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Abstract
Currently several green propellants as substitute for the highly toxic hydrazine are under investigation. A possible alternative are so called nitrous oxide fuel blends. This paper presents the results of combustion tests conducted with a premixed monopropellant consisting of N$_2$O and C$_2$H$_4$. In four test series the influence of the mixture ratio, the chamber pressure, the chamber length and the mass flux on the combustion efficiency and on the heat flux is analyzed and discussed. Furthermore four empirical Nusselt correlations derived by Bartz, Cinjarew, Dittus-Boelter and Gnielinski are compared to the experimental results and finally modified to improve their accuracy.

1. Introduction
The global quest for green propellant alternatives to the highly toxic hydrazine (N$_2$H$_4$) is still ongoing. Different alternatives for monopropellant hydrazine with different degrees of maturity are currently under investigation. Among those are hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$), Ammonium dinitramide (ADN) based propellants as LMP-103S, HAN (hydroxylammonium nitrate) based propellants as AFM-315E, water propulsion systems and nitrous oxide fuel blends. All mentioned propellants or systems come along with several advantages or disadvantages compared to conventional hydrazine:

High concentrated hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$) is non-toxic, has a high density, cold start capable catalysts are available and can be used as oxidizer in bipropellant systems.\textsuperscript{9,18,27} Despite those advantages the specific impulse of H$_2$O$_2$ is not very high ($I_{sp}$ max. 185 s), long term storability might be tricky and material compatibility with many currently used materials is a big issue.\textsuperscript{10,17,19}

ADN based propellants deliver a high specific impulse ($LMP-103S \approx 253$ s, $FLP-106 \approx 260$ s\textsuperscript{15}), offer a high density and a low toxicity.\textsuperscript{3-5,12} Drawbacks regarding ADN based propellants are that catalysts for cold start operations are not available\textsuperscript{31,43} so preheating is required, upscaling of thrusters seems to be a difficult challenge and high temperature alloys are needed to handle the combustion temperatures ($\approx 1903$ K\textsuperscript{31}).

HAN based propellants (AFM-315E or SHP 163) might offer a similar or even higher performance than ADN based propellants ($LMP-103S \approx 248$ s\textsuperscript{28,35} or 276 s\textsuperscript{2} respectively). Those propellants show a high density ($\approx 1400$ kg/m$^3$)\textsuperscript{2} and a low toxicity. On the other hand HAN based propellants tend to be explosive,\textsuperscript{22} high temperature chamber materials need to be deployed and catalysts may be damaged due to the high combustion temperatures. A test flight (NASA Green Propellant Infusion Mission - GPIM) was postponed several times\textsuperscript{34} and is now scheduled for June 2019. Currently a 1 N thruster is intended to fly on the GPIM, while a 22 N thruster is still under development.\textsuperscript{28}

Furthermore the so called “water electrolysis propulsion” is another promising candidate regarding green orbital propulsion.\textsuperscript{17,20,21} Those propulsion systems consist of a water tank, an electrolyzer, a hydrogen and an oxygen buffer tank, and the thruster. The satellite is fueled with water and during the operation in orbit the water is split into hydrogen and oxygen via electrolysis. The gaseous H$_2$ and O$_2$ is then stored in separate tanks and fed to a thruster equipped with a catalyst to propel the spacecraft. This propulsion system can achieve a high specific impulse ($I_{sp} > 300$ s), the propellant is cheap, completely green and non-toxic. One the opposite the propulsion system is quite complex and thus prone to errors, the high combustion temperatures need to be addressed with a cooling system and the thrust level and thrust duration is limited by the tank and electrolyzer sizes.
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Another class of green propellants are mixtures of nitrous oxide and a fuel, which often are referred to as nitrous oxide fuel blends.\textsuperscript{29,30,37,38,40,41} These propellants are stored in premixed, liquid state and comprise hydrocarbons or alcohols as fuels and nitrous oxide as oxidizer. Advantages of nitrous oxide fuels blends are their high $I_{sp}$ (>$300\text{ s}$), the cheap and non-toxic components as well as the possibility to realize a self-pressurized propulsion system. Drawbacks are the high combustion temperatures (up to $\approx 3400\text{ K}$) and the hazards connected to flame flashback and possible explosion of the propellant mixture.\textsuperscript{39} Since 2014 DLR’s Institute of Space Propulsion investigates a nitrous oxide fuel blend, consisting of nitrous oxide ($\text{N}_2\text{O}$) and ethene ($\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$), which is called "HyNOx" (Hydrocarbons and Nitrous Oxide). Due to the above mentioned challenges, DLR’s research was focused on how to avoid flame flashback and on the development of suitable flashback arresters\textsuperscript{39,40} for a gaseous $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ propellant. A specific ignition and flashback setup was used to evaluate the quenching capability of different flashback arresters.

In parallel to those quenching experiments, the flame arresters were used in an experimental rocket combustion chamber to evaluate their flame quenching performance with regard to the later application. Several hot gas test campaigns with a gaseous, premixed $\text{N}_2\text{O}/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ mixture were conducted.\textsuperscript{38,41} During this campaigns the operation ranges and the operation limits of the flashback arresters were determined. Besides the examination of the flashback arresters, a first analysis of the propellant performance, occurring heat loads and the needed combustion chamber size ($L^*$) was conducted.\textsuperscript{32,37,38} Due to the use of a capacitively cooled combustion chamber and the premixed, gaseous state of the propellant, the combustion efficiency is strongly connected to the heat loss to the chamber walls. In addition the heat fluxes to the chamber walls need to be evaluated, to be able to design a regenerative cooling system for a future thruster. By knowing the heat loads a appropriate cooling channel design for the thruster can be chosen and overheating of the material and structure is avoided.

To generate a valid dataset of the occurring heat loads, as well as to determine the characteristic exhaust velocity $c^*$ and the combustion efficiency $\eta^*$, a test campaign with variation of the mixture ratio, the chamber pressure, the chamber length and the mass flux was conducted. The overall heat flux to the chamber walls was derived by using the temperature rise in the chamber walls during the combustion tests. The resulting heat flux data were subsequently compared to analytical correlations. The analytical Nusselt correlations used for the comparison are the commonly used Bartz equation,\textsuperscript{8} the Dittus-Boelter correlation,\textsuperscript{24} a correlation derived by Cinjarew,\textsuperscript{13,26} and one obtained by Gnieinski.\textsuperscript{14} This paper summarizes the theoretical and experimental results regarding the propellant performance ($c^*$ and $\eta^*$), furthermore the predictions of the Nusselt correlations are presented and compared to the experimental values. The analysis concludes with a modified and optimized Nusselt correlation for the used propellant and combustion chamber.

