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Outline

- Status quo of microphone array measurements in closed and open test section wind tunnels
  - Typical setup of industrial wind tunnel measurements
  - Application in ground transportation
  - Summary and conclusions
- Challenges and limitations, open issues
- Two examples:
  - Re-number effects → Measurements in cryogenic wind tunnels
  - Comparability → Measurements in different test facilities
- Conclusion
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT

Measurement setup

- Half-model
- Microphone array
  - 144 microphones
  - Logarithmic spiral arrangement
  - Dimensions: 1756x1300 mm²
  - Thickness of array fairing: 25 mm
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT

Measurement setup

- Frequency range: $f_{s,\text{max}} = 250$ kHz
- Number of channels: $7 \times 48 = 336$ at DLR
- AD conversion: 16-bit sigma/delta
- Filters: Several high-pass and low-pass filters
- Gain factor: 0.5 to 500000
- Dynamic range: $\geq 80$ dB
- High pass filter: 500 Hz or 6 kHz (A weighting)
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT
Results, Source maps
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Measurement in industrial closed test section WT

Results, SPL for variation of angle of attack
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Measurement in industrial closed test section WT
Noise in closed test section measurements

- SPL of single microphone vs. SPL calculated from microphone array
- Reduction of noise by 21 dB (144 times)
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT
Reduction of high frequency random pressure fluctuations

- Turbulent boundary layer of a wall in a closed test section
- Reduction of noise from turbulent boundary-layer (TBL) pressure fluctuations \(\rightarrow\) diagonal removal (DR)

40000 Hz without DR

40000 Hz with DR
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT

Reduction of low frequency background noise

- Closed test section: background noise in low frequencies
- Upstream propagating waves (acoustically hard side-walls)
- Waves cause artifacts in source maps
- Reduction by 6 dB with BiClean algorithm
- Subtracting of Low frequency background noise (noise = plane wave)
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT
Improved spatial resolution by deconvolution – Embedded DAMAS, CLEAN-SC

Conventional beamforming:

Deconvolution:
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT

Sensor calibration

- Comparison with a reference microphone
- Traversable speaker for exact positioning in top of every microphone

- reference 1: pressure-field microphone mounted in plate
- reference 2: free-field microphone mounted in foam
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT

Sensor calibration

Array-microphone sen. (example)

- ≈ flat response: 1 kHz < f < 20 kHz

Comparison of references

- ≈ 6 dB difference at overall frequency range
Measurement in industrial closed test section WT
Truck model in DNW-KKK @ ambient temperature

- Truck model in DNW-KKK
- Test parameters: $Ma = 0.253$, $T = 290.3K$
- $Re = 1 \times 10^6$ (w.r.t. width of the truck)
- SPL [dB] with 12 dB Dynamic

\[ f_{1/3} = 12.5kHz \]
\[ f_{1/3} = 16kHz \]
\[ f_{1/3} = 20kHz \]
\[ f_{1/3} = 25kHz \]
Measurement in open test section WT (AWB)

High speed train

- Measurement on ICE 3, 1:25
- Details:
  - Bogies, Pantograph, Gap between traction unit and first car
  - 143 microphones, aperture 1 x 2 meters
  - Microphones mounted on an aluminium grid, outside the flow
  - Model mounted on a splitter plate
  - $Re_{\text{max}} = 0.5 \times 10^6$
Measurement in open test section WT (AWB)

High speed train

- High-speed train in aeroacoustic wind tunnel (AWB)
- \( f_{1/3} = 12.5 \text{ kHz} \)
- \( U_\infty = 40 \text{ m/s} \)
- Dynamic range: 12 dB

Main sources:
1. Pantograph
2. First bogie
3. Third bogie
4. Cavity
5. Second bogie

\[ f_{1/3} = 12.5 \text{kHz} \]
Microphone array measurements in wind tunnels
Status and conclusions

- Microphone array measurements in wind tunnels
  - Source localization and quantification
  - Quantification of level differences (configuration, modification)
  - Noise source ranking
  - Frequency range:
    - 2 kHz – 63 kHz \(\rightarrow\) closed test section
    - 500 Hz – 16 kHz \(\rightarrow\) open test section
  - DLR arrays can be installed in any closed and open test-section WT
    - Mobile system
    - Minor installation effects: Measurement in parallel to aerodynamics
  - Very fast measurement techniques
Microphone array measurements in wind tunnels

