CONTIDENTIAL

Copy RM E55F01

NACA RM E55FOl

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS -

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF A TRANSONIC AXIAL-FLOW-COMPRESSOR

ROTOR WITH DOUBLE-CIRCULAR-ARC AIRFOIL BLADE SECTIONS

TII - COMPARISON OF BLADE-ELEMENT PERFORMANCE WITH

THREE LEVELS OF SOLIDITY

By Francis C. Schwenk and George W. Lewis, Jr.

SUMMARY

Two low-solidity transonic axial-flow-compressor rotors were tested over a range of speeds up to a corrected tip speed of 1000 feet per see-*7* ond to determine **the** performance of such rotors and **to** provide experimen- **%e** tal rotor blade-element data for low solidity **levels.** The **two** rotors were 16- and 12-blade versions of a 19-blade rotor previously tested and reported. Tip solidities of the 19-, 16-, and 12-blade rotors are 1.0, 0.84, and 0.63, respectively. The rotor blade sections are doublecircular-arc airfoils.

Comparisons of the hub and mean blade-element **losses** for the three rotors showed that **the** losses tended to decrease **with** a decrease in solidity. Hub- and man-section losses were low for all three rotors, and . measured diffusion factors were **below** the limiting value. **Losses** near **the** rotor tip were about the **same** level for the three solidities at 60 and 80 percent of design speed but increased significantly **with** a decrease in solidity **at** 90 and 100 percent of design speed.

Hub- and mean-section deviation angles for **minimum-loss** incidence angles **were** nearly constant over the speed range tested for all three rotors, and the general level of the measured deviation angles agreed with values computed from Carter's rule. However, no distinct variation of deviation angle with solidity was observed. Near the rotor tip, the deviation angles at design speed increased with decreasing solidity at a greater rate than is anticipated from Carter's rule.

Stall characteristics appeared to change with solidity, as indicated by studies **made with** hot-wire anemometers at 60-percent design speed. Periodic rotating stalls were observed in tests of the 19-blade rotor. the 16- and 12-blade rotors. However, only nonperiodic flow fluctuations were sensed in the tests of

CONFIDENTIAL

UNCLASSIFIED

 \mathbf{A}

*

3530

INTRODUCTION

2 **ACA RM E55FO1**

INTRODUCTION

The results of testing transonic axial-flow-compressor rotors (refs. he results of testing transonic axial-flow-cmpressar rotors **(refs.** 1 to *6)* have shown that compressor rotors can operate efficiently with tip-region relative inlet **Mach** numbers greater than 1.0. The **high** Mach number levels permit the design of rotors that produce high stage totalpressure ratios and pass large weight **flows.** These features are neces*sary* for the **design** of light-weight multistage compressors **for** aircraft turbo jet engines. -

Design information for transonic compressors is, as yet, incomplete. For example, most of the reported test data dealwlth rotors **having** tip solidities (chord-spacing ratios) around 1.0 and greater (refs. 1 and **³** to 5). Some data have been reported for rotors with tip solidities around 0.75 (refs. 2 and 6). However, the effects of solidity have not been systematically investigated aud reported.

Information on transonic rotors **having** tip solidities **less** than 1.0 is particularly desirable, **since** there are reasous that **may** dictate the use of low solidities. **Among** these reasons **are** blade mounting and hub choking **problems** that could prevent the **design** of a high-tip-solidity compressor rotor if the hub-tip radius ratio is **low.** Therefore, three related transonic rotors were tested at the NACA Lewis laboratory to investigate solidity effects at solidity levels below 1.0.

These tests were conducted on **an** available set of **transonic rotor** blades with double-circular-arc cross sections. References 5 and 7 describe these **blades** and present **the** design ani over-all and **blade-element** performance of a **19-blade** transonic rotor **(tip** solidity of *1.0).* **For** the study of solidity effects, these blades were tested in 16- and 12-blade solidities are 1.67, 1.41, and **1.05** for the 19-, 16-, and **12-blade** rotare, respectively. **Blade** setting angles (angles *cf* the blade munting **slots** in the rotor disk) were identical for all three rotors; and, therefore, the **mean** camber line directions are identical. In such an investigation the velocity **diagrams** change **with solidity,** because **deviation angles** tend to increase with decreasing solidity. Because *of* these changes in **the** the velocity diagrams change with solidity, because deviation angles tend
to increase with decreasing solidity. Because of these changes in the
velocity diagrams, the effect of solidity will not be completely isolated.
The The results, however, can be used to predict **solidity** effects and, **at** the same time, to supplement existing transonic-rotor data. **.rotors** that **provide tip** solidities of 0.84 **and 0.63,** &.the **hub,** the

The characteristics of all three rotors were determined by means of detailed radial survey tests. Complete blade-element and over-all performance characteristics of the 16- **and** 12-blade **rotors** are given in this report. Reference **6** 5 and 7 give similar results for the 19-blade. rotor. In addition, the present report utilizes some of the **19-blade**rotor data of references 5 and **7.for** direct. compasisons of the **blade**element and over-all performance charactersitics for the three solidity levels. levels. The contraction of \overline{a} is a set of \overline{a} is a set of \overline{a} is a set of \overline{a}

NACA IIM E55FOI

SYMBOLS

The following symbols are used in thi's report: compressor frontal area based on rotor tip diameter, sq ft $A_{\overline{R}}$ specific heat of air at constant pressure, $Btu/(1b)$ $({}^OR)$ c_p diffusion factor (ref. 8) **D** acceleration due to gravity, 32.17 $ft/sec²$ *0 04 Q* total enthalpy, $c_p g J T$, **sq** ft/sec² **H** *i* incidence angle, angle between inlet relative air-velocity vector and **a** tangent to blade mean camber **line** at leading edge, deg J Joule's constant, 778.26 ft-lb/Btu **Mach** number **M** total pressure, lb/sq ft $\mathbf P$ *cr'* r radius measured from axis of rotation, in. T **total** temperature, *aR* u blade speed, ft/sec v air velocity, ft/sec air weight **flow,** lb/sec **W B air-flow** angle measured from axis of rotation, deg *7p* blade angle, direction of tangent to blade mean camber line at leading or trailing edge measured from **axis** of rotation, **deg** *6* ratio of inlet total pressure to NACA standard sea-level total pressure of 2116.22 lb/sq ft 8° deviation angle, angle between **outlet** relative air-velocity vector and tangent to blade mean camber line at trailing edge, deg adiabatic temperature-rise efficiency η *8* ratio of inlet total temperaturce to **NACA** standard sea-level temperature of **518.688O** R