### 2. Theoretical Background

#### 2.1 Characteristic Exhaust Velocity $c^*$ and Combustion Efficiency $\eta^*$

The characteristic exhaust velocity $c^*$ is a commonly used parameter to evaluate the performance of a rocket propellant. By comparing the experimentally determined $c^*$ ($c^*_{\text{exp}}$) to the theoretical $c^*$ ($c^*_{\text{theo}}$), the $c^*$ efficiency or combustion efficiency ($\eta^*$) can be derived. Reduced $c^*_{\text{exp}}$ and a corresponding reduced $\eta^*$ show losses in the combustion chamber caused by heat fluxes, chemical non-equilibrium, non-ideal mixing, mixture ratio variations, incomplete combustion, boundary layers or due to non-uniformities of the overall flow field. To determine the overall system performance and to take also nozzle effects into account, the specific impulse $I_{sp}$ is a widely used parameter.\textsuperscript{36} The characteristic velocity $c^*$ is depending on the injector design, the propellant itself, the mixture ratio, the chamber pressure and the combustion chamber size.\textsuperscript{36} Compared to the specific impulse $I_{sp}$, $c^*$ is independent on the nozzle shape and expansion ratio. So by means of $c^*$ different propellant and injector combinations as well as combustion chamber designs can be compared to each other. To derive the experimental $c^*$ from test data, equation (1) is used:

$$
c^*_{\text{exp}} = \frac{p_c \cdot A_{th}}{\dot{m}}
$$

Here $p_c$ is the stagnation pressure in the combustor, $\dot{m}$ symbolizes the propellant mass flow and $A_{th}$ the nozzle throat area. For the later analysis, the experimentally obtained $c^*_{\text{exp}}$ is divided by the theoretical $c^*_{\text{theo}}$ determined via NASA CEA code\textsuperscript{16} to obtain the combustion efficiency $\eta^*$:

$$
\eta^* = \frac{c^*_{\text{exp}}}{c^*_{\text{theo}}}
$$

The characteristic combustion chamber length $L^*$ is a further commonly used design parameter for rocket combustion chambers. $L^*$ is defined as the chamber volume $V_{cc}$ divided by the nozzle throat area $A_{th}$.
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\[ L^* = \frac{V_{cc}}{A_{th}} \]  

(3)

if the cross-sectional area of the combustion chamber \( A_{cc} \) is constant and the volume of the injector plate and the volume of the converging part of the nozzle is neglected, the length of the chamber \( L_{cc} \), \( L^* \) can be written as:

\[ L^* \approx \frac{L_{cc} \cdot A_{cc}}{A_{th}} \]  

(4)

The optimum \( L^* \) for a given chamber geometry, injection system and propellant combination is achieved, if \( c^* \) and the corresponding combustion efficiency \( \eta_c \) reach a maximum. On the one hand, if \( L^* \) is too short, the propellant might not burn completely and the efficiency is reduced. On the other hand, if the chamber is too long and not equipped with a regenerative cooling system, heat losses to the chamber walls and to the environment will diminish the combustion efficiency.

2.2 Heat Fluxes/Heat Loads in Rocket Combustion Chambers

The combustion temperature of nitrous oxide and ethene can get as high as 3300K. In general, the temperature of the combustion chamber wall is significantly lower than the combustion temperature. Therefore a heat flux from the hot gas into the chamber wall appears. To avoid melting or overheating of the chamber walls, the heat flux applied to the walls is of great interest for the design of a combustion chamber. Furthermore the precise knowledge of the occurring heat loads is crucial to design an appropriate regenerative cooling system. One option to determine the heat flux to the combustor is to employ CFD simulations of the combustion and the flow field inside the chamber. Another less costly option is to calculate the heat flux by using a so called Nusselt correlation. The Nusselt number \( Nu \) is defined as follows:

\[ Nu = \frac{a l}{\lambda} \]  

(5)

With \( a \) being the convective heat transfer coefficient, \( l \) a characteristic length scale of the flow and \( \lambda \) the thermal conductivity. Concerning the average Nusselt number \( Nu_{\text{avg}} \) for a given surface area, the rate of heat flow \( \dot{Q} \) applied to this area can be calculated via equation (6):

\[ \dot{Q} = Nu_{\text{avg}} \frac{\lambda}{l} \left( T_{\text{ref}} - T_{\text{wall}} \right) A_{\text{ref}} \]  

(6)

While \( A_{\text{ref}} \) denotes the reference surface area, \( T_{\text{wall}} \) the wall temperature and \( T_{\text{ref}} \) the reference temperature of the fluid. Furthermore the heat flux \( \dot{q} \) is defined as:

\[ \dot{q} = \frac{\dot{Q}}{A_{\text{ref}}} \]  

(7)

For the analysis of the later described combustion test, it was assumed that the convective heat transfer from the combustion process will result in a heating of the combustion chamber walls.

\[ \dot{q} = \dot{q}_{\text{wall}} \]  

(8)

Thus the mass of the chamber segments \( m_{\text{seg}} \), the heat capacity \( c_p \), the chamber segments surface area \( A_{\text{seg}} \), the test duration \( \Delta t \) and the temperature rise in the chamber walls \( \Delta T \) was taken into account to calculate the heat flux \( \dot{q} \) to the chamber walls:

\[ \dot{q}_{\text{wall}} = \frac{m_{\text{seg}} \cdot c_p \cdot \Delta T}{\Delta t \cdot A_{\text{seg}}} \]  

(9)

Regarding the analytical description of the heat flux (equation (6)), the average Nusselt number is only a function of the dimensionless variables Reynolds number \( Re \), Prandtl number \( Pr \), Grashof number \( Gr \) and Eckert number \( Ec \):

\[ Nu_{\text{avg}} = f(Re, Pr, Gr, Ec) \]  

(10)

