Postprint of: Wasilczuk F., Flaszyński P., Doerffer P., Marugi K., Borzęcki T., The Application of Fluidic Sealing in Shrouded Gas Turbine Blades, JOURNAL OF TURBOMACHINERY-TRANSACTIONS OF THE ASME, Vol. 146, iss. 1 (2024), 015001, DOI: 10.1115/1.4064045

https://asmedigital collection.asme.org/turbomachinery/article-abstract/146/1/015001/1170048/The-Application-of-Fluidic-Sealing-in-Shrouded-Gas?redirectedFrom=fulltext

The Application of Fluidic Sealing in Shrouded Gas Turbine Blades

| 4 | Filip Wasilczuk ¹ |
|----|---|
| 5 | Institute of Fluid-Flow Machinery, Polish Academy of Sciences |
| 6 | Fiszera 14, 80-231, Gdańsk, Poland |
| 7 | fwasilczuk@imp.gda.pl |
| 8 | |
| 9 | Paweł Flaszyński |
| 10 | Institute of Fluid-Flow Machinery, Polish Academy of Sciences |
| 11 | Fiszera 14, 80-9522222, Gdańsk, Poland |
| 12 | pflaszyn@imp.gda.pl |
| 13 | |
| 14 | Piotr Doerffer |
| 15 | Gdańsk University of Technology |
| 16 | Narutowicza 11/12, 80-233 Gdańsk Poland |
| 17 | doerffer@imp.gda.pl |
| 18 | |
| 19 | Krzysztof Marugi |
| 20 | Avio Polska Sp. z o.o. |
| 21 | Grażyńskiego 141, 43-300, Bielsko-Biała, Poland |
| 22 | krzysztof.marugi@avioaero.it |
| 23 | |
| 24 | Tomasz Borzęcki |
| 25 | Avio Polska Sp. z o.o. |
| 26 | Grażyńskiego 141, 43-300, Bielsko-Biała, Poland |
| 27 | tomasz.borzecki@avioaero.it |
| 28 | |
| 29 | |
| | |
| 30 | |

3

³¹

¹ Corresponding author.

32 ABSTRACT

33 This paper presents a study conducted on a new gas turbine, designed to limit 34 leakage in the labyrinth seal. The slots in the fin are used to generate a bypass flow, which obstructs the flow in the gap above the fin. The method was tested numerically and 35 36 experimentally beforehand using a simplified model without rotation or blade passages. 37 In this paper, the validation of the method using a model of a turbine stage is shown. 38 RANS simulations using two turbulence models – Spalart-Allmaras (SA) and k- ω EARSM 39 were conducted. Comparisons of leakage flow and stage efficiency for reference and fluidic sealing configurations are presented. Fluidic sealing configuration is effective and 40 41 reduces the leakage flow by 13-18.5% (depending on the turbulence model). The analysis of the flow structure in the seal region revealed, that the use of fluidic sealing resulted in 42 43 significant circumferential flow anisotropy.

44 Keywords: Labyrinth Seal, Flow Control, Leakage reduction

45

46 **1. INTRODUCTION**

Pollution from air travel can be reduced by increasing engine efficiency, which also improves operation profitability. There are many aspects of engine operation that can be investigated in order to reduce loss. However, this study is mainly focused on losses resulting from leakage, which contribute up to 25% of stage losses [1]. Seal leakage impacts three aspects of turbine performance. Firstly, it reduces working potential, as some of the air that could work in the blade passage passes through the seal. Secondly,

| 53 | the flow's kinetic energy is dissipated as mixing occurs in the seal. Lastly, the fluid passing |
|----|---|
| 54 | through the seal has a different velocity to the fluid in the main channel, thus mixing |
| 55 | occurs, leading to decreased performance in further turbine stages [2]. In the shrouded |
| 56 | blades, which are investigated in this work, labyrinth seals are used to limit the leakage |
| 57 | [3]. Labyrinth seals consist of several fins, which engage in a series of contractions that |
| 58 | obstruct the flow. The shape of those fins is optimized to reduce the leakage [4]. |
| 59 | Introducing flow control in the seal region can lead to a further reduction, as shown in [5- |
| 60 | 8]. Considering the widespread use of the gas turbines in aircraft, even a modest |
| 61 | reduction in leakage would have a considerable impact globally. |
| 62 | Fluidic sealing in turbine labyrinth seals was first presented in the 1950s patent by |
| 63 | Auyer [9], which used pressurized air from a compressor and injected it into the tip gap |
| 64 | of an unshrouded turbine. Smile and Paulson [10] implemented the same concept with |

high pressure air introduced in the cavern between the fins' labyrinth seal of a shrouded
blade. Hilfer [11] optimized the configuration, which resulted in a 28% leakage reduction.
Placing the fluidic seal in the gap above the fin of the labyrinth seal was first proposed by
Rushton [12].

Subsequent research shows passive configurations of the fluidic sealing, where no additional air supply is needed. In this case, the source of pressurized air is usually upstream of the seal [7], where the pressure is greater than in the gap. Ghaffari [13,14] presented a similar idea, but used the elevated pressure from the stagnation point at the leading edge of the turbine blade.

