



X-Ray Characterization of Diesel Sprays and the Effects of Nozzle Geometry

Christopher F. Powell, Ph.D.

Argonne National Laboratory

Seong-Kyun Cheong, Stephen A. Ciatti, Jinyuan Liu, Jin Wang







30 August, 2004

Project Motivation

- Goal: Understand the mechanisms of spray atomization
 - In-Nozzle effects nozzle structure, cavitation
 - Aerodynamic effects air entrainment, stripping, collisions
 - Relative magnitudes unknown
- Near-nozzle spray studies
 - This region determines downstream behavior
 - Aerodynamic effects have little impact
 - Lack of existing data, lack of reliable models
- X-Ray technique
 - Quantitative measurement of fuel, even near the nozzle
 - Provide data necessary for accurate models



Schematic of X-Ray Setup N₂ Flow X-Ray Window 6 KeV X-ray Beam Avalanche Photodiode X-Y Slits 50 µm (V) х Fuel 200 µm (H) Injector

Direct relation between x-ray intensity and fuel mass

$$I/I_0 = \exp(-\mu_M M)$$

- I₀ Incident x-ray intensity
- Measured x-ray intensity
- μ_M Fuel absorption constant
- M Mass of fuel in x-ray beam

X-Ray Image Reconstruction



- Image represents line-of-sight mass distribution
- Image is single snapshot in time, we measured more than 250 snapshots throughout spray lifetime

Injection Pressure = 500 bar Ambient Pressure = 1 bar N_2 200 µs after SOI

Effects of Nozzle Geometry

- Different geometries predicted to produce different mass distributions.
- Models most easily validated near nozzle exit, other influences minimized
- Quantitative data not available



Schmidt et al., SAE 971597



Measurement Conditions

Common rail, single hole, mini-sac nozzles

- ➤Fuel pressure
- ➢Pulse duration
- ≻Spray chamber gas
- ≻Fuel
- ➤Fuel Additive
- Data Averaging

HydroGround Nozzle

- 183 mm Orifice
- 24% Hydrogrinding
- 109 cm³/30s @ 100bar

500,1000 bar

400 μs

N₂ @ 1 bar, 25 °C

Calibration fluid

Ce compound, 10%

50 sprays

Non-Ground Nozzle

- 207 mm Orifice
- No Hydrogrinding
- •115 cm³/30s @ 100bar



X-Ray Images of Sprays

500 bar 100 μs after SOI



X-Ray Images of Sprays

1000 bar 100 μs after SOI





Effects of Nozzle Geometry

- Different geometries predicted to produce different mass distributions.
- Models most easily validated near nozzle exit, other influences minimized
- Quantitative data not available

Non-Ground ⋥⋥⋥ HydroGround

Schmidt et al., SAE 971597



Transverse Mass Distributions

Mass of Fuel in Beam (µg)



1000 bar 221 μs after SOI HydroGround

Non-Ground



Spray Widths



500 bar

Spray Widths



Conclusions

- We observe differences in sprays between nozzles
 - Differences are small, fluctuate over lifetime of spray
 - Difficult to measure, model



Modeling Fuel Density in the Nozzle



D. P. Schmidt and S. Gopalakrishnan, 17th Annual Conference on Liquid Atomization and Spray Systems, Arlington, VA, May 2004

Predicted Fuel Density at Nozzle Exit



D. P. Schmidt and S. Gopalakrishnan, 17th Annual Conference on Liquid Atomization and Spray Systems, Arlington, VA, May 2004

X-Ray Imaging of Nozzle Structure



Images Courtesy of Kamel Fezzaa and Wah-Keat Lee



Future Work

- Studies of Nozzle Geometry
 - Need better position resolution
 - Small-area x-ray beam to probe near-nozzle region
 - Conical nozzles, VCO nozzles
- Measurements at Higher Ambient Pressure
 - We recently completed measurement at 20 bar
- Measurements at High Pressure, Temperature
 - Rapid Compression Machine
 - "Diesel-Like" conditions
- X-Ray Imaging of Nozzle Structure
 - Image the pintle in motion

Acknowledgments

U.S. Dept of Energy Gurpreet Singh

Robert Bosch GmbH

Gerd Bittlinger Phillip Bohl Manuel Hesser Johannes Schaller Jochen Walther

DaimlerChrysler

Christoph Espey Gerhard Kőnig Eberhard Wagner

Visteon Corp David Hung

John Stefanski

General Motors Scott Parrish

This work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract W-31-109-Eng-38 and by the **Office of FreedomCar and Vehicle Technologies**. Experiments were performed at the 1-BM Beamline of the Advanced Photon Source, Argonne National Laboratory.