For cases in which no free convection occurs and the Mach numbers are low, \( Ma \), \( Gr \) and \( Ec \) can be neglected. For this cases the Nussel number is only a function of the Reynolds \( Re \) and Prandtl \( Pr \) number:

\[ Re = \frac{\rho \cdot v \cdot l}{\mu} \]  

(11)
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\[
Pr = \frac{\mu \cdot c_p}{\lambda} \tag{12}
\]

Here \( \rho \) is the density, \( v \) the flow velocity, \( l \) a characteristic length scale, as for example the hydraulic diameter \( d_h \), \( \mu \) the dynamic viscosity, \( c_p \) the specific heat at constant pressure and \( \lambda \) the heat conductivity of the fluid. During the last decades several semi-empirical correlations have been established to determine the value of the Nusselt number for different flow conditions and applications. For a fully developed turbulent pipe flow the Dittus-Boelter equation (13) gives a first estimation of the Nusselt number:

\[
N_{t.m, DB} = 0.023 {Re}^{0.8} {Pr}^{n} \tag{13}
\]

With the following limitations:

\[
10000 \leq Re
\]
\[
0.7 \leq Pr \leq 160
\]
\[
10 \leq \frac{l_{pipe}}{d} \leq \infty
\]

Here \( d \) is the diameter and \( l \) the length of the pipe. The exponent \( n \) depends on corresponding heating or cooling process. So for heating of the wall by the fluid \( n = 0.3 \), for cooling of the wall by the flow \( n = 0.4 \). The thermo-physical properties which are needed to calculate \( Re \) and \( Pr \) have to be determined at a reference temperature. Regarding the original form of the Dittus-Boelter equation the reference temperature \( T_{ref, DB} \) for a pipe flow is the mean value of the fluids inlet and \( T_{in} \) and outlet temperature \( T_{out} \):

\[
T_{ref, DB} = \frac{T_{in} + T_{out}}{2} \tag{14}
\]

Especially for rocket combustors Cinjarew proposed the following equation:\textsuperscript{25,26}

\[
N_{t.m, Cj} = 0.0162 (Re \cdot Pr)^{0.82} \left( \frac{T_{stag}}{T_{wall}} \right)^{0.35} \tag{15}
\]

with the stagnation temperature \( T_{stag} \). While \( T_{stag} \) is defined as:

\[
T_{stag} = T_{stat} + r_c \cdot (T_c \cdot \eta_c - T_{stat}) \tag{16}
\]

Here \( T_{stat} \) is the static temperature of the fluid, \( T_c \) the adiabatic combustion temperature, \( \eta_c \) the combustion efficiency and \( r_c \) the recovery factor. The recovery factor is an empirical value and usually ranges from 0.7 and 0.9.\textsuperscript{25} Furthermore, the static temperature \( T_{stat} \) is defined as:

\[
T_{stat} = \frac{T_c}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot Ma^2} \tag{17}
\]

With the Mach Number \( Ma \) and the heat capacity ratio \( \kappa \). According to the initial equation, the fluid properties for the calculation of the Prandtl and Reynolds number have to be determine at the wall temperature \( T_{wall} \). In contrast Kirchberger\textsuperscript{25} gained a better agreement with experimental data by using the mean value of the adiabatic combustion temperature \( T_c \) and the wall temperature \( T_{wall} \) for calculation of the viscosity, thermal conductivity and the heat capacity:

\[
T_{mean} = \frac{T_c + T_{wall}}{2} \tag{18}
\]

A more general equation is given by Gnielinski:\textsuperscript{1,14}

\[
N_{t.m, Gn} = \left[ \frac{\frac{\xi}{5}(Re - 1000) \cdot Pr}{1 + 12.7 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{5} (Pr^{\frac{2}{3}} - 1)}} \right] \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{d_h}{l_{pipe}} \right)^{2} \frac{1}{3} \right] \tag{19}
\]

Gnielinski correlation additionally takes the hydraulic diameter \( d_h \) and the length \( l_{pipe} \) of the pipe into account. Additionally \( \xi \) is defined as:

\[
\xi = (1.82 \log(Re) - 1.64)^{-2} \tag{20}
\]

The correlation derived by Gnielinski is valid for a Reynolds number \( Re \), Prandtl number \( Pr \) and length \( l \) to diameter \( d_h \) ratio of:
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\[ 10^4 \leq Re \leq 10^6 \]
\[ 0.1 \leq Pr \leq 1000 \]
\[ \frac{l_{pipe}}{d_h} \geq 1 \]

The fluid properties for the Gnielinski equation must also be evaluated at the mean temperature \( T_{mean} \) according to equation (18).

For rocket engines and especially rocket nozzles Bartz\(^8\) derived a correlation under consideration of the thermal and velocity boundary layer:

\[ Nu_{in,Ba} = 0.026 \cdot Re^{0.8} \cdot Pr^{0.4} \left( \frac{d_h}{r_{BK}} \right)^{0.1} \cdot \sigma_B \]

while \( \sigma_B \) is defined as:

\[ \sigma_B = \left[ 0.5 \cdot \frac{T_{wall}}{T_{stag}} \left( 1 + \frac{\kappa - 1}{2} Ma^2 \right) + 0.5 \right]^{-0.68} \left[ 1 + \frac{\kappa - 1}{2} Ma^2 \right]^{-0.12} \]

\( d_h \) is the nozzle throat diameter, \( r_{BK} \) is the radius of the combustion chamber and \( \kappa \) the ratio of the specific heats. Bartz proposed to evaluate \( \epsilon_p \) and \( Pr \) for the conditions at the stagnation temperature \( T_{stag} \), while and \( \mu \) and \( \rho \) should be evaluated at the mean temperature \( T_{mean} \).

3. Experimental Setup and Test Conduction

In the following section the test bench layout, the piping and instrumentation diagram and the used combustor are described. Furthermore the test procedure is explained. The combustion tests were conducted at DLRs M11 test facility.\(^11,42\)

3.1 Test Bench Layout and P&ID

![Figure 1: Simplified piping and instrumentation diagram of the test setup](image-url)

Figure 1 shows a simplified piping and instrumentation diagram (P&ID) of the test setup. The left hand side of the figure shows the gas supply, the used C₂H₄ had a purity of 3.0, while the N₂O was garde 5.0. Downstream the gas bottles in each feeding line a pressure regulator is mounted, it is used to adjust the supply pressure and mass flow to the combustion chamber. The nitrous oxide and ethene feeding lines are each equipped with a Coriolis mass flow meter (Rheonik RHM015 and RHM04), a 2-2 way valve and a control valve to adjust the mixture ratio and mass flow. Upstream the combustor, the nitrous oxide and ethene feeding lines are connected at a pipe crossing and after a mixing section the oxidizer and fuel are injected in premixed state in the combustion chamber.