,-

c

-

 \mathbf{r} denotes conditions relative to **blade row** -

APPARATUS *AND* PROCEDURF:

The solidity tests were conducted on 16- and **12-blade** versions of the 19-blade transonic compressor rotor described in referenceB 5 **and** 7. The double-circular-mc **blades** of *the* 19-blade rotor were installed in two new rotor disks at the **same** blade setting angles. Therefore, the blade angles (given in table I) are similar for all three rotors.

References *5.* and 7 describe the cmpres6br test rig ip **which** the . rotors were tested. These references also discuss the instruments, test procedure, and calculations. Figure 1 is a diagram of the compressor test section **showing** the location of the measuring planes upstream and downstream of the rotor.

The rotors were tested over a range of weight flows at four corrected rotor speeds: 60, 80, 90, and 100 percent of design speed (design corrected tip speed is 1000 ft/sec).

.?

3530

DATA ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS

The rotor performance is analyzed by means of the blade-element approach described in reference 1. In **this** method, the complex compressor **flow** field is replaced by the flow across a series of blade elements. In applying the blade-element approach, the following assumptions are made:

(I) The state of **the** air **is** axially symmetric upstream and downstream of the compressor blade row.

(2) The flow is divided into two regions, the boundary layer near the inner and outer **walls** and the free-stream region outside the **wall boundary** layer.

(3) In the free-stream portion the flow is assumed **to** OCCUT along conical stream surfaces of revolution, and the action of the **blade** row is the sum **of** the performances of the blade sections or elements **that** lie on the stream surfaces.

(4) The **flow across** each blade element is considered a function *only* of **the** section geometry, **the** incidence angle, the ratio of outlet to inlet axial velocities, and inlet relative **Mach** number. The action of the rotor can then be replaced by a radial distribution of **turning** angle and losses (characteristics of the **blade** elements). **^t**

-I (5) *Tbe* stream surfaces **were** assmd the same for the three rotors discussed in **tbis** report; therefore, except for **solidity,** the bladeelement geometry is the **same** for **all** thee rotors.

The last assumption **may** give a fictitious picture of **solidity** effects on rotor blade-element performance, since it says that **the** flow always follaws **the** same paths through **the** rotor regardless of solidity and operating condition. The successful application of **this** assumption depends on the radial flow of air through the rotor, which may vary with **solidity** level and operating condition. The use of **similar** blade elements for **the** three rotors seems justified, because, **at** flow rates corresponding to efficient operation at each speed, the measured radial **dis**tributions of weight **flow** at the rotor-inlet and -outlet stations change only slightly **with** changes in solidity.

BLADE-ELEMENT PERFORMANCE OF 16- AND 12-BLADE ROTORS

The blade-element characteristics for the two low-solidity (16- and 12-bl.ade) rotors are **shown** in figures 2 and 3 for four blade elements The four blade elements &re located at 12.7, **17.7,** 49 **.O,** and 84.4 percent of the passage height away from the **outer** wall. The blade-element charerence ?. **^F**and corrected rotor tip speeds **of** *60, 80,* 90, and **100** percent of design. of the passage height away from the outer wall. The blade-element char-
acteristics for the high-solidity rotor (19 blades) are reported in ref-

I

్లా
నే *4*

> .. ""
""

._

6

The characteristics shown in figures 2 and 3 are the variations with

incidence angle of relative total-pressure-loss coefficient $\overline{\omega}$, deviation

angle δ° , inlet relative Mach number M_z^1 , axial velocity The characteristics shown in figures 2 and 3 are the variations with incidence angle of relative total-pressure-loss coefficient $\bar{\omega}$, deviation angle δ^0 , inlet relative Mach number M_5 , axial velocity ratio $V_{Z,4}/V_{Z,3}$, diffusion factor D (ref. 8), work coefficient $\Delta E/U_{+}^{2}$ (nondimensional temperature rise), and blade-element adiabatic temperaturerise efficiency **q.** Incidence angles were computed from the **measured** blade angles and the relative inlet-air **angles, which** were determined according to the procedure outlined in reference 7. The large **number** of vasiables given **provide** complete information on the performance *of* these rotors and **allow** the construction of the velocity diagrams.

The blade-element characteristics of the 16- and 12-blade rotors are very similar to those of the 19-blade rotor $(ref, 7)$ and other transonicrotor data (refs. I, 2, and **4).** Therefore, the results in figures 2 **and ³**will not be discussed in detail, and the data **are** Largely used for solidity comparisons in this report.

For both the 16- **and** 12-blade **rotor&** (figs. 2 and 3), the **variations** of relative total-pressure-loss coefficient with incidence angle and speed are similar to previously reported compressor test results (e.g., refs. 1, 2 **4,** and 7). Except for **the** hub section of the **16-blade rotor** (fig. 2(d)j, there is the usual shift **in-the** value of **minimum-lose** incidence angle to **high** values a6 the Mach number (speed) is increased. **At** the hub and mean sections (figs. $2(c)$ and (d) and $3(c)$ and (d)), the minimum **losses** are **low** and do **not** *vary* **with rotational** speeds. *As* observed in references 1, 2, **4,** and. 7, there is aa increase in **the minirmun-lose** level with speed associated with the sections near **the** rotor **tip** (figs. $2(a)$ and (b) and $3(a)$ and (b) . These results also show that the losses for the tip section at design speed are greater for the lower solidity. More **is** said **about** this **observation in** a later pection.

