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Experimental identification of dynamic coefficients of lightly-loaded tilting-pad bearings under several lubrication regimes

Jorge G. Salazar1,2 and Ilmar F. Santos1

Abstract
This paper presents the identified dynamic coefficients of a lightly-loaded actively-lubricated bearing under three lubrication regimes: passive, hybrid and feedback-controlled. The goal is to experimentally demonstrate the feasibility of modifying the bearing dynamic properties via active lubrication. Dominated by the latest two regimes, the bearing properties become adjustable or controllable due to the injection of either a constant or variable pressurized oil flow. Such a flow is regulated by a hydraulic control system composed of a) a high pressure oil supply unit, b) servovalves, c) radial injection nozzles, d) displacement sensors and e) well-tuned digital controllers. A scaled-down industrial rotor featuring active lubrication, composed of a flexible rotor supported by a four-rocker load-between-pads tilting pad bearing under light load condition, is used for this objective. The experimental identification is performed by means of measured frequency response functions and a rotor finite element model. Predicted coefficients are also provided for benchmarking. Comparing results between the different regimes, presented along with their expanded uncertainty, provides the experimental evidence of the bearing properties modification via active lubrication.
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Introduction
Tilting-pad journal bearings (TPJB) have experienced widespread usage to the point of becoming a standard machine element when designing high speed turbomachinery. This is due to their distinguishing stability characteristics among fluid film bearings1, which strongly influence the dynamic characteristics of the entire rotor-bearing system. Such characteristics are predefined at an early design stage when selecting machines for specific process lines. However, increasing demands of plant production still requires faster machines with enhanced load carrying capacity and dynamic stability able to adapt themselves to the new requirements. One way to fulfill these requirements is by modifying the bearing properties according to such demands. Nevertheless, the dynamic properties of a standard TPJB are completely determined by its Sommerfeld number2 and there is no way of significantly “on-line” changing such properties. In order to provide “in-situ”, “on-line” and “on-demand” capabilities of adaptation, standard TPJBs have been re-designed and transformed into a mechatronic machine element.

Santos3 proposed two different design solutions for TPJBs with controllable characteristics based on hydraulic actuators: 1) the hydraulic chamber system and 2) the hydraulic radial oil injection system. The present work is focused on the second design solution also known as actively-lubricated bearing4 (ALB). This system injects pressurized oil into the bearing clearance through radial nozzles usually placed at the midspan of the pad surface. Servovalves, commanded by well-defined control laws, control the pressurized oil flow injection, resulting in a modification of the oil film pressure field and thereby of the “controllable forces” exerted on the rotor. Most of the early theoretical studies on ALBs considered iso-viscous hydrodynamic models, focusing on the development of control strategies for rigid as well as flexible rotor applications5–9. Multibody dynamics and finite element methods are often used to describe the behaviour of rigid and flexible rotating elements, i.e. discs and shaft. Their dynamics are linked to the bearing dynamics through force coefficients of stiffness and damping. In the case of ALBs, the dynamics of hydraulic components and of the feedback control system are additionally included in the modelling. In this multiphysics modelling approach, experimental identification of bearing force coefficients is key to ensuring model accuracy.

The bearing coefficients are experimentally identified in terms of the journal degrees-of-freedom (DOFs) since they are of crucial importance and normally the only ones easily accessible via eddy-current displacement sensors. Such DOFs are normally called “master” DOFs. DOFs such as the pad tilting10, pad bending11 and pad pivot flexibility10,12–16 are not directly measured, but strongly influence the dynamic
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behaviour of such force coefficients, leading to a frequency dependency. Furthermore, in the case of ALBs, the DOFs related to servovalve dynamics, pressure-flow relationship and feedback control make the frequency dependency of such force coefficients even stronger. The DOFs different from those of the journal are normally called “slaves” DOFs. To make the theoretical force coefficients comparable to those experimentally obtained, a dynamic condensation of the “slaves” DOFs is necessary.

By using the identification methods based on the frequency domain, the bearing dynamic characteristics – represented by complex impedance functions – are determined in a broad frequency range aided by multi-frequency excitations. One of the most used methods is the KCM model introduced for hydrostatic bearings by Rouvas and Childs and mostly applied to “floating bearing-fixed shaft” setups after Glienicke. The KCM approach experimentally addresses the frequency dependency by introducing a set of mass coefficients which account for bearing stiffening or softening. However, its application is limited to rigid rotors. To cope with flexible rotors, like the one in this work, Arumugam et al. and Wang and Maslen proposed approaches based on “fixed bearing-free shaft” configurations. The limitation of such approaches arises when dealing with systems with a large number of DOFs. This limitation can be more easily overcome by introducing selector matrices, which allow for the selection of a few DOFs related to excitation and measurement points.

