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SUMMARY

A test program was conducted on a two-dimensional supersonic inlet. Internal disturbances in diffuser exit mass flow were produced by oscillating overboard bypass doors. Open-loop dynamic responses of shock position, throat exit and diffuser exit static pressures are presented. The steady-state and dynamic coupling between ducts were also obtained. The inlet was run with and without a splitter plate. The splitter plate is an extension of the ramp and extends to the choked orifice plate. Response for the inlet at various angles-of-attack at an off-design Mach number and with different bleed configurations are presented and compared to results for the design operating conditions.

The experimental results from the two-dimensional inlet are compared to results from a similar size axisymmetric inlet and also to a transfer function synthesis program.

INTRODUCTION

The increased use of supersonic aircraft requires new, sophisticated inlet systems and inlet controls to insure that the engine is supplied with the proper airflow and pressure distribution. Problems, unique to the supersonic flow regime, demand reliable methods for operation and control of these inlets. The inlet's function is to convert the kinetic energy of the moving air into potential energy (static pressure rise). In addition, the inlet must present the compressor with a uniform pressure distribution.

Inlet efficiency is a strong function of terminal shock position; therefore, holding the shock at a given position in the inlet is of paramount importance. To develop a good shock position sensor and shock position control, the inlet's dynamic characteristics must be defined; then, suitable controls can be developed. The inlet may be subjected
to internal and external disturbances which tend to move the terminal shock from its
design point. The final control must, therefore, be capable of minimizing the effects
of these disturbances on terminal shock position.

Experimental tests of these shock dynamics were conducted on a two-dimensional
inlet in the Lewis 10- by 10-Foot Supersonic Wind Tunnel. This inlet has a wedge-
shaped, collapsible centerbody. Seventy percent of the supersonic area concentration
occurs externally at the inlet design Mach number of 2.7. The inlet is referred to as a
70-30 two-dimensional inlet. The inlet is separated into two ducts. Each duct is
equipped with a pair of servodriven overboard bypass doors and performance bleed
ports which are located on the centerbody and cowl.

Previous work with inlets is reported in references 1 to 4. The response of a
Mach 2.5 axisymmetric inlet, with different terminations, is reported in reference 1.
The inlet was subjected to both internal and external disturbances. Reference 2 presents
results for both internal and external disturbances introduced to an inlet operating at
Mach 3. In these tests, measurement of terminal shock position, throat exit static and
diffuser exit static pressures were made. A mathematical analysis of supersonic inlet
dynamics is presented in reference 5.

In the current series of tests open-loop dynamic tests were conducted to define the
inlet's dynamic characteristics. To obtain these results, the inlet was subjected to
internal disturbances by oscillating an overboard bypass door in each duct. This pro-
duced changes in diffuser exit mass flow. The response of throat exit and diffuser exit
static pressure and terminal shock position to this disturbance was measured. Results
are presented for both design and off-design conditions.

Tests were conducted to determine the coupling between ducts when the disturbance
was introduced in one duct. All the results presented herein were obtained by oscillating
one bypass door. Coupling effects between the two ducts are shown.

A transfer function synthesis program was used to represent the experimental data
with a simplified transfer function. The results obtained from this program provided a
relatively simple transfer function which adequately described the dynamic characteris-
tics of the inlet over the frequency range considered. Comparisons between the analyti-
cal program results and experimental data are presented.

APPARATUS AND PROCEDURE

Model

Two views of the inlet are shown in figures 1 and 2. The inlet is a two-dimensional,
mixed-compression inlet with a wedge-type, collapsible centerbody. The inlet is de-
sign for operation at Mach 2.7 with 70 percent of the supersonic area contraction
occurring externally at the design Mach number. The corresponding free stream conditions were total pressure of $9.55 \text{ N/cm}^2$, total temperature of 320 K, specific heat ratio of 1.4, and test section Reynolds number of $7.75 \times 10^6$ per meter. The inlet is separated into two ducts and has a removable splitter plate attached to the aft end of the centerbody and extended to an orifice located approximately at the compressor face plane. The splitter plate is shown in figures 2 and 3. The orifice operates choked. A comparison of inlets terminated in an orifice, a long cold pipe, and a turbojet engine is presented in reference 1. It was shown that the choked orifice termination more closely represents a turbojet termination as far as the inlet responses are concerned.