Limitations → Error sources

- Real-flight Reynolds numbers are not achieved in conventional wind tunnels
- Comparability between results from different test facilities (open, closed) and between wind tunnel and full scale aircraft (train, vehicle) not guaranteed
- Airframe noise is simulated by scaled and therefore simplified wind tunnel models
- Microphones are exposed to pressure fluctuations originating from turbulent boundary layer → near field noise
- Different type of sound sources (monopole, dipole..., coherent) results in different results
- Wind tunnel background noise leads to a limited measurement range → low signal-to-noise-ratio
- Reliability and accuracy of data analysis
Microphone array measurements in wind tunnels

Challenges → Open issues in MA wind-tunnel measurements

- Assess Re-number dependency of aeroacoustic sources
- Investigate comparability of test results from different facilities:
  - Open closed test section
  - Scaled models
  - Real aircraft/train/…
- Systematic investigation on optimal mounting of microphones (Recessed, Kevlar, flush mounted)
- Absolute level of resulting spectra (diagonal removal, deconvolution)
- Consider the directivity of sound sources (not only in the transfer function!)
- Coherent sound sources: Determine the coherence lengths of typical aeroacoustic sound sources (implication on microphone array results)
- Wind tunnel modifications
- Assess data analysis software
Microphone array measurements in wind tunnels

Open issues in MA wind-tunnel measurements: three examples

- Assessment Re-number effect on aeroacoustic source radiation:
  - Measurements setup: Array measurements in cryogenic flows
  - Results

- Investigate comparability of test results from different facilities: open/closed test section
  - Measurements with a reference loudspeaker
  - Measurements with an airframe noise model

- Note on data analysis: EWA Benchmark test to evaluate data analysis software
Microphone-Arrays in cryogenic environment
Motivation: Assess Re-number dependency

- Common practice: Acoustic measurement on small-scale models …

- Conventional wind tunnel: real-flight Reynolds numbers not achieved
  - cryogenic and/or pressurized wind tunnel

- Objective:
  - Provide cryogenic acoustic measurement technique for industrial applications
  - Investigate Re number effects on aeroacoustic measurements

real-flight conditions       scaled model in wind tunnel
Microphone-Array for cryogenic flows
Wind tunnel: KKK, Cryogenic wind tunnel cologne

- Cryogenic wind tunnel located at the DLR’s Cologne Site (from DNW) “Göttingen type wind tunnel”

- Closed test section 2.4 m x 2.4 m
- Operational range:
  
  $300 \text{ K} > T > 100 \text{ K}$  
  $0.1 < \text{Ma} < 0.38$  
  $Re_{0.1\sqrt{S}} \leq 9.5 \times 10^6$
Microphone-Array for cryogenic flows
Measurement Setup @ KKK

Microphone array
- 144 microphones
- Arranged in spiral arms

Parameter
- Ma number: 0.125 – 0.25
- Temperature: 300 K – 100 K
- $Re_c = 1 \cdot 10^6 – 9 \cdot 10^6$

DO–728 half model
- Scale: 1 : 9.24
- ½ - spanwidth: 1.44 m
- Chord length: 0.338 m

DO-728 half model in landing configuration
Microphone-Array for cryogenic flows
Setup – considerations due to cryogenic environment

- Appropriate electronic components
- Durability and reliability of sensors and electronic equipment verified in previous study\[1\]
- Contraction at lower temperatures 
  \[L = 1 \text{ m} \quad dL_{290\text{K}-100\text{K}} \approx -3.7 \text{ mm}\]
  - Array fairing movably mounted
  - Rigidly fixed at bottom center
- Data analysis:
  - Temperature, pressure, nitrogen gas etc.

Microphone-Array for cryogenic flows

Sensor Calibration – Temperature

- Electret cryo microphone capsule -recessed behind a cone-
- Brüel & Kjær ¼-inch microphones for use in cryogenic environment -flush mounted-