COMPARISON OF BLADE-ELEMENT PERFORMANCE FOR TERFE SOLIDITY LEVELS

Blade-Element Losses

The effects of **solidity** on blade-element losses **are** discussed in two sections. Eub and mean **losses** are considered first, because **the** performance of these elements generally compares with cascade results, and then losses **at** the tip elements **axe** considered.

Hub **and** mean **sections.** - The losses **for .the** hub and man **blade** *ele*ments of the 19-, 16-, and 12-blade rotors are given in figures 4(a) and

(b) where relative total-pressure-loss coefficient $\frac{1}{n}$ is plotted agains (b), where relative total-pressure-loss coefficient ω is plotted against incidence angle. Data are **shown** for 60, 80, 90, and 100 percent of de**sign** corrected tip speed. The **hub** section Is. located at l5.6 percent of the passage height from the inner wall. Generally, very little effect the passage height from the inner wall. Generally, very little effect

NACA RM E55FO1

?

c

w *cn 0* **w**

of solldity on losses is noticed for the range of conditions tested. Incidence-angle range seems to **be** the same for all solidities, and values of minimum-loss incidence angle change only sli@tly in the range of *so*lidities tested.

Losses at the hub element (fig. $4(a)$) increase with an increase in solidity. Tihe loss-level change is most pronounced at **design** speed and is not *as* well defined at the lower speeds. *An* increase **in loss** level at **the** mean **blade** section with **an** increase in solidity can be seen in figure **4(b),** although not **as** cleazly **as** for the hub section. Low-speed twodimensional cascade data {ref. 9) also show an increase in loss level **with** increasing solidity, *as* .indicated by the analysis of cascade data given in reference 8.

Since the flow field probably **follows** two-dimensional Cascade **flow** and *the* secondary-flow effects are probably small, the measured losses for the hub (15.6 percent away from the inner **wall)** and mean sections are primarily centered in the blade wakes. Therefore, the losses as **shown** in figures $4(a)$ and (b) depend on the size and shape of the wake leaving each blade and the number of **blades** present.

In order to rate the losses on a per-blade basis, the measured losses ^ffor each rotor were **reduced** to a **loss-solidity** ratio, **u/u.** The variation of the **loss-solidity** ratio **with** incidence angle (for hub and mean sections) - is shown in figures 5(a) and (b) for 80 and **100** percent of design speed. On a per-ble,de basis, the Losses **for** each **solidity** are **about** the same in the minimum-loss range of operation. To the extent of experimental accuracy, this is an indication that the size and shape of the blade wake are much the same for the three rotor solidities. In retrospect, little effect of solidity on the loss per blade should have **been** observed in these tests for two reasons: (1) The solidity at the hub and mean was not reduced enough to cause excessive blade loading and flow sepaxation to occur, and (2) **below** limiting **loading,** the variation of loss-solidity ratio with *loading is mall* and **probably** within measurement accuracy.

The first reason is illustrated in figures $6(a)$ and (b) . These fig**ures** present the loss-solidity ratio plotted 8gainst diffusion factor (blade-Loading parameter, ref. 8) for the hub and mean sections. Only data **near minim-loss** operation **are** given in figure 6, since the diffusion factor applies *only* in the **low-loss** range of incidence angle. Reference 8 states a value of 0.6 for limiting loading (diffusion factor) for cascades, and figure 6 **smws** that for aLL solidities the measured diffusion factors were **less** than 0.6 for **the** hub and mean sections. Mgure 6 **shows** no appreciable change in loss-solidity ratio with diffusion factor below **limiting loading.**

Tip section. - *The* losses for the tip blade elements of **the** 19-, 16-, **A** and **12-blade** rotors are given in figure 4(c). The blade-element is located at 12.7 percent of the passage height from the outer wall, and data are given for 60, 80, 90, and 100 percent of **design** speed. The value for

" *

. .. "
"

0

-

A ..

the minimm-loss incidence angle decreases slightly **with** decreasing **so**lidity. At high speeds, the change in the minimum-loss incidence angle is about 1° to 1° over the range of solidities test.

One fact stands out on these curves. At the low speeds, the minimumloss level is nearly the **same** for each **solidity;** whereas, at 90 and **100** percent of design speed, the **minimum-loss** level increases with the **de**crease in solidity. *This* trend *is* most noticeable at design speed and is opposite that of the. hub and mean sections. The **test** results indicate that the increase in loss level with **a** decrease in solidity occurs *oniy* w in the tip region. That is, this reversal in solidity effect was not observed for a blade element located 33 percent of the passage height away **from** the outer.wal1. Instead, for this 33-percent **blade** element, the **loss** variation **with solidity** was **similar** to the trends observed at the hub and mean elements and from cascade data.

These tests results introduce the following questions:

(1) Why **do** tip-section losses increase with decreasing solidity **In** opposition to the trends observed at the hub **and** mean?

(2) **Why** does this reversed solidity effect appear *only* **at high** speeds?

As an attempt to answer these questions, it is first desirable to look at some of the conventional **flow** parameters *on* **which** losses **may de**pend and to determine their variation with solidity in these tests. Among the conventional flow parameters are inlet relative Mach number and blade loading as expressed by **diffusion** factor D (ref. 8). It is **also** suspected that axial velocity **ratio** (outlet to inlet) may **also af**fect the loss level.

Inlet relative Mach number, of course, does not change **Kith** solidity in this investigation. *As* shown in figure 7, the measured **axial** velocity ratios **Vz,4/Vz,3** do not vary **with** solidity; **and** fig**ure** 8 shows that measured diffusion factors are about the same for *the* three rotors.

