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Protecting the environment from the consequences of human activity has become a major challenge and goal in recent years, and therefore such considerations have become a critical component of engineering design and operation as well as of the formulation of policies and legislation. Emission from aircraft engines is a major environmental issue. To assess and control aircraft emission, one needs an accurate tool for predicting it reliably. Many methods of prediction are available for NOx emission index in the open literature, while some methods used by the industries require proprietary information. This paper brings together many important prediction methods (listed in the Appendix) and makes a systematic study of their accuracy and applicability. Finally, a new method called NOx: generic is proposed here, which compares well with the most dependable method (preferred by the industries), viz., the \( P_3 - T_3 \) method, but unlike the \( P_3 - T_3 \) method the present formulation does not require any proprietary information.

\[ D_p = \text{mass of NOX emitted during the landing and takeoff cycle, g} \]

\[ F = \text{air fraction in primary zone} \]

\[ F_{\text{ao}} = \text{rated output of the engine, kN} \]

\[ H = \text{humidity factor} \]

\[ h = \text{specific humidity, kg of water per kg of dry air} \]

\[ M_a = \text{Mach number} \]

\[ P_{\text{amb}} = \text{ambient pressure, kPa} \]

\[ P_3 = \text{combustor inlet pressure, kPa} \]

\[ p_3 = \text{combustor inlet pressure, psia} \]

\[ T_{\text{amb}} = \text{ambient temperature, K} \]

\[ T_{\text{fl}} = \text{flame temperature, K} \]

\[ T_{\text{pa}} = \text{temperature in the primary zone of the combustor, K} \]

\[ T_{\text{k}} = \text{temperature for stoichiometric combustion, K} \]

\[ T_i = \text{combustor inlet temperature, K} \]

\[ T_o = \text{combustor outlet temperature, K} \]

\[ t_{\text{form}} = \text{formation time of NOx in the combustor chamber, s} \]

\[ t_{\text{res}} = \text{residence time in the combustor chamber, s} \]

\[ t_3 = \text{combustor inlet temperature, °R} \]

\[ V_c = \text{combustor volume, m}^3 \]

\[ V_{\text{fc}} = \text{fully expanded jet speed of the cold bypass stream, m/s} \]

\[ V_{\text{ch}} = \text{fully expanded jet speed of the hot core stream, m/s} \]

\[ W_d = \text{combustor inlet airflow rate, kg/s} \]

\[ W_f = \text{fuel flow rate, kg/s} \]

\[ \Delta P_3 = \text{liner pressure drop in the combustion chamber, kPa} \]

\[ \delta_{\text{amb}} = \text{ratio of flight level ambient pressure to sea level ambient pressure} \]

\[ \delta_i = \text{ratio of flight level pressure at engine intake to sea level ambient pressure} \]

\[ \eta_f = \text{isentropic efficiency of the fan} \]

\[ \eta_{\text{LPT}} = \text{isentropic efficiency of the low-pressure turbine} \]

\[ \theta_{\text{amb}} = \text{ratio of flight level ambient temperature to sea level ambient temperature} \]

\[ \theta_i = \text{ratio of flight level temperature at engine intake to sea level ambient temperature} \]

I. Introduction

This paper provides a systematic study of the prediction methods for NOx emission from aircraft gas turbine engines and proposes a modified method based on nonproprietary data. Currently, the total amount of emission of NOx and other species from worldwide fleet of aircraft is less than that of land-based vehicles. However, emissions from aircraft have become a very important issue because cruise emissions in the upper troposphere [1, 2] and lower stratosphere [2] directly contribute to the climate change. The worldwide fleet of aircraft is expected to grow by more than a factor of two in the next two decades [3] which may worsen the situation further. Any possible reduction in the emission due to improvement in technology will not be able to counteract the increase in emission due to the growth in aviation [4]. To restrict the effect on global warming, the regulations or legislations for engines and aircraft are expected to be made more stringent. From the brief discussion on regulations given in the next section, it becomes clear that the major emphasis of regulatory control is on the NOx emission. Therefore, the accurate prediction and assessment of NOx emission from engines during all phases of an aircraft mission become essential.

Aircraft emissions include carbon dioxide (CO\(_2\)), water vapor (H\(_2\)O), sulfur oxide (SO\(_x\)), nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)), nitrous oxide (N\(_2\)O), carbon monoxide (CO), unburned hydrocarbons (UHC), soot, and particulate matter. Typical cruise emissions of a modern turbofan engine consist of 72% CO\(_2\), 27.5% H\(_2\)O, 0.02% SO\(_x\), and 0.4% trace species. The trace species in turn contains 84% NOx, 11.8% CO, 4% UHC, and 0.2% soot [4].

Among the emissions listed previously, main contributors for climate change are CO\(_2\) (a direct greenhouse gas [4]), soot, H\(_2\)O, and NOx (indirect greenhouse gases [4]). Soot and H\(_2\)O emission lead to contrail and cirrus cloud formation, whereas NOx leads to a change in methane and ozone [4]. Ozone enhances the greenhouse effect at the low temperature of cruise altitude more than at sea level (SL). CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\)O emissions can be directly estimated from the fuel burn,
whereas NOx emission cannot be estimated directly because it depends also on the way the combustion is controlled.

Therefore, the prediction of NOx emission is complex and has become an active research area. As a result, various prediction methods are available in the open literature, although some methods used by the industries require proprietary information. This paper brings together many such important prediction methods (listed in the Appendix) and makes a systematic study about their accuracy and applicability. Finally, a new method is proposed here, which compares well with the most dependable method (preferred by the industries), viz., the \( P_F - T_F \) method, but unlike the \( P_F - T_i \) method the present formulation does not require any proprietary information.

