



Numerical Study of a Fluidic Precessing Jet Flow

Xiao Chen

School of Mechanical Engineering
Faculty of Engineering, Mathematical and Computer Sciences
The University of Adelaide, Australia

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 2017.

Contents

Abstract	vii
Statement of Originality	ix
Acknowledgements	xi
List of Figures	xxii
List of Tables	xxiv
List of Symbols	xxvi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 Hazard of oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x) emission	1
1.1.2 Emissions of NO _x by rotary kilns	2
1.1.3 Gyro-Therm burner	2
1.1.4 Computational fluid dynamics	5
1.2 Thesis outline	6
1.2.1 General objectives	6
1.2.2 Dissertation structure	7
1.3 Publications arised from this work	9
2 Literature review	11
2.1 Fluidic precessing jet (FPJ) flow	11
2.2 Velocity field within and in the emerging region of an FPJ nozzle	12
2.2.1 Phase-averaged measurement on the internal velocity field of the FPJ flow	12
2.2.2 The effect of nozzle configurations	12
2.2.3 Precession frequency	13

2.2.4	Numerical simulation on the velocity field of an FPJ flow	14
2.2.5	The first aim: Assessment of two-equation URANS models in predicting the velocity field of a precessing jet flow	16
2.3	Scalar field in the external region of an FPJ nozzle	17
2.3.1	The influence of the precession motion on the scalar mixing	17
2.3.2	The influence of the co-flow velocity and confinement on the scalar mixing	17
2.3.3	Numerical simulation on the scalar field of an FPJ flow	18
2.3.4	The second aim: Assessment of both the Hybrid-LES approach and a two-equation URANS model in predicting the scalar mixing of a precessing jet flow	19
2.4	Flow structure	19
2.4.1	Structure of the FPJ flow	19
2.4.2	Structure of similar flows	24
2.4.3	Critical point theory	27
2.4.4	The third aim: develop a topological structure of the ensemble-averaged FPJ flow	30
2.5	Mode switching	30
2.5.1	Bi-stable flows	30
2.5.2	The bi-stable FPJ flow	31
2.5.3	The mechanism of the mode switching phenomenon of the FPJ flow	33
2.5.4	The fourth aim: provide increased understanding of the mechanism by which the flow switches from the AJ to the PJ modes	33
3	Numerical Methodology	35
3.1	Geometric configuration of the FPJ nozzles	35
3.2	Mesh generation	37
3.3	Numerical configurations	40
3.4	Mathematical approach	42
3.4.1	General conservation equations	42
3.4.2	Two-equation URANS turbulence models	42

3.4.3	Large Eddy Simulation	48
3.5	Phase averaging method	49
3.6	Methods to trigger mode switching	51
3.6.1	Approach A: continuous axial perturbation	52
3.6.2	Approach B: continuous tangential velocity component	52
3.6.3	Approach C: slightly asymmetric initial flow field	52
4	Assessment of the reliability of two-equation URANS models in predicting a precessing flow	55
5	Numerical investigation on the scalar mixing of a fluidic precessing jet flow	99
6	The topology of a precessing flow within a suddenly expanding axisymmetric chamber	127
7	New understanding of mode switching in the fluidic precessing jet flow	141
8	Conclusions and Future Work	155
8.1	Conclusions	155
8.1.1	Reliability of numerical approaches in predicting the FPJ flow . . .	155
8.1.2	Topological model of the structure of the FPJ flow	157
8.1.3	Investigation of the mode switching phenomenon of the FPJ flow .	158
8.2	Future Work	160
8.2.1	Simulating the FPJ flow with an LES approach	160
8.2.2	Effect of fluctuation in the flow on the scalar field simulation	160
8.2.3	Sensitivity of geometric configurations on the structure of the FPJ flow	160
8.2.4	Effect of the asymmetries on the mode switching time	161
8.2.5	Study of the mode switching process (from the PJ to the AJ modes)	161
8.2.6	Modelling a reacting FPJ flow	161
	References	161
	Appendix A Publications arising from this thesis	173
	Appendix B Confirmation of the hypothesised vortex region	187