The measured tip-section losses are compared wlth **some** previously published results In figure 9, where the relative total-pressure-loss coefficient for operation near **mini-mum-loss** Incidence angle is plotted against diffusion factor D. The **dashed** lines in figure 9 represent the band of data. observed **for** tip sections in reference 8. The **19-blade**sign speed, the 16- and 12-blade-rotor data also correlate with earlier test results. However, at design speed, the losses for the lower-solidity rotors fall above the band, the 12-blde data being farther **out** of **line. ^P** than the **16-blade** data. . "

NACA RM **E55F01**

3

U

04 **VI** *0* **w**

R? I

 $\overline{}$

Therefore, the increase in tip-section losses associated with a **de**crease in solidity is not accounted for by changes in diffusion factor, axial velocity ratio, and inlet Mach number levels. Solidity changes, then, must have caused differences in the tip-region flow field at **design** speed that cannot be measured by these *gross* flow parameters. Exactly what changes in the **flow** field occur with solidity changes is unknown; therefore, concrete reasons for the occurrence of high losses at **low** solidity levels in these tests cannot be given.

Some factors that could conceivably cause the increase in tip losses with **a** decrease in solidity me as follows:

- (I) Adverse changes in blade-surface velocity distributions that **may** cause **flow** separation
- (2) Changes in secondary **flows** in the wall **and blade** surface boundary layers
- (3) Changes in the secondary **flows** of the free-stream portion of **the** air **flow**
- *(4)* Changes in rotor tip-clearance effects.

To illustrate the manner in **which** an adverse suction-surface velocity distribution could arise at low solidity, **consider the** two-dimensional supersonic flow about a cascade of ahfoils **shown** in a very simplified f om in figure 10. **Ws** figure shows an **approximate** picture of the shockwave configurations for the tip-section $(r_A = 6.62 \text{ in.})$ airfoils in a twodirnensional cascade at *two* solidity levels **(1.04** and *0.66).* A designspeed (supersonic inlet relative velocity) operating condition with a back pressure on the cascade is used for the comparison; thus, *a* detached bow wave is shown.

Blade surface Mach numbers cmputed by means of *a* two-dimensional Prandtl-Meyer expansion (assuming no **losses)** are **also shown** in figure 10. *The* Mach numbers indicate the relative strength of the normal shock waves at **the** suction surface for the two solidity levels. *As* shown in figure 10, conditions that cause suction-surface separation are likely to **b** worse for the **low** solidity levels, because

(a) me pressure rise **across the shock** wae is greater at **low** *so*lidity because of the higher blade-surface Mach number, and

(b) The shock waves hit closer to *the* trailing edge where the bound*ary* layer **may** be somewhat thicker.

The preceding discussion presents *only* a possible source of the **high** losses at low solidities, and it is based on a simplified picture **of** the

3

I

L

and the second control of the

10
 10
 **10 in the tip region, neglecting changes in stream-tube height through

the rotor. Actually, local changes in the three-dimensional effects

(items (2) (3) and (4)) could also contribute to educate velocity** flow in the **tip** region, neglecting changes in stream-tube height through the rotor. Actually, local changes in the three-dimensional effects (items **(Z), (3),** and **(4))** could also contribute to adverse velocity **dis**tributions at **low** solldity levels. Changes in the tip-region **flow** field due largely to secondary-flow and tip-clearance effects cannot be overlooked. For example, decreasing the solidity **could** alter the **blade scrap**ing action near the casing so that larger losses could occur.

In general, the increase in losses **with** a decrease in **solidity proba**bly results from several causes, no **om** cause being completely independent *8* of the others. **3**

Deviation Angles

The variations of deviation angle with incidence angle are compared for the three rotors in **figure** 11. Data **for** the **hub, mean,** and tip **sec**tions at 60, 80, 90, and 100 percent **of** design speed are given.

The deviation angles for **the** minimum-loss incidence angles are plotted in figure 12 against percent of **design** speed for the 19-, 16-, and 12-blade rotors. The values of deviation angle plotted in figure 12 were taken from the fatred curves of figure 11. The **minimum-loss** incidence angles were estimated from **figure 4,** a **plot** *of* **loss** coefficfent against Incidence angle.

Some **remazks** regarding the selection of rotor speeda for the **abscissa** of **figure** 12 are necessary. Rotor **speed** is **not** a **fundamental** independent **variable; it is merely a means to catalog the data. Changes in rotor** variance, it is mattery a means of closing one district cominges in food speeds imply variations in the flow characteristics, which in turn affect the deviation angles. Furthermore, even for fixed speeds, the flow charthe deviation angles. Furthermore, even for fixed speeds, the flow characteristics will vary with solidity.

The study of measured rotor deviation angles can be simplified **by** comparing the results **with** deviation angles measured in two-dimensional cascades. Such a comparison is given in figure 12, and Carter's rule for **airfoils having** circuhz-arc mean camber Unes is **the** source of **the** cascade **data.** Previous rotor data have shown that Carter **'6 rule applies** to the selection *of* design deviation **angles.** Carter *1s* -e (ref. **10)** ie

$$
\delta^{\circ} = m\Phi \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sigma}}
$$

where m depends on chord angle and is a' constant for one blade **element,** and the camber angle Φ is also fixed for a given blade element. There**fore, the** deviation angles computed **from** Carter **'s** rule **as** shown in figure 12 reflect the geometric effect of a change in solidity. For the ranges of solidity covered in these tests, the changes in deviation angle with solidity according to Carter's rule are about 1.5° at the hub and 1° at *the* tip.

NACA RM **E55F01** . ..

3

m α α

CF-2 back

 $\ddot{}$

At the hub and mean radii (figs. 12(a) and **(b)),** the measured rotor *^a*deviation angles at **minimum-loss** incidence angles eze roughly the **same** level **aa** the Carter's rule values; however, **no** distinct variations with solidity are present in the measured results. Generally, the deviation angles for the hub and mean are nearly constant over the speed range tested.