The supply pressure and the feeding temperature upstream the tube crossing and the injector are measured via pressure transducers (P-C₂H₄, P-N₂O) and thermocouples (T-C₂H₄, T-N₂O). The data acquisition rate for the pressure sensors is 5 kHz while the data of the thermocouples and the mass flow are recorded with 100 Hz and 10 Hz, respectively.
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3.2 Combustion Chamber

Figure 2: Sectional view of the combustion chamber

Figure 2 show a sectional view of the combustion chamber. The gaseous propellant mixture enters the combustor at the left hand side through the feeding line and the injector. To ignite the mixture, a spark plug is used. Opposite to the spark plug at the the injector faceplate a pressure transducers is mounted. The influence of the chamber length ($L^*$) can be investigated by using different numbers of segments, which additionally vary in length.

Each chamber segment is equipped with three thermocouples in 3, 8 and 13 mm radial distance to the inner chamber wall and an additional pressure sensor. The segments and the nozzle as well as the injector fitting are made of CuCr1Zr. Convergent-divergent nozzle with throat diameters ranging from 5 mm to 9 mm are available, while the inner diameter of the combustion chamber is 24 mm. By combining the different segments and nozzles a wide variation of the characteristic combustion chamber length $L^*$ is achieved. The chamber has no active cooling system, so the heat generated by the combustion results in a temperature rise of the chamber segments, faceplate and nozzle.

3.3 Test Conduction and Sequence

Figure 3: Schematic of the test sequence

The test procedure is visualized in Figure 3. Prior to the test sequences, the combustion chamber and the whole setup were leak tested. At the beginning of a test sequence, the mixture ratio and pressure were adjusted by using the pressure regulators and control valves. During a cold flow the approximate mass flow and the propellants mixture ratio was checked and corrected if not in the desired range. Subsequent to the cold flows, the test sequence was started. The setup was purged with nitrogen for 3 s, followed by 10 s of waiting to release the nitrogen pressure. Then the spark plug was activated and shortly afterwards the N$_2$O and C$_2$H$_4$ valves were opened. During all tests the burn time was 6...
set to 10 s to assure a steady state combustion and a sufficient time span to evaluate the chamber pressure and the mass flow.

The hot run ended with closing the N\textsubscript{2}O and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} valves. After the test run all valves were kept closed for 35 s to allow an equalization of the temperature in the chamber. For the later heat flux calculation the average chamber temperature 30 s after closing the feeding valves was taken into account. Subsequent to this waiting time, the whole setup was purged with nitrogen again. Each test was repeated twice with nearly identical mass flow and mixture ratio, slight variations in the mixture ratio and mass flow were caused by small differences of the supply pressure in between two test runs.

4. Theoretical Performance Calculation, \(c^*_{\text{theo}}\), \(I_{\text{sp}}\) and Combustion Temperature \(T_c\)

In a first step the theoretic performance of the propellant mixture was assessed by means of NASA CEA\textsuperscript{16}.

Figure 4 shows the theoretical specific Impulse \(I_{\text{sp}}\), the theoretical, characteristic exhaust velocity \(c^*_{\text{theo}}\) and combustion temperature \(T_c\) depending on the mixture ratio (ROF). For calculating the \(I_{\text{sp}}\) expansion in vacuum and an expansion ratio \(\epsilon\) of 50 was chosen. All calculations were performed assuming frozen reactions at the nozzle throat. Furthermore the \(I_{\text{sp}}, c^*_{\text{theo}}\) and \(T_c\) were calculated for a chamber pressure of 5 and 10 bar, while the unburned gas temperature was 283 K.

(a) Specific impulse \(I_{\text{sp}}\) and combustion Temperature \(T_c\) depending on mixture ROF

(b) Characteristic exhaust velocity \(c^*_{\text{theo}}\) and combustion Temperature \(T_c\) depending on mixture ROF

Figure 4: Specific impulse \(I_{\text{sp}}\), characteristic exhaust velocity \(c^*_{\text{theo}}\) and combustion temperature \(T_c\) depending on mixture ratio. Calculation with NASA CEA\textsuperscript{16} frozen at throat and expansion ratio \(\epsilon=50\)

The solid lines in figure 4a and figure 4b give \(I_{\text{sp}}, c^*_{\text{theo}}\) and \(T_c\) for 10 bar chamber pressure and 283 K propellant inlet temperature. The dashed lines mark the values for 5 bar chamber pressure and 283 K.

Figure 4a shows a maximum \(I_{\text{sp}}\) of 305 s at a mixture ratio in between 5.5 and 6 at 10 bar chamber pressure. The maximum combustion temperature of 3300 K for 10 bar chamber pressure is reached at a mixture ratio of 7.3. The blue dashed line symbolizes the stoichiometric mixture ratio which is 9.41. Figure 4b gives the theoretical \(c^*_{\text{theo}}\) again in comparison to the combustion temperature \(T_c\). At a mixture ratio of 5.7 a maximum \(c^*_{\text{theo}}\) of 1655 m/s is reached for a chamber pressure of 10 bar and a propellant inlet temperature of 283 K.

5. Test Results and Discussion

In this section the results of four different test campaigns with more than 60 single test runs are evaluated. For each test run, the average pressure in the combustion chamber, the mean mass flow for the given test run and the measured nozzle throat diameter were taken into account. To assure a steady state combustion and to wait for the rise time of the Coriolis mass flow sensors, the evaluation slot for averaging the pressure and mass flow was in between second four and second ten.

First the experimentally derived \(c_{\text{exp}}\) and \(\eta_c\) depending on the mixture ratio will be shown and discussed. Second the measured and calculated heat flux depending on the mixture ratio will be analysed and compared to the results of the above mentioned Nusselt correlations.