74 The solution presented in this paper combines two important features of the 75 solutions presented in the literature review, which, to the best of the authors' knowledge, 76 has not been done before. Namely, the bypass slot is entirely incorporated within the fin 77 of the seal while at the same time being passive. The modus operandi is shown in Fig. 1. 78 In the labyrinth seal, the pressure upstream of the fin is higher than downstream of the 79 fin. Therefore, the pressure is higher at the slot inlet than the slot outlet, which drives the 80 flow through the slot. The proposed method is passive, which is an advantage and may 81 lead to an overall improvement in performance in the gas turbine stage.



82

83

Fig. 1 Operation principle of the fluidic seal [15]

84 The experiment was conducted on a simplified, static (non-rotating), linear 85 labyrinth seal configuration of a low-pressure turbine stage [5,6,15], where various configurations of the seal were placed in a wind tunnel. The pressure ratio between the 86 section's inlet and outlet was set using valves, after which the stagnation parameters, 87 88 mass flow at the inlet and pressure distribution in the seal were measured. A pressure 89 ratio ranging from 1.05 to 2.05 was tested to verify the design in a wide range of TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

conditions. One of the selected conditions corresponds to the pressure ratio in the design point of the labyrinth seal in a turbine. However, due to experimental restrictions, the ambient temperature was used instead of the elevated one. Additionally, the test section allowed for the investigation of configurations with different gap heights, which reflects the changing gap height present during turbine operation. However, in this paper only two gap heights are presented: h=0.85s and 1.25s, where s is the thickness of the reference fin.

97 The experimental results, comparing the reference case and the case with fluidic 98 sealing [5,6] show the leakage reduction of up to 16% was achieved in the latter 99 configuration.

100 As the purpose of this paper is to present turbine stage simulations, the 101 experimental data is shown only as a validation tool for the numerical model, thus not 102 many details are presented. A more inquisitive reader should refer to [5,6,15], where 103 more information, including the equipment used and measurement errors are presented. 104 The numerical simulations were carried out using the k-ω EARSM [16] and Spalart-105 Allmaras [17] turbulence models. Both models showed satisfactory qualitative agreement 106 with the experimental data, with small quantitative differences [5,6]. The efficiency of the 107 fluidic sealing in reducing the leakage flow was proven in simulations using both 108 turbulence models. The CFD approach also showed that fluidic sealing may reduce the 109 leakage flow by up to 22%.

110 Results from the RANS simulations of simplified configuration (described in detail in 111 section 2) served as a source for a brief description of operating principles of the fluidic 112 sealing presented below. The air at the slot outlet has significant velocity, perpendicular 113 to the main flow, which constitutes an obstacle for the main flow. In addition, the 114 difference in the magnitude and direction of the velocity creates additional vortex 115 structures (Fig. 2), which are described in sections 4 and 6. Additionally, since the slot 116 does not cover the entire fin in the circumferential direction, the main flow is impacted 117 by the flow exiting the slot differently at various sections of the gap. This introduces an 118 additional non-uniformity of the flow in the gap, which then propagates into the cavern 119 between the fins. The non-uniformity causes additional mixing in this zone, which leads 120 to a higher dissipation of kinetic energy in the flow. The comparison of the flow structure 121 with and without the fluidic sealing is analyzed in detail in [6].



122

125

126

6

- 123 Fig. 2 The vortex structure generated by the fluidic seal, direction of vortex rotation
- 124 marked with arrows. Example representation based on data obtained in RANS

simulations [6].

127 2. NUMERICAL MODEL VALIDATION

Before fluidic sealing was implemented in the simulations of the turbine stage model, an extensive study was conducted on the simplified model, which included experimental campaign. The comparison of experimental and numerical results was used to validate the numerical model. The definition of the configuration is presented in this section, along the validation results.

Fine/Turbo Numeca code was used to simulate the flow through the labyrinth seal.
Steady RANS calculations were conducted, with the k-ω EARSM and Spalart-Allmaras
turbulence models. Perfect gas was assumed with viscosity calculated according to
Sutherland's law. The code uses the second order central difference spatial discretization
scheme with artificial dissipation, as well as the explicit Runge-Kutta numerical scheme.
Additionally, the Full Approximation Storage multigrid strategy, with coarse grid
initialization was utilized. Numerical settings are presented in Tab. 1.

140

Tab. 1 Numerical settings for performed simulations.

| Parameter | Setting |
|------------------------|--|
| Turbulence model | S-A, EARSM |
| Spatial discretization | 2 nd order central difference |
| | with artificial dissipation |
| Numerical scheme | Explicit Runge-Kutta |
| Multigrid strategy | Full Approximation Storage (3 levels) |
| Medium | Perfect gas |
| Viscosity | According to Sutherland law |

141

142 The boundary conditions were set according to the measurement set up (described 143 in section 1). The stagnation pressure and temperature were set at the inlet and the static

pressure at the outlet. Walls were set as adiabatic. The turbulence at the inlet was not measured in the experiment, so it was assumed. The turbulent viscosity ratio was set to 5 and the turbulence intensity to 5%. The configuration has significant contraction (10:1) between the inlet and the channel leading to the labyrinth seal (which is the focus of the study), followed by yet another contraction (about 10:1, depending on gap height) between the channel and the gap above the fin. Thus the turbulence at the inlet does not impact the flow in the seal in meaningful manner.

A block-structured hexahedral mesh was used, refined close to the wall to keep y+ at less than 2 around the seal. The selection of the final grid was preceded by a grid convergence study, so that the results are grid-independent [6]. The final grid size is equal to 5.8 million cells.

