 are at larger Z, and regions where St/St0 are lower than St/St0 are at smaller Z. The opposite trend is present in Fig. 13 because vortex L0 rotates in a direction opposite to vortex R0. However, in spite of these differences, both vortices R0 and L0 produce St/St0 > St/St0 beneath downwash regions, and St/St0 < St/St0 beneath upwash regions. Greater disturbances and higher St/St0 are present beneath the downwash regions of vortex R0 because injectant is swept away from the wall more efficiently than occurs with vortex L0. This is because near-wall secondary flows of vortex R0 are coincident with the spanwise velocity components of the film injectant. As mentioned earlier, this results in larger reductions in injection than if the secondary flows are opposite to the spanwise component of injectant velocity, as with vortex L0. Regions where St/St0 are greater than St/St0 also cover larger spanwise portions of the test plate with vortex R0. This is consistent with the St/St0 results in Figs. 6 and 10. It is also consistent with the injectant distributions in Figs. 7 and 11, which show that injectant is present much closer to the downwash regions of vortices L0-L4 than to the downwash regions of vortices R0-R4.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Experimental results are presented which describe the effects of embedded, longitudinal vortices on heat transfer and film injectant downstream of staggered rows of film cooling holes with compound angle orientations. Holes are oriented so that their angles with respect to the test surface are 30 degrees in a spanwise/normal plane projection, and 35 degrees in a streamwise/normal plane projection. A blowing ratio of 0.5, non-dimensional injection temperature parameter $\Theta$ of about 1.5, and freestream velocity of 10 m/s are employed. Injectant hole diameter is 0.945 cm to give a ratio of vortex core diameter to hole diameter of 1.6:1.67 just downstream of the injection holes ($x/d=10.2$). At the same location, vortex circulation magnitudes range from 0.15 m2/s to 0.18 m2/s. With film injection at a blowing ratio of 0.5, the ratio of vortex circulation to injection velocity then ranges from 3.2 to 3.8, and the ratio of vortex circulation to injection velocity times vortex core diameter ($S_W = \Gamma / \nu C d$) ranges from 2.0 to 2.2.

The most important major conclusion is that local heat transfer and injectant distributions are strongly affected by the longitudinal embedded vortices, including their directions of rotation and their spanwise positions with respect to film injection holes. Vortices are generated using half-delta wings attached to the test surface of the wind tunnel at 16 degree angles of attack with respect to the mainstream flow direction. By changing the sign of the angle of attack, vortices are produced which rotate either clockwise or counter-clockwise when viewed looking downstream in spanwise/normal planes. As the vortex direction, the spanwise locations of the vortices with respect to the film cooling holes are also changed.

Differences resulting from vortex rotation are due to secondary flow vectors, especially beneath vortex cores, which are in different directions with respect to the spanwise velocity components of injectant after it exits the holes. When secondary flow vectors near the wall are in the same direction as the spanwise components of the injectant velocity (clockwise rotating vortices R0-R4), the film injectant is readily swept beneath vortex cores and into vortex upwash regions. Consequently, the protection provided by the injectant is reduced significantly and St/St0 may be as large as 1.05 compared to St/St0 values with no vortex from 0.80 to 0.85. With the opposite situation (counter-clockwise rotating vortices L0-L4), the secondary flow vectors near the wall are directed opposite to the direction of the spanwise components of the injectant velocity, and the injectant is less likely to be rearranged by vortex secondary flow. As a result, higher St/St0 are present over larger portions of the test surface with vortices R0-R4 because the injectant is swept away from near wall regions (which results in decreased protection) more efficiently than with vortices L0-L4. Because of the design of the present experiment, these comparisons are made for the same locations of vortex centers with respect to the central film injection hole (located at Z/d=0.0) such that the only changes are due to the direction of vortex rotation. With this type of comparison, St/St0 distributions downstream of the injection holes show higher local maxima and maxima peaks which are broader and spread over greater areas compared to St/St0 measured beneath vortices L0-L4.

Differences resulting from vortex rotation are due to secondary flow vectors, especially beneath vortex cores, which are in different directions with respect to the spanwise velocity components of injectant after it exits the holes. When secondary flow vectors near the wall are in the same direction as the spanwise components of the injectant velocity (clockwise rotating vortices R0-R4), the film injectant is readily swept beneath vortex cores and into vortex upwash regions. Consequently, the protection provided by the injectant is reduced significantly and St/St0 may be as large as 1.05 compared to St/St0 values with no vortex from 0.80 to 0.85. With the opposite situation (counter-clockwise rotating vortices L0-L4), the secondary flow vectors near the wall are directed opposite to the direction of the spanwise components of the injectant velocity, and the injectant is less likely to be rearranged by vortex secondary flow. As a result, higher St/St0 are present over larger portions of the test surface with vortices R0-R4 because the injectant is swept away from near wall regions (which results in decreased protection) more efficiently than with vortices L0-L4. Because of
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