Furthermore for a variation of the chamber pressure \(p_c\), the chamber length (\(l_{\text{seg}}\) or \(L^*\)) and the mass flux \(j_m\), the experimentally observed combustion efficiency \(\eta_c\) and heat flux will be shown and discussed. In a final step, a modification to the Nusselt equations is shown, which describes the observed heat fluxes with greater accuracy.
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5.1 $c_{\text{exp}}^*$, $\eta_c^*$ and Heat Flux Depending on Mixture Ratio (ROF)

Figure 5 gives the characteristic exhaust velocity $c_{\text{exp}}^*$ as determined during the experiments. The calculation of $c_{\text{exp}}^*$ was done according to equation (1). Table 1 summarizes the boundary conditions for this test campaign. While the chamber segment length $l_{\text{seg}}$, the nozzle throat diameter, the chamber pressure and the test duration were kept constant, the mixture ratio was varied in between 3.4 and 22. The stoichiometric propellant mixture has an O/F of 9.41.

![Figure 5a](image1.png) (a) Experimental and theoretical $c^*$ depending on mass mixture ratio ROF for fixed pressure, chamber length and nozzle diameter

![Figure 5b](image2.png) (b) combustion efficiency $\eta_c^*$ depending on mass mixture ratio ROF for fixed pressure, chamber length and nozzle diameter

Figure 5a shows the experimental $c_{\text{exp}}^*$ and the corresponding theoretical $c_{\text{theo}}^*$ depending on the mixture ratio. For this test series a maximum $c_{\text{exp}}^*$ of 1530 m/s at a mixture ratio of 6.8 was observed. When moving to richer or leaner mixtures, the experimental and theoretical $c^*$ drops, while for a propellant with a mixture ratio richer than 3.38 most of the test resulted in a flame out.

![Figure 5](image3.png)

Figure 5: Experimental and theoretical $c^*$ and $\eta_c^*$ depending on mixture ratio ROF for tests with an average pressure of 7.5 bar, an $L^*$ of 1.02 m, chamber segment length of 20 mm and a nozzle throat diameter of 5 mm

The combustion efficiency $\eta_c^*$ in figure 5b changes slightly with variations in the mixture ratio. This variation is most likely caused by changes in the combustion temperature depending on the current mixture ratio. A higher combustion temperature results in higher heat losses to the chamber walls, thus for mixture ratios with a higher combustion temperature the $c^*$ efficiency is lower. The lowest combustion efficiency of 91.8 % is observed at a mixture ratio of 5.5, here figure 5a shows the largest difference in between the experimental and theoretical $c^*$.

Figure 6 shows heat flux observed during the experiments and compares it to the Nusselt correlations of Gnielinski, Bartz, Cinjarew and Dittus-Boelter. The experimental heat flux was calculated according to equation (9) by assuming that the heat flux is only applied to the cylindrical part of the combustion chamber. For calculation of the Nusselt numbers according to Gnielinski, Cinjarew and Dittus-Boelter, the fluid properties at the combustion temperature $T_c$ were taken into account. For calculation of the Nusselt number with Bartz’ equation the fluid properties at the stagnation temperature $T_{\text{stag}}$ (see equation (16)) were used. Taking this reference temperatures into account resulted in the least differences to the experimental data, while other reference temperatures resulted in much bigger differences (up to 100%) between the measured and calculated data.

As figure 6 indicates, depending on the used correlation, difference of up to 0.7 MW/m² or 50% in between the measured and calculated heat fluxes are observed. The correlation of Bartz (green line) gives the largest heat fluxes across the whole range of mixture ratios. Despite this general overestimation Bartz’ equation predicts the heat flux for rich or lean mixtures (ROF ≤ 5 and ≥ 13) in quite good accordance. The Dittus-Boelter equation (yellow line) results in lower heat fluxes compared to the experimental values, while the correlations proposed by Cinjarew and Gnielinski show a good agreement for near stoichiometric and rich conditions (ROF ≥ 5 and ≤ 11). Despite the differences, the curve of the measured and calculated heat fluxes show a similar shape. In general the peaks of the measured heat flux...
near the stoichiometric mixture ratio are lower than the calculated values, while for lean and rich mixture ratios the experimental heat fluxes are higher than the calculated values. For lean (ROF \( \leq 5 \)) and rich (ROF \( \geq 13 \)) mixtures the correlation of Bartz seems to provide good results, while for near stoichiometric mixture ratios (ROF \( \geq 5 \) and \( \leq 11 \)) the Cinjarew and Gnielinski correlation give a good estimation of the heat flux.

5.2 \( \eta_c \) and Heat Flux Depending on Chamber Pressure

In a second test series, the chamber pressure was varied via adjustment of the mass flow, while the mixture ratio, the chamber segment length and nozzle diameter were kept constant. Table 2 shows the boundary conditions for this test series.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( l_{\text{seg}} ) [mm]</th>
<th>( d_{\text{th}} ) [mm]</th>
<th>( p_c ) [bar]</th>
<th>ROF</th>
<th>test duration [s]</th>
<th>( L^* ) [m]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7-11.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 presents the combustion efficiency \( \eta_c \) depending on the chamber pressure. With rising chamber pressure, the efficiency also rises. In general the theoretical \( c^\prime_{\text{theo}} \) increases with rising chamber pressure due to higher combustion temperatures (see figure 4). However, a rise in theoretical \( c^\prime \) does not directly cause \( \eta_c \) or \( c^\prime_{\text{exp}} \) to rise. Additional effects seem to increase the experimental \( c^\prime_{\text{exp}} \) compared to the theoretical values. As it will be shown in section 5.4 an increase in pressure and thus density results in a lower heat loss per mass flow. With increasing pressure the additional energy release caused by the reaction overcompensates the effect of larger heat losses generated by a larger pressure. Finally this results in a higher efficiency at larger chamber pressures.