Two main publications related to the identification of dynamic coefficients of controllable fluid film bearings are found in the literature. In Santos, a pair of tilting-pads controlled by hydraulic chambers are investigated and the frequency dependency of stiffness and damping coefficients is theoretically as well as experimentally studied. Therein, a simple hydrodynamic (isothermal) model with rigid pads supported on flexible membranes is explored. Conversely, in Cerda and Santos, the stiffness and damping coefficients for a single tilting-pad under several lubrication regimes are theoretically and experimentally researched. Therein, a complex elastothermohydrodynamic (ETHD) model for a single-pad ALB is used. The experimental work is carried out using a simple test rig, but with pads fully instrumented.

In this framework the main goals of this paper are:

a) to experimentally demonstrate the feasibility of modifying the dynamic force coefficients of full ALB composed of four pads controlled pairwise by two servovalves. Lightly-loaded conditions are used with the aim of resembling certain radial compressor configurations and some applications to vertical turbomachinery in which TPJBs are prone to instabilities due to, among others, the lack of damping. Such instabilities, led by low static loads, have been profusely reported for instance by Olsson, White and Chan, Flack and Zuck and Lie et al. among others.

b) to build an experimental database for validation of the ETHD model applied to ALBs under different operation conditions, which will be useful and available for other authors interested in the dynamic behaviour of TPJB under several lubrication regimes and the frequency dependency of its force coefficients. Due to the frequency dependence nature of the bearing force coefficients, the experimental identification procedure is carried out in the frequency domain aided by the approach presented by Wang and Maslen, taking advantage of the finite element model to include the shaft flexibility and to compute the expanded uncertainty as proposed by Moffat.

The Flexible Rotor - ALB Test-Rig

The test rig is depicted in Figure 1. It comprises an approx. 50 kg and 1150 mm long shaft supported by an ALB and rigidly supported by a ball bearing at its driven end. It is flexibly driven by a layshaft which in turn is belt-driven by a 4 hp AC motor provided with a frequency converter to run up to 7000 rpm. An active magnetic bearing is currently mounted between bearings to exert vertical loads up to 1900 N. An excitation bearing is placed at the free end to carry out model parameter identification by means of an electromagnetic shaker. The ALB is a tilting-pad journal bearing with 4 bronze pads in a load-between-pads (LBP) configuration. The pads are rocker-pivoted in the circumferential middle of the pad, i.e. with an offset of 0.5. The controllable or active feature of the bearing is developed by a hydraulic radial oil injection system as proposed by Santos. This injection system adds a hydrostatic pressure to the hydrodynamic pressure distribution by injecting pressurized oil between the journal and pad clearance through a nozzle placed in the middle of the pad surface. The pressurized oil flow is controlled by two high frequency response servovalves installed orthogonally at 45°, aligned with the “1 – 2” reference frame, each one coupled to a pair of counter pads. The lubricant is supplied by a low pressure (max. 2 bar) and high pressure (max. 100 bar) pumping units for the passive and active lubrication cases, respectively. Figure 1 also depicts a scheme of the radial oil injection system overlapped by a 3D drawing of the ALB. Eddy-current inductive proximity probes, aligned with the “x – y” reference frame, and used for monitoring and feeding back controllers are also included. Further design parameters can be found in Table 1.

The Three Lubrication Regimes

The ALB is capable of operating under three different lubrication regimes, namely:

i) the passive regime which gives the hydrodynamic backup support in terms of the load carrying capacity in case of a hydraulic injection system failure;

ii) the hybrid lubrication regime which is a combination of the passive case with a hydrostatic effect developed by the hydraulic injection system. The larger the pressure in the high pressure unit, the more pronounced the hydrostatic effect obtained. Since the bearing is a four pad arrangement in an LBP configuration and governed by two servovalves shifted 45°, the journal can be moved within the plane “x – y”. However, since the servovalves’ dynamic properties are slightly different, the journal cannot be strictly moved upward or downward without the aid of an I-controller.