Abstract

This thesis reports the structure of turbulent, unsteady, fluidic precessing jet (FPJ) flow within a suddenly expanding axisymmetric chamber and the mode switching phenomenon using finite volume Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) method. The reliability of these CFD methods in predicting both the velocity field and the scalar field has also been assessed. Although a number of experimental studies were reported, due to the challenges of measuring all relevant parameters in the flow-field simultaneously, the understanding of the structure of the FPJ flow is still incomplete. Moreover, the FPJ flow is bi-stable and it switches occasionally between the Precessing Jet (PJ) and the Axial Jet (AJ) modes, which is undesirable. However, the mode switching phenomenon has not been investigated yet. Computational Fluid Dynamics was chosen to address these research gaps. Since no systematic numerical study on the FPJ flow has been reported in literature, the reliability of CFD method in predicting this flow remains unknown. Increasing the understanding of the structure, the mode switching phenomenon and the feasibility of CFD models in predicting the FPJ flow will contribute to the development of industrially relevant design tools, which is the overall objective of this thesis.

The first aim of this research is to comprehensively assess the reliability of two-equation Unsteady Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes (URANS) models in predicting the velocity field of the FPJ flow. Five two-equation URANS models, namely the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model, the modified $k-\varepsilon$ (1.3) model, the modified $k-\varepsilon$ (1.6) model, the Re-Normalisation Group (RNG) $k-\varepsilon$ model and the Shear Stress Transport (SST) model, were employed to simulate the complex FPJ flow. The predicted phase-averaged velocity field within and in the emerging region of the nozzle, energy of total fluctuation and precession frequency of the FPJ flow were compared against the measured data. Both the RNG $k-\varepsilon$ model the modified $k-\varepsilon$ (1.6) model failed to predict the precession motion. All main features of the FPJ flow that observed from previous visualization studies were predicted with both the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model and the SST model. Furthermore, reasonable quantitative agreement against the experimental result was achieved with both the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model and the SST model, although the spreading

and velocity decay rate of the phase-averaged jet within the nozzle were under-predicted.

Secondly, the scalar field of the FPJ flow was simulated with both a two-equation UR-ANS model and a Hybrid Large Eddy Simulation (LES) approach. Under the current numerical configurations, the jet downstream from the nozzle exit was predicted to be mainly distributed in the region near to the wall of the external confining cylinder with both the two approaches, while the measured jet was preferentially concentrated near to the centreline region. This may due to the over-predicted deflection angle of the emerging jet and the under-predicted mixing rate. In addition, the distribution range of the Probability Distribution Function (pdf) of the centreline concentration in the far field was predicted to be narrower than the measured jet. Although the results calculated with the Hybrid-LES approach agrees better with the measured data than that calculated with the SST model, it still did not reproduce the external scalar field of the FPJ flow well. This implies that the simulation of the scalar field of the FPJ flow is significantly more sensitive than is the velocity field.

The third aim of this work is to provide further details of the flow structure and develop a topological model of the FPJ flow, based on the critical point method, previous experimental observations and the numerical results of the CFD model. The unsteady SST model was chosen because it exhibited good qualitative agreement with the experimental result, which is essential for the critical point method. The predicted flow pattern at the surface of both the nozzle and the centre-body were compared against those deduced previously. The flow streamlines, velocity and vorticity cross-sectional contours within the FPJ nozzle were presented to provide further flow details for the development of the vortex skeleton. A vortex skeleton of the FPJ flow within and in the emerging field of the nozzle with six main vortex cores is identified for the first time. All the six vortex cores are deduced to be responsible collectively for the continuous precession.

The fourth aim of this study is to investigate the switching phenomenon and the change of flow structure during the mode switching process using the unsteady SST model. Three methods were employed to trigger the flow to switch from the AJ to the PJ modes, namely imposing a continuous axial perturbation onto part of the inflow, imposing a continuous swirling component to the inlet flow and adopting a slightly asymmetric initial flow field. Some asymmetry was found to be necessary to trigger the mode switching, while the switch time is inversely proportional to the extent of asymmetry. It was also found that the direc-

tion and frequency of the precession are both dependent on the direction and intensity of the imposed inlet swirling, respectively, which is consistent with previous experimental observations. The change to the vortex skeleton of the FPJ flow during the mode switching process is reported for the first time.

