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Abstract—The article deals with pneumatic and hot wire anemometry measurement on subsonic axi-symmetric air ejector. Performances of the ejector with and without pulsations of primary flow are compared, measuring of characteristic pressures and mass flow rates are performed and ejector efficiency is evaluated. The pulsations of primary flow are produced by a synthetic jet generator, which is placed in the supply line of the primary flow just in front of the primary nozzle. The aim of the pulsation is to intensify the mixing process. In the article we present: Pressure measuring of pulsation on the mixing chamber wall, behind the mixing chamber and behind the diffuser measured by fast pressure transducers and results of hot wire anemometry measurement. It was found out that using of primary flow pulsations yields higher back pressure behind the ejector and higher efficiency. The processes in this ejector and influences of primary flow pulsations on the mixing processes are described.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The article deals with experimental investigation of mixing in axi-symmetric subsonic ejector with included device generating pulsations of primary flow. The aim of pulsations is to intensify the mixing process. The mixing can be intensified by many ways that can be divided into two groups, passive and active, as they were in publication by authors Ginevsky, Vlasov and Karavosov [1]. Shaping of the primary nozzle trailing edge belongs to the passive methods, generating of flow pulsation is the active method. The work [1] deals with free streams from jets, number of works dealing with active or passive control of mixing in ejectors are quite limited. E.g. Havelka et al. in experimental work [2] used a device inserted into the primary nozzle to add a tangential velocity component into the primary stream. Measuring showed that the secondary mass flow rate is increased for certain range of tangential velocity and the shorter mixing chamber was satisfactory. Waitz et al. investigated intensification of mixing with the help of a lobe nozzle in work [3]. Dvořák [4] optimized the lobe nozzle for mixing and found out that the nozzle with low number of big lobes is advantageous for high efficiency of the ejector. Chang and Chen [5] used a petal nozzle in a supersonic ejector and compared it with common diverging nozzle. They showed that the ejector with petal nozzle is better for higher area ratio $A_3/A_1 \geq 150$ than the ejector with common nozzle.

Tylor and Williamson [6] divided the mixing into two regions. In the initial region of mixing, the shear layer between the primary and the secondary stream does not reach the mixing chamber wall or the boundary layer. In the main region of mixing, the shear layer spreads across the whole mixing chamber cross section. The momentum decay is slow in the initial region and static pressure changes only slightly. We can consider a free stream here. But the momentum decay and also static pressure rise are accelerated in the main region. Optimizations made by Dvořák in work [7] showed that only choosing the velocity ratio $\alpha = c_2/c_1 \approx 0.3$ can lead to the high efficiency of the ejector. Unfortunately, the length of the initial region of mixing is than relatively long ($L_0 \approx 3D$) in this case and causes high friction losses. The length of the main region depends less on the velocity ration. To intensify and accelerate the mixing processes, it is essential to generate fluctuations either at the beginning of the mixing chamber or even in front of it, i.e. in the primary flow supply pipeline.

The former work by authors Dvořák and Dančová [8] dealt with an ejector with only one synthetic jet. The aim of the study was to determine the influences of the synthetic jet (SJ), which was placed in the beginning of the mixing chamber. The purpose of that work was to investigate the possibility of using SJ to accelerate the mixing processes by the intensification of momentum and mass transfer, as it was shown by Trávníček and Vít in work [9].

In work [8], it was proved, that the influences of the operating SJ on the flow in the ejector were follows: SJ accelerated the mixing process only negligibly, but for the regimes with high ejection ratio, SJ stabilizes the flow fluctuations in the diffuser and thus the higher back pressure and higher efficiency are achieved. SJ placed in the beginning of the mixing chamber influenced the flow in the diffuser positively, but when placed at the end of the mixing chamber, the improvements were reduced. Velocities of the primary stream in the centre of the mixing chamber were affected during the operation of SJ, but the secondary stream and the mixing shear layer were affected only in the immediate vicinity of SJ. The aim of current study is to use SJ actuator to generate pulsation in the primary flow in front of the mixing chamber, i.e. in the primary flow supply pipeline.