155 The focus of the research presented in this paper is the fluidic sealing, which is 156 created using the slots drilled in the labyrinth seal fins. The crucial geometrical features of the slot such as its outlet dimensions are the same for simplified configuration and 157 158 stage configuration (shown in sections 4-6). The shape of the slot is a compromise 159 between its effectiveness and the manufacturing feasibility. However, in the future, 160 additive manufacturing technology will allow for more complex and optimal slot shapes. The dimensions of the slot, including the inlet and outlet dimensions as well as the slot 161 162 inclination angle were determined using a parametric study, presented in [8], while the relative dimensions of the slot are shown in Fig. 3. 163

TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl



164

165

Fig. 3. Geometry of the fluidic sealing slot.

166 The labyrinth seal configuration was modified to allow for the design of a relatively 167 simple test section, without sacrificing the key features of the seal flow. The 168 simplifications neglect some secondary geometrical features, reducing the model domain to the seal only (without the blade channel) as well as disregarding rotational effects. The 169 170 analysis of the impact of those simplifications is described extensively in [5]. Overall, it can be concluded, that while some of the simplifications have a non-negligible impact on 171 the level of leakage flow, the main features of the labyrinth seal flow are conserved in the 172 173 simplified model. Thus, the simplified model was deemed sufficient for proving the concept and assessing the effectiveness of proposed modifications. Nevertheless, testing 174 175 of the fluidic sealing in the actual turbine configuration before it can be implemented is 176 essential.

Figure 4 presents a comparison of the mass flow from the numerical model with the
 measurements in the test section, normalized by the maximum value obtained in the
 TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk *et al.*

| 179 | experiment. The mass flow for both turbulence models is very similar and is |
|-----|--|
| 180 | underestimated by about 8% in the entire range. However, the trend of mass flow change |
| 181 | with rising pressure ratio is the same for experimental and numerical results. At the same |
| 182 | time, the pressure distribution at the platform (upper wall of the model) calculated using |
| 183 | both turbulence models, concurs well with the measured values. In previous studies [5,6] |
| 184 | it was established, that the leakage flow is sensitive to the turbulence model used. The |
| 185 | leakage flow highly depends on the flow area in the gap, which in turn is impacted by |
| 186 | separation bubble height. After exiting the gap the flow enters the cavern, where it is also |
| 187 | separated. It is well known, that the accuracy of the turbulence models in separated flow |
| 188 | is limited. In this case, the proposed model is considered accurate for the purpose of the |
| 189 | study. The improvement of accuracy may be obtained with LES simulations, which are |
| 190 | planned in the future. |

191



193 Fig. 4. Comparison of the quantities obtained in the experiment [5] and the numerical

model with two turbulence models (Spalart-Allmaras and $k-\omega$ EARSM). 194 Gap height = 0.85s, pressure ratio = 1.25. a) Mass flow through the seal normalized with 195 196 the maximum value in the experiment. b) Static pressure at the casing normalized by 197

inlet total pressure.

198

192

199

3. TURBINE STAGE MODEL DESCRIPTION

200 Turbine stage simulations used the same numerical settings as the simplified 201 configurations simulations, while the geometry and boundary conditions were modified. The details of the seal configuration are protected, but key information can be 202 203 shared. Similarly to the configuration used in the experimental step, the seal in the stage 204 configuration has two fins, the clearance used was 0.38 of the fin thickness. However, there are some geometrical differences between the simplified (experimental) and the 205 206 stage configuration, due to the labyrinth seal optimization conducted in the period 11 TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

207 between the experiment and the stage simulations [18]. Figure 5 presents comparison of 208 two configurations - simplified and stage. Apart from geometry differences, other 209 differences between the models that were mentioned in section 2 and discussed in detail in [5] are listed in the figure. 210



Fig. 5. Schematic comparison of stage and simplified configurations. Differences 212 between configurations are listed in the figure. 213

214 Even though the stage configuration is much more faithful representation of a real 215 turbine than the simplified configuration, there is one major difference between it and 216 the real engine – namely the honeycomb at the casing was neglected. The experimental 217 studies on the simplified test section show that the currently investigated fluidic sealing 218 is not effective when a honeycomb is used. This issue is still being researched, as the honeycomb adds complexity to the case. Some of the concepts that can make the 219 220 configuration with fluidic sealing and the honeycomb combination effective are discussed 221 in [15]. It is important to note, that the fluidic sealing is investigated as a means to reduce 222 the leakage flow in a wide range of applications, where the clearance is small and unavoidable, not only in LP turbines, where honeycombs are prevalent. 223

The stage used in simulations is defined based on the last stage of a low-pressure turbine of a GEnx engine. As with the seal geometry, the details cannot be shown, but for reference approximate dimensions and features are specified below. The stator consists of 168 blades, while the rotor of 114 blades. The shroud radius is about 1 m, with blades length of about 300 mm. The gap between the casing and the labyrinth seal roughly 1 mm. The rotation rate of the rotor is 2100 RPM. The ratio of total pressure ratio at stage inlet and static pressure at the outlet is equal to 1.6.

Two models were created with two versions of the labyrinth seal mounted on the rotor blade. In the reference configuration a standard, unmodified labyrinth seal was installed, while the seal of the second model included fluidic sealing slots. Apart from the slots, both configurations were identical.