When the servovalve spool is kept centred there is still some hydrostatic effect detectable as a consequence of leakage flow through servovalve ports. The servovalves used are of
Figure 1. Flexible rotor - ALB test-rig. (a) picture of the test-rig and its main components: ① the excitation bearing, ② the flexible shaft, ③ the actively-lubricated bearing (ALB), ④ servovalves, ⑤ the active magnetic bearing, ⑥ the ball bearing, ⑦ the AC motor with frequency driver. (b) A scheme of the radial oil injection control system overlapped to the ALB with its main parts, the high pressure supply unit, the servovalves ④ and ⑤, proximity sensors ⑧ and the digital controller (FPGA). Low pressure and return pumping units as well as the fixed orthogonal reference frames "x−y" and "1−2" are also included.

Table 1. Conventional and controllable design parameters of the actively-lubricated bearing (ALB).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Design Parameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal radius (R)</td>
<td>49.89</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad inner radius (R_p)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad aperture angle (α_p)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad width (L)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad thickness (t)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal radial clearance (C_p)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly radial clearance (C_b)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubrication oil type</td>
<td>ISO VG22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal flow (2 bar)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>L/min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controllable Design Parameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servovalve type</td>
<td>MOOG E760-912</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servovalve configuration</td>
<td>4 way, spool valve</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-off frequency (210 bar)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damping (210 bar)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control flow (210 bar)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>L/min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-off frequency (100 bar)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection orifice diameter (d_0)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injection orifice length (L_0)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) The feedback-controlled lubrication regime (active lubrication) in which the hydrostatic effect is dynamically modified by the servovalves and well-tuned digital controllers. Different classical or modern control strategies can be developed aided by model-free or model-based approaches. For simplicity, the ones utilized in this work are based on a proportional-derivative (PD) controller.

ALB Modelling

The state-of-the-art regarding ALB modelling requires the inclusion of several effects apart from the well-known hydrodynamic oil film pressure build-up to achieve an acceptable level of accuracy, i.e. thermal effects related to the oil film temperature build-up, heat transfer among fluid-film, bearing pads and surroundings, flexibility associated with compliant pivot and pads due to the exerted loads. Additionally, for coping with the controllable features, it is necessary to also include servovalve and pipe flow dynamics. An exhaustive revision of all the involved equations can be found in Cerda and Santos, in which the bearing dynamic properties have been validated using a single pad system. Figure 3 shows the predicted coefficients for a full ALB under the operational conditions tested, i.e. 3000 rpm, for an almost null applied load (light-load condition) and 80 bar of supply pressure for the injection system. To incorporate the pivot stiffness for calculations, a value of 2 · 10^7 N/m.

If the width of the land is smaller than the port in the valve sleeve, the valve is said to have an open center or to be underlapped. Quoted from reference 34.
has been considered based on the experimental results obtained in a test rig with a similar pad design. Bearing force coefficients are depicted in Figure 3(a) and (b) for the ALB operating under passive and hybrid lubrication regimes. Due to the bearing symmetry the direct and cross coupling coefficients are respectively equal in both directions, for passive and hybrid cases. Furthermore, the cross coupling coefficients are negligible compared to the direct ones, despite the lightly-loading condition imposed. In the frequency range studied, theory predicts almost constant direct stiffness coefficients in the order of $10^7$ N/m and low damping for the passive case (solid line). Almost negligible changes can be observed for the leakage case (dash-dot line). Contrarily, in the upward (dotted line) and downward (dashed line) cases both the stiffness and damping force coefficients significantly increase (about 2.3 times at low frequencies for the stiffness direct coefficients) and slight differences between them can be seen. Such an increase is more significant for the damping coefficients at lower frequencies. The difference between upward and downward cases is also more prominent at lower frequencies.

Results under the feedback-controlled lubrication regime are reported in Figure 3(c) and (d). The control law simulated is reported in Table 2 and it corresponds to the PD-controller #1. The controller imposes large modification of the cross coupling coefficients (dotted and dash-dot lines) rather than the direct coefficients (solid and dashed lines). It does not necessarily mean an improvement in rotor-bearing system behaviour, it just illustrates the stronger dependency of the bearing force coefficients on the control law implemented.