Each duct is equipped with bleed ports and vortex generators located on the centerbody, cowl, and sidewalls. In addition, each duct is equipped with a pair of overboard bypass doors, located on the cowl, downstream of the geometric throat. Figure 1 illustrates the location of the bypass doors, collapsible ramp, and throat bleed pipes. The bleed flow can be varied by means of retractable plugs that terminate the throat bleed pipes. Figure 2 is a cutaway view, showing the bleed ports and the internal configuration of the collapsible ramp.

The inlet is 180.34 centimeters long and has a capture area of 2220 square centimeters.

Test Configurations

The design operating point for this inlet is at a free stream Mach number of 2.7. The design operating configuration was at zero angle-of-attack with the splitter plate extension in position and with the minimum bleed flow, which provided high levels of performance. Other cases run were with splitter plate extension removed, a $\pm 2^\circ$ angle-of-attack, larger geometric throat area (1.04 times design area), and a Mach number of 2.3. A case was also run with maximum bleed flow.

Disturbance Device

Each duct is equipped with a pair of overboard bypass doors. Each door assembly consists of two slotted plates. On plate is fixed on the cowl. The second plate moves relative to this fixed plate. Each door has four slots. The dimension of each slot is 19.05 by 2.54 centimeters. The door motion for these tests was 0.42 centimeter (maximum) peak-to-peak, providing a peak-to-peak area change of 32 square centimeters. Each door is driven by a high-response, two-stage electrohydraulic servovalve and hydraulic actuator combination. Detailed information on the servosystem is presented in reference 6. The dynamic response of the bypass door assembly, shown in figure 4, is flat to 100 hertz. This response, typical for these tests, is for a peak-to-
peak door movement of 0.42 centimeter (16 percent of full travel). All four doors were tuned to yield approximately the same response shown in figure 4.

One bypass door was sued to produce an internal disturbance in the inlet. The other three doors remained at their design operating point. Since the bypass door flow was choked, the real effect of oscillating the door was to produce changes in the diffuser exit mass flow which corresponded to the changes in door flow area.

Instrumentation

Pressure measurements were made with strain gage transducers connected to the cowl with short tubes (6.35 cm (maximum)). The tubes were provided with orifices which extended the frequency response of the measuring system. The transducer response had less than 1 decibel attenuation and negligible phase shift over the frequency range (1 to 150 Hz) considered in these tests.

The location of the pressure transducers in each duct is shown in figure 3. Eight transducers (Pₜ₁,ₐ to Pₜ₁,h and Pₜ₂,ₐ to Pₜ₂,h) are located on the cowl, 8.64 centimeters off the inlet's centerline. These transducers, located in the inlet's throat region were used as the shock position sensor (ESPₜᵤ for upper duct and ESPₜ₇ for lower duct). The throat exit static pressures (Pₜᵤ₂,8₇, Pₜ₇ₐ,8₇) and the diffuser exit static pressures (Pₜᵤ₇₇, Pₜ₇₇, Pₜ₇₈₇, Pₜ₇₈₇) were also measured. The numbers 57 and 87 indicate the distance from the cowl lip in centimeters.

Shock Sensor

Terminal shock was determined by an electronic shock sensor. Inputs to the sensor were the outputs of the eight throat static pressures. These taps were evenly spaced in both upper and lower ducts. The spacing between these taps was 1.27 centimeters. Each throat static pressure output was compared to a reference pressure. As the terminal shock moved upstream, a constant voltage level was turned on for each tap having a higher output than the reference. The terminal shock was considered to be between the tap that had a higher output than the reference and the adjacent pressure tap. The constant voltage levels switched in were summed by an analog amplifier. This resulted in a shock sensor output that was a stepwise-continuous function proportional to shock position. Sensor resolution is limited to the spacing of the pressure taps.