II. METHODS

Dimensions of the synthetic jet actuator used for generating of primary flow oscillations and its position on the primary
nozzle are obvious from Fig. 1. SJ actuator consists from a sealed cavity and two loudspeakers (MONACOR SP-8/4SQ) with nominal parameters: $4\Omega$, 20Wmax. These loudspeakers have the same power and diameters ($D_c = 70\text{mm}$, membrane diameter $D_m = 68\text{mm}$) and are parallel-connected. Loudspeakers membranes have stiff cone shape and they can be considered to be pistons, which control the jet. Actuator was fed with sinusoidal signal with electrical power $P = 9.2\text{W}$. Signal was generated from Tektronix AFG 3102 signal generator and was amplified with Omnitronic MPZ-180 amplifier.

![Fig. 1 System of the ejector and the generator of primary flow oscillations](image)

A circular converging nozzle with diameter $d = 19.2\text{mm}$ was used. The mixing chamber had diameter $D = 40\text{mm}$. The area ratio of nozzles was $\mu = A_f / A_e = 0.3$ and the relative length of the mixing chamber was $L / D = 8$. A diffuser with $6\degree$ enlargement and with outlet diameter $71.2\text{mm}$ was placed behind the mixing chamber. First step of the measurement was the determination of the system nominal frequency – i.e. frequency on which ejector works with the highest power. Nominal frequency was found as $f = 69.1\text{Hz}$. This low frequency is given by the length of the pipeline behind the ejector, which ends by orifice used for measuring of mixed mass flow rate $m_1$, see position 20 in Fig. 2.

For slow pressure measuring, we used pressure sensors Druck LP 1000 with range 100, 500, 1000 and 2000Pa. These low pressure sensors with high accuracy 0.25% are slow, so only mean value of pressures were measured. Arrangement of the experiments is obvious from Fig. 2. We also used very fast miniature pressure sensors Kulite XTL-123B-190M with MDAQ-OR16-BRIDGE-D and PC card DEWE-ORION-1616-100 for fast pressure measuring with frequency of 10 kHz.
III. RESULTS

The results for ejector with pulsation generator switched OFF and ON are in Fig. 3, 4, 5 and 6. The efficiency of the ejector is defined by relation

$$\eta = \frac{m_2}{m_1} \left[ \left( \frac{p_4}{p_{02}} \right)^{\frac{T_01}{T_02}} - 1 \right]$$

where 

where $m$ is mass flow rate, $p$ static pressure, $p_0$ stagnation pressure, $T_0$ stagnation temperature and $\kappa$ ratio of specific heats. Subscript 1 denotes primary flow, 2 secondary flow, 3 mixed flow and 4 state behind the ejector, i.e. behind the diffuser. For incompressible fluid, or for compressible fluid when $T_0 = T_02$ and $(p_01 - p_02)/p_02 \ll 0.05$ the relation (1) can be simplified to

$$\eta = \Gamma \frac{p_4 - p_{02}}{p_{01} - p_{02}},$$

where ejection ratio $\Gamma$ is used. The ejection ratio is given by relation

$$\Gamma = \frac{m_2}{m_1} = \frac{c_2 A_2 \rho_2}{c_1 A_1 \rho_1},$$

where $c$ is velocity, $A$ area of inlet nozzle and $\rho$ density.

A. Results of Slow Pressure Measuring

The evaluation of the ejector efficiency from measured data is in Fig. 3. We can see that with pulsation generator turned ON the efficiency are higher. It means that higher back pressure and ejection ratio are obtained. These results contrast with work [8], where fluctuations of back pressure were strongly suppressed with operating synthetic jet actuator.