Identification of ALB Force Coefficients

A mathematical model capable of representing the relevant rotor-bearing system dynamics must be formulated as a first step. If the shaft is modeled as rigid, then the approach presented by Arumugam et al. can be used since a reduced number of DOFs are used, leading to the eight linearized oil film bearing coefficients by comparing directly the experimental FRFs against the theoretical ones. Examples of its application to cylindrical and tilting-pad journal bearings can be found in the same reference, and to air foil journal bearings and polymer faced tilting-pad journal bearings in Larsen et al. and Simmons et al. respectively.

If shaft flexibility cannot be neglected, the shaft model can be built using the finite element method. Due to the substantially large number of DOFs, it becomes unfeasible to obtain experimental input/output relationships of every single DOF to build an identification procedure. This difficulty can be overcome by applying the method presented by Wang and Maslen, which allows the inclusion of the shaft flexibility and to identify unknown dynamics from a reduced number of input/output relationships. For the sake of completeness the method is summarized in the following section. Nevertheless, the reader is advised to refer to for a comprehensive presentation of the method.

Finite Element Model of the Shaft and Rotor

The flexible shaft, depicted in Figure 4, is discretized using 21 finite elements. The model accounts for inertia and flexibility of the shaft. Damping is neglected. The relevant nodes for the identification procedure are highlighted with...
Figure 4. Schematic of the flexible rotor and ALB test rig depicting the finite element discretization. The inertial reference frame – xyz – is included. Note that the bearing cross coupling force coefficients have been omitted for simplicity.

black dots, i.e. point (B) for the ball bearing, point (R) for the active magnetic bearing rotor, point (S) for the shaft center of mass, point (T) for the placement of the ALB, point (P) for the placement of the sensor and point (E) for the excitation bearing. Main distances are also depicted and defined as $l_{ij}$ for which the subscripts stand for the distance between points $i$ and $j$. Rigid discs for the active magnetic bearing rotor $M^R$ and the excitation bearing $M^E$ are placed in their respective nodes, taking into account lumped mass and inertia. The shaft mass $M^S$ is distributed along its nodes. The mean values of these parameters are given in Table 3 along with their uncertainty information.

Linking Theoretical and Experimental FRFs

The procedure is aimed at obtaining the equivalent bearing complex impedance function $[H_b(i\omega)]$ by means of the measured frequency response functions $[\text{FRF}^\ast(i\omega)]$ and an equivalent mathematical model of the test setup. The test setup can be dynamically described around an equilibrium position by the well-known equation of motion:

$$[M]\{\ddot{q}\} + ([D_b] - \Omega[G])\{\dot{q}\} + ([K] + [K_b])\{q\} = \{f\}$$

(1)

where $[M]$ stands for the generalized inertia matrix, $[G]$ for the gyroscopic matrix, $[K]$ for the stiffness matrix and $\{f\}$ and $\{q\}$ represent the generalized external force and displacement coordinate, respectively. $\Omega$ denotes the angular velocity. The contribution from the ALB in terms of stiffness $[K_b(\omega)]$ and damping $[D_b(\omega)]$ is to be determined. Under the assumption of a linear system and considering a harmonic excitation $\{f(t)\}$ of frequency $\omega$, the generalized coordinate $\{q(t)\}$ and its time derivatives are dominated by a harmonic response at the same frequency, hence they can be written using complex notation as:

$$\{f(t)\} = \{f_0\} e^{i\omega t}; \quad \{\ddot{q}(t)\} = i\omega\{q_0\} e^{i\omega t}$$

$$\{q(t)\} = \{q_0\} e^{i\omega t}; \quad \{\dot{q}(t)\} = -\omega^2\{q_0\} e^{i\omega t}$$

(2)

Combining Equation (2) and Equation (1) leads to:

$$[-\omega^2[M] + i\omega([D_b(\omega)] - \Omega[G]) + [K] + [K_b(\omega)]]^{-1}\{f_0\} = \{q_0\}$$

$$[Z_0] + [H_b(i\omega)]^{-1} = [\text{FRF}(i\omega)]$$

(3)