The reference pressure used for switching was 0.528 times the total pressure measured at the inlet's geometric throat. The responses shown for the shock position
represent the output of this shock sensor to a disturbance in diffuser exit mass flow caused by a change in bypass door area. The following sketch illustrates the output of the shock sensor:

![Shock sensor output](image)

**Data Reduction**

The method used consisted of initial on-line analysis using a commercial frequency response analyzer. The analyzer output was then used as the input to a digital program which put the data into the desired form. Results are presented as amplitude ratios and phase differences. The responses represent the change in shock position and pressures to changes in bypass door area. The data are normalized by dividing the amplitude ratio of each signal by their value at 1 hertz.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Large noise content was present in the variables measured. A cause of noise could be due to an inherent instability in shock position. Figure 5 is a strip chart recording of upper duct pressures as the terminal shock moves from a position upstream of transducer \( P_{u,a} \) toward the aft end of the inlet. Shock motion was produced by slowly ramping the overboard bypass doors from a closed to an open position. Shown in figure 5 are pressures \( P_{u,a} \), \( P_{u,b} \), \( P_{u,c} \), \( P_{u,d} \), \( P_{u,e} \), \( P_{u,f} \), and \( P_{u,h} \) which make up the shock sensor. Pressure \( P_{u,g} \) was not recorded. Also shown in this figure are the throat exit static pressure \( P_{u,57} \) and the diffuser exit static pressure \( P_{u,87} \). As the bypass doors open, the shock moves across the pressure taps. An instability occurs in the transition from subsonic to supersonic conditions. With the doors fully open, the terminal shock is in the region between \( P_{u,h} \) and \( P_{u,57} \). It is apparent from the figure that the shock instability is reflected as far upstream as pressure \( P_{u,c} \). The
operating point has the terminal shock positioned between $P_{u,c}$ and $P_{u,d}$. The shock instability is also reflected in the throat exit static pressure $P_{u,87}$.

A condition that may be responsible for this shock instability is that the transition is too abrupt from the square to circular cross section of the diffuser.

Open-Loop Results

Figures 6 to 10 show the response of shock position $ESP_{u}$, $P_{u,h}$, throat exit static pressure $P_{u,57}$, and diffuser exit static pressure $P_{u,87}$ to perturbations in diffuser exit mass flow. Diffuser exit mass flow was changed by oscillating the overboard bypass door. The range of disturbance frequencies was 1 to 150 hertz.

A splitter plate was installed to separate the upper and lower duct. It extended from the aft end of the ramp to the compressor face plane. Addition of the splitter plate significantly reduced the coupling between ducts, but complete isolation was not achieved. The coupling between ducts is not significantly affected by the amount of bleed flow. The coupling data discussed hereinafter was obtained with minimum bleed flow. A disturbance introduced into the upper duct by varying the bypass door area produced changes in lower duct pressures. The steady-state gain between the pressure $P_{u,h}$ (last tap of the upper duct shock sensor) and bypass door area change was $0.050 \text{ N/cm}^2/\text{cm}^2$. The gain for $P_{f,h}$ (last tap of lower duct shock sensor) to upper duct bypass door area change was $0.008 \text{ N/cm}^2/\text{cm}^2$. Similar gains for the throat exit static pressures were $0.027 \text{ N/cm}^2/\text{cm}^2$ and $0.003 \text{ N/cm}^2/\text{cm}^2$. These gains were obtained for a peak-to-peak area change of 32 square centimeters. Figure 11 illustrates the dynamic response of lower duct signals for upper duct disturbance with and without the splitter plate extension. There is approximately 12 to 20 percent steady-state coupling with splitter plate against 39 to 57 percent steady-state coupling with splitter plate out. Data for the splitter plate in were only obtained out to 25 hertz.