Average of the obtained transfer functions

Large deviations:
- high frequencies
- low temperatures
Microphone-Array Results

\[ \text{T} = 290 \text{ K} \mid \text{Re} = 2.00 \cdot 10^6 \]

\[ \text{f} = 51.4 \text{ kHz} \]

\[ \text{vs.} \]

\[ \text{T} = 100 \text{ K} \mid \text{Re} = 9.01 \cdot 10^6 \]

\[ \text{f} = 30.5 \text{ kHz} \]

\[ \text{St} = 300 \]

\[ \text{Ma} = 0.175 \]

\[ \alpha = 7^\circ \]
Microphone-Array
Results

Ma = 0.2 | $\alpha = -2^\circ$

Ma = 0.2 | $\alpha = 3^\circ$

Ma = 0.2 | $\alpha = 5^\circ$

Ma = 0.2 | $\alpha = 10^\circ$

- T = 290 K; Re = $1.6 \cdot 10^3$
- T = 100 K; Re = $7.2 \cdot 10^3$
- empty test section; T = 290 K
- empty test section; T = 100 K
Microphone-Array Results

Ma = 0.2 | \( \alpha = -2^\circ \)

Ma = 0.2 | \( \alpha = 5^\circ \)

\[ T = 290 \text{ K}; \ Re = 1.6 \cdot 10^3 \]

\[ T = 100 \text{ K}; \ Re = 7.2 \cdot 10^3 \]

empty test section; \( T = 290 \text{ K} \)

empty test section; \( T = 100 \text{ K} \)
Microphone-Array

Results

Ma = 0.2 | \( \alpha = -2^\circ \)

Ma = 0.2 | \( \alpha = 5^\circ \)

- T = 290 K; Re = 1.6 \cdot 10^3
- T = 100 K; Re = 7.2 \cdot 10^3
- empty test section; T = 290 K
- empty test section; T = 100 K

Re = 1.66 \cdot 10^6

Re = 7.22 \cdot 10^6
Microphone-Array
Results

- $T = 290 \, \text{K}; \, \text{Re} = 1.6 \cdot 10^3$
- $T = 100 \, \text{K}; \, \text{Re} = 7.2 \cdot 10^3$
- empty test section; $T = 290 \, \text{K}$
- empty test section; $T = 100 \, \text{K}$
Microphone-Array
@ cryogenic condition (DNW-KKK): Influence of Re-number

“Strake“ on nacelle

- Local sound power spectra on nacelle
- Clear effect of Re-number on radiated sound power
Microphone-Array for cryogenic flows

Future developments: Microphone array measurements in ETW

- Objective: Aeracoustic measurements at flight Re-numbers
- European Transonic Wind Tunnel (ETW) in Cologne
- Measurements at cryogenic conditions and total pressure of 4.5 bar
- National research project
- Partner: ETW, DLR, TU Berlin
Microphone-Array for cryogenic flows
Future developments: Microphone array measurements in ETW

- ETW specifications:
  - Mach number: 0.15 - 1.35
  - Total pressure: 1.15 bar - 4.5 bar
  - Temperature: 110 K - 313 K

Max. Re-number: 50 million *full-span models*
Max. Re-number: 90 million *semi-span model*

- Wind tunnel requirements:
  - Non intrusiveness
  - Full reliability over the complete tunnel operating range
  - Remotely controlled operation
  - Not affecting the flow-field near the model
Microphone-Array for cryogenic/pressurized flows
Microphone array measurements in ETW: Main issues

Approach:
- Concepts of sensors and electronic components
- Cabling
- Remotely controlled data acquisition
- Calibration of sensors in cryogenic and pressurized environment
- Pretests under real conditions PETW
- Demonstration test in ETW
Microphone-Array for cryogenic/pressurized flows

First demonstration at ETW

December 2011:
- Test array with 14 sensors
- Measurements on a R&T scaled half-model in high-lift configuration
Microphone-Array for cryogenic/pressurized flows
First demonstration at ETW

\[ p_{total} = 187 \text{ kPa} \mid T = 272 \text{ K} \]
St = 350 \mid f = 60.8 \text{ kHz} \]

\[ p_{total} = 397 \text{ kPa} \mid T = 115 \text{ K} \]
St = 350 \mid f = 40.4 \text{ kHz} \]

\[ Re = 5.2 \cdot 10^6 \]

\[ Re = 25 \cdot 10^6 \]

\[ \alpha = 5^\circ \]
\[ M = 0.2 \]
Microphone-Array for cryogenic flows

Summary

- **First successful application** of microphone arrays in cryogenic and pressurized environment
  - Re-number variation at constant Ma-number
  - Gives us the possibility to investigate Re-number effects in aeroacoustic measurements
- **Clear effect of Re-number** on radiated sound power
  - Depends on: Ma-number, model configuration, source mechanism
  - Definition of acoustic **Re-number corrections** between WT-models and real flight condition **very challenging**
Microphone-Arrays in different test facilities