### II. Engine Testing, Databank, and Regulations

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), United Nations, frames rules, guidelines, and regulations of air navigation for existing and future engines and ensures safe and orderly growth of air transport. The emission standards formulated by the ICAO in “Annex 16: environmental protection, volume 2: aircraft engine emissions to the convention on international civil aviation” [5] are the regulations that are to be followed by all the aircraft engine manufacturers. In this document, upper limits for all major pollutant emissions (CO, HC, NOx, and soot emissions) during standardized landing and takeoff (LTO) cycle are specified for all existing and future turbojet and turbofan engines.

The term **smoke number** is used to define soot emissions, and its regulation came into effect in 1983. The limits for other gaseous emissions like NOx, CO, and UHC started from the year 1986, and they were applicable to those engines whose takeoff thrust exceeded 26.7 kN at international standard atmosphere (ISA) static (SL) condition. The existing regulation of the ICAO for NOx, CO, UHC, and smoke are for LTO. An LTO cycle includes four phases of an aircraft mission based on throttle settings: takeoff (100% thrust), climbout (85% thrust), approach (30% thrust) and idle (7% thrust), and it covers only up to 3000 ft altitude. The engine manufacturers have to test their engines for various throttle settings at SLS condition, and values from such tests are to be listed in the ICAO databank [6], which is publicly available. The characteristic level of gaseous pollutants \( D_p/F_{oo} \) (in g/kN) is the basis for certifying engines, where \( D_p \) is the mass of NOx emitted during the LTO cycle, and \( F_{oo} \) is the rated output (RO) of the engine. It is a function of the time in mode (TIM), emission index (EI), fuel flow rate \( (W_f) \), and RO engine thrust specified in the ICAO aircraft engine emissions databank:

\[
D_p/F_{oo} = \sum_i EI_i \cdot TIM_i \cdot W_f/RO \tag{1}
\]

in which the summation is over the ICAO LTO cycle and the index \( i \) represents the four throttle settings. EI is defined as the ratio of grams of a particular pollutant to kilograms of fuel burned (in g/kg). Unlike \( D_p/F_{oo} \), EI is used for entire mission including cruise to calculate the amount of emission from the aircraft.

Over the past four decades, the specific fuel consumption (SFC), noise, and UHC emission are all reduced (by 70, 50, and 90%, respectively), but the NOx emissions for commercial aircraft in the same time period have increased by approximately 10% [2]. This is so because the research on aircraft engines has focused mainly on improving engine fuel efficiency, which often leads to an increase in NOx emissions. The increase in thermal efficiency was achieved by the use of improved blade cooling methods and temperature-resistant materials, thereby enabling the use of higher maximum temperature in the cycle and higher overall pressure ratio (OPR). The OPR has approximately increased from 20 to 40, and the turbine entry temperature (TET) has correspondingly increased by 350°C, resulting in an increase of thermal efficiency from 48 to 55% [8].

Table 1 lists overall characteristics of the various types of combustor generations. Currently, the dominant type existing in the market is the generation-three combustor. A higher generation indicates a higher level of technology and thus a reduction in NOx emission at a given OPR and TET. But the use of higher OPR (and correspondingly higher TET), as explained in the previous paragraph, would tend to offset the reduction of NOx emission achieved through improved combustor design.

The regulation level set by the ICAO in 1993 for NOx had a linear relation with OPR. The regulation has been revised three times already (ICAO 1993, ICAO 1999, and ICAO 2005), due to its high influence on climate change. Hence, the allowed level of NOx emission depends on the date of manufacture of the engine. According to the latest regulation, the allowed limit of NOx emission is a function of OPR and maximum takeoff thrust. The emission standards proposed by the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP, a technical committee formed by the ICAO to assist the council in making new policy and standards for aircraft emissions and noise level) are becoming more stringent, and they may cover cruise emissions in the near future. Figure 1 shows the various NOx emission standards available at present (data taken from [5,9]). The most recent standard incorporated into Annex 16 is CAEP/8, in which a 15% more stringent NOx standard is proposed on the current standard, and its effective date is 31 December 2013. The effective date for the production cutoff of engines according to the current standard is 31 December 2012. The CAEP/8 goals [5] are 1) a medium-term goal (2016) of CAEP/6 levels \(-45\% \pm 2.5\% \) (of CAEP/6) at an OPR of 30 and 2) a long-term goal (2026) of CAEP/6 levels \(-60\% \pm 5\% \) (of CAEP/6) at an OPR of 30.

Despite the upper limits for pollutant emissions from aircraft (set by the ICAO regulations), policy makers in some countries are announcing incentives for the airlines based on the emissions [10]. Such market-based approaches encourage the airlines to use best-in-class engine technology. These include emission dependent landing fees, emission dependent en route charges, and emissions trading of airline CO2 and other gases.

Among the approaches stated, the first is already in practice at a few airports, whereas the rest are being discussed in Europe [10]. Presently, the landing fee is charged on the basis of LTO cycle NOx emissions. In the emission-dependent landing fees approach, OPR is not taken into consideration, which is different from the ICAO standards. Emission factors are calculated for each aircraft, and the grouping of aircrafts is done into different emission classes. Landing fee rebates are offered to the aircrafts depending upon the emission class. A standard for this approach of NOx-dependent landing fee was adopted as a European Civil Aviation Conference recommendation in 2003 [11].