235 The grid for the blades channel was generated by the Autogrid/Numeca code with 236 O4H topology, which provided good quality [15,19]. The grid of the labyrinth seal (Fig. 6) 237 was created in IGG/Numeca and added to the channel grid. The grid of the labyrinth seal 238 was split into two parts, one connected to the stator grid and the one to the rotor grid 239 (see Fig. 7). The periodicity of the seal grid matches the periodicity of the blade passage. Both domains - the seal and the blade passage, were connected with non-matching 240 241 interfaces. The non-matching connection is created using Alternating Digital Trees (ADT) 242 algorithm [20]. One side of the connection is triangulated and projected on the other side.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl



243

244

Fig. 6. Grid of the labyrinth seal.

The grid resolving the flow through the blades consists of two parts – rotor part and stator part, connected with rotor-stator interface. Table 2 shows the grid resolution in selected directions, such as radial, circumferential, pressure side (PS) and suction side (SS) resolution for the blades, as well as resolution in all three directions for the seal and the gap above the fin.

250

251 Tab. 2 Resolution of the computational grid in selected directions

| | Circumferential (X) | Radial (Y) | Axia | nl (Z) |
|--------|---------------------|------------|----------|----------|
| Gap | 364 | 36 | 11 | 12 |
| Seal | 364 | 128 | 42 | 12 |
| Stator | 64 | 108 | 112 (PS) | 232 (SS) |
| Rotor | 125 | 108 | 116 (PS) | 300 (SS) |

252

| 253 | Appropriate grid resolution on the side walls of the slot leads to a significant number |
|-----|---|
| 254 | of elements in the circumferential direction. This causes the grid to be large. Introducing |
| 255 | a non-matching interface (Fig. 7) allows for the reduction of circumferential resolution in |
| 256 | the inlet and outlet caverns of the seal, where refinement is not required. As a result, the |
| 257 | mesh size can be significantly reduced. Still, the final grid consists of 21 million cells, out |
| 258 | of which about 16.5 million are located in the labyrinth seal zone. |





boundary conditions and interfaces used.

262

259

261

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl

263

264 The boundary conditions were a result of a 2D, throughflow simulation of the entire 265 engine. The distribution along the turbine radius of total pressure p1 (average ~60 kPa), temperature T₁ (average ~700K) and flow direction was specified at the inlet, upstream 266 of the stator. Turbulence quantities were not known, therefore they were assumed: the 267 268 turbulent viscosity ratio was at 10 and turbulence intensity at 5%. However, the 269 turbulence quantities at the inlet should not impact the flow in the labyrinth seal, since 270 before reaching it, the flow passes through the turbine stator. At the outlet, a static 271 pressure level of 38 kPa was imposed at the radius of the hub with the hub-to-shroud 272 pressure profile calculated according to the radial equilibrium conditions [21]. The speed 273 of rotation is 2100 RPM.

As for the simplified seal configuration the Numeca/FineTurbo code, which is widely used for turbomachinery simulations, was applied. Simulations were carried out for the steady flow and the full non-matching mixing plane (with the conservation of fluxes) for stator/rotor interface. Additionally, the field variables on one side of the interface were circumferentially averaged and applied to the other side.

279

280 4. TURBINE STAGE MODEL COMPARED TO SIMPLIFIED CONFIGURATION

As mentioned before, the concept of fluidic sealing in a turbine labyrinth seal was proved effective for simplified, non-rotating configurations. However, due to the simplifications used in the model, additional simulations with fluidic sealing applied to a

turbine stage configuration were performed. This made it possible to check the conceptin target conditions.

Ideally, the numerical model for the turbine stage with the labyrinth seal would be validated against the experimental data. However, even conducting the experiment with just the rotating labyrinth seal (without the blade channel) would be too complex a task and currently beyond available options. Therefore, despite the number of differences between the simplified case and the turbine stage configuration, a qualitative comparison is presented to show that the main features of the labyrinth seal and fluidic sealing flow characteristics are maintained. The differences between cases include (Fig. 5):

• Geometry

• Rotational velocity

• Boundary conditions

296 Obviously, the simplified case (the static test section) did not include rotational velocity, which is present in stage simulations. While the absolute-to-static pressure ratio 297 298 differs between the cases (due to the significant dynamic pressure from rotational 299 velocity), the static-to-static pressure ratio in the seal is the same for both cases (the 300 dynamic pressure from axial velocity at the seal inlet is negligible). It is worth noticing, 301 that in the stage simulations, the pressure ratio in the seal is not prescribed, but rather a result of the blade passage solution. The rotational velocity in the seal is significant for 302 303 the stage simulations, while for the experimental setup it is non-existent. Moreover, in

TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl

the simplified case, an ambient temperature was set, while in the stage simulations theinlet temperature was derived from the real turbine.

