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1. Motivation and objectives

Despite identification of jet noise as an important byproduct of the newly invented jet engine (Morley 1939), and as an impediment to the incipient commercial jet aircraft industry in the 1950s (Lighthill 1952; Westley & Lilley 1952; Lassiter & Hubbard 1952; Lighthill 1954; Lassiter & Hubbard 1956), a completely satisfactory description of jet noise—that is, of the noise produced by the turbulent exhaust gases of a jet engine—has proven elusive. Two primary reasons for this difficulty are the lack of a universally agreed-upon theory of noise generation in turbulent flows and the challenge in taking experimental measurements in (often heated) high-speed jets.

Regardless, significant progress has been made on some of the theoretical descriptions of jet noise (Lighthill 1952, 1954; Lilley 1974; Goldstein 2003, to name but a few) and in its experimental characterization (Davies et al. 1963; Bradshaw et al. 1964; Tanna 1977a, b; Viswanathan 2004, for example). However, only recently have there been successful attempts at the numerical prediction of jet noise from first principles using large-eddy simulation (LES) and direct numerical simulation (DNS).

Much of the current jet noise work originates at the Center for Turbulence Research through its associated students or post-doctoral fellows (Boersma & Lele 1999; Constantinescu & Lele 2001; Freund 2001; Jansen et al. 2002; Bodony & Lele 2005b). The aforementioned studies have also been quite useful in establishing numerical databases for the continued exploration of noise source processes, both in general and as specifically applies to jets. This report documents some of the current efforts underway at CTR that are relevant to jet noise prediction and to its understanding, including both studies that are well documented and those that are in their early stages.

2. Cold and hot jets from subsonic to supersonic speeds

For the jet conditions listed in Table 1, large-eddy simulations were carried out in cylindrical coordinates for the filtered, compressible equations using non density-weighted variables. (See Bodony & Lele (2005b) for details.) The dynamic Smagorinsky model (Germano et al. 1991) was used to close the subgrid scale stresses. Sixth order optimized compact (Padé) finite difference schemes were used in the radial and axial directions; Fourier-spectral differencing was used in the azimuthal direction. Time integration used the low-dispersion, low-dissipation Runge-Kutta scheme of Stanescu & Habashi (1998).

Forcing and absorbing sponges (Bodony 2005) provide boundary conditions on the computational boundaries. For all boundaries, the sponges absorb without reflection the outgoing vortical, entropic, and acoustic waves. At the inflow boundary, the sponge also induces jet unsteadiness by forcing disturbances formed by a normal-mode solution of the linearized stability equations for a spatially-growing disturbance on the inflow mean flow profile. Azimuthal mode number combinations, including \( n = \pm 1, \ldots, \pm 4 \), are random walked in time to provide broadband forcing without generation of unphysical noise;
the axisymmetric mode was not explicitly forced (Bodony & Lele 2002). The forcing amplitude, when summed over all modes, was $u_{rms}/U_j = 0.03$.

The initial mean axial velocity profile, specified at $x/r_0 = 0$, was of the form

$$U/U_j = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \tanh \left[ \frac{1}{4\theta_0} \left( \frac{r}{r_0} - 1 \right) \right] \right),$$

where $\theta_0$, the initial momentum thickness, is a parameter. In all calculations $\theta_0/D_j = 0.045$. Assuming constant static pressure and known jet centerline temperature $T_j$, the density was found from the Crocco-Busemann relation. The reference solution used in the sponge zones was found from Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes solutions of the parabolized Navier-Stokes equations using the $\nu^2-f$ turbulence model (Choi & Lele 2001). A schematic of the computational domain, with sponge zones identified, is given in Fig. 1. Also shown in Fig. 1 are the bounding cylindrical surfaces of the Kirchhoff surface used to extrapolate the sound to the far-field, beyond the LES computational domain. Set at a distance of $R_s = 5D_j$, the Kirchhoff surface predictions are insensitive to the choice of $R_s$. The cylindrical surface is open with the upstream and downstream surfaces ignored. Although their absence may be accounted (Freund et al. 1996) the current results are instead restricted to polar angles in the range of $20^\circ \leq \Theta \leq 150^\circ$.