Advisory Council for Aeronautics Research in Europe (ACARE) 2020 goals [12] are proposed in Europe that set individual targets for

| Table 1 Variation in NOx emission with the combustor generation |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------------|
| Combustor generation | OPR range | Characteristic NOx range, g/kN |
| 1 | 18–20 | 70–80 |
| 2 | 27–34 | 90–110 |
| 3 | 19–42 | 30–92 |
| 4 | 22–31 | 30–41 |

Fig. 1 Evolution of NOx emission standards (data taken from [5,9]).
both engines and aircrafts. An 80% reduction of NOx (based on the technological level of 2000) is the goal set by ACARE 2020. Because of such measures, there will be more pressure on engine manufacturers to innovate new low-emissions technology. As the regulations are becoming more and more stringent, accurate prediction and assessment of emissions from engines during all phases of an aircraft mission have become essential.

III. Prediction Techniques for NOx Emission

Engine NOx emission is indicated by an index called NOx emission index (EINOx). To quantify EINOx, various techniques are proposed in the open literature. In the present work, many such techniques are brought together and classified into five general categories (Fig. 2) to assess them in a systematic way: 1) correlation-based models, 2) the $P_3 - T_3$ method, 3) fuel flow models, 4) simplified physics-based models, and 5) high-fidelity simulations. Each method has its own strengths and weaknesses, and these are discussed next.

A. Correlation-Based Models

Correlation methods are classified into empirical and semi-empirical models (Fig. 2). Empirical and semi-empirical models are further classified into two types, direct models and ratio models, all based on engine performance and emissions data obtained via combustor rig tests or full-scale engine tests at ground level, i.e., SLS and/or at altitude.

Correlation-based models tend to be the simplest of the five model types to apply, but the correlations may involve a large number of parameters to make the predictions fall within acceptable accuracy. These models typically employ data from emission measurements on a specific engine/combustor for various operating conditions: primary variables such as $P_3$, $T_3$, $T_4$, fuel-to-air ratio (FAR), water-to-air ratio (WAR), etc., are used for formulating the required correlation for the empirical subcategory, while the variables $t_{fg}$, $t_{fg}$, $T_{fl}$, $T_{pz}$, $\Delta P_3$, $V_c$, etc. (which are combustor specific), in addition to the primary variables, are used for the semi-empirical subcategory. Therefore, semi-empirical models require complete details of the combustor. In the direct model, as the name implies, EINOx value can be calculated from the correlation that contains engine parameters like $P_3$, $T_3$, FAR, $T_{fl}$, $T_{pz}$, etc., directly, whereas, in the case of ratio models, ratios of engine conditions, i.e., $P_3$, $T_3$, FAR, $T_{fl}$, $T_{pz}$, etc., at an altitude and those at SLS (typically from an open source like the ICAO databank [6]) are used.

Some of the disadvantages of empirical and semi-empirical modeling are: 1) the number of input parameters in correlations is large, and a few of them are difficult to obtain; 2) some terms in the correlations may contain exponents that may significantly amplify any error in the input data; and 3) they cannot capture the effects of design change on engine emissions, because the model inputs will not be known accurately unless the engine is tested physically.

Most of the correlations available in the open literature are based on experimental work done on a specific type of engine/combustor. Hence, the correlations available in the open literature cannot be used...
in their original form to predict emissions for other engines. But a
method of adapting a particular correlation on other engines (for
which emission measurement data are available) to predict EINOx
was suggested in Tsalvoutas et al. [13]. It is done by using the
Simplex downhill optimization algorithm. The disadvantage is that
adaptation has to be done for each engine.

B. \( P_3 - T_3 \) Method

Of the simple prediction methods, the most dependable [4] and
popular one is the \( P_3 - T_3 \) method. In this method, EI measured at
altitude \( h_3 \) corrects to the conditions at altitude by using both
altitude and ground level combustor operating conditions. Unlike the
correlation methods described previously, the \( P_3 - T_3 \) method
can be applied to all engines (i.e., using the same values of the
exponent \( m \) and \( n \)). However, if greater accuracy is needed, then
engine-specific values of the exponents are used.

Steps to be followed for calculating EINOx are:

1) First, combustor inlet conditions \( P_i, T_i \), and FAR
(corresponding to four throttle settings given in the ICAO
databank) are determined using a gas turbine simulation software like GasTurb
[14] (to be explained later). As in Fig. 3, \( P_i \) and \( T_i \) determined previously are plotted against the combustor inlet temperature \( T_3 \)
corresponding to four throttle settings. Similarly, EINOxSL values
from the ICAO databank are also plotted against \( T_3 \) value corresponding to four throttle settings (Fig. 3).

2) Combustor inlet conditions \( (P_{3FL}, T_{3FL}) \) for the altitude in
question [shown in Section B of Fig. 3] are determined, using, for
example, GasTurb, for the known fuel flow from [15]. The values of
EINOxSL, \( P_{3FL}, \) FARSL [shown by arrows in Section A of Fig. 3]
corresponding to combustor inlet temperature at altitude \( T_{3FL} \)
are obtained from the previously mentioned plots.

3) EINOxSL can then be calculated by using corrections for the
difference in combustor inlet pressure \( P_i \) and FAR between ground
level and altitude. It is done by using suitable values of pressure
exponent \( n \), FAR exponent \( m \), and humidity factor \( H \) in Eq. (2):

\[
\text{EINOx}_{SL} = \left( \frac{P_{3FL}}{P_{3SL}} \right)^n \left( \frac{\text{FAR}_{SL}}{\text{FAR}_{SL}} \right)^m \exp(H)
\]

where \( H = 19(H_{SL} - H_{FL}) \).