306 Because of these differences, a direct comparison of the mass flows obtained in the experiment and the stage simulations is not valid. Instead, a qualitative comparison of the 307 308 flow structure created by the jet exiting the fluidic sealing slot, is shown in the following 309 section. The axial velocity profiles (normalized with the maximum value) at two traverses 310 located at the outlet of the gap above the fin are presented in Fig. 8. The first traverse is 311 located in the middle of the slot (black lines) and the second one between the neighboring 312 slots (grey lines). While the flow structure for the stage configuration will be investigated 313 in more detail in section 6, it is worth noting the similarities and differences between the stage and experimental configurations. In both cases, the average velocity is greater in 314 315 the area between the slots than in the zone where the jet exits the slot, causing a velocity 316 reduction. In the space in the gap close to the slot, the velocity field is very similar in both cases. Downstream of the gap, the flow in the stage configuration is subject to rotational 317 318 effects (discussed in more detail below), thus differences arise. In both cases, in the area 319 between the slots, the separation in the gap which is present in the reference 320 configurations (not shown here), is reduced when fluidic sealing is used. In the stage 321 configuration, the velocity is almost constant across the gap (excluding the boundary 322 layers), while in the experimental configuration it is variable. This happens, because the complex vortical structure generated by the jet in the simplified configuration is disturbed 323 by significant rotational velocity. 324

TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl



325

Fig. 8. Profile of the normalized axial velocity in the first gap for two traverses in the
experimental and stage configurations.

Fig. 9 presents the streamlines of relative velocity. The jet exiting the slot (black 328 streamlines) creates a fluidic seal, that obstructs the main flow. Additionally, the air 329 330 exiting the slot in a sideways direction generates stream-wise vortices. They are present 331 in both of the configurations shown, however in the stage configuration the vortices are much less developed and more thinly spread in the circumferential direction. In the 332 333 simplified configuration one can also notice that the air exiting from the front part of the slot (red streamlines) enters the separation vortex and later forms a counter-rotating 334 335 vortex in the area between the slots. This flow feature is not present in the stage 336 configurations, as the separation is less pronounced due to the significant rotation

- 337 velocity of the fin. Moreover, the flow structures generated by mass transport in the
- tangential direction are subject to disturbance caused by the rotational velocity of the fin.



Fig. 9. Comparison of vortex structure in experimental and stage configurations.

Overall, some of the flow features, such as velocity reduction in the area of the slot and the generation of streamwise vortices at the side edges of the slot, are similar in both presented configurations. The flow in the area between the slots has a higher average velocity in both configurations, however the velocity profile in the gap differs. Additionally, the counter rotating vortices in the area between the slots are not present in the stage configuration, contrary to the experimental configuration.

347

348 **5. TURBINE STAGE MODEL RESULTS**

The investigation of the impact of fluidic sealing on the flow through a labyrinth seal in the turbine stage is split into two parts. Firstly, the change in global parameters, such as leakage flow and stage efficiency is presented. This is followed by a comparison of the flow structure existing in the reference case and the case with the fluidic seal. This is helpful in assessing the reasons for the change in the global parameters.

The implementation of fluidic sealing in the labyrinth seal of a turbine stage reduces the leakage flow. The predicted reduction depends on the turbulence model used in the simulation. For k- ω EARSM it is equal to 13%, while for Spalart Allmaras it is 18.5% (Fig. 10). This difference is caused by different separation sizes in the gap above the fin, predicted by these models, which is discussed in the next paragraph. Interestingly, the reduction of the leakage flow leads to a slight increase in the blade passage flow.



360



362 of main channel flow for reference Spalart Allmaras case.

363

364 Decreasing leakage leads to an increase in stage isentropic total to total efficiency,

365 which is defined as:

$$\eta = \frac{1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}}{1 - \left(\frac{p_2}{p_1}\right)^{\frac{\kappa - 1}{\kappa}}}$$
(1)

| 366 | Where: |
|-----|---|
| 367 | p_1 , p_2 – total pressure at inlet and outlet |
| 368 | T_1 , T_2 – total temperature at inlet and outlet |
| 369 | κ – heat capacity ratio |
| 370 | |

371 Of course, the isentropic efficiency increase is also dependent on the turbulence 372 model and is equal to 0.065% and 0.04% for k- ω EARSM and Spalart-Allmaras respectively. 373 This efficiency increase is not large, however there are several reasons why the concept 374 is worth further investigation. Firstly, in the case of the investigated stage, the blades are 375 very long compared to the gap size, so the leakage flow is only 0.3% of the total mass 376 flow. Therefore, even a significant leakage reduction impacts the stage efficiency only 377 marginally. In the future, the concept will be tested further using blades with different 378 lengths. Additionally, the slots that generate fluidic sealing were not optimized to operate 379 in the rotating framework. In fact, as the aim of the research was to test the viability of the fluidic sealing as a leakage reduction device, the geometry of the slot was not 380 381 optimized. Last but not least, the presented efficiency is calculated for one stage only, implementing fluidic sealing in more stages would likely bring further gains, since the 382 383 leakage would be reduced at each stage. Leakage losses are not only connected with loss 384 of working potential, which is could be treated as isolated to the single stage, but also the 385 mixing losses that impact other stages.

386

23

387 6. FLOW FIELD ANALYSIS

388 A flow field analysis was conducted to study the reason behind the leakage 389 reduction when the fluidic sealing was used. A comparison of the flow structure in the 390 reference and the fluidic sealing cases is presented in Figs. 11-12. Figure 11 shows the contour of the axial velocity in the meridional cross-section. Even though there is some 391 392 circumferential non-uniformity in the reference case, it is minor in comparison to the 393 fluidic sealing case. Therefore, only one cross-section for the reference case is shown, 394 while for the fluidic sealing case, the cross-sections in the middle of the slot as well as in 395 the area between the slots are shown. In Fig. 12, the axial velocity distribution in the 396 constant radius surface is shown. This surface is located in the middle of the tip gap. The location of the fins and slots (in the fluidic sealing case), as well as the rotation direction, 397 398 is marked in the figure. In the cross section, recirculation zones with very low velocity in 399 the cavities upstream and downstream of the seal can be noticed.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl



400

401 Fig. 11. Normalized axial velocity for the reference case and the two cross-sections of the402 fluidic sealing case.

In the reference case, the flow accelerates in the gaps above the fins. This leads to 403 404 the creation of the high velocity zone that goes into the area between the fins (which can 405 be seen in Fig. 11). A similar zone is created above the second fin. In Fig. 12, the non-406 uniformity of velocity in the circumferential direction can be noticed. The flow through 407 the blade passages is not uniform, which impacts the conditions at the inlet and outlet of 408 the seal. Additionally, the slight impact of the computational grid can be noticed. As 409 mentioned before, both the reference and fluidic sealing grids are very similar, with the 25 TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

| 410 | only difference being the presence of slots. In the fluidic sealing case, the grid was created |
|-----|--|
| 411 | so that the boundary layer inside the slots was properly resolved. This means that the grid |
| 412 | refinements which are close to walls propagate in an axial direction which causes visible |
| 413 | non-uniformity in the circumferential direction. This effect also exists in the reference |
| 414 | grid, since both grids are almost the same. Nevertheless, the non-uniformity of the flow |
| 415 | in the reference case, resulting from the grid resolution, is minor and does not |
| 416 | significantly affect the results. In fluidic sealing case, the periodic high velocity zones |
| 417 | downstream of the second fin have a different periodicity than the grid blocks. |



a) Reference configuration

Flow direction

b) Fluidic sealing configuration

TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

Zones between the slots

Flow direction

Ζ

420 Fig. 12. Normalized axial velocity for the reference and the fluidic sealing case for a 421 constant radius cross-section. Implementing fluidic sealing significantly impacts the flow in the gap above the fins. 422 Strong circumferential non-uniformity is present, with two distinct flow patterns. Firstly, 423 424 in the zones above the slots, the high velocity is significantly diminished in comparison with the reference case. The main flow in that region is blocked and pushed upwards by 425 the jet exiting the slots. Moreover, the very presence of the jet causes the expansion of 426 27

418

⁴¹⁹

the high velocity zone in the cavern to be less prevalent than in the reference case (Fig. 11,cross section 1).

429 On the other hand, a part of the flow blocked by the jets exiting the slots, passes the gap through the zone between the slots. This increases the maximum velocity there 430 431 and the size of the high velocity zone (Fig. 11, cross section 2). In contrast to the zone 432 above the slots, the flow exiting the gap between the slots expands more in the cavern 433 than in the reference case. One can easily notice in Fig. 12, that the high velocity zones 434 created between the slots, enter the cavern between the fins and bend in the opposite 435 direction to the rotation. This is a result of rotation. The circumferential velocity 436 component in the gap is almost equal to the rotation velocity of the seal, therefore, the shape of the high velocity zones in the gap is not changed. At the same time, the 437 438 circumferential velocity in the cavern, between the fins and downstream of the second 439 fin is lower than the rotation velocity of the seal. Thus, in the rotating frame of reference, 440 the high velocity zone seemingly bends in the opposite direction to the rotation.

In addition, the velocity exiting the seal is slightly more uniform than in the reference case. This is caused by increased mixing due to the high non-uniformity of the flow in the circumferential direction. A more uniform flow at the outlet may be beneficial since mixing occurs between the flow exiting the seal and the blade passage flow. However, this aspect should be further investigated.

446 In the non-rotating framework, the air exits the slots in a direction which is aligned 447 with the main flow, but also with the sides of the slot. When the seal rotates, it has an

448 additional circumferential component. The superposition of those two effects results in 449 non-symmetric flow in the gap, which can be observed in Fig. 13. On the one side of the 450 slot, where the direction of the velocity exiting the slot matches that of the 451 circumferential velocity, there is a local speed-up. On the opposite side of the slot, the 452 circumferential velocity is reduced by the velocity of the flow exiting the slot. This 453 promotes additional mixing and may be one of the reasons for more overall flow 454 uniformity at the exit of the seal.

455



456

457 Fig. 13. Contour of circumferential velocity, normalized by the velocity of shroud rotation.
458 Streamlines (in plane) in rotating frame.

459

460 **7. CONCLUSIONS**

This new concept for fluidic sealing in labyrinth seals, which was previously tested
 only in simplified conditions, was implemented in turbine stage simulations. As in the
 simplified configurations shown in [5,6], the fluidic sealing proved to be effective in
 reducing the leakage flow. The reduction predicted by the simulations differs, depending
 TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk *et al.*

| _ |
|-------------------------|
| <u><u> </u></u> |
| $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ |
| 0 |
| <u>e</u> |
| \geq |
| 5 |
| ő |
| Ē |
| 2 |
| |
| 2 |
| 4 |
| 0 |
| B |
| a |
| |
| |
| \geq |
| 0 |
| |
| |
| \succ |
| N |
| N |
| |
| ш. |
| |
| 2 |
| |
| L., |
| |
| |
| 0 |
| č |
| 2 |
| |
| 1 |
| / i |
| $\overline{)}$ |
| |

465 on the turbulence model used, with 18.5% reduction obtained for Spalart Allmaras and

466 13% for k-ω EARSM. Evaluation of the stage isentropic efficiency shows improvement by

467 0.065% and 0.04% for $k-\omega$ EARSM and Spalart-Allmaras.