Figure 2 shows the centerline axial velocity $U_c$ as a function of axial position using the Witze (1974) scaling to remove the jets’ axial elongation with increasing $M_j$. (Note that $\kappa = 0.08(1 - 0.16M_j)(\rho_\infty/\rho_j)^{0.22}$.) In these coordinates the present calculations, along with those of Bogey et al. (2003) and Freund (2001), collapse onto a single curve which over-predicts the centerline velocity decay rate as measured by Tanna (1977a) and by others. The increased rate of change of $U_c$ with $x$ is believed to be caused by the relatively thick initial shear layers of the calculations, with $0.01 < \theta_0/D_j \leq 0.045$, compared with those found in experiment of $\theta_0 \sim 10^{-3}D_j$ (Viswanathan & Clark 2004). From the root-mean-square of centerline axial velocity (not shown) the LES data is found to over-predict the experimental data by $0.01U_j$ ($3-4\%$). The discrepancy between the numerical and experimental data is believed to be related to the influence of the initially thick shear layers, which lack realistic turbulence.

The overall sound pressure level (OASPL) predictions of the calculations are shown in Fig. 3 for all of the jets in Table 1. In general, the LES data of higher-speed jets better predicts the experimentally measured sound pressure levels than do simulations of lower-speed jets. In the case of a low-speed heated jet (M05TR176), the jet noise predictions differ substantially from their measured values. The pressure spectra for each of these jets are found, in those cases in which the OASPL predictions agree with the experimental data, to be low-pass filtered versions of the experimental spectra. In most cases the maximum frequency available in the simulations was around $St = fD_j/U_j = 1.2$.

For the three highest-speed jets (M09TR086, M15TR056, and M15TR230), the agreement in the acoustic far-field to the experimental data justified additional investigation of the numerical databases. Of particular interest was the ability of Lighthill’s acoustic analogy to predict the radiated noise of these high-speed jets. Then the analogy is used to explore reasons why a high-speed jet, with $U_j/a_\infty > 0.7$, becomes quieter when heated. Note that two of the jets (M15TR056 and M15TR230) have the same jet velocity and differ only by temperature.
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\[ T_j = a_j \]

\[ M_c \]

\[ Re = \frac{U_j D_j}{\nu_j} \]

\[ N_r \times N_\theta \times N_x \]

**Table 1.** Conditions of the simulations presented. The nomenclature sp\( N \), where \( N \) is an integer, listed in the ‘TID’ column, refers to conditions tabulated in Tanna (1977a). †The conditions for run M09TR086 are approximately the same as those used by Tanna (1977a). ‡The Reynolds numbers, with \( Re = \rho_j U_j D_j/\mu_j \), are those used in the present LES and are not the same as in the experiments.

**Figure 1.** Schematic of calculation domain showing major features. The central region contains the LES domain and the sponge (---) and Kirchhoff surface surfaces (---).
As described in more detail in Bodony & Lele (2005a), the Lighthill predictions were remarkably close to the direct sound predictions from the large-eddy simulations. Figures 4 and 5 demonstrate the agreement for the two observer locations of \( \theta = 30^\circ \) and \( 90^\circ \).
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Figure 3. Overall sound pressure levels for all six simulated jets at a common distance of 100Dj. Legend: –□–, M05TR095; –■–, M05TR176; –○–, M09TR086; –●–, M09TR270; –△–, M15TR056; –▲–, M15TR230. Experimental data: □, Tanna (M05TR095); ■, Tanna (M05TR176); ○, Tanna (M09TR086); ●, Tanna (M09TR270); △, Tanna (M15TR056); ▲, Tanna (M15TR230).

3. Imperfectly expanded supersonic jets

A more recent extension of the pressure-matched jets discussed in the previous section concerns the presence of shock-cells within the early stages of the jet when operated at off-design conditions. When the jets are turbulent the interaction of the shock cells with the jet turbulence—both along the jet shear layers and downstream of the potential core collapse—is a significant source of noise. This shock-associated noise has been characterized experimentally (Harper-bourne & Fisher 1973; Tanna 1977b; Seiner & Norum 1979, 1980; Seiner & Yu 1981; Norum & Seiner 1982) and theoretically by Tam & Tanna (1982); Tam et al. (1985); Tam (1987, 1990), and more recently by Ray et al. (2004). A summary of shock-associated noise is given by Tam (1995). From the experimental studies it is known that the broadband shock associated noise is preferentially directed upstream towards the jet nozzle, resulting in a measurable increase in the overall sound pressure levels (OASPLs) for cold jets. For angles closer to the downstream jet axis the shock associated noise contributes less to the OASPL but is visible in the acoustic spectra.