The disadvantage of this method is that it needs proprietary
information of an engine like \( P_i, T_i, \) FAR at reference conditions,
and the engine-specific exponents. It is observed that pressure
exponent \( n \) of 0.4 and FAR exponent \( m \) of zero are the best ones to use
if the engine-specific exponents are not known.

C. Fuel Flow Methods

The use of the \( P_3 - T_3 \) method requires access to proprietary
information of the engine/combustor. If the emissions are to be
estimated without the proprietary information of the engine/
combustor, an alternative method is necessary that uses the data of the
engine, which is publicly available. Two such methods [the Boeing
fuel flow method 2 (BFFM2) [16,17] and the DLR fuel flow method
[18]], called fuel flow methods, are proposed in the open literature
and are derived from the \( P_3 - T_3 \) method. The parameter used in
these methods is the fuel flow at altitude, which is a nonproprietary
indicator of the engine power setting.

BFFM2 is a method formulated by Martin et al. in 1994, available
in Appendix C of Baughcum et al. [16]. The DLR fuel flow method
is formulated by the DLR, German Aerospace Center [18]. In these
methods, measured EINOxSL has to be corrected to the conditions at
altitude by using both altitude and ground level combustor operating
conditions similar to the \( P_3 - T_3 \) method. These correction factors for
BFFM2 are derived by DuBois and Paynter [17] using thermo-
dynamic relationships and energy balances, whereas for the DLR
fuel flow method they are from the DLR, German Aerospace Center.
Fuel flow methods consider the influence of ambient pressure,
temperature, humidity, and Mach number. The aim of the methods
proposed is to calculate emissions even at cruise conditions without
the need for proprietary information.

For BFFM2 [16,17],

\[
W_{fa} = W_{fl} \left( \frac{\theta_{1.8}^{0.8}}{\theta_{amb}} \right)^{0.25} e^{2.2M} \]  

(3)

EINOxSL = EINOxSL \left( \frac{\theta_{0.25}^{0.8}}{\theta_{3amb}} \right)^{0.5} e^{H} \]  

(4)

where \( \theta_{amb} = \frac{T_{amb}}{288.15} \), \( \delta_{amb} = \frac{P_{amb}}{101.325} \), and \( H = 19(h_{SL} - h_{FL}) \).

For the DLR fuel flow method [18],

\[
W_{fa} = W_{fl} \left( \frac{\theta_{-0.5}}{\delta_{i}} \right)^{0.5} \]  

(5)

EINOxSL = EINOxSL \left( \frac{\delta_{i}^{0.4}}{\delta_{i}} \right)^{0.5} e^{H} \]  

(6)

where \( \theta = \frac{T_{amb}}{288.15} (1 + 0.2Ma^{2}) \), \( \delta_{i} = \frac{P_{amb}}{101.325} \), and \( H = 19(h_{SL} - h_{FL}) \).

Steps to be followed for calculating EINOx are:

1) Fuel flow data for four throttle settings from the ICAO databank
[6] must be corrected for installation effects of engine air bleed for
aircraft use. These are corrected fuel flows \( W_{fa} \) for fuel flows \( W_{f} \)
listed in the ICAO databank.

2) The emission indices EINOxSL are plotted against \( W_{fa} \) on a
log10-log10 scale and are curve fitted.

3) For the known fuel flow [15] \( W_{fa} \) at any altitude in
question, EINOxSL is determined from the plot corresponding to the calculated
\( W_{fa} \) [from Eq. (3) or Eq. (5)]. Finally, EINOxSL can be estimated from \( T_{amb}, P_{amb}, Ma \) (all corresponding to the altitude in question),
EINOxSL, and a humidity correction factor \( H \). BFFM2 is available
for NOx, CO, and UHC, while the DLR fuel flow method is available
only for NOx. The two methods are similar, but the ratio definition
and exponent values used for the correction between ground and
altitude conditions are different.

D. Simplified Physics-Based Models

The complex behavior of combustion in the gas turbine is
approximately captured in the simplified physics-based models. The
combustion chamber is divided into many zones based on the
assumptions (reduced-order physics and chemistry), and each zone is
modeled as a combination of many ideal reactors. Though computa-
tionally inexpensive, simplified physics-based models are not
widely used because they cannot include the complex kinetics
necessary for predicting pollutant formation and emissions [19].

E. High-Fidelity Simulations

High-fidelity simulations are the most accurate among all the
models if the combustor is accurately modeled using a large number of
grids and the kinetic mechanisms and a few of them are discussed.
These require complete details of the combustor geometry, which are
combustor specific and confidential. Reynolds-averaged Navier-
Stokes solution techniques require accurate boundary conditions,
which can be given only if complete details of the combustor geometry
are known [20]. Direct numerical simulation for combustion
captures all the continuum physics of combustion but such compu-
tations for realistic geometries and flow conditions are not practical at
this moment [21]. Large-eddy simulation (LES) is the technique that
attempts to overcome the previously mentioned difficulty by using a
model for small-scale behavior of turbulence in combustion but at the
cost of accuracy. Even then, the computational time taken for the
simulation is large, which makes the LES not suitable as an emission
prediction tool.