Dynamic response of upper duct signals to bypass door disturbance in the upper duct are shown in figure 6. These responses are for the design operating point with the inlet at zero angle-of-attack, splitter plate extension in, minimum bleed flow, and free stream Mach number of 2.7. The response of shock position $ESP_{u}$, pressure $P_{u,h}$, and throat exit static pressure $P_{u,57}$ all show a slight attenuation beginning below 10 hertz. The response of $P_{u,87}$ is flat to approximately 15 hertz. Beyond this the response resembles a first order lag in the 20 to 60 hertz range. A resonance is detected at approximately 100 hertz. In the 100 hertz region the response of $ESP_{u}$, $P_{u,h}$, and $P_{u,57}$ indicate higher damping.

Tests were conducted to check the similarity of upper and lower ducts. The results showed that both ducts have similar dynamic characteristics.
Tests were also conducted for effects, upon dynamic response, of maximum bleed flow. The results showed that the response of the selected variables were relatively insensitive to bleed conditions.

Other configurations were run, including a larger geometric throat area (1.04 times the design area), ±2° angle-of-attack, and operation at a free stream Mach number of 2.3. These responses are shown in figures 7 to 10. These figures include, for comparison, the results for the design operating case. The design conditions were run at a free stream Mach number of 2.7, zero angle-of-attack, and a small amount of bleed flow. The most significant difference in response occurs for Mach 2.3 operation (refer to fig. 10).

The splitter plate extension was removed and frequency responses were taken. A comparison of responses with and without splitter plate is shown in figure 12. This figure illustrates the difference in response for ESP, Pu,57, and Pu,58 for a disturbance produced in the upper duct by varying the bypass door area.

Figure 13 compares the response of shock position, throat exit static, and diffuser exit static pressures of the 70-30 two-dimensional inlet with similar signals from a 40-60 axisymmetric inlet. The responses for the 70-30 inlet are for half of the total inlet (inlet separated into two ducts by the splitter plate), the design case as shown in figure 7. The transducer locations for the 40-60 inlet are illustrated in reference 4.

Open-Loop Transfer Function

Considerable time savings and subsequent cost reductions can be realized if the model's open-loop dynamics can be accurately described by a transfer function. Selection of suitable controls and control optimization studies could be done on the computer if the open-loop dynamics can be expressed analytically. The results could then be used in the test cell, eliminating the time normally used in testing to achieve these objectives. This approach could result in shorter overall testing programs.

A program for synthesizing transfer functions was used for the data from this inlet program. The transfer functions obtained, together with the experimental dynamic characteristics are shown in figure 14. The results show a normalized response for throat exit static and diffuser exit static pressure to bypass door area change. These responses are for upper duct signals.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Dynamic responses of a two-dimensional inlet are presented. The response of three variables: shock position, throat exit, and diffuser exit static pressures to a
change in diffuser exit mass flow are presented. The inlet was disturbed by oscillating an overboard bypass door. The frequency range covered in these tests was 1 to 150 hertz.

The dynamic responses of the three variables show attenuation starting at about 10 hertz with a damped resonance at approximately 100 hertz. The response of the throat and diffuser exit static pressures show less attenuation at the higher frequencies and less damping of resonance. The two ducts of the inlet are similar in dynamic response. Results show that the inlet's dynamic characteristics are relatively insensitive to the amount of bleed flow. A different response, with less attenuation in the midfrequency range of 10 to 60 hertz, was obtained by running the inlet at free stream Mach number 2.3.

The addition of the splitter plate changes the dynamic response of the inlet. The splitter plate is an extension of the ramp to the choked orifice plate. A comparison of responses with and without the splitter plate shows a more attenuated response with the splitter plate in. Results show there is between 12 to 20 percent steady-state coupling with splitter plate in against 39 to 57 percent steady-state coupling without splitter plate. Coupling is defined as the response of lower duct variables to disturbance introduced in upper duct only.