The flow structure in the reference and fluidic sealing configurations was compared. The comparison revealed that the jet exiting the slots blocks the flow and leads to significant circumferential flow non-uniformity. This promotes mixing, which in turn increases flow resistance, eventually leading to a decrease in leakage flow.

472

473 8. FURTHER WORK

474 Since the fluidic sealing concept has proven to be viable, further steps can be taken 475 in order to assess its full potential, as well as to tackle possible implementation 476 challenges.

477 Firstly, the shape of the fluidic sealing slot used in this study was not optimized with
478 rotating machinery in mind. Therefore, the concept could be more efficient if the slots
479 were a different shape and were inclined in a circumferential direction.

The leakage reduction and stage efficiency gain resulting from the use of fluidic sealing should be also assessed for different stages of the turbine and shorter blades. Such a study would show whether the gains achieved in the entire turbine are significant enough to warrant further investigation.

TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

30

| 484 | Additional analyses, regarding material strength and possible manufacturing |
|-----|--|
| 485 | techniques should be performed. This would allow for a more precise selection of |
| 486 | optimization constraints for the slot. This may also lead to an improvement in efficiency. |
| 487 | Last but not least, an experimental campaign using a rotating seal could be |
| 488 | conducted to validate the numerical model in a more robust manner. This would |
| 489 | definitely illustrate whether or not the concept is viable in rotating seals. |
| 490 | |
| 491 | 9. ACKNOWLEDGMENT |
| 492 | This research was supported by CI TASK and by PL-Grid Infrastructure in part. |
| 493 | 10. FUNDING |
| 494 | This work was supported by the Coopernik project "Cooperative Research for Next |
| 495 | Generation High Efficiency LP Turbine" INNOLOT/I/11/NCBR/2014. |
| | |

496

497 **11. NOMENCLATURE**

498

| b | Size of the slot in axial dimension |
|------------------|---|
| h | Gap height |
| р | Pressure |
| p 1 | total pressure at inlet |
| p ₂ | total pressure at outlet |
| T ₁ | total temperature at inlet |
| T ₂ | total temperature at outlet |
| S | Thickness of the fin of the seal |
| γ+ | Non dimensional wall distance |
| V _{tan} | Tangential velocity |
| V_{shroud} | Velocity of the shroud |
| Vz | Axial velocity |
| Z | Axial dimension |
| к | heat capacity ratio |
| π | Inlet to outlet pressure ratio |
| CFD | Computational Fluid Dynamics |
| FS | Fluidic Sealing |
| HP | High pressure |
| k-ω EARSM | k-ω Explicit Algebraic Reynolds Stress turbulence model |
| LP | Low pressure |
| PS | Pressure side |
| RANS | Reynolds Averaged Navier Stokes |
| REF | Reference case (without modifications) |
| RPM | Revolutions per minute |
| | |

| RS | Rotor-Stator |
|----|-----------------------------------|
| SA | Spalart-Allmaras turbulence model |
| SS | Suction side |

499 **12. REFERENCES**

- 500 [1] Pfau, A., 2003, "Loss Mechanisms in Labyrinth Seals of Shrouded Axial Turbines", PhD
- 501 Dissertation, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.
- 502 [2] Kim S., Kim K., Son C., 2019 "Three-dimensional unsteady simulation of a multistage
- 503 axial compressor with labyrinth seals and its effects on overall performance and flow
- 504 characteristics", Aerospace Science and Technology, 86 (2019), pp. 683-693, DOI:
- 505 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ast.2019.01.055.
- 506 [3] Denton J.D., 1993, "Loss mechanisms in turbomachines, ASME J. Turbomach. 115(4)
- 507 (1993) 621, https://doi.org /10.1115 /1.2929299.
- [4] Lin, Z., Wang, X., Yuan, X., Shibukawa N., Noguchi T., 2015, "Investigation and
 improvement of the staggered labyrinth seal" *Chin. J. Mech. Eng.* 28 (2), pp. 402-408,
 https://doi.org/10.3901.
- 511 [5] Wasilczuk F., Flaszyński P., Kaczyński P., Szwaba R., Doerffer P., Marugi K., 2021 "Air
- 512 curtain application for leakage reduction in gas turbine shroud sealing", Aeropace Science
- 513 *and Technology*, 112, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ast.2021.106636
- 514 [6] Wasilczuk F., Flaszyński P., Kaczyński P., Szwaba R., Doerffer P., Marugi K., 2021,
- ⁵¹⁵ "Passive Reduction of Leakage by Transverse Jet", *J Fluids Eng Transactions of the ASME*,

516 143

- 517 [7] Turnquist, N. A., Bruce, K. L., Cerretelli, C., Tourigny J. E., 2009, "Fluidic sealing for
- 518 turbomachinery", US patent No. 8052375B2, USA.