Statement of Originality

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

I acknowledge the support I have received for my research through the provision of an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Xiao Chen

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I must gratefully acknowledge my supervisor Professor Graham (Gus) Nathan for the great support of my PhD study. His patient guidance has greatly improved my research ability and writing skill. His accuracy and strict attitude has deepened my understanding of academic study.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to my co-supervisor Dr. Zhao Tian for his continuous support and guidance in every aspect of my research work, for his immense knowledge and rich experience in CFD. Thanks for his positive attitude and dry humour, which helped me to “survive” under the pressure of the PhD study.

Besides my supervisors, I would like to thank Associate Professor Richard Kelso for teaching me Critical Point theory, Dr Jordan Parham, Dr Chong Wong and Dr Soon-Kong Lee for their experimental data.

I am thankful to Mr Billy Constantine for providing computer hardware and network support. Thanks also to my schoolmates Dr Chenxi Li, Dr Gary Cai, Dr Yinli Liu, Dr Boyin Ding, Dr Zhiwei Sun, Dr Dahe Gu, Dr Tao Zhu, Dr Shi Zhao, Dr Yangkun Zhang, Dr Manabendra Saha, Dr Ashok Kaniyal, Dr Mehdi Jafarian, Dr Javad Farrokhi Derakshandeh, Dr Alfonso Chinnici, Dr Michael Evans, Dr Yunpeng Xue, Dr Yonglin Zhao, Dr Junwei Wu, Ms Xue Jin, Ms Jingjing Ye, Mr Long Sheng, Mr Houzhi Wang, Mr Chia Thong, Mr Difan Tang, Mr Zhao Lu, Mr Fantai Meng, Mr Elias Arcondoulis and Mr Karn Schumacher for their support and companionship during my PhD candidature.

Finally, a special acknowledgement to my family, Mr Yu Chen, Mrs Jing Xiao and Mrs Shuhan Wang for their enduring patience, endless support and encouragement.

List of Figures

1.1	Sketch of a typical cement rotary kiln. (a) Main layout (Nobes 1997) and (b) detailed view of the reaction region (Nathan & Rapson 1995). Adapted from Lee (2009).	3
1.2	Images of a Gyro-Therm MK II kiln burner . (a) The burner and (b) the detailed view of the jet nozzle (FCT Combustion Pty. Ltd 2016).	4
1.3	Diagram of numerical approaches. (a) Direct numerical simulations, (b) large eddy simulation and (c) Reynolds averaged Navier-Stokes models (Ruprecht et al. 2004).	6
2.1	A schematic diagram of the fluidic precessing jet nozzle and flow.	11
2.2	A schematic diagram of the configurations of the fluidic precessing jet nozzles. Adapted from Wong et al. (2004).	13
2.3	Visualization of an instantaneous FPJ flow obtained from Nathan et al. (1998) at $Re=15,000$. (a) The surface visualization flow pattern and (b) the interpreted flow pathlines. Adapted from Nathan et al. (1998).	20
2.4	Visualization of the time-averaged flow pattern on the inlet base surface of an FPJ nozzle (Nathan et al. 1998). (a) The surface visualization flow pattern and (b) the interpreted flow pathlines. Adapted from Nathan et al. (1998).	21
2.5	Visualization of the time-averaged flow pattern on the surface of an FPJ nozzle (Nathan et al. 1998). (a) The surface visualization flow pattern and (b) the interpreted flow pathlines. Note that NB is negative bifurcation and PB is positive bifurcation. Adapt from Nathan et al. (1998).	22
2.6	Streamlines of the FPJ flow that deduced based on the measured phase-averaged axial velocity. Adapted from Wong et al. (2004).	23