For the tip section $(fig. 12(c))$, the 19- and 16-blade measured deviation angles we nearly constant over the speed range tested. These deviation angle increases with decreasing **solidity,** as expected from cascade results. However, at design speed the change in deviation angle with solidity is much greater than the variation observed at low speeds and from Carter's rule. The larger deviation-angle changes at design speed are caused by the increase in tip-section losses with decreasing solidity (fig. $4(c)$) and indicate a possible flow separation on the blade suction surface. data are lower than the Carter's rule value. For the tip section, the

P RADIAL **VAKLATION** *OF* ROTOR-INLET AND -0UYiET CONDITIONS

AND OVER-ALL PERFORMANCE

Rotor-Inlet Conditions

Rotor-inlet conditions are presented to show the measured inlet velocity profiles used in the blade-element performance calculations. Data for the three rotors are given to indicate possible effects of changes in solidity and rotor performance on the inlet velocity profile. The rotorinlet conditions shown in figure 13 are the radial variations of inlet absolute Mach number plotted as the ratio of **Mach** number to mean-radius Mach umber. *The* figure gives the vdations for 80 and **100** percent of design speed and for a raqge of wei&t **flows** at each speed. The inlet velocity direction was **assumed** &B axial {no inlet guide vanes), and the radial static-pressure variation for rotor-inlet calculations was faired between outer- and inner-wall static-tap readings at station **3** (1/8 in. upstream of **rotor** hub}. In fairing, a radial trend **similar** to that recorded from the inlet Static rake and **wall** taps at station 2 **(1** in. upstream from station 3) was used. This procedure seemed reasonably correct, since there were *only a small* area change and small statrcpressure differences between stations 2 **and** 3.

In the analysis of the 19-blade rotor performance (ref. 7), a radial variation of inlet Mach number was observed. A *s* milar profile existed at the high-wei&t-flow ograting points **for** all speeds. At the low with high tip losses and stalling of the blades. - weight flows, changes in the inlet Mach number profile were asaociated

" = "

0 **m** Lo

.-

L

"

-

The inlet Mach number profiles for all three rotors are similar at
the high weight flows (fig. 13). However, at design speed (fig. 13(a)),
a change in the inlet Mach number variation is observed for the 12-blade The inlet Mach mber profiles **for** all three rotors are simiLar **at** the **high** weight flows (fig. 13). **However,** at design **speed** (fig. 13(a)), **^I** ^achange in the inlet Mach number variation is observed for the **12-blade** rotor at $w\sqrt{\theta}/\delta A_{\pi}$ of 27.4. For the same weight flow, the change in the profile was not observed for the 19- and 16-blade rotors. Similar trends are observed at 80 percent of design speed; the inlet Mach number varia**tions are similar at high weight flows, and a change in the variation is** noted at low-weight-flow operation of each rotor. $\frac{1}{100}$. $\frac{1}{100}$

M. It is interesting to note that, at the **low** weight flows for whlch a change in the inlet Mach number profile occurred, the outer-wall static pressures at station 3 were slightly higher than outer-wall pressures at station 2.. *This* observation is **not** consistent with *the* decrease in area from station 2 to 3 and is apposite to the **wall** static-pressure variatlun irom station 2 to 3 and is opposite to the wall static-pressure variation \sim

Rotor-Outlet Conditions

The radial variations of blade-element temperature-rise efficiency **q**, total-pressure ratio P_4/P_1 , and work coefficient $\Delta H/U_t^2$ for the 19-, **16-,** and **12-blade** rotars **are** plotted in **figure 14.** These results **axe** 16-, and 12-biade rotors are plotted in figure 14. These results are given for design and 80 percent of design speed and one corrected weight flow for each rotor. All rotors were operating close to peak efficiency flow for each rotor. All rotors were operating close to peak efficiency for the conditions shown in figure 14. Also, nearly equal weight flows were chosen for the three rotors. These rotor-outlet conditions axe **shown** largely to indicate the manner in which the blade-element performance should be faired to reconstruct the characteristics of the complete rotor **row.**

The difference in total-pressure ratio at 80 percent **of design** speed Since the losses and work coefficient tend to decrease with decreasing solidity, **the** efficiencies **do** not vary **from** one rotor to **the** next.

At **design** speed, there is a large increase **in** the tip-region totalpressure **ratio with** increasing **solidity** (fig. **14(a)**) . **This** *change* **stems** partly from work-coefficient variations and **partly** frm **the** decrease in losses with an increase in solidity. Near the tip, the loss-solidity variation causes a decrease in efficiency with a decrease in solidity. However, the efficiency **near** the hub is highest for the Larest solldity, because, in **this** region, the observed losses tended to decrease with decreasing solidity.

Over -All Performance

The mass-averaged **rotor** performance **data** are plotted in **figure** 15 against the corrected.weight flow **per** unit frontal area (specific wigkt

NACA RM E55FOl RACA RM E55FOL

2

crr **UI** *0 crl*

-

flow) as computed from the orifice data. Given in the plot **are** the **mass**ficiency for the three rotor solidities. **Data are** presented for 60, 80, 90, and 100 percent of design speed for a weight-flow range at each speed. averaged total-pressure ratio and the mass-averaged temperature-rise ef-

The average total-pressure-ratio level increases **with** increasing solidity for all speeds similarly to the work-coefficient variation **shown** in figure 14. Small differences in total-pressure level are shown at low speeds and large differences at **design** speed. At the low speeds, where the loss levels do not vary greatly **with** solidity, the increase in totalpressure ratio stems largely from the increase in the work-coefficient level. However, at design speed, the large variations in tip-section losses along with the work-coefficient variation cause large increases in total-pressure Level with increasing solidity.

The peak efficiencies at design speed axe about the same for the **19** and 16-blade rotors. Therefore, the higher **losses** observed in the tip region of the 16-blade rotor must be counterbalanced by the observed lower losses near the rotor hub. The 12-blade-rotor peak-efficiency values at 90 **and 100** percent of design speed are *at a* lower.-level tplan for *the* **19 and** 16-blade rotors. Excessive tip **1OSSeG** for this rotor along with a decrease in work coefficient with decreasing soIidity cause this effi*r* ciency chaage.

At 80 percent of design speed, **the** peak-efficiency values tend to in- - crease with decreasing solidity, and the opposite trend appears at 60 percent speed. These variations of efficiency level, particularly at 60 percent speed, may not be significant, because of measurement errors.