Table 2 provides data from a NASA Glenn simulation of a GE90
engine and from a simulation at the University of Manchester of a
Cray T3E combustor to predict temperature and velocity fields. The
table shows that the time and computing power required for the LES
approach is too high to use as a design or policy making tool.
IV. Engine Cycles

In the ICAO databank, the available public data that are relevant for this study are 1) fuel flow rate and EINOx values for all phases of LTO cycle and 2) ambient conditions (pressure, temperature, and WAR) at the test location, bypass ratio, OPR, and maximum rated thrust for the takeoff condition only. Inlet airflow rate at takeoff is taken from a standard webpage [15]. However, the use of the $P_3 - T_3$ method (as well as other correlation-based methods) needs the values of $P_3$ and $T_3$ of the engine cycle, but these values are not available in the public database. In this work, therefore, thermodynamic variables at various points of the engine cycle, including $P_3$ and $T_3$, are reconstructed with the help of the commercially available gas turbine performance simulation software GasTurb [14], using the data available in [6,15]. The details of the method of reconstruction are explained in Sec. IV.A. Sections IV.B and IV.C deal with the implementation of the $P_3 - T_3$ method and the comparison of its predictions with engine-specific correlation (ESC), available for two engines, the CF6-50C2 and GE-90 family, in [24].

A. Reconstruction of Engine Cycles

Six different subsonic turbofan engine cycles are reconstructed in this study: CF6-50C2, CF6-80C2, Rolls Royce Trent 892, CFM-56-5B1, GE-90-76B, and GE-90-85B. A cycle modeled after the CF6-50C2 engine is used as an example for older in-use technology and a cycle modeled after GE90-85B engine is used to represent the recent in-use technology. Because most of the data publicly available, as discussed, are for the takeoff condition, the reconstruction of engines is carried out at this condition in GasTurb. In other words, the design point chosen in GasTurb to reconstruct the engine is the takeoff condition.

Steps to be followed to reconstruct an engine cycle are as follows.

1. Takeoff (Design Point)

   1) The input data used for reconstructing an engine in GasTurb are inlet airflow [15], bypass ratio [6], OPR [6], and relative humidity (from ambient conditions [6] and WAR [6]).
   2) Mechanical efficiency, intake pressure ratio, and burner pressure ratio are assumed to be 100%. Cooling airflow rates, burner part load constant, burner efficiency, and power offtake are fixed at the default value of GasTurb because they are not known.

2. Cruise

   1) The cruise condition is simulated by running the reconstructed engine in GasTurb at off-design mode.

3. Fan

   1) The fan condition is simulated by running the reconstructed engine in GasTurb at off-design mode.

F. Summary

From the preceding discussions, it can be concluded that most of the correlation-based models are not suitable for predicting pollutant emissions for all engines because they are valid only for the engines in which experiments are conducted. The simplified physics-based models and high-fidelity simulations use complex methodologies to estimate pollutant emissions and they cannot be used as a prediction tool for the reasons explained previously. The $P_3 - T_3$ method is the most accurate of the simple prediction techniques but it requires proprietary information. The fuel flow methods remove the necessity of proprietary information, but the accuracy deteriorates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Computed and published fuel flow, kg/s</th>
<th>Computed thrust, kN</th>
<th>Published thrust, kN</th>
<th>% error in thrust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF6-50C2</td>
<td>2.361</td>
<td>229.33</td>
<td>230.4</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF6-80C2</td>
<td>2.581</td>
<td>266.43</td>
<td>267.3</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM-56-5B1</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>133.88</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls Royce Trent 892</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>411.16</td>
<td>411.48</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-76B</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>359.92</td>
<td>360.62</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-85B</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>395.12</td>
<td>395.31</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Comparison of reconstructed cycle data (obtained from GasTurb) and published data [6] at SLS takeoff condition
of $P_{3FL}$ and $T_{3FL}$, are calculated [using Eq. (2)] and plotted (Fig. 4) against respective $T_{3FL}$ values to study the NOx emission characteristics of the engine in question.

C. Comparison of $P_3 - T_3$-Predicted NOx Emission Index and Engine-Specific Correlations

ESC is a correlation derived by employing data from emission measurements on a specific engine/combustor for various operating conditions. These correlations predict EINOx value accurately only for the engine in which measurements are carried out. From the open literature, two such ESCs (with $P_3$, $T_3$, and WAR as parameters) are available: one for CF6-50C2 [Eq. (2)], which is of a single annular combustor (SAC) type, and another for the GE90 family [Eq. (8)], which is of a double annular combustor (DAC) type. They can be used to predict EINOx for all operating conditions of an engine due to the presence of the humidity correction term, which varies with altitude.

For ESCs (Table 6 in [24]),

$$EINOx_{(CF6-50C2)} = 1.35 \times 0.0986 \cdot \left(\frac{P_3}{1 \text{ atm}}\right)^{0.4} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{T_3}{194.4} - \frac{53.2 \text{ g H}_2\text{O/kg dryair}}{H}\right) + 1.7 \quad (7)$$

$$EINOx_{(GE90)} = 0.0986 \cdot \left(\frac{P_3}{1 \text{ atm}}\right)^{0.4} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{T_3}{194.4} - \frac{53.2 \text{ g H}_2\text{O/kg dryair}}{H}\right) \quad (8)$$

where $H = 1000 \cdot \text{WAR}$.

$P_{3FL}$, $T_{3FL}$, and WAR at flight level (FL) obtained by the application of GasTurb are used to estimate EINOxFL from ESCs [Eqs. (7) and (8)]. The EINOxSL value can also be calculated by the $P_3 - T_3$ method (as explained in Sec. IV.B); this can then be compared with the value predicted by ESC in the following two cases: case 1 [EINOxFL($P_3$, $T_3$)] with the EINOxSL value derived from the ICAO databank [6], versus EINOxSL(ESC) and case 2 [EINOxFL($P_3$, $T_3$)] with EINOxSL predicted by Eq. (7) or Eq. (8) with appropriate WAR from [6], versus EINOxSL(ESC).