![Fig. 3 Results of slow pressure measuring, ejector efficiency.](image)

![Fig. 4 Results of slow pressure measuring, relative back pressure $(p_4 - p_{02})/(p_{01} - p_{02})$.](image)

The relative suction pressure in the beginning of the mixing chamber is in Fig. 5. We can see that during operation of the generator the curve changes – it moves towards higher ejection ratios, while the suction pressure $p_{12}$ decreases only negligibly. These results are rather surprising because suction pressure, which is measured in the beginning of the mixing chamber, is given by ejection ratio, see [8]. It is because the suction pressure determines the inlet velocity of both flows and thus, for used inlet area ratio $\mu = A_1/A_2$, the ejection ratio is given. It means that all measured data should fall into the single curve in Fig. 5. But in work [8], the SJ generator was placed behind the beginning of the mixing chamber, i.e. behind the place where pressure $p_{12}$ is measured, while in this work, the generator is placed in front of this place.

![Fig. 5 Results of slow pressure measuring, relative suction pressure $(p_{12} - p_{02})/(p_{01} - p_{02})$.](image)
almost constant. Velocity \( c_1 \) will oscillate because of pressure changes, but the mean velocity \( c_\bar{} \) should be lower. These required further investigation with the help of fast pressure transducers and hot wire anemometry.

The differences are also obvious on Fig. 6, where mixing pressure \( p_3 \), measured behind the mixing chamber, is carried out. Again, higher ejection ratio is obtained with almost the same mixing pressure while the generator of pulsations is operating. With the same static pressure, the dynamic pressure and mass flow rate behind the mixing chamber are higher and higher back pressure behind the mixing chamber is obtained. To further understand to the flow processes, we also performed very fast measurements of the pressures.

Results of fast pneumatic measuring are carried out on Fig. 7, 8, 9 and 10. We measured only one particular regime characterized by the highest efficiency. In Fig. 7 and 8, results for generator turned OFF are carried out. We can see that the flow is not steady, but there is some periodic fluctuations in the primary supply tube with the frequency of 1560 Hz, while the fluctuations close to the generator are of the half frequency of 780 Hz. These fluctuations are generated in the beginning of the primary flow supply pipeline. Theirs frequencies are obviously given by the length of free space in the stilling chamber, see positions 8 and 9 in Fig. 2, i.e. it is the length between the stilling riddles and the end of the stilling chamber. It is obvious from Fig. 8 that these fluctuations spread downstream slightly at the beginning and more significantly at the end of the mixing chamber, see courses of suction pressure \( p_{12} \) and mixing pressure \( p_3 \) and values in Table 1.

### TABLE I

<p>| RESULTS OF FAST PNEUMATIC MEASURING FOR GENERATOR OFF AND ON, MEAN, RMS AND AMPLITUDE VALUES |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>((p - p_{02})/(p_{01} - p_{02}))</th>
<th>(p_{01})</th>
<th>(p_{pipe})</th>
<th>(p_{gen})</th>
<th>(p_{12})</th>
<th>(p_3)</th>
<th>(p_4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFF mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amplit.</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780 Hz phase</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amplit.</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.1 Hz Phase</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, we discuss the influences of operating generator on the suction pressure \( p_{12} \) in the beginning of the mixing chamber. By comparison of Fig. 7 and 9, we can see that the
fluctuations of $p_{12}$ are increased only negligibly. The amplitude of $p_{12}$ is only 0.021 and the phase after the generator is 0.5, see table 1. It means that for the highest pressure near the generator, the lower expansion pressure $p_{12}$ is obtained. It should be caused by the highest primary velocity $c_1$ from the nozzle and accordingly the strongest effect of suction of surrounding air. The working frequency of 69.1 Hz is not almost evident on the course for $p_{12}$, which is caused by the fact that the suction pressure is measured in the beginning of the mixing chamber, for $x = 0$, i.e. almost in unconfined space. Thus, the secondary flow, which is entrained into the mixing chamber, should not change its velocity during the working period of the generator. Changes of the primary flow velocity $c_1$ and alternatively secondary flow velocity $c_2$ were investigated with the help of hot wire anemometry.