Stall Characteristics

Hot-wire anemometers **were** placed downstream of the rotors to detect the stall characteristics of the' 16- and **12-blade** rotors at 60-percent design speed. Reference 5 **describes** the stall characteristics of the *19* blade rotor, **wbich** operated with periodic rotating **stalls** at **low** weight **flows st** 60-percent design speed. However, periodic stalls were not observed in the tests of the **16-** and 12-blade rotors at **the** low weight flows. "

The observations **made with** the hot-wire anemameters on the **16-** aud 12-blade rotors at 60-percent design speed can be summzized as follows:

(1) At high weight **flows, the** hot-wire anemometers detected **only blade** wakes.

(2) After the weight flow was reduced to a value below that **for** the peak pressure ratio, the blade wakes were obscured by large flow fluctuations in the tip region. These flow fluctuations can best be described

m

 α sz α

. -.

L $\mathcal{L}_{\rm{max}}$ **I**

. ..

-

as a random or **nonperiodic** stall. At 60-percent design **speed,** the nonperiodic type of stall persisted for corrected specific weight flows as low as 10 pounds per second per square foot of frontal area. This weight flow is **below** the values **for** which rotating stalls were observed in the 19 -blade rotor.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Two low-solidity versians **Qf** a previously reported transodc **&al-** *⁸* flow-compressor rotor were tested to provide some data on the performance of low-solidity compressor rotors that operate at high levels of rotorinlet relative Mach numbers **(up** to 1.1). The original rotor contained 19 blades **and** had a tip solidity of 1.0. Rotors having tip solidities of 0.84 and 0.63 were constructed by plcing first **16** and then **12** of *the* original blades in new rotor **disks.** Blade-element characteristics **of.** the 16- and 12-blade rotors were cmputed **from** detalled survey test **data** for a range of corrected tip speeds up to **the design** value of lo00 **feet per** second and **are** plotted against Incidence angle in **this** report. The **blade-element loss** characteristics of the two **low-solidity** rotors were generdly similaz to prevfously reported rotor test results.

Comparison of the losses for the **19-, 16-,** and **12-blade** rotors **in** the **hub** and mean regions **of** the blade showed that.

1. The relative total-pressure-loss coefficient tends to increase with increasing solidity; however, on a **per-blade** basis, the **hub-** and mean-section losses **were about** the same **for all** three rotors.

2. **Hub- and** mean-section **minimum-loss** levels were generally low, and **blade** loadings (diffusion factors} were below the limiting value.

Comparison of the **blade-element** losses in the tip region for the 19-, 16-, and **12-blade rotors** showed that

1. At the **low rotor** speeds (60 and 80 percent of design **speed),** the minimum-loes levels **near** the tip were **about** the same for the three **so**lidity levels.

2. At design and 90 percent of design speed, losses increased with decreasing **solidity.** A larger increase in **loss** occurred at **design** speed.

3. TJp to 90 percent of **design speed,** the tip-section **losses** of **all** *three* rotors agreed with previous rotor test result8 on the basis **of** the loss - diffusion-factor correlation. At design speed, only the **19-bladerotor Loss data** correlated **with** previously **reported data.** *^I* - .. -_ **NaCA** RM **E55FO1** *⁷*

3530

Comparison of the measured deviation angles at minimum-loss incidence angles for the 19-, 16-, and 12-blade rotors showed that

1. The hub- and mean-section deviation angles were about constant over **the** speed range tested, and **the** general level of **the** measured deviation angles agreed with deviation angles computed from Carter's rule. However, no distinct variations of measured deviation angle with solidity were observed.

2. Tip-section deviation angles of **the** 16- **and 19-blade** rotors were nearly constant over the speeds tested and slightly below the value computed from Carter's rule. Tip-section deviation angles at design speed increased with decreasing solidity, a greater smount than was calculated from Carter's rule.

Eot-wire-anemometer tests at 60-percent **design** speed showed changing stall patterns with solidity. The anemmeter sensed periodic stall **pat**terns with the 19-blade rotor **and** only Imge nonperiodic flow fluctuations at the rotor tip with the 16- and **12-blade** rotors.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics Cleveland, Ohio, June 2, 1955

REFERENCES

- 1. Schwenk, Francis **C.,** Lieblein, **Seymour, and Lewis,** George W., Jr . : Experimental Investigation of an Axial-Flow Compressor Inlet *Stage* Operating at Transonic Relative **Inlet Mach Numbers. III** - Blade-Row Performance of Stage with Transonic Rotor and Subsonic Stator at Corrected Tip Speeds of *800* and1OOO Feet Per Second. **NACA** RM **E53Gl7,** 1953.
- 2. Robbins, William H., and Glaser, Frederick W.: Investigation of an Axial-Flow-Compressor **Rotor** with Circular-Arc **Blades** Operating up to a Rotor-Inlet Relative Mach Number of 1.22. NACA **RM E53D24,** 1953.
- 3. **561,** Edward R., **Schw-enk,** Francis C., **and,** Watkins, **'Ilbomas** B. : Experimental Investigation of a Transonic Compressor Rotor with a 1.5-Inch Chord Length and **an** Aspect **Ratio** of **3** .O. I - Design, Over-All Performance, **and** Rotating-Stall Characteristics. NACA **RM** E5AL31, 1955.
- **4.** Montgomery, **John** C., and Glaser, Frederick W.: Experimental Investigation of **a** 0.4 Hub-Tip Diameter Ratio Mal-Flow Compressor Inlet Stage at Transonic Inlet Relative **Mach Numbers.** II - Stage and Blade-Element Performance. NACA RM E54129, 1955.