This comparison is done for both the SAC (e.g., CF6-50C2) and DAC (GE-90-85B, GE-90-76B) type of combustors, and the graphs are plotted in Fig. 4.

It is observed from Fig. 4 that, for case 1 (Figs. 4a–4c), the difference between EINOx values predicted by the $P_3 - T_3$ method and by ESC is more than that for case 2 (Figs. 4d–4f). Table 4 explains the underlying reason for this: the EINOx values predicted by the ESC [i.e., Eq. (7) or Eq. (8)] at four ICAO throttle settings do not agree well with the EINOxSL values given in the database, the maximum deviation being 24.99% for SAC and 151.07% for DAC. This means that when the deviation between tested EINOxSL values of an engine for the ICAO certification and experimental EINOx values (used for formulating the ESC) is less, EINOx values predicted by the $P_3 - T_3$ method match well with those by the ESC (as in case 2, which can be inferred from Figs. 4d–4f). Thus, the $P_3 - T_3$ method (when the ESC is not available) is a good, simple prediction technique for EINOx emissions if sufficient engine details are available to reconstruct the engine.

V. Results and Discussion

This section covers comparison of various methods for NOx prediction with the $P_3 - T_3$ method and a proposal of a new emission prediction tool obtained by modifying an existing technique.

A. Comparison of Various Methods for NOx Prediction

A classification of various NOx prediction methods has been presented in Sec. III and Fig. 2. A list of major correlation-based NOx prediction methods is collated together in the Appendix for ready
reference. NOx correlations proposed by Becker et al. (as cited in [13]), Odgers and Ketchmer (Eq. 9.8 in [30]), Rizk and Mongia (Eq. 2 in [7]), and Lefebvre (Eq. 1 in [31]) belong to the direct semiempirical model because they involve combustor parameters like $t_{\text{r}}$, $t_{\text{d}}$, $T_{\text{fl}}$, $T_{\text{SL}}$, $\Delta P_{\text{r}}$, $V_{\text{c}}$, etc. The direct empirical model includes the correlations proposed by Blazowski (Eq. 11 in [32]), Lipfert (Eq. B4 in [8]), the European Association of Aerospace Industries (AECMA) (Eq. B15 in [8]), NASA (Eq. 1 in [33]), the numerical propulsion system simulation (NPSS) tool (Eq. 1.4 in [34]), the one proposed in the GasTurb User manual [14], and a modified model based on the GasTurb correlation proposed by Morales and Hall [35] because they do not contain any combustor parameters. The correlation proposed by Dopelheuer and Lecht (Eq. 3 in [18]) belongs to the ratio semiempirical model because it has $T_{\text{fl}}$ as a parameter, whereas the one proposed by Deidewig and Dopelheuer (Eq. 1 in [36]) is a ratio empirical model. As discussed in Sec. III.A, the semi-empirical models require complete details of the combustor, and hence they cannot be used as prediction tools as easily as empirical models (both direct and ratio types). However, empirical models also require information like $P_{\text{fl}}$ and $T_{\text{fl}}$ for a particular engine, which has been obtained in this work from gas turbine simulation software like GasTurb by following the methodology described earlier.

In Fig. 5, various methods that do not require combustor parameters like $t_{\text{r}}$, $t_{\text{d}}$, $T_{\text{fl}}$, $T_{\text{SL}}$, $\Delta P_{\text{r}}$, $V_{\text{c}}$, etc., are compared for the same sets of $P_{\text{fl}}$ and $T_{\text{fl}}$ values (obtained from GasTurb). The comparative study is done in two graphs for each engine, and in total three engines are analyzed: three SAC (CFM-56-5B1, CF6-80C2, and Rolls Royce Trent 892) and a DAC (GE-90-85B). Because the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method is a good, simple prediction technique, all empirical models and fuel flow methods are compared with it. The left side of Fig. 5 compares six different NOx prediction methods with the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method, and the right side compares five more NOx prediction methods with the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method. Because the ENOX data points predicted by various methods for all engines in Fig. 5 are fairly close to each other, numerical values of all these points are provided here in Table 5 for easy comparison.

The following observations can be made from Fig. 5:

1) ENOX values predicted by fuel flow methods, which do not require proprietary information, lie within ±10% of that of the value predicted by the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method for SAC, and the deviation of above ±10% at few points is observed when used for DAC. This is so because fuel flow methods are not conceived for DAC combustors in which the main dome and the pilot domes are not working in the same way.

2) Though the correlation proposed by Deidewig and Dopelheuer (Eq. 1 in [36]) takes the ICAO databank value [6] as a reference, it does not predict well for all engines. A main contributory factor is that the correlation takes only the takeoff value as the reference and it does not capture the trend of ENOX variation of an engine over other phases of the LTO cycle.

3) Correlations of Blazowski, AECMA, and NASA predict well for SAC type combustor but not for the DAC type.

4) The correlation proposed by Lipfert (Eq. B4 in [8]) overpredicts for all the engines analyzed in this paper.

5) GasTurb correlation and the method suggested by Morales and Hall [35] do not compare well with the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method for all the engines analyzed here (reasons are explained next).