2.7	Visualization of the flow pattern on the downstream face of the centre body of a steady deflected jet nozzle (Wong et al. 2008). (a) The surface visualization flow pattern and (b) the interpreted flow pathlines. Adapted from Wong et al. (2008).	24
2.8	Two proposed skeletons of the vortex originated from the downstream face of the centre body. (a) Extending to infinity (Wong et al. 2008) and (b) forming a vortex loop (Wong 2004).	25
2.9	The structure of the three edge vortices downstream from the centre body (Wong et al. 2008). (a) the vortex skeleton of the three edge vortices and (b) the streamlines in the near field of the nozzle exit. Note that the dotted lines indicate the deduced Edge 3 vortex. Adopted from Wong et al. (2008) . . .	26
2.10	The deduced surface flow pattern of the OTJ nozzle. Adapted from Lee (2009). 27	
2.11	The deduced streamlines on the cross-sectional plane of (a) the OTJ nozzle and (b) the FPJ nozzle. Adapted from Lee (2009).	28
2.12	A schematic diagram of the three types of the flow patterns in the vicinity of the critical point, i.e. nodes, foci and saddle points.	29
2.13	Visualization of the flow (in the AJ mode) through an FPJ nozzle that obtained from Nathan et al. (1998). (a) The surface visualization flow pattern and (b) the interpreted flow pathlines. Adapted from Nathan et al. (1998). .	32
3.1	The geometries and dimensions of the fluidic precessing jet nozzles (Geometry V) adopted for the reliability assessment of the two-equation URANS models in predicting the internal velocity field, the investigation of the FPJ flow structure and the mode switching phenomenon.	36
3.2	The geometries and dimensions of the fluidic precessing jet nozzles (Geometry S) adopted for the reliability assessment of a Hybrid-LES approach and the SST model in predicting the external scalar field.	37
3.3	Mesh and boundary type for the FPJ nozzle (Geometry V) with a contraction inlet.	38
3.4	Mesh and boundary type for the FPJ nozzle (Geometry S).	39
3.5	A schematic diagram of the phase-averaging method.	51

3.6	Sketch of the alternative perturbation zones within the inflows at the pipe inlet (x_i) that were used to initiate precession, i.e. $A_{pz}/A_{pipe} =$ (a) 1/8, (b) 1/4, (c) 1/2 and (d) 1. Note that A_{pz} is the area of the perturbation zone and A_{pipe} is the area of the pipe inlet.	53
3.7	The streamlines on the contraction inlet with an imposed tangential velocity of 30% of the U_{inlet}	54
4.1	A schematic diagram of the fluidic precessing jet nozzle and flow.	88
4.2	The dimensions of the fluidic precessing jet nozzle modelled here, based on the configuration investigated experimentally by Wong et al. (2003), where d , D and D_e are the diameters of the nozzle's inlet, nozzle chamber and nozzle's exit, respectively, L is the length of the FPJ nozzle.	88
4.3	Mesh of the current model. (a) the whole domain, (b) detailed view of the FPJ nozzle, (c) the longitudinal plane through the nozzle and (d) the cross-sectional plane through the nozzle.	89
4.4	Axial evolution of the normalized predicted equivalent diameters of the precessing jet through the domain, as calculated from the average of 5, 10 and 15 cycles of precession. Refer to Figure 4.2 for symbols and coordinates. The vertical dashed line indicates the location of the upstream surface of the centre body.	90
4.5	Three-dimensional visualisations of the predicted streamline through the FPJ nozzle with the (a) $k-\epsilon$ model, (b) SST model, (c) RNG $k-\epsilon$ model and (d) is the streamline through a longer FPJ nozzle ($L_c=240$ mm) predicted with RNG $k-\epsilon$ model.	90
4.6	Axial evolution of the normalized measured and predicted equivalent diameters of the phase-averaged jet (Wong et al. 2003). The vertical dotted and dashed lines indicate the location of the centre body's upstream surface in the conventional geometry and extended geometry ($L_c=240$ mm) respectively. Refer to Figure 4.2 for symbols and coordinates.	91

4.7 Cross-sectional images of the phase-averaged axial velocity contours at the transverse plane $x/d=8.93$ within the FPJ nozzle as obtained with: (a) the experiment (Wong 2004), (b) the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model and (c) the SST model. Data are normalized by the local centreline velocity in this plane. The red line indicates the half-width contour of the jet. Refer to Figure 4.2 for symbols and coordinates. 92

4.8 Phase-averaged axial velocity contours in the near external field of the FPJ nozzle, $x/D_e=0.16$, obtained by: (a) experiment (Wong 2004), (b) the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model and (c) the SST model. Data are normalized by the local centreline velocity in this plane. The regions enclosed by the red line indicate the area of the jet. Refer to Figure 4.2 for symbols and coordinates. . . . 93