-

-,,

v) M

- 16 NACA RM E55FO1

5. Lewis, George W., Jr., Schwenk, Francis C., and Serovy, George K.:

Experimental Investigation of a Transonic Axial-Flow-Compressor

Rotor with Double-Circular-Arc Airfoil Blade Sections. I Design. 5. **Lewis,** George **W.,** Jr . Schwenk, Francis C., and Serovy, George K. : Experimental Investigation of a Transonic Axial-Flow-Compressor **^P** Rotor **with** Double-Circulax-Arc Airfoil Blade Sections. **I** - **Design,** Over-All Performance, and Stall Characteristics. NACA RM E53L2la, 1954.
- 6. Savage, Melvyn, and Felix, **A. Richard:** . Investigation of a **High-**Performance Axial-Flow **Compressor Transonic** Inlet Rotor **Designed for** 37.5 Pounds Per.Second Per **Square Foot** of Frontal Area. Aerodynamic **De sign** and Over-All Performance. NACA RM L55A05, 1955. *8*
- 7. **Lewis,** George W., **Jr.,** and Schwenk, Francis C. : lkperimentsl Investi**gation** of *a* Transonic Axial-Flow-Compre6sor Rotor **with** Double-Circulm-Arc **Airfoil** Blade Sections. **I1** - Blade-Element Performance. NACA RM E54J08, 1955.
- 8. Lieblein, **Seymour,** Schwenk, Francis **C.,** and Woderick, Robert **L.** : Diffusion Factor **for Estimating** Losses **and** LimLting Blade Loadings in Axial-Flaw-Compressor Blade Elements. NACA **RM E53Do1, 1953.**
- 9. Herrig, **L.** Joseph, Emery, **James** C., and Erwin, John R. : Systematic Two-Dimensional Cascade Tests of NACA 65-Series Compressor Blades at Law **Speeds.** NACA RM **L51G31,** 1951. *^L*
- **10. Carter, A. D. Si:** The **Low** Speed Performance of Related **Airfoils** in Cascade. Rep. **No.** R. 55, British **N.G.T.E.,** Sept. 1949. *I*

Radius,		Solidity,			Measured blade Measured blade	outlet angle,
in.		σ			inlet angle,	
Inlet, r_3	\mathtt{r}_4	Outlet, 12-Blade 16-Blade 19-Blade			r^{o}_3 , deg	η_4^o , deg
7.00	7.00	0.63	0.84	1.00	52.7	41.5
6.55	6.62	.66	.88.	1.04	51.0	37.2
6.38	6.47	.67	.89	1.06	50.2	35.6
5,80	5.97	.71	.95	1.13	47.6	30.0
5.22	5.47	.78	1.04	1.23	44.7	23.7
4.63	4.97	.85	1.14	1.35	41.5	16.7
4.05	4.47	.95	1.27	1.51	37.6	8.3
3.50	4.00	1.05	1.41	1.67	$a_{33.5}$	$a_{-1,0}$

TABLE I. - ROTOR BLADE-ELEMENT GEOMETRY

^aAngles *are* **extrapolated values.**

 $\overline{}$

 $\overline{}$

Figure 1. - Schematic diagram of transonic-compressor test rig.

Figure 2. - Blade-element characteristics of 16-blade rotor.

3530

 $CF-3$ back

Figure 2. - Continued. Blade-element characteristics of 16-blade rotor.

 \bar{z}

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 \mathbb{Z}

 \sim \sim

 \cdot

 $\ddot{}$

 \mathbf{I}

 \cdot

 \cdot \cdot \cdot

 1.4 corrected tip
apsed,
parcent design Adal velocity ratio,
 $V_{\mathbf{z},\mathbf{t}}V_{\mathbf{z},\mathbf{3}}$,
 $\sum_{\substack{1\\ \text{to}}}$ $\ddot{}$ Work ooeffiaient,
AMV_t $\frac{100}{90}$
 $\frac{80}{60}$ ь **DO** 쫘 п $.5$ m Ъ $\overline{\mathbf{2}}$ \cdot 8 1.0 Relative rotor-inlet Mach
Relative number, M₃ . 2 ۸ Relative total-
pressure-loss
coefficient, m \cdot B ō \cdot 'n λ .6 E ᢁ \mathbf{o} $\begin{array}{c}\n\hline\nI\n\hline\n\text{Mathact} & \text{term} \\
\text{Mathact} & \text{term} \\
\text{pretest} & \text{term} \\
\text{pretest} & \text{if} \\
\hline\n\end{array}$ $,4$ йν $\ddot{}$ 6 Diffusion factor, D 10 \cdot Deviation angle,
⁵⁹, deg $\frac{1}{2}$ 6 . 2 Г 0.6 T2 间 -4 $\overline{\mathbf{4}}$ ō 4 8 (c) Outlet radius (mean), 5.47 inches; solidity, 1.04.

Figure 2. - Continued. Blade-element characteristics of 16-blade rotor.

Ľ

INCA RM E55FO1

NACA RM E55FO1

Figure 2. - Concluded. Blade-element characteristics of 16-blade rotor.

NACA RM E55FOL

 \sim

Figure 3. - Blade-element characteristics of 12-blade rotor.

Figure 3. - Continued. Blade-element characteristics of 12-blade rotor.

NACA RM E55FO1

3530

 P CF-4

NACA RM E55FO1

 \sim \sim

(d) Outlet radius (hub), 4.47 inches; solidity, 0.95.

Figure 3. - Concluded. Blade-element characteristics of 12-blade rotor.

26

 $CF-4$ back

3530 $\overline{}$

 \cdot

(a) Outlet radius (hub), 4.47 inches.

 \overline{a} , and \overline{a}

and the company

 \cdot \cdot $=$ \cdot \cdot \cdot

 -0.00000 \sim \sim

 \blacksquare

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{A}}$

 \ddotsc

 $\overline{}$

ï

 \mathbf{r}

SS
O

2220

 \sim \sim

 $.3$ m 'о $\ddot{\mathbf{2}}$ Corrected tip speed \diamondsuit Corrected tip speed ۵۱ 80% Design ٣ 60% Design Relative total-pressure-loss coefficient, $\overline{\omega}$ \cdot 1 $\mathbf{\hat{P}}$ \Box ট Ϲ ळ O $\mathbf 0$ $.4$ г ♦ B lades Local n 100% Design solidity $\begin{array}{c} 19 \\ 16 \\ 12 \end{array}$ 1.04 \circ ğ $.88$
 $.86$ \cdot ₃ O 90% Design 帶 \cdot 2 ۸ ┍ \cdot 1 6 $0 - 8$ ᅙ $\overline{\mathfrak{o}}$ $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ ī $\overline{6}$ $\overline{12}$ -4 $\ddot{}$ 15 -4 Incidence angle, i, deg

 $\sim 10^{-1}$.

and the control

 \bullet

 \mathbf{r}

 \mathbf{A}

 ω is a second order.