Figure 7b shows the calculated and measured heat fluxes for different chamber pressures at a mixture ratio of 7.1. The course of the heat flux rise is described in good accordance by most of the correlations, except for the Gnielinski correlation, which gives higher heat fluxes for low chamber pressures and slightly lower heat fluxes for high chamber pressures. The best agreement with the experimental heat flux data is shown by the Cinjarew equation. This is most likely caused by the already good agreement of the Cinjarew equation at near stoichiometric conditions (see figure 6) and a good representation of the heat flux rise with increasing chamber pressure. Fitting of the experimental heat flux data shows a correlation of the heat flux to the chamber pressure with the power of 0.827:

\[
\dot{q} \sim p^{0.827}
\]  

This correlates well to literature data\(^\text{23}\) and the above described Nusselt correlations. As the Reynolds number is proportional to the density and the density of an ideal gas proportional to the pressure, the pressure directly influences the Reynolds number. Regarding the Nusselt correlations of Bartz, Dittus-Boelter and Gnielinski the Reynolds number influences the Nusselt number with the power of 0.8, while Cinjarew gives an exponent of 0.82.
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5.3 $\eta_c^*$ and Heat Flux Depending on Chamber Segment Length $l_{seg}$ or Characteristic Chamber Length $L^*$

A third test series was conducted to evaluate the influence of an increasing chamber length $l_{seg}$ or an increasing surface area $A_{cc}$ on the combustion efficiency and heat loads. With increasing chamber length $l_{seg}$, the residence time of the flow in the chamber increases and $L^*$ increases for a constant nozzle throat diameter. Table 3 gives the operation points for the test series with variation of the chamber length.

Table 3: Operating points of the combustion chamber to analyse the influence of the characteristic chamber length $L^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$l_{seg}$[mm]</th>
<th>$d_{th}$[mm]</th>
<th>$p_c$[bar]</th>
<th>ROF[−]</th>
<th>test duration [s]</th>
<th>$L^*$[m]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.79 - 1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already shown by a previous study, the optimum characteristic chamber length $L^*$ for the premixed, gaseous propellant is around 0.5 m. During the current test campaign the trend of decreasing performance with rising chamber length was confirmed. Additionally in the current test campaign the occurring heat loads were derived. Figure 8a shows the combustion efficiency depending on the characteristic chamber length $L^*$. As during this test campaign only the chamber segment length $l_{seg}$ and not the nozzle throat diameter was varied, the changes in $L^*$ directly correspond to the changes in the chamber length (see equation (4)).

Figure 7: $\eta_c^*$, experimental heat flux and heat flux derived by Nusselt correlations depending on chamber pressure for tests with an average mixture ratio of 7.1, an $L^*$ of 1.02 m, chamber segment length of 20 mm and a nozzle throat diameter of 5 mm

Figure 8: $\eta_c^*$ and heat flux depending on chamber length for tests with an average mixture ratio of 11, an average chamber pressure 3.4 bar and a nozzle throat diameter of 5 mm
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As shown in figure 8a the $c^*$ efficiency drops from 92.5% to 89.5% when $L^*$ is increased from 0.79 m to 1.71 m. The increase in surface area of the combustion chamber causes a larger heat flow $\dot{Q}$ to be lost to the chamber walls. While figure 8b shows a decrease of the heat flux $\dot{q}$ with increasing chamber length and increasing chamber surface area, the overall heat flow $\dot{Q}$ increases with rising chamber length. If e.g. the characteristic chamber length and thus the chamber surface area doubles from 0.8 m to 1.6, the heat flux only drops from approximately 1.4 to 1.1 MW/m$^2$. Extrapolated to the heat flow $\dot{Q}$ a doubled surface area and a 22% decrease in heat flux results in a 1.56 times higher heat flow. Due to this increase in overall heat flow $\dot{Q}$, the combustion efficiency drops with increasing chamber length. Furthermore the drop of the heat flux with increasing chamber length also indicates that the maximum heat flux to the chamber walls will be located near to the injector at an $L^*$ smaller 0.79 m.

5.4 $\eta_c$ and Heat Flux Depending on Mass Flux $j_m$

A fourth test series was conducted to evaluate the influence of the mass flux on the combustion efficiency and the heat flux. The boundary conditions for this test series are given in table 4, while the nozzle throat diameter and with this the $L^*$ was changed, the chamber surface area and chamber segment length was kept constant. Furthermore the mixture ratio and the chamber pressure were fixed to a very narrow range to evaluate the influence of the mass flux only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$l_{seg}[\text{mm}]$</th>
<th>$d_{th}[\text{mm}]$</th>
<th>$p[\text{bar}]$</th>
<th>ROF$[-]$</th>
<th>test duration$[\text{s}]$</th>
<th>$L^*[/m]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.26 - 0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: $\eta_c$ and heat flux depending on mass flux for tests with an average mixture ratio of 8.5, an average chamber pressure 3.4 bar, a chamber segment length of 10 mm and nozzle diameters in between 5 and 9 mm

As the mass flux $j_m$ is:

$$j_m = \frac{\dot{m}}{A_{cc}} = \frac{\rho \cdot v \cdot A_{cc}}{A_{cc}} = \rho \cdot v$$

and the pressure and thus the density was kept constant during this test series, the increase in heat flux with increasing mass flux is presumably caused by the increase of the flow velocity $v$:

$$\dot{q} \sim v^{0.702}$$

$$\dot{q} \sim j_m^{0.702}$$

Figure 9a gives the combustion efficiency depending on the mass flux $j_m$. A moderate increase of the efficiency from 90.5% at a mass flux of $10$ kg/(s · m$^2$) to an efficiency of 93% at a mass flux of $33$ kg/(s · m$^2$) can be observed. As figure 9b shows, the heat flux also rises with increasing mass flux. Fitting of the experimental data shows a proportionality of the heat flux to the mass flux to the power of 0.702:

$$\dot{q} \sim \rho \cdot \dot{m}$$

$$\dot{q} \sim v^{0.702}$$
If during the test series the mixture ratio and the chamber pressure are kept constant, the average flow velocity in the combustion chamber increases with rising nozzle throat area, respectively nozzle throat diameter. Higher flow velocities result in higher Reynolds numbers which again increase the heat flux to the chamber walls. Furthermore the flow field in the chamber might change with increasing mass flow, which then changes the heat loads to the chamber walls. Those differences in the flow field could be caused by a change or occurrence of a recirculation zone downstream the injector in the combustion chamber. The recirculation zone might be formed by the rapid change of the diameter and the corresponding expansion, when the flow leaves the injector and enters the chamber (see figure 2).