4.9 Measured (Wong et al. 2003) and predicted results of inverse centreline velocity decay of the phase-averaged jet. The parameter $U_{jet,cl}$ is the maximum velocity in the local plane and U_i is the bulk inlet velocity. The vertical line indicates the location of the centre body’s upstream surface. 94

4.10 Measured (Wong 2004) and calculated time average (a) axial velocity and (b) total fluctuation energy (E_f) profile at $x'/D_e=0.16$. The velocity values are normalised with the inlet velocity u_i , E_f are normalised with u_i^2 and the abscissa is normalised with the diameter of the nozzle’s exit D_e 94

4.11 Contours of the value F_1 in the SST model (see Equation 4.16) at the five cross-section planes of $x/d=1.52, 3.67, 5.32, 7.03$ and 8.93 , within the FPJ nozzle. 95

4.12 Predicted frequency spectrum. 95

4.13 Iso-surface of the $200 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2$ instantaneous turbulence kinetic energy (k) predicted with (a) the modified $k-\varepsilon$ (1.3), (b) the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model, and (c) the modified $k-\varepsilon$ (1.6) model. 96

4.14 Axial evolution of the measured (Wong et al. 2003) and predicted equivalent diameters of the phase-averaged jet. The vertical line indicates the location of the centre body’s upstream surface. Refer to Figure 4.2 for symbols and coordinates. 96

4.15	Measured (Wong et al. 2003) and predicted results of inverse centreline velocity decay of the phase-averaged jet. Refer to Figure 4.9 for symbols and coordinates.	97
4.16	Three-dimensional visualisations of the predicted instantaneous streamlines through the FPJ nozzle with (a) the modified $k-\varepsilon$ (1.3) model, (b) the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model and (c) the modified $k-\varepsilon$ (1.6) model.	97
5.1	The dimensions of (a) the FPJ nozzle and (b) the external confinement adopted in the current simulation, where d_{PJ} , d_{or} , U_{or} and U_a are the diameters of the nozzle chamber, diameter of the nozzle's inlet, nozzle's inlet velocity and co-flow velocity, respectively.	118
5.2	Mesh of the model. (a) The FPJ nozzle, (b) the whole fluid domain, (c) the cross-sectional plane and (d) the longitudinal plane through the whole domain.	119
5.3	Mean centreline concentration of the predicted precessing jet for the assessment of convergence for the cases of 5, 10 and 15 precession cycles, where the ξ_{ja} is the centreline concentration. Refer to Figure 5.1 for other symbols and coordinates.	119
5.4	Mean centreline concentrations of the precessing jet flow for the assessment of convergence for the cases predicted with 2.15, 4.3 and 8.6 million nodes. Refer to Figure 5.1 for other symbols and coordinates.	120
5.5	Measured (Parham 2000) and predicted mean centreline concentration of the FPJ flow with co-flow velocities of (a) $4.31 \times 10^{-3}U_{or}$, (b) $6.8 \times 10^{-3}U_{or}$ and (c) $12.3 \times 10^{-3}U_{or}$. Refer to Figure 5.1 for other symbols and coordinates.	121
5.6	Visualisations of the instantaneous streamlines through the FPJ nozzle and the external co-flow as predicted with (a) the SST and (b) the Hybrid-LES approaches.	122
5.7	Iso-surface of the Q-criterion at $Q = 200 s^{-2}$ in the region downstream from the nozzle exit for the instantaneous FPJ flows as predicted with (a) the SST and (b) the Hybrid-LES approaches. Refer to Equation 5.1 for the definition of Q	123