C. Static pressure distribution on the mixing chamber wall

Results of pneumatic measuring of static pressure distribution on the mixing chamber wall obtained by the help of both slow and fast pressure transducers are carried out in Fig. 11 for generator switched OFF and in Fig. 12 for generator switched ON. By comparison of both curves of mean values, we can see that the static pressure distribution is influenced by the operating generator only negligibly.

On the other hand, the amplitudes of pulsations, which are also carried out in Fig. 11 and 12, are increased rather significantly. The amplitudes are from 0.006 to 0.013 for generator turned OFF, while the frequency is 780 Hz, and do not change notably along the mixing chamber, see Fig. 11.

For generator turned ON, the amplitude is 0.021 in the beginning of the mixing chamber and it increases fluently to 0.28 at the end of the mixing chamber, see Fig. 12. The frequency is of 69.1 Hz. More detailed measuring for
generator turned ON is in Fig. 13, where the curve for $p_{gen}$. Is carried out too. We can observe that for phase 0.15 and 0.85 the mixing can be almost considered as a constant pressure mixing. For the phase of 0, the static pressure even decreases during the mixing, while for the phase 0.5, the maximal static pressure gradient is obtained.

As we can see in Fig. 14, for generator turned OFF, the primary flow velocity $c_1$ and secondary flow velocity $c_2$ have nonzero amplitude of fluctuations. Again, the mixed flow velocity $c_3$ fluctuates as a result of mixing processes and high turbulence intensity at the end of the mixing chamber, while the periodic component of the velocity $\tilde{c}$ is small.

The velocity ratio increased to the value $\omega = 0.333$, though the increase is not as was expected according to results of slow pneumatic measuring, see ejection ratio in Fig. 5 and 6. This does not agree with our observation that ejection ratio increases more significantly while the generator is operating.

As we can see in Fig. 15, for generator turned ON, the primary flow velocity $c_1$ and secondary flow velocity $c_2$ have nonzero amplitude of fluctuations. The mixed flow velocity $c_3$ fluctuates as a result of mixing processes and high turbulence intensity at the end of the mixing chamber. Values of measured velocities are in Table 2.

### TABLE II

<p>| RESULTS OF HOT WIRE ANEMOMETRY MEASURING |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$c_1$ [m/s]</th>
<th>$c_2$ [m/s]</th>
<th>$c_3$ [m/s]</th>
<th>$\omega$ [1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFF mean</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON mean</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.1 Hz amplitude</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. CONCLUSION

Ejector with primary flow oscillation generator was investigated with the help of low and fast pneumatic measurements. We compared ratio of mass flow rates – ejection ratio, expansion pressure in the beginning of the mixing chamber, mixing pressure behind it, back pressure behind the diffuser and ejector efficiency for both generator turned OFF and ON. It was found out that for generator turned ON, the back pressure and the efficiency are higher. Of course we should keep in mind that operating generator adds extra energy to the ejector. During that, the ejection ratio is higher while expansion and mixing pressures do not change. It indicated that velocity ratio could be affected due to the...
operating generator. Therefore, we also performed a preliminary hot wire anemometry measuring, but our presumption was not confirmed.

We also performed slow and fast pneumatic measuring of static pressure distribution on the mixing chamber wall and the results illustrate how the pressure field in the mixing chamber pulsates. We have found out that the mixing processes are not significantly faster when the pulsation generator is operating, which was the main purpose of our investigation.

Still, we do not fully understand to the mechanisms how the primary flow pulsations influence the flow processes in the ejector. Further and more detailed investigation with the help of hot wire anemometry will follow and the changes of velocity and turbulence profiles will be inspected. Measuring of more nozzles with various inlet area ratio $A_1/A_2$ and regimes with various velocity ratio $c_2/c_1$ are planned.
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