Motivation

- Comparability between results from different test facilities (open, closed) and between wind tunnel and full scale aircraft (train, vehicle) not guaranteed
- Question: How far is it possible to compare beamforming results from different wind tunnels?
- Dedicated experiments: Similar experimental setup and aeroacoustic sound generation
  1. Measurements with a reference loudspeaker
  2. Measurements with an airframe noise model designed specifically for this purpose
Comparison measurements

DLR reference source – Design

- Electro dynamic ribbon loudspeaker: defined signal, repeatable
- Large frequency range (up to 65 kHz)
- Two guiding flanges serve as an impedance adjustment
- Ribbon diameter: 90mm; height 15 mm
- Omnidirectional sound radiation in centre plane
Comparison measurements
DLR reference source – Design and directivity

\[ f = 8 \text{ kHz} \]

\[ f = 63 \text{ kHz} \]
Comparison measurements
DLR reference source – integrated spectra

Comparison: closed vs. open test section
Comparison measurements

DLR reference source – Signal-to-Noise-Ratio

Signal-to-noise-ratio

\[ \text{SNR [dB]} \]

\[ \Delta \text{SNR [dB]} \]

\[ 10^3 \text{ f [Hz]} \]

\[ 10^4 \]
**Comparison measurements**

**Airframe noise source – measurement setup**

- Aeroacoustic wind tunnel
  - Braunschweig (AWB)
- Closed circuit wind tunnel, open test section with anechoic room
- Nozzle exit: 1.2 m x 0.8 m

- Wind tunnel at Technical University Berlin
- Closed circuit wind tunnel, closed test section
- Test section dimensions: 1.4 m height, 2.0 m width
- Wind speed up to 35 m/s
Comparison measurements
Airframe noise source – source maps

$\alpha_{os} = 12^\circ$

$\alpha_{cs} = 12^\circ$
Comparison measurements
Airframe noise source – source maps

\[ \alpha_{os} = 12^\circ \]

\[ \alpha_{cs} = 5.5^\circ \]
Comparison measurements
Airframe noise source – integrated spectra

Integrated spectra: open/closed section

Integrated spectra: $L_{\text{open}} - L_{\text{closed}}$
Comparison measurements

Summary

- DLR reference source provides:
  - Known sound field in a large frequency range (up to 70 kHz)
  - Repeatable results with known amplitude and phase
  - Independent of flow condition
  - **Signal-to-noise-ratio and comparative measurements**
  - **Assessment of wind tunnel with respect to aeroacoustic measurements**
- Comparisons show:
  - Level differences open/closed in the range ± 2dB;
  - Low frequency range: larger deviations in CS (reverberant field)
  - Higher frequency range: larger deviations in OS (coherence loss)
  - **Signal-to-noise-ratio higher in OP than in CS**
  - **Limited frequency range in OS**
  - **Accuracy depends on aerodynamic setup**
  - **Measurements have to planned and analysed by experts**
Microphone array measurements in wind tunnels

Summary

- General:
  - State-of-the-art microphone array measurements in closed and open test section at DLR
  - Accurate and reliable source localization
  - Mobile measurement systems
  - Fast measurement technique with minor installation effects

- High Re-number measurements:
  - First successful application of microphone arrays in cryogenic and pressurized WT
  - Clear influence of Re-number on aeroacoustic source strength
  - Definition of acoustic Reynolds corrections between WT-models and real flight condition very challenging

- Comparability between wind tunnels (and to real flight):
  - Challenge: Accuracy depends on aerodynamic setup → Measurements have to planned and analysed by experts
Microphone array measurements in wind tunnels

Challenges → Open issues in MA wind-tunnel measurements

- Assess Re-number dependency of aeroacoustic sources
- Investigate comparability of test results from different facilities:
  - Open closed test section
  - Scaled models
  - Real aircraft/train/

{Dedicated experiments}
- Systematic investigation on optimal mounting of microphones (Recessed, Kevlar, flush mounted)
- Absolute level of resulting spectra (diagonal removal, deconvolution)
- Consider the directivity of sound sources (not only in the transfer function!)
- Coherent sound sources: Determine the coherence lengths of typical aeroacoustic sound sources (implication on microphone array results)
- Wind tunnel modifications

Future progress in microphone array (wind tunnel) measurements can only be achieved by physical understanding and hardware oriented activities!