5.8	Cross-sectional instantaneous and mean concentration contours of the FPJ flows that were (a) measured (Parham 2000) and predicted with (b) the Hybrid-LES and (c) the SST approaches.	124
5.9	Measured (Parham 2000) and predicted mean centreline concentrations. Refer to Figure 5.1 for symbols and coordinates.	124
5.10	Measured (Parham 2000) and predicted probability distribution function (pdf) of the concentration on the jet axis (ξ) that is normalized by the local mean concentration ($\bar{\xi}$) at $x = 12d_{PJ}$. Here the predicted pdf data was based on the result of 10 precession cycles. Refer to Figure 5.1 for symbols and coordinates.	125
6.1	The geometry and dimensions of the FPJ nozzle with a smoothly contraction inlet and a centre-body	132
6.2	Mesh of the current model. (a) the whole domain, (b) detailed view of the FPJ nozzle, (c) the longitudinal plane through the nozzle and (d) the cross-sectional plane through the nozzle	132
6.3	Qualitative comparison of the FPJ flow pattern and the main flow features that (a) obtained from the CFD simulation and (b) derived based on the measured phase-averaged axial and radial velocity (Wong et al. 2003)	133
6.4	Measured (Wong et al. 2003) and predicted centreline velocity ($u_{jet,cl}$) decay of the phase-averaged jet. Here the bulk nozzle inlet velocity (u_o) is 78.7 m/s	133
6.5	Measured (Wong et al. 2003) and predicted normalised equivalent diameters (D_{eq}) of the phase-averaged precessing jet. Refer to Figure 6.1 for symbols and coordinates	133
6.6	Measured (Wong 2004) and calculated total fluctuation energy (E_f) profile at $x/d = 14.45$. The total fluctuation energy are normalised with u_o^2 and the abscissa is normalised with the diameter of the nozzle's exit D_e	133
6.7	The calculated streamlines and normalized axial velocity contours within the internal cross-sectional planes within the FPJ nozzle	134

6.8	A comparison of the calculated and experimental derived flow pattern on the surfaces of the centre-body. (a) the calculated streamlines on the upstream and (b) downstream face of the centre-body. Also shown (c) is the surface flow pattern on the downstream face of the centre-body that is deduced based on visualization study of a steady deflected jet from the FPJ nozzle (Wong et al. 2008)	134
6.9	Cross-sectional view of (a) the streamlines and critical points derived from the present calculations, (b) the predicted streamlines at the same phase and (c) the calculated normalised axial velocity field	135
6.10	A comparison of the calculated and experimentally derived flow patterns over the internal surface for configurations of the FPJ and the OTJ nozzles. (a) Ensemble-averaged flow pattern that calculated from the present FPJ nozzle, (b) derived from the present calculation, (c) mean flow pattern obtained in the experiment (Nathan et al. 1998) and (d) ensemble-averaged flow pattern derived from the experimental results for a closely related OTJ nozzle (Lee 2009). Note that the dotted lines indicate the location of the centre-body	135
6.11	The position of Vortex Core A within the FPJ flow shown with the related calculated vorticity contours in cross-sectional planes. The unit of the vorticity is s^{-1}	135
6.12	Calculated contour of normalized axial velocity, vorticity and relative pressure on four cross-sectional planes $x/D=0.775, 1.075, 1.375$ and 1.675 . The dot lines show the half-width of the jet based on the axial velocity, following Wong et al. (2003). Note that the reference pressure being the atmospheric pressure outside the chamber	136
6.13	The position of Vortex Core B within the FPJ flow shown with (a) the calculated vorticity contours and (b) the predicted sectional streamlines within the FPJ nozzle. The unit of the vorticity is s^{-1}	137
6.14	(a) The position of Vortex Core C within the FPJ flow shown with the related calculated vorticity contours and (b) the calculated vorticity contour at the nozzle surface. The unit of the vorticity is s^{-1}	137