Equation (3) states the relationship between the system dynamic stiffness matrix $[Z_0]$ from the finite element model, the unknown bearing impedance function $[H_b(i\omega)] = [K_b(\omega)] + i\omega[D_b(\omega)]$ and the matrix $[\text{FRF}(i\omega)]$ containing the input/output relationships for every degree of freedom in the finite element model. Experimentally, it is not possible to determine every component of this matrix, hence some additional techniques must be applied. By introducing the usage of selector matrices $[S_i]$ to deal only with several excited/sampled locations, the bearing impedance function $[H_b(i\omega)]$ can be determined by:

$$[H_b(i\omega)] = [-[A_{TT}]]$$

$$+ [A_{TE}][[A_{PE}^{-1} - [\text{FRF}^\ast(i\omega)]]^{-1}][A_{PT}]]^{-1}$$

(4a)

$$[A_{TE}] = [S_T]^T[Z_0]^{-1}[S_E]; \quad [A_{PE}] = [S_P]^T[Z_0]^{-1}[S_E]$$

$$[A_{PT}] = [S_P]^T[Z_0]^{-1}[S_T]; \quad [A_{TT}] = [S_T]^T[Z_0]^{-1}[S_T]$$

(4b)

where $[S_E]$ stands for the selector matrix associated with the excited degrees of freedom (point E), $[S_P]$ stands for the measured degrees of freedom (point P) and $[S_T]$ stands for the bearing degrees of freedom (point T). The required experimental data is significantly reduced from N DOFs to 2 DOFs, since the main requirement to apply the method is that the number of excitations and sensors match the dimension of the un-modeled bearing dynamics. Hence the reduced measured FRFs matrix $[\text{FRF}^\ast(i\omega)]$ only contains the transfer functions between the excitation point (E) and the response at the measurement point (P). From Equation (4a) the bearing dynamic properties are obtained as the real and imaginary parts of the bearing impedance which reads:

$$[K_b] = \begin{bmatrix} K_{xx} & K_{xy} \\ K_{yx} & K_{yy} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{Re}\{[H_b(i\omega)]\}$$

$$[D_b] = \begin{bmatrix} D_{xx} & D_{xy} \\ D_{yx} & D_{yy} \end{matrix} \quad \text{Im}\{[H_b(i\omega)]\}$$

(5a)

(5b)

Experimental Procedure

The bearing dynamic coefficients are identified in the frequency range 15-130 Hz. A reference operational
Control Law #1

Feedback-Controlled Lubrication – Control Laws

Control Law #1 If the simplest control law is considered, only a pair of control gains \( (k_p, k_d) \) must be determined. Despite such an advantage, an important drawback is obtained by using the same control gains to govern both servovalves. Their dynamics cannot be independently managed. The servovalve control signals \( \{u_1 \ u_2\}^T \) can be obtained in terms of the measured displacement as \(35\):

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  u_1 \\
  u_2
\end{bmatrix} = -k_p \begin{bmatrix}
  1 & 1 \\
  -1 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  x_P \\
  y_P
\end{bmatrix} - k_d \begin{bmatrix}
  1 & 1 \\
  -1 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  \dot{x}_P \\
  \dot{y}_P
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(6)

where \( \{x_P \ y_P\}^T \) and \( \{\dot{x}_P \ \dot{y}_P\}^T \) stand for the feedback control signals of rotor lateral displacement and velocity at point P respectively. To determine the velocity signals, the displacement signals are low-pass filtered and then numerically differentiated. Under the simplifying assumption of a frequency independent relationship between the control signals and the fluid film active forces, the control law #1 influences predominantly the cross coupling coefficients rather than the direct ones. See appendix A. Although the effect of increasing the cross coupling coefficients does not lead to any benefit to the rotor-bearing system dynamics, it illustrates the capability of influencing the bearing force coefficients, which is one of the work goals.

Control Law #2: A more aggressive control law can be chosen for modifying the direct coefficients. However, additional gains for the controller must be determined. If the following proportional control law is used, then only a pair of proportional gains \( (k_{p1}, k_{p2}) \) for the P-controller must be synthesized. This control law #2 allows us to command the servovalves as:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  u_1 \\
  u_2
\end{bmatrix} = -k_{p1} \begin{bmatrix}
  r & 1 \\
  -1 & -1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  x_P \\
  y_P
\end{bmatrix} - k_{p2} \begin{bmatrix}
  1 & 1 \\
  -1 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  \dot{x}_P \\
  \dot{y}_P
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(7)

where \( r \) is a constant identified in the experimental gain matrix which relates the control signals with the active forces. It is shown in appendix A, under the same simplifying assumption adopted, that each gain \( k_{pi} \) modifies the direct stiffness coefficients, and that the cross stiffness coefficients stay unaltered. Since the derivative gains \( k_{di} \) are disregarded, the bearing damping properties are not affected. This control law can be beneficial for the rotor-bearing system since it can be used to increase the asymmetry of the bearing direct force coefficients while not affecting the cross coupling ones.