The results from the tests on the two-dimensional inlet were also compared to test results from a similar size 40-60 axisymmetric inlet. The response of the 70-30 two-dimensional inlet shows more attenuation in the 30- to 100-hertz region than the results from the 40-60 axisymmetric inlet.

An inherent instability in shock position was detected. This may be due to an excessively abrupt transition from square to circular cross-sectional area.

Using the experimental data, transfer functions were synthesized to describe the dynamic behavior. In general, the simplified transfer function was adequate in describing the inlet's dynamic response.
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APPENDIX - SYMBOLS

A  bypass door area, cm$^2$
E  input signal to bypass doors, V
ESP electronic shock position sensor
P  pressure, N/cm$^2$

Subscripts:

a, ..., h  refers to taps of the shock sensor
l  refers to lower duct variables
u  refers to upper duct variables
57, 83  distance of pressure tap from cowl lip
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Figure 1. - Two-dimensional inlet.
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Figure 2. - Cutaway view of the two-dimensional inlet.
Figure 3. Location of pressure transducers in upper and lower duct of two-dimensional inlet. Views 1, 2, and 3 show only inside cowl and/or sidewall surfaces, looking downstream.
Figure 4. - Response of overboard bypass door to sinusoidal input voltage. Peak-to-peak movement of 0.42 centimeter (16 percent of maximum door travel).
Figure 5. - Throat static pressure changes as terminal shock traverses inlet.
Figure 6. Upper duct signals for upper duct bypass door oscillation. Zero angle-of-attack; backpressured bleeds; Mach 2.7.
(c) Throat exit static pressure $P_{u,57}$. Steady-state gain, $0.026 \text{ N/cm}^2/\text{cm}^2$.

(d) Diffuser exit static pressure $P_{u,87}$. Steady-state gain, $0.016 \text{ N/cm}^2/\text{cm}^2$.

Figure 6 - Concluded.
Steady-state gain, N/cm²/cm²

- 0.026 Design case
- 0.025 1.04 Throat area

Figure 7. - Concluded.
Steady-state gain, N/cm²/cm²

- 0.026 Design case
- 0.015 +2° Attack angle

(c) Throat exit static pressure $P_{u,57}$

(d) Diffuser exit static pressure $P_{u,87}$

Figure 8. - Concluded.
Figure 9. - Upper duct signals for upper duct bypass door oscillation. -2° Angle-of-attack; backpressured bleed; Mach 2.7.
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Steady-state gain, N/cm²/cm²

- 0.016 Design case
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(d) Diffuser exit static pressure $P_{u,87}$

Figure 9. - Concluded.
Figure 10. - Upper duct signals for upper duct bypass door oscillation. Zero angle-of-attack; back pressured bleeds, Mach 2.3.
Steady-state gain, N/cm²/cm²

- Design case 0.026 Mach 2.3
- Design case 0.016 Mach 2.3

(c) Throat exit static pressure $P_{u,57}$

(d) Diffuser exit static pressure $P_{u,87}$

Figure 10. - Concluded.
Figure 11. - Coupling between ducts (lower duct signals for disturbance in upper duct only) for inlet with and without splitter plate extension. Backpressured bleeds; Mach 2.7.
Figure 12. Upper duct signals for upper duct bypass door oscillation for inlet with and without splitter plate. Zero angle-of-attack; Mach 2.7.
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- 0.297 70-30 Inlet
- 0.184 40-60 Inlet

Steady-state gain,
N/cm²/cm²

- 0.026 70-30 Inlet
- 0.014 40-60 Inlet

Steady-state gain,
N/cm²/cm²

- 0.016 70-30 Inlet
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Figure 13. - Comparison of signals between 70-30 two-dimensional inlet and 40-60 axisymmetric inlet.
Figure 14. Comparison of synthesized transfer function and experimental data.