6.15	The position of Vortex Core D within the FPJ flow shown with the calculated vorticity contours in cross-sectional planes. The unit of the vorticity is s^{-1} .	137
6.16	The calculated vorticity contours in three cross-sectional planes at (a) $x/D = 2.455$, (b) $x/D = 0.575$, (c) $x/D = 2.725$ and (d) the position of Vortex Core E within the FPJ flow. The unit of the vorticity is s^{-1}	137
6.17	The position of Vortex Core F within the FPJ flow shown with the calculated vorticity contours in cross-sectional planes. The unit of the vorticity is s^{-1} .	138
6.18	The proposed vortex skeleton of the ensemble-averaged FPJ flow. The black arrow above the nozzle chamber indicates the precession direction	138
7.1	Sketch of the flow through the FPJ nozzle in (a) the axial jet and (b) the precessing jet flow modes. Adapted from (Wong 2004).	144
7.2	Dimensions of the FPJ nozzles investigated here with (a) a contraction inlet and (b) a pipe inlet. Also shown (c) is the dimension of the computational fluid domain downstream from the FPJ nozzle.	145
7.3	Mesh employed to model the flow for the case in which the nozzle has smooth contraction inlet.	146
7.4	Sketch of the alternative perturbation zones within the inflows at the pipe inlet (x_i) that were used to initiate precession, i.e. $A_{pz}/A_{pipe} =$ (a) 1/8, (b) 1/4, (c) 1/2 and (d) 1. Note that A_{pz} is the area of the perturbation zone and A_{pipe} is the area of the pipe inlet. The magnitude of perturbation is showed in table 7.1.	146
7.5	Calculated normalized mean equivalent diameters of the precessing jet within the FPJ nozzle as a function of axial distance for three computational meshes. Refer to Fig 7.2 for symbols and coordinates.	147
7.6	Calculated normalized mean equivalent diameters of the precessing jet within the FPJ nozzle as a function of axial distance for two time steps, i.e. 2×10^{-4} s and 2×10^{-5} s, respectively. Refer to fig 7.2 for symbols and coordinates.	147
7.7	Comparisons of the measured (Wong et al. 2004) and calculated normalised mean axial velocity profiles at $x'/D_e = 0.16$ for the cases with (a) a pipe and (b) a contraction inlet.	147

-
- 7.8 Cross-sectional contours of (a) the imposed axial velocity at the pipe inlet (x_i) and (b) the predicted axial velocity at x_o for the case $A_{pz}/A_{pipe} = 1/2$ (color figure available online). The perturbation intensity in this example is 100%. Please note that all the cross-sectional views of data in this paper should be viewed looking upstream. 147
- 7.9 The predicted flow condition at x_o for the case with an imposed tangential velocity component at the inlet flow to the contraction. Shown here are (a) the streamlines, (b) the profile of velocity u in x-direction, (c) the profile of velocity v in y-direction and (d) the profile of velocity w in z-direction at x_o . The imposed tangential velocity at the inlet of the computational domain here is 30% of the axial velocity at x_o 148
- 7.10 The predicted cross-sectional axial velocity contours for the three asymmetric initial flow fields ($t_{flow} = 0.112$ s, 0.180 s and 0.223 s) chosen from the result for case B2 to trigger the mode switching for Approach C (color figure available online). Here t_{flow} is the flow time after the start of the simulation. The velocity is normalized by the bulk mean axial velocity at the nozzle inlet (u_o). 149
- 7.11 The predicted cross-sectional predicted axial vorticity contours for the three asymmetric initial flow fields ($t_{flow} = 0.112$ s, 0.180 s and 0.223 s) that were chosen from the result of case B2 to trigger the mode switching for Approach C: (a) $X/D = 0.175$, (b) $x/D = 0.6375$, (c) $x/D = 1.25$ and (d) $x/D = 2.125$. 150
- 7.12 The simulated structure of the flow for case C3 at $t_{flow} = 0.023$ s. (a) The streamlines within an axial-radial cross-section through the flow, (b) the position of Vortex Core A shown with the calculated vorticity contours in cross-sectional planes and (c) the deduced vortex skeleton. 150
- 7.13 The simulated structure of the flow for case C3 at $t_{flow} = 0.103$ s. (a) The streamlines within an axial-radial cross-section through the flow, (b) the positions of Vortex Cores A, A1, B, E1 and E2 shown with the calculated vorticity contours in cross-sectional planes and (c) the deduced vortex skeleton. 151

7.14 The simulated structure of the flow for case C3 at $t_{flow} = 0.193$ s. (a) The streamlines within an axial-radial cross-section through the flow, (b) the positions of Vortex Cores A, B, E1 and E2 shown with the calculated vorticity contours in cross-sectional planes and (c) the deduced vortex skeleton. . . . 151

7.15 The simulated structure of the flow for case C3 at $t_{flow} = 0.308$ s. (a) The streamlines within an axial-radial cross-section through the flow, (b) the positions of Vortex Cores A, B, E1, E2 and F shown with the calculated vorticity contours in cross-sectional planes and (c) the deduced vortex skeleton. . . . 152