Uncertainty Analysis

To estimate the interval (normally, with 95% of confidence) on which the results are thought to lie, the total uncertainty of the identified coefficients is calculated as proposed by Moffat \(31\) following the ISO GUM \(40\) recommendations. It is considered that measurement random uncertainties in the FRFs are not influencing the results, and this work only accounts for measurement and modelling systematic uncertainties. A large amount of FRFs averages is considered to minimize their standard deviation and to work with their mean values as their best estimates. Referring to Equation (1) the modelling uncertainties arise from the determination of the system dynamic stiffness \( [Z_0] \) and from the length of the finite elements.

Table 2. Main parameters for the lubrication regimes featured with the ALB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lub. Regime</th>
<th>( \Omega ) [rpm]</th>
<th>( P_{inj} ) [bar]</th>
<th>Injection</th>
<th>PD-controller ( #1 )</th>
<th>P-controller ( #2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Leakage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Upwd(15 ( \mu m ))</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Dwnd(30 ( \mu m ))</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active #1</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active #2</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+30/-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Main parameters for the lubrication regimes featured with the ALB.
Table 3. Model parameters considered for the uncertainty evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Param.</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Error Limits</th>
<th>Standard Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M^P$</td>
<td>49.55 kg</td>
<td>CAD file</td>
<td>±1%</td>
<td>±0.2528 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M^E$</td>
<td>6.48 kg</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>±0.020 kg</td>
<td>±0.0115 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M^L$</td>
<td>1.1224 kg</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>±0.020 kg</td>
<td>±0.0112 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{BR}$</td>
<td>0.4850 m</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>±0.005 m</td>
<td>±0.0029 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{BT}$</td>
<td>0.7315 m</td>
<td>CAD file</td>
<td>±1%</td>
<td>±0.0037 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parameters which strongly contribute to the total uncertainty are: the transducer sensitivities and lengths, particularly the displacement sensor sensitivity and the distances $l_{BT}$ and $l_{BE}$. In general, acceptable values of the expanded uncertainties are obtained which are to be presented simultaneously with the results.

Rotor-Bearing System Response. Experimental FRFs

Insight into the overall system behaviour can be obtained by analyzing the experimental FRFs under several lubrication regimes. Moreover, such FRFs are fundamental for bearing parameter identification. Four representative cases are presented: the passive and the hybrid (leakage case) lubrication regimes in Figure 5 and two feedback-control lubrication regimes in Figure 6. These FRFs are obtained with the aid of an electromagnetic shaker by sweeping a linear bidirectional chirp excitation from 15 to 130 Hz with the supply pressure and flow conditions tested. The cross coupling coefficients are not significantly affected for any of these cases. Secondly, 900 N downward load is applied to the shaft via AMB. For such a new loading condition, the cross coupling coefficients are reduced. Other authors, such as Childs and Carter, and Rodriguez and Childs, also report cross coupling coefficients within the same order of magnitude as the direct ones, although those experiments do not correspond to the same TPJB design and load conditions.

Back to Figure 7(b), it can be seen that the damping coefficients weakly depend on the frequency for the passive case. Due to light load condition, their values are small, i.e. in the order of $10^4$, especially for frequencies over
40 Hz. The experimental results are little affected by the expanded uncertainty. Comparison of the experimental damping coefficients against the predicted ones shows poor agreement, which set some room for modelling improvements. It is important to underline here that, the work goal is to demonstrate experimentally the modification of the bearing force coefficients due to active lubrication and not to, from any point of view, validate the theoretical model.