6) ENOX values predicted by the new tool developed here, named NOX: generic in Fig. 5, compare with that of the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method better than other correlation-based methods and also better than the fuel flow methods in some cases (e.g., for DAC type combustors). In GasTurb [14], ENOX is calculated from $S_{\text{NOx}}$: the NOx severity index. $S_{\text{NOx}}$ is determined from Eq. (9):

$$S_{\text{NOx}} = \left( P_{3} \right)^{0.4} \cdot \text{exp}\left( \frac{T_{3} - 826}{194} + \frac{6.29 - 100 \cdot \text{WAR}}{53.2} \right)$$

(9)

ENOX in GasTurb [14] is calculated from $S_{\text{NOx}}$ by multiplying it by 32 for engines having conventional SAC combustors and by 23 for engines having DAC combustors. One can draw a graph of ENOX (obtained from [6]) versus $S_{\text{NOx}}$ (obtained from Eq. (9)) at SL conditions. From this graph, one observes that the factors 32 and 23 used in GasTurb represent approximately the slope of a straight-line fit through the data of ENOX versus $S_{\text{NOx}}$.

It is, however, observed in this study that the GasTurb method is an oversimplification because the factor 32 does not apply for all SAC engines (similarly, the factor 23 does not apply for all DAC engines). This fact leads to the large deviation between the ENOXSL values estimated by the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method and by GasTurb, as seen in Fig. 5. From Fig. 5, it can be observed that the deviation between the ENOXSL value predicted by the $P_{j} - T_{j}$ method and by GasTurb is small for CF6-80C2 (SAC), for which the slope of the ICAO ENOXSL versus $S_{\text{NOx}}$ curve is 28.08 (which is close to 32), but the deviation in prediction is large for CFM-56-5B1 (which also uses SAC) because the aforementioned slope is 18.2 in this case (which is very different from 32).

To avoid the preceding difficulty, a method is suggested by Morales and Hall [35] in which the number representing the slope will be chosen as per the actual ENOXSL variation over the LTO cycle of an engine. For the engine in question, the ENOXSL values from the ICAO database [6] and $S_{\text{NOx}}$ are fitted in the form $\text{ENOXSL} = C \cdot S_{\text{NOx}}$, where $S_{\text{NOx}}$, at each throttle setting is calculated from Eq. (9) with respective $P_{3}$ and $T_{3}$ values and with WAR from [6]. Having determined the value of the constant $C$ under SL conditions, $\text{ENOXSL}$ can now be estimated using the same $C$ from the relation $\text{ENOXSL} = C \cdot S_{\text{NOx}}(\text{FL})$, where $S_{\text{NOx}}(\text{FL})$ is calculated from Eq. (9) with $P_{\text{FL}}$ and $T_{\text{FL}}$ values, and with WAR corresponding to the conditions at altitude.

B. New Prediction Tool for NOx Emission (NOX: Generic)

Calculations of the present work, depicted in Fig. 5, demonstrates that the modification suggested by Morales and Hall [35] does not seem to work well for all cases; in fact in some cases (as shown in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Throttle settings</th>
<th>ENOX from ICAO databank [6]</th>
<th>ENOX calculated from Eq. (7)</th>
<th>Percentage difference or Eq. (8) (WAR from [6])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF6-50C2</td>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>−10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF6-50C2</td>
<td>Climbout</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF6-50C2</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-85B</td>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>−24.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-85B</td>
<td>Climbout</td>
<td>52.01</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>68.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-85B</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>47.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-85B</td>
<td>Idle</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>151.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-76B</td>
<td>Takeoff</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>27.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-76B</td>
<td>Climbout</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>31.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-76B</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>116.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE-90-76B</td>
<td>Idle</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>123.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the predictions are worse than the original GasTurb method [14]. Morales and Hall [35] make the tacit assumption that the linear fit for \( \text{EINO}_x \) versus \( S_{\text{NOx}} \) [calculated by Eq. (9)] always passes through the origin. It is discovered during the present investigation that a linear fit for the \( \text{EINO}_x \) values for most of the tested engines listed in the ICAO databank [6] does not pass through the origin.

From a study on various engines it is found here that a relation of the form \( \text{EINO}_x = C_1 \cdot S_{\text{NOx}} + C_2 \) fits the \( \text{EINO}_x \) values of four ICAO throttle settings (thus capturing the actual trend of
Table 5 EINOx values of various NOx prediction methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no</th>
<th>$T_J$, K</th>
<th>$P_J - T_J$</th>
<th>CFM-56-5B1</th>
<th>CF6-60-C2</th>
<th>Rolls Royce Trent 892</th>
<th>GE90-85B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BFFM</td>
<td>DLR</td>
<td>GasTurb</td>
<td>NOx: generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From [35]. M = 0.8 for CFM56 and CF6-60C2, and M = 0.83 for GE90 and Trent. Altitude=10,668 m for all engines.*

VI. Conclusions

Many important computational tools for the prediction of EINOx are brought together in this paper, and a systematic study is performed by comparing them with the most dependable method (preferred by the industries), called the $P_J - T_J$ method. It is observed that all the methods discussed in this paper either underpredict or overpredict the value of EINOx as compared with the $P_J - T_J$ method. A new prediction method proposed in this paper (represented as NOx: generic in Fig. 5) is simple and does not require sensitive proprietary information, and at the same time its prediction of EINOx compares well with that of the $P_J - T_J$ method. The new prediction method has been applied in this paper for various engines from three major aeroengine manufacturers, and the same formulation works well for all cases examined.