519 [8] Wasilczuk, F., Flaszynski P., Pyclik L., and Marugi K., 2021, "Feasibility Study of Fluidic

- 520 Sealing in Turbine Shroud" *Materials*, 14, no. 13: 3477.
 521 https://doi.org/10.3390/ma14133477
- 522 [9] Auyer, E. L., 1954, "Dynamic sealing arrangement for turbomachines," US patent No.
 523 2,685,429, USA.
- 524 [10] Smile, H. J. and Paulson E. E., 1960, "Pressurized seal," US patent No. 2963268, USA.
- 525 [11] Hilfer M., Hogg S., Ingram G., 2015, "Experimental Validation of a Curtain Type Fluidic

526 Jet Seal on a Turbine Rotor Shroud," Proceedings of the ASME Turbo Expo 2015: Turbine

527 Technical Conference and Exposition. Volume 5C: Heat Transfer. Montreal, Quebec,

528 Canada. June 15–19, 2015, ASME Paper No. GT2015-42624,

529 https://doi.org/10.1115/GT2015-42624.

530 [12] Rushton, G. J., 2007, "Seal arrangement" US patent No. 7238001B2, USA.

[13] Ghaffari, P. and Willinger, R., 2016, "On the Impact of Passive Tip-Injection on the
Downstream Flow Field of a Shrouded LP-Turbine: CFD and Experimental Results,"
Proceedings of the ASME Turbo Expo 2016: Turbomachinery Technical Conference and
Exposition. Volume 2B: Turbomachinery, Seoul, South Korea. June 13–17, 2016. ASME
Paper No. GT2016-56196, https://doi.org/10.1115/GT2016-56196.

MOST WIEDZY Downloaded from mostwiedzy.pl

- 536 [14] Ghaffari P. and Willinger R., 2015, "Preliminary Investigation of Passive Tip-Injection
- 537 in a Linear Turbine Cascade.", ETC Paper No. 205, 11th European Turbomachinery
- 538 Conference, Madrid, Spain, 2015
- 539 [15] Wasilczuk F., 2020, "Fluidic Control of Shroud Leakage Flow in Gas Turbine", PhD
- 540 Thesis, IMP PAN, Gdańsk, Poland
- 541 [16] Menter F., Garbaruk A., Egorov Y., 2012, "Explicit algebraic Reynolds stress models
- 542 for anisotropic wall-bounded flows", Progress in Flight Physics 3 (2012) 89-104,
- 543 https://doi.org/10.1051/eucass/201203089
- 544 [17] Spalart, P. R. and Allmaras, S. R., 1992, "A one-equation turbulence model for
- 545 aerodynamic flows", AIAA 30th Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit 06 January 1992
- 546 09 January 1992 Reno, NV, USA, https://doi.org/10.2514/6.1992-439.
- 547 [18] Szymański, A., Wróblewski, W., Frączek, D., Bochon, K., Dykas, S., and Marugi, K. 2018
- 548 "Optimization of the Straight-Through Labyrinth Seal With a Smooth Land." ASME J Eng
- 549 Gas Turbines Power. December 2018; 140(12): 122503.
- 550 <u>https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4040767</u>
- 551 [19] Numeca, 2014, "Theoretical Manual", November, Numeca, 2014.
- 552 [20] Bonet, J. and Peraire, J. (1991), An alternating digital tree (ADT) algorithm for 3D
- 553 geometric searching and intersection problems. Int. J. Numer. Meth. Engng., 31: 1-17.
- 554 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/nme.1620310102</u>
- 555 [21] Wu, C.-H., & Wolfenstein, L., 1950, "Application of radial-equilibrium condition to
- axial-flow compressor and turbine design.", NACA Report No. 955
 - TURBO-23-1021 Wasilczuk et al.

557

35

| 558 | 13. Table caption list |
|-----|--|
| 559 | Tab. 1 Numerical settings for performed simulations. |
| 560 | Tab. 2 Resolution of the computational grid in selected directions |
| 561 | |
| 562 | 14. Figure caption list |
| 563 | Fig. 1 Operation principle of the fluidic seal [15] |
| 564 | Fig. 2 The vortex structure generated by the fluidic seal, direction of vortex rotation |
| 565 | marked with arrows. Example representation based on data obtained in RANS simulations |
| 566 | [6]. |
| 567 | Fig. 3. Geometry of the fluidic sealing slot. |
| 568 | Fig. 4. Comparison of the quantities obtained in the experiment [5] and the |
| 569 | numerical model with two turbulence models (Spalart-Allmaras and k- ω EARSM). Gap |
| 570 | height = 0.85s, pressure ratio = 1.25. a) Mass flow through the seal normalized with the |
| 571 | maximum value in the experiment. b) Static pressure at the casing normalized by inlet |
| 572 | total pressure. |
| 573 | Fig. 5. Schematic comparison of stage and simplified configurations. Differences |
| 574 | between configurations are listed in the figure. |
| 575 | Fig. 6. Grid of the labyrinth seal. |
| 576 | Fig. 7. A numerical model of a turbine stage with the labyrinth seal, with marked |
| 577 | boundary conditions and interfaces used. |

- 578 Fig. 8. Profile of the normalized axial velocity in the first gap for two traverses in the
- 579 experimental and stage configurations.
- 580 Fig. 9. Comparison of vortex structure in experimental and stage configurations.
- 581 Fig. 10. Mass flow for reference and fluidic seal configuration, normalized with the
- value of main channel flow for reference Spalart Allmaras case.
- 583 Fig. 11. Normalized axial velocity for the reference case and the two cross-sections
- 584 of the fluidic sealing case.
- 585 Fig. 12. Normalized axial velocity for the reference and the fluidic sealing case for a
- 586 constant radius cross-section.
- 587 Fig. 13. Contour of circumferential velocity, normalized by the velocity of shroud 588 rotation. Streamlines (in plane) in rotating frame.

589