Figure 10: Heat flux per mass flow depending on mass flux

Figure 10 shows the average heat flux per mass flow depending on the mass flux. The diagram indicates that with increasing mass flux, respectively velocity, the heat loss per mass drops as the density is constant in this test series. This effect explains the rising combustion efficiency with increasing mass flux. As the heat loss per mass element decreases with increasing mass flux, a smaller percentage of the energy is lost to the chamber walls with increasing mass flux. As a consequence $\eta_c$ rises.

5.5 Modification of the Nusselt Correlations to Improve the Heat Flux Prediction

Due to the big differences of the calculated values for reach or lean mixtures, a modification of the Nusselt correlations was employed. To improve the accuracy of the mentioned correlations, the correction factor $\zeta$ was introduced:

$$\zeta = 1 + 0.163 \cdot \left(\frac{\text{ROF}}{\text{ROF}_{st}} - 1\right)^2$$ (27)

Figure 11: Experimental heat flux and heat flux calculated via modified Nusselt correlations

Here $\text{ROF}_{st}$ indicates the mixture ratio at stoichiometric conditions, which is 9.41 for the $N_2O/C_2H_4$ mixture. By using the correction factor, the Nusselt number is modified according to equation (28):
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\[ Nu_{mod} = Nu \cdot \zeta \quad (28) \]

Figure 11 shows the results for the heat flux calculated with the four modified Nusselt correlation (28). For stoichiometric conditions, the heat flux stays at the same level, while for rich and lean conditions the prediction is improved slightly (compare figure 6 and figure 11). Nevertheless, no single correlation can predict the measured heat fluxes across the whole range of mixture ratios.

As mentioned before, Bartz’ equation gives a good prediction for the rich (ROF ≤ 5) and lean (ROF ≥ 13) mixture ratios, while the heat loads at near stoichiometric mixture ratios (ROF ≥ 5 and ≤11) are well predicted by Cinjarew’s and Gnielinski’s equation.

5.6 Error Analysis

To analyze the possible errors, the pressure and temperature sensors were compared to a calibrated device (Beamex MC 5, Modul EXT 250 and Beamex FB660 Field Temperature Block). The comparison resulted in a maximum deviation of 3 K or 4% for the thermocouples over a temperature range up to 600°C, while the largest error of the pressure sensors’ was 0.1 bar or 0.8% in between 1 and 40 bar. Due to a high contraction ratio of the combustion chamber even for the largest nozzle throat, low Mach numbers in the chamber occurred. Thus for the calculation of the \(c^*\) values a correction of the experimental pressure data to obtain the stagnation or total pressure was not employed.

The two Coriolis mass flow meter (Rheonik RHM 015 and RHM 04) were compared to a third just calibrated reference mass flow meter. Despite the manufacturer’s specification, differences of up to 5% in between the reference mass flow meter and the two other Coriolis sensors were observed.

The nozzle throat diameter was measured via micrometer, here a measurement accuracy of 2% on the throat area was assumed.

For calculation of the \(c^*\) the average mass flow and pressure in between 4 and 10 s of each test run was taken into account. To determine the heat flux \(\dot{q}\) an error of the heat capacity \(c_p\) of 50 J/(kg \cdot K) was assumed, while the error on the test duration \(\Delta t\) was estimated to be 0.2 s due to the transient ignition process. The temperature error to calculate the heat flux was estimated to be within 5 K due to small temperature differences in the whole chamber 30 s after shutdown, due to heat conduction to the feeding lines and due to heat losses to the surrounding atmosphere. The mass of the chamber segments was determined by a calibrated scale so this error was assumed to be small and was thus neglected.

The error bars were calculated using a worst case approach. For example the maximum error of the \(c^*\) value according to equation (1) is determined using the maximum possible occurring pressure, the maximum nozzle area and the minimal mass flow. Therefore \(\Delta c^*_{max}\) is calculated as shown in equation (29). Errors of other variables were calculated the same way.

\[ \Delta c^*_{max} = \frac{(\rho_c + \Delta \rho_c)(A_{th} + \Delta A_{th}) + \dot{m} + \Delta \dot{m}}{\dot{m} + \Delta \dot{m}} - c^*_{exp} \quad (29) \]

6. Summary

In sum four test series with a premixed, gaseous green propellant consisting of N₂O and C₂H₄ were conducted. The aim of the test campaign was to evaluate the influence of the mixture ratio ROF, the chamber pressure \(p_c\), the chamber length \(L^c\) and the mass flux \(j_m\) on the characteristic exhaust velocity \(c^*\), on the combustion efficiency \(\eta_c\), and on the heat flux \(\dot{q}\) to the chamber walls. To perform the experiments a CuCr1Zr rocket combustion chamber equipped with several temperature and pressure sensors was used. The chamber was not equipped with an active cooling system, thus the combustion process resulted in heating of the chamber segments.

In a first step the theoretical values for \(c^*\), \(I_{sp}\) and the combustion temperature \(T_c\) were calculated via NASA CEA. Second the theoretical \(c^*_{tho}\) was calculated for each test point of the combustion tests. By dividing the experimental \(c^*_{exp}\) by the theoretical \(c^*_{tho}\) the combustion efficiency \(\eta_c\) for all test series was derived. Furthermore by taking the temperature rise in the chamber segments \(\Delta T\), the heat capacity \(c_p\), the mass of the chamber segments \(m_{seg}\), the chamber surface area \(A_{seg}\) and the test duration \(\Delta t\) into account, the average heat flux \(\dot{q}\) to the combustion chamber was determined. The heat flux was additionally compared to the predictions of four empirical Nusselt correlations. Here the Nusselt correlations of Bartz, Cinjarew, Dittus-Boelter and Gnielinski were used to calculate the hot gas side heat transfer.