In this study, the multiple-scales solution of Tam et al. (1985) is used to prescribe stationary shock cells into the large-eddy simulations (LES) of supersonic jets. The shock cell solution is used as an inlet boundary condition to jet calculations, and no special shock capturing numerical techniques are used.

For a cold jet with Mach number \( M_j = 2.2 \) and design Mach number of \( M_d = 2.0 \), the instantaneous dilatation and vorticity magnitude fields are shown in Fig. 6. The shock cells are visible in the initial portions of the jet, prior to the collapse of the potential core. The jet’s pressure fluctuations are collected along a cylindrical surface parallel to the jet
at a distance of $6D_j$ from the jet centerline. The OASPL for the pressure mismatched jet and the corresponding pressure matched jet (with $M_j = 1.95$ and described in detail in Bodony & Lele (2005b)) are shown in Fig. 7. Although taken close to the jet the data appear to show an increased upstream radiated noise level with some moderate increase in the downstream noise. Accompanying spectra, shown in Fig. 8, taken at three locations on this surface demonstrate that in the upstream direction, the imperfectly expanded jet shows increased sound near a frequency of $St = fD_j/U_j = 0.2$–0.3. At larger angles, in the downstream jet direction, the noise enhancement due to shock-associated noise occurs primarily for $St > 0.5$.

4. Human phonation

An effort was started in late 2005 to use the experience gained in jet noise prediction of industrial jets for the prediction of human speech (phonation). As described in Titze (2000), the primary source of voice production stems from the pulsing of the glottal jet (which has a diameter-based Reynolds number approaching 10,000) by the vibrating vocal folds, which oscillate with a fundamental frequency around 125–200 Hz for adults. Turbulence in the glottal jet, complex modal vibrations of the vocal folds, and reshaping of the cavity defined by the mouth and tongue contribute to the generation and
selection of harmonics and broadband noise, the addition of which greatly enhances the ‘pleasantness’ of the voice.

Beyond this description very little is known about the fundamental processes of sound generation by the glottal jet. For example, the relative importance of the pulsating jet and the glottal jet turbulence is not well known, nor is there much evidence of the influence the mouth and tongue have on the sound generation. The relation between the vocal fold dynamics and the resulting sound harmonics is also ill-understood.

Some answers to these questions will arise from simulations of the vocal folds, with structural modeling, coupled to the trachea (including the larynx and glottal jet), mouth, and tongue. Realistic geometric data will come from CT (Computed Tomography) scan measurements of human vocal tracts and will be modeled using the immersed boundary method (Ghias et al. 2004). Comparisons are planned for prediction of the sound \( \text{\textbackslash pa\textbackslash} \), the first syllable in Parviz, with measurements taken on human participants.

5. Conclusions and future work

There are strong and active studies of jet noise being performed under the guidance and support of CTR. Industrial and medical applications are represented. In both classes, fundamental sound-generation questions remain to be answered.
Figure 6. Instantaneous dilatation (background) and vorticity magnitude (near image) for a $M_j = 2.2$ ($M_d = 2.0$) cold jet. The shock cells are visible within the early regions of the jet. $r_0 = D_j/2$ is the jet radius.

Figure 7. Overall sound pressure levels recorded along a cylindrical surface at a distance of $6D_j$ from the jet centerline. Pressure matched jet with $M_j = 1.95$, ---; imperfectly expanded jet ---.

It has been found that lower speed jets, both heated and unheated, are sensitive to the conditions specified at the computation inlet. In particular, the correct disturbances introduced into the initial shear layers are not yet known. As the jet Mach number increases, the sensitivity to the inlet conditions decreases. Using relatively thick initial shear
layers, reasonable turbulence and sound predictions were obtained. With the introduction of shock-cells into a jet simulation, the increased noise due to the shock-turbulence interactions appears to be qualitatively captured by the LES; a quantitative comparison is not yet available.

The relative success of the prediction of noise for industrial jets suggests that the human phonation study is within current capabilities. However, the low-speed jet sensitivity to inlet conditions demands that the glottal jet calculations proceed with strict attention to the environment immediately surrounding the vocal folds.
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