7.16 Predicted relative pressure contours on an internal cross-sectional plane ($x/D=1.375$) for case C3 at $t_{flow} = 0.023$ s, 0.103 s, 0.193 s and 0.308 s. The dashed lines indicate the position of the jet and the reference pressure is 1 atm. 152

7.17 Predicted axial evolution of the normalised equivalent diameter of the jet within the nozzle chamber during the transition from the AJ to the PJ modes for case C3. Refer to fig 7.2 for symbols and coordinates. 152

7.18 Predicted axial evolution of the inverse normalised maximum velocity of the jet within the nozzle chamber during the transition from the AJ to the PJ modes for case C3. Refer to fig 7.2 for symbols and coordinates. 152

B.1 Comparison of the streamline in the emerging field of the FPJ flow. (a) Hypothesised streamline based on the experimental result (Wong 2004), (b) predicted with the SST model. 187

List of Tables

3.1	Numerical configurations for the simulations adopting Geometry V.	41
3.2	Numerical configurations for the simulations adopting Geometry S.	42
3.3	Values of empirical constants in the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	44
3.4	Values of empirical constants in the RNG $k-\varepsilon$ model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	44
3.5	Values of empirical constants in the present $k-\omega$ model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	45
3.6	Values of empirical constants in the SST model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	46
4.1	Values of empirical constants in the standard $k-\varepsilon$ model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	87
4.2	Values of empirical constants in the RNG $k-\varepsilon$ model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	87
4.3	Values of empirical constants in the present $k-\omega$ model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	87
4.4	Values of empirical constants in the SST model (Versteeg & Malalasekera 2007).	87
4.5	The measured (Wong 2004) and predicted values of the precession frequency and equivalent diameter of the phase-averaged jet at $x/d=8.93$	87
6.1	The measured (Wong 2004) and predicted values of the precession frequency	133
7.1	The calculated switch time (t_{switch}) for the approach with a continuous axial perturbation of various intensity imposed at the various areas of the inflow at the pipe inlet (x_i) as shown in fig 7.4.	148

7.2	The calculated switch time triggered by imposing a tangential velocity component to the inflow at the contraction inlet (x_i)	149
7.3	The mode of the predicted flows resulting from Approach C, in which each initial flow field is asymmetric, here obtained from the flows for case B2 with the three flow times of $t_{flow} = 0.112$ s, 0.180 s and 0.223 s	150

List of Symbols

k	Turbulent kinetic energy	8
ε	Dissipation rate of the turbulent kinetic energy	8
$C_{1\varepsilon}$	model constant for the standard k - ε model	8
D	Diameter of the FPJ nozzle	11
d	Diameter of the FPJ nozzle inlet	11
L	Length of the FPJ nozzle	11
Re	Reynolds number	11
U_o	Bulk velocity at the nozzle inlet orifice	11
ν	Kinematic viscosity	11
S_t	Strouhal number	13
f_p	Precession frequency	13
y^+	Y plus value	37
U_{inlet}	Bulk velocity at the contraction, pipe or orifice inlet	40
U_a	Bulk velocity at the co-flow inlet	41
S_M	momentum source	42
τ	shear stress	42
$\rho \overline{u_i u_j}$	Reynolds stresses	43
μ_t	Eddy viscosity	43
μ_{eff}	effective viscosity	43
μ	molecular viscosity	43
P_k	shear production of turbulence	43
$C_{1\varepsilon RNG}$	RNG k - ε model coefficient	44
β_{RNG}	RNG k - ε model coefficient	44
ω	turbulent frequency	45
FD	fluid domain	48
G	LES filter function	48

List of Symbols

V	Control volume	48
τ_{ij}	Subgrid-scale stress	48
\bar{S}_{ij}	Large scale strain rate tensor	48
μ_{sgs}	LES SGS viscosity	49
l	Length scale of the unresolved eddies	49
ρ	Density	49
q_{sgs}	LES unresolved eddies velocity	49
Δ	Grid size	49
C_S	Smagorinsky constant	49
f_μ	LES wall damping function	49
l_{mix}	mixing length function	49
κ	LES constant	49
u	flow velocity at x direction	50
A_{pz}	area of the perturbation zone	52
A_{pipe}	cross-sectional area of the pipe inlet	52
v_r	radial component of the velocity	52
v_θ	tangential component of the velocity	52