Regarding the four different test series, the following observations were made:
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a) Due to large changes in the combustion temperature $c^*$ changes significantly with the mixture ratio ROF. Additionally the combustion efficiency $\eta_c$ is effected by the mixture ratio, because the respective combustion temperature results in higher or lower heat losses to the chamber walls. Higher combustion temperatures and thus higher losses to the chamber walls result in lower $c^*$ efficiency, e.g. for near stoichiometric conditions the heat losses are at a maximum.

b) The combustion efficiency rises with increasing chamber pressure. For higher chamber pressures the energy generation by the combustion process overcompensates the heat losses to the chamber walls, thus the efficiency rises. For the used combustor the heat losses to the chamber walls are proportional to the chamber pressure to the power of 0.827:

$$\dot{q} \sim p_c^{0.827}$$

(30)

This e.g. means a doubling of the mass flow results in a doubling of the chamber pressure, while the heat flux just grows by a factor of 1.77. Additionally the theoretical $c^*$ also rises due to higher combustion temperatures with higher chamber pressures.

c) The combustion efficiency $\eta_c$ and the heat flux $\dot{q}$ per chamber segment decrease with increasing chamber length. Due to the premixed, gaseous state of the propellant, the flame and the combustion zone is located very close to the injector. Thus the maximum heat flux occurs near the injector. If the chamber length and the chamber surface area is increased, the average heat flux per chamber segment decreases due to a declining heat flux downstream of the injector. Despite the heat flux decreases with increasing chamber length, the overall heat losses caused by an increase of chamber surface area surpass the decrease of the heat flux. Thus a larger chamber length reduces the combustion efficiency due to additional heat losses.

d) The combustion efficiency $\eta_c$ and the heat flux $\dot{q}$ increase with growing mass flux $j_m$. For identical pressure and mixture ratio, $\eta_c$ slightly increases with higher mass flux, while the heat flux grows to the mass flux or the velocity to the power of 0.702:

$$\dot{q} \sim j_m^{0.702} \sim v^{0.702}$$

(31)

A growing mass flux at constant pressure and density results in a growing flow velocity. The larger velocity leads to a higher heat flux, due to a larger Reynolds number as already predicted by the Nusselt correlations. Nevertheless the average heat loss per mass flow declines with increasing mass flux. In sum this results in lower overall heat losses at higher mass fluxes and an increase in $\eta_c$. The changes in the heat loss with variations of the mass flux might also be caused by changes in the flow field inside the combustion chamber. So e.g. occurrence or movement of recirculation zones might influence the overall heat flux.

Finally, to improve the accuracy of the used Nusselt correlations, the calculated Nusselt number was multiplied by the expression $\zeta$:

$$\zeta = 1 + 0.163 \cdot \left( \frac{\text{ROF}}{\text{ROF}_{st}} - 1 \right)^2$$

(32)

$\zeta$ modifies the resulting Nusselt number with respect to changes in the mixture ratio. The modified Nusselt number $\text{Nu}_{\text{mod}}$ then is given by:

$$\text{Nu}_{\text{mod}} = \text{Nu} \cdot \zeta$$

(33)

By using the modified Nusselt number, the prediction of the Bartz correlation for rich and lean mixture ratios (ROF $\leq 5$ and ROF $\geq 13$) is improved. For near stoichiometric mixture ratios (ROF $\geq 5$ and ROF $\leq 11$) the Cinjarew equation gives a reasonable approximation of the experimental heat flux.
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### Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Symbols</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A_{cc} )</td>
<td>Combustion chamber cross sectional area</td>
<td>( m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_{ref} )</td>
<td>Reference surface area</td>
<td>( m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_{seg} )</td>
<td>Inner surface area of chamber segment</td>
<td>( m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_{th} )</td>
<td>Nozzle throat area</td>
<td>( m^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{exp} )</td>
<td>Experimental characteristic exhaust velocity</td>
<td>( \frac{m}{s} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{theo} )</td>
<td>Theoretical characteristic exhaust velocity</td>
<td>( \frac{m}{s} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_p )</td>
<td>Specific heat capacity at constant pressure</td>
<td>( \frac{J}{kg \cdot K} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d )</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>( m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d_{th} )</td>
<td>Nozzle throat diameter</td>
<td>( m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l_{sp} )</td>
<td>Specific impulse</td>
<td>( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( j_{m} )</td>
<td>Mass flux</td>
<td>( \frac{kg}{m^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l )</td>
<td>characteristic length</td>
<td>( m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l_{pipe} )</td>
<td>Pipe length</td>
<td>( m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L^* )</td>
<td>Characteristic chamber length</td>
<td>( m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{cc} )</td>
<td>Combustion chamber length</td>
<td>( m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m )</td>
<td>Mass flow</td>
<td>( \frac{kg}{s} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_{seg} )</td>
<td>Mass of chamber segment</td>
<td>( kg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Ma )</td>
<td>Mach number</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Nu )</td>
<td>Nusselt number</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Nu_{mod} )</td>
<td>Modified Nusselt number</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_c )</td>
<td>Combustion chamber pressure</td>
<td>( bar )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Pr )</td>
<td>Prandtl number</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \dot{q} )</td>
<td>Heat flux</td>
<td>( \frac{W}{m^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \dot{q}_{wall} )</td>
<td>Heat flux to chamber walls</td>
<td>( \frac{W}{m^2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Q )</td>
<td>Rate of heat flow</td>
<td>( W )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Re )</td>
<td>Reynolds number</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROF</td>
<td>Ratio oxidizer to fuel O/F</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROF_{st}</td>
<td>Stoichiometric mixture ratio</td>
<td>( - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_c )</td>
<td>Adiabatic combustion temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{in} )</td>
<td>Fluid inlet temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{mean} )</td>
<td>Mean temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{out} )</td>
<td>Fluid outlet temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{ref} )</td>
<td>Reference temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{stag} )</td>
<td>Stagnation or total temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{stat} )</td>
<td>Static temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{wall} )</td>
<td>Wall temperature</td>
<td>( K )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v )</td>
<td>flow velocity</td>
<td>( \frac{m}{s} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Symbols</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Convective heat transfer coefficient</td>
<td>[W/m$^2$K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta t_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>Maximum value for the error of $c^*$</td>
<td>[m/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta T$</td>
<td>Temperature rise in walls</td>
<td>[K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta t$</td>
<td>Test duration</td>
<td>[s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>Expansion ratio; Area of nozzle exit divided by area of nozzle throat</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\zeta$</td>
<td>Modification function to the Nusselt number</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{c^*}$</td>
<td>$c^*$ or combustion efficiency</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Heat capacity ratio</td>
<td>[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
<td>[W/m$^2$K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>Dynamic viscosity</td>
<td>[m$^2$/s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>[kg/m$^3$]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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