In Figure 7 (c) and (d) the bearing dynamic coefficients for the leakage case are illustrated using solid lines. Comparing the passive and the leakage lubrication cases, it becomes evident that the vertical direct stiffness coefficient $K_{yy}$ significantly increases its value to about $7.5 \cdot 10^7$ N/m above 50 Hz, while the values of the horizontal direct
stiffness coefficient $K_{xx}$ remain almost the same, i.e. the bearing becomes more asymmetric. For $K_{xx}$, a stronger frequency dependency is seen after 50 Hz. Comparing the passive and the leakage lubrication cases, it can be seen that the cross coupling coefficients are significantly reduced for the hybrid case. The expanded uncertainty becomes more important as the frequency increases and it is far more important for the vertical direct stiffness coefficient $K_{yy}$ with a magnitude of about $\pm 17\%$. In the case of the damping coefficients, Figure 7(d), it is noticed that the bearing becomes more damped, especially in the vertical direction, i.e. increased value of $D_{yy}$. Moreover, all damping coefficients significantly diminish from $10^5$ to $10^4$ over the frequency span of 60 Hz. In the horizontal direction, at low frequencies, the damping coefficients $D_{xx}$ and $D_{xy}$ are significantly smaller than those in the vertical direction. Over 60 Hz, $D_{xy}$ provides the largest damping to the system while the cross coupling coefficients $D_{xy}$ and $D_{xx}$ are negative. Considering the damping coefficients, the expanded uncertainty is more significant for the direct coefficient $D_{yy}$ at low frequencies where it reaches $\pm 37\%$.

**Bearing Force Coefficients – Hybrid Cases**

Figure 8 depicts comparative plots of the identified dynamic properties of the ALB for all hybrid lubrication regimes, i.e., for the leakage, upward and downward injection cases. The leakage case, plotted in solid lines, is used as a benchmark, while the upward and downward cases are plotted with dotted and dashed lines, respectively. Although it can be argued that all differences among the cases lie within the confidence limits, it is clear that the vertical direct stiffness coefficient $K_{yy}$ is reduced when the shaft is moved upward, closer to the bearing center, which turns the ALB softer in the vertical direction. In the downward injection case the cross coupling coefficients are significantly reduced for frequencies higher than 50 Hz and are simultaneously less influenced by uncertainties. Regarding the damping coefficients, there are no significant differences between the different hybrid cases and they behave similarly within the uncertainty bounds. Hence, it can be stated that the damping is hardly affected by the mentioned changes under these different hybrid lubrication conditions. Comparison against theoretical results of Figure 3(b) shows fair agreement in the sense that theoretical as well as experimental stiffness and damping coefficients increase their values when compared against the passive case. However, comparing upward against leakage case, a softening effect in the vertical direction can be observed. Such an experimental finding though is hardly predicted by the theoretical model. Furthermore, among the three hybrid lubrication cases, the leakage case shows the largest discrepancies between simulations and experiments, see Figure 7(c) and (d). Further efforts towards theoretical modelling improvements are necessary.

**Bearing Force Coefficients – Feedback-Controlled Cases**

Figure 9 shows selected results for the identified coefficients under the feedback-controlled lubrication regimes in the frequency range of 60-130 Hz. Figures 9(a) and (b) show the results obtained with the active lubrication defined by the control law #1, i.e. a PD-controller and Figures 9(c) and (d) the coefficients obtained using the control law #2, a PI-controller. Gains of both control laws are summarized in

Table 2. As a benchmark, the coefficients obtained for the leakage case are added with thin solid lines.

Using the PD-controller #1 (dashed lines) the direct stiffness coefficients (Figure 9(a)) have a constant behaviour over the frequency range investigated, suppressing the frequency dependency of $K_{xx}$ seen under the leakage case. The cross coupling coefficients, as aforementioned, are strongly affected by the control law adopted. Indeed, this particular behaviour is also theoretically reproduced as seen in Figure 3(c) and (d). Between 60-80 Hz large uncertainties can be detected for both direct coefficients with maximum confidence limit of ±37%. For the cross coupling coefficient $K_{yx}$ smaller uncertainties are found in the whole frequency span analysed. The same behaviour is observed for the damping coefficients, i.e. the direct damping coefficients vary significantly when compared to the one obtained in the leakage case and the cross coupling damping coefficients are the ones mostly affected by the controller. Large uncertainty of about 40% is seen for the cross coupling damping coefficients, especially between 60-80 Hz. The cross coupling stiffness coefficients are less affected by the controller #2 (dotted lines) in comparison with controller #1, see Figure 9(c). The direct stiffness coefficients are the most affected by the control law #2, leading to a reduction of the direct stiffness coefficients, as it was pursued. Damping coefficients, see Figure 9(d), are also modified by the control law, even though the featured controller is a P-controller.