 ~ 10

 \cdots

 $\alpha_{\rm c} = 0.006$

 $\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle$, $\langle\alpha\rangle$

 $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}$

and a

 ~ 100

 \bullet

 $1 - 2 - 1 = 1$

(c) Outlet radius (tip), 6.82 inches.

 \sim \sim \sim

 \sim \sim

TO JESH NE VOW

3530

الجارا القدامينة المتقدر الممالك

(a) Outlet **radius** (hub), **4.47 inches.**

Figure *5.* - **Variation** of loss-8olidity ratio **with** incidence angle for **three solidity** levels.

CCCC

 $\alpha = \alpha \beta$

NACA RM E55F01 31

(b) Outlet **radius** (mean), **5.47** inches.

Figure 5. - Concluded. Variation of loss-solidity ratio with incidence angle for three solidity levels.

UCCC

بان

(b) Outlet radius (mean), 5.47 inches.

Figure 6. - Variation of loss-solidity ratio near minimumloss incidence angle with diffusion factor for three solidity levels.

(b) Corrected tip speed, 80-percent design.

Figure *7.* - **Variation** of tip-sectton **axial** velocity ratio with incidence angle for three solidity levels. **Outlet** radius, 6.62 inches.

 ~ 100

(b) Corrected tip speed, 80-percent **&sign.**

Figure 8. - Variation of tip-section **diffusion** factor **vith** incidence **angle** for **three solfd**ity levels. Outlet **radius,** 6.62 inches.

 \bullet 3530

 $CF-5$ back

 ϵ

3530

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 1.111

Figure 9. - Variation of relative total-pressure-loss coefficient near minimum-loss incidence angle with diffusion factor for three solidity levels. Outlet radius, 6.62 inches.

 $\ldots \quad \ldots \quad$

 ~ 100 km s $^{-1}$

ςq

 α , α and α , α , α

 \cdots \sim .

 \sim \sim \sim

Figure 10. - Supersonic flow through a cascade indicating change in location of bow wave and resulting higher blade surface Mach
mumbers with desrease in solidity. Outlet radius, 6.62 inches.

IQGESH NE WOW

ပ္တ

Blades Local solidity Corrected tip speed Corrected tip speed 12 1.51
 1.27 \bullet 19 60% Design 80% Design $\begin{array}{c} 16 \\ 12 \end{array}$ \Box $\ddot{\circ}$ $.95$ \bullet ó τ 8 ᢌ Ω ୦∨ Deviation angle, 8°, deg Π ō. o Ó $\ddot{}$ o, \mathbf{o} 12 90% Design 100% Design $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$ Ó \pmb{e} **of** п. \mathbf{z}_0 y, \mathbf{r} & 4 $\pmb{\mathsf{o}}$ $\pmb{4}$ 8 12 \rightarrow \mathbf{o} 8 $\mathbf{12}$ ${\bf 16}$ $\overline{4}$ -4 Incidence angle, 1, deg

 \blacksquare

 $\pmb{\epsilon}$

(a) Outlet radius (hub), 4.47 inches.

Figure 11. - Variation of deviation angle with incidence angle for three solidity levels.

3530

37

INCA RM ESSETOL

 \sim

 \sim .

 $\Delta \phi = 0.01$.

 $\sim 10^{11}$ M

 \pm

MACA RM E55F01

 \bullet

The Carl Alan

 12 Corrected tip speed Corrected tip speed. Ó 80% Design 8 \mathbf{a} 60% Design O ୕ୢୢ Ó \mathbf{u} ᇁ \bullet \bullet \bullet Blades Local solidity 1.04 19 \bullet $\frac{16}{12}$ $.88$ 12 \Box $.66$ $\ddot{\circ}$ 90% Design 100% Design $\ddot{}$ Ó 8 π $\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$ $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$ $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$ ۵ Ŕ \Box цp 4 ள п ъ $\frac{0}{-8}$ $\overline{\circ}$ $\overline{1}$ -4 $\overline{\mathbf{4}}$ \mathbf{g} $12\,$ $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$ $\pmb{4}$ 8 -4 Incidence angle, i, deg

(c) Outlet radius (tip) , 6.62 inches.

Derivation angle, 8⁰, deg

 \sim .

NACA RM ESSE'OL

39

3530

سائل سائل

Figure **12.** - Deviation angle6 **at minimum-loss** incidence **angle** for **three** solidity **levels.**

Figure **13.** - **Radial variation of rotor-inlet absolute Mach number.**

42 NACA RM E55F01

Y -

(b) Corrected tip speed, 80-percent deeign.

Figure 13. - Concluded. Radial variation of rotor-inlet absolute **Mach number.**

 $\Delta\omega_{\rm{max}}$ $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$

المتواصل المتعارف للمحافظ والمتحدث

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle$, $\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle$

(a) **Correated tip speed, 100- (b) Corrected tip speed,** *80-* **percent design. percent** *design.*

Figure 14. - Radial variation of blade-element adiabatic efficiency,
total-pressure ratio, and work coefficient (nondimensional temper-
ature rise) for three solidity levels.

TO ABSEX NEW YOUN

쵻

 \sim

 \sim $-$

 \mathbf{i}

(b) Corrected tip speed, 80-percent design.

NACA RM E55FOL

3530

ਨੂੰ
ਹ

NACA - Langley Pield, Va.

ICONDEN TOPS OF

 $\ddot{\bm{5}}$

É ال ہفت

í ł