Which of the many methods for the prediction of NOx emission discussed in the present paper would be used in practice would depend on what data and software are available. We have shown that if a gas turbine performance software like GasTurb is available then the $P_J - T_J$ method can be used with the ICAO databank (by calculating appropriate values of $P_J$ and $T_J$ at all four phases of the LTO cycle and at cruise condition), but this method would be most accurate if engine-specific values of the exponents $S$ and $n$ are known. The method proposed in the present work (NOx: generic, Sec. YB) does not require any engine-specific proprietary information (such as $m$ and $n$) but still needs the application of a gas turbine performance software like GasTurb. When such softwares are not available, the fuel flow methods (Sec. III.C) may provide the best compromise.
Appendix: NOx Prediction Methods Available in the Open Literature

I. List of Correlation-Based Models

1) For Rizk and Mongia (Eq. 2 in [7]),
   \[ \text{EINOx} = 15 \times 10^{14} \cdot \left( \frac{0.55}{T_f} \right) \exp\left( \frac{-71,100}{T_h} \right) \]

2) For Lipfert (Eq. B4 in [8]),
   \[ \text{EINOx} = 0.17282 \cdot \exp(0.00676593T_f) \]

3) For AECMA (Eq. B15 in [8]),
   \[ \text{EINOx} = 2 + 28.5 \left( \frac{T_h - 825}{250} \right) \]

4) For Becker et al. (as cited in [13]),
   \[ \text{NOx (ppmv)} = 5.73 \times 10^{-6} \cdot \exp(0.008337T_h)P_f^{0.5} \]

5) For GasTurb [14],
   \[ S_{\text{NOx}} = \left( \frac{P_f}{296.5} \right)^{0.4} \exp\left( \frac{T_h - 826}{194} + \frac{629 - 100 \cdot \text{WAR}}{53.2} \right) \]

6) For Dopelheuer and Lecht (Eq. 3 in [18]),
   \[ \text{EINOx} = \text{EINOx}_{\text{SL}} \left( \frac{P_f}{P_{\text{SL}}} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{T_h}{T_{\text{SL}}} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{T_{\text{FL}}}{T_{\text{SL}}} \right)^{1.5} \times \exp\left( \frac{38,000}{1 - \frac{1}{T_{\text{FL}}} - \frac{1}{T_h}} \right) \]

7) For Odgers and Kretchmer (Eq. 9.8 in [30]),
   \[ \text{EINOx} = 29 \cdot \exp\left( \frac{-21670}{T_f} \right) \left( P_f^{0.66} \right) \exp(-250t_{\text{form}}) \]

8) For Lefebvre (Eq. 1 in [31]),
   \[ \text{EINOx} = 4.59 \times 10^{-9} \cdot P_f^{0.25} \cdot F \cdot t_{\text{cav}} \cdot \exp(0.01(T_f + 273)) \]

9) For Blazowski (Eq. 11 in [32]),
   \[ \text{EINOx} = \frac{10^{-19.0032(T_h - 581.25)} \sqrt{\text{ambient}}}{\sqrt{\text{ambient}}} \]

10) For NASA (Eq. 1 in [33]),
    \[ \text{EINOx} = 33.2 \cdot \left( \frac{P_f}{432.7} \right)^{0.4} \exp\left( \frac{T_h - 459.67 - 1027.6}{349.9} \right) + \frac{6.29 - 6.3}{53.2} \]

11) For NPSS (Eq. 1.4 in [34]),
    \[ \text{EINOx} = 0.068 \cdot P_f^{0.5} \cdot \exp\left( \frac{T_h - 459.67}{345} \right) \cdot \exp(H) \]

12) For Deidewig and Dopelheuer (Eq. 1 in [36]),
    \[ \text{EINOx} = \text{EINOx}_{\text{SL,TD}} \cdot \exp\left( \frac{15000}{T_h} \right) \left( P_f \right) \cdot W_{\text{FL,TD}} \cdot T_{\text{FL}} \text{ \text{SL,TD}} \]

II. P_f – T_h Method

The P_f – T_h method is described in [4]:
\[ \text{EINOx}_\text{FL} = \text{EINOx}_{\text{SL}} \cdot \left( \frac{P_f}{P_{\text{SL}}} \right)^{m} \left( \frac{\text{FAR}_{\text{FL}}}{\text{FAR}_{\text{SL}}} \right)^{m} \exp(H) \]
where \( H = 19(h_{\text{FL}} - h_f) \).

III. Fuel Flow Methods

1) For BFFM [16,17],
   \[ \frac{W_f}{\text{FL}} = \frac{\theta_{\text{amb}}}{P_{\text{amb}}} \cdot \frac{0.2M_a^2}{\delta_{\text{amb}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{EINOx}_{\text{FL}} = \text{EINOx}_{\text{SL}} \cdot \left( \frac{\delta_{\text{amb}}}{\theta_{\text{amb}}} \right)^{0.5} \exp(H) \]
where \( \theta_{\text{amb}} = T_{\text{amb}}/288.15 \), \( \delta_{\text{amb}} = P_{\text{amb}}/101.325 \), and \( H = 19(h_{\text{FL}} - h_f) \).

2) For the DLR fuel flow method [18],
   \[ \frac{W_f}{\text{FL}} = \frac{\theta_{\text{fl}}}{\delta_{\text{fl}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{EINOx}_{\text{FL}} = \text{EINOx}_{\text{SL}} \cdot \left( \frac{\theta_{\text{fl}}}{\delta_{\text{fl}}} \right)^{0.5} \exp(H) \]
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