Conclusions

The contribution of this paper is mainly experimental in nature. It should be re-emphasized that the work goal was to show the modification of the bearing dynamic properties via the active lubrication and it should not be seen, under any case, as an attempt to validate the theoretical bearing coefficients. Having said that and keeping in mind the light-load condition imposed on a bearing supporting a “flexible” rotor, the comparison between theoretical and experimental results shows a fair agreement for a reduced number of cases only. This suggests the need for further improvements of the multiphysics modelling of the ALB and of the identification modelling as well. In the first case, the way how all different regimes are modelled should be further investigated and in the second case, the extension of the identification modelling to account for further dynamics, such as, for instance, foundation and hydraulic dynamics shall be included if needed. Currently, both approaches are being researched.

Again, heading towards the research goal and in the light of the experimental investigations followed by comprehensive uncertainty analysis, it can be concluded that:
Feedback-Controlled Lubrication

Figure 9. Identified dynamic coefficients for the ALB. (a) and (b): ALB under feedback-controlled lubrication regime, control law #1 (dashed lines (--)), $k_p = -30$ kV/m & $k_d = 20$ Vs/m. (c) and (d): ALB under feedback-controlled lubrication regime, control law #2 (dotted lines (····)), $k_p = -30$ kV/m & $k_d = -30$ kV/m. Results obtained under the leakage hybrid case are superimposed with solid lines (--) as a benchmark.

- The development of the hybrid or feedback-controlled lubrication regimes clearly modify the rotor-bearing system properties as a whole, significantly reducing the rotor vibration amplitudes. This can be clearly seen from the FRFs used to identify the bearing coefficients under several lubrication conditions.

- The stiffness coefficients identified under passive lubrication show weak frequency dependency in the whole range of study. Considering the direct stiffness coefficients, good agreement between simulated and experimental results is found. Nevertheless, it is not the case for the cross coupling stiffness coefficients.

- The hybrid lubrication regimes can increase the bearing stiffness asymmetry and significantly contribute to reducing the cross coupling coefficients identified under light load conditions. Furthermore, under these lubrication regimes, the ALB becomes more damped.

- The hybrid lubrication regimes also allow us to modify the direct stiffness coefficients by changing the journal equilibrium position aided by I-controllers. A softening of the vertical direct stiffness coefficient – in comparison to the leakage case – can be observed, due to the shaft lifting to a more centred equilibrium position.

- The feedback-controlled lubrication clearly modifies the ALB dynamic properties and can be developed using classical PD controllers. By properly choosing the control law and gains, beneficial modification of the rotor-bearing system dynamic properties can be achieved. It was shown that different control laws can produce different effects on the direct and cross coupling force coefficients.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their deepest acknowledgments to Mr. Alejandro Cerda Varela for his valuable support during the experimental tests and fruitful discussions on the matter.

References

6. Santos IF and Scalabrin A. Control System Design for Active Lubrication With Theoretical and Experimental Examples.
Appendix A: Effect of Control Law on Bearing Force Coefficients

The matrix \([W]\) defines the relationship between the control signals \([u]\) and active fluid film forces \([f]\), taking into account the dynamics of amplifiers, servovalves and pipelines. Normally, the matrix \([W]\) is frequency dependent. Nevertheless, using short pipelines, high response servovalves and high values of pressurization such a frequency dependency can be neglected in the frequency range studied. Therefore the matrix \([W]\) can be considered constant and defined by \(W (kN/V)\) and \(r\) as:

\[
[W] = \begin{bmatrix} W_{x1} & W_{x2} \\ W_{y1} & W_{y2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W & W \\ -rW & W \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(8)

In order to determine the effect of the control law on the bearing dynamic properties, the DOFs corresponding to lateral displacement at the ALB node and \(r\) stands for the 2 DOFs related to the lateral displacement (dimension \(2 \times 2\)). The placement of the identity matrix within the matrix of the dynamic stiffness \(\hat{K}\) determined as follows:

\[
\hat{K} = \Re \left( \begin{bmatrix} \omega^2 M_{TT} & -Z_{TO} \\ Z_{TT} & \omega^2 M_{OO} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \omega^2 M_{OO} & -Z_{OO} \\ Z_{OT} & \omega^2 M_{OT} \end{bmatrix} \right) + \Im \left( \begin{bmatrix} \omega^2 M_{OO} & -Z_{OO} \\ Z_{OT} & \omega^2 M_{OT} \end{bmatrix} \right)
\]  

(12a)

\[
\hat{D} = \Im \left( \begin{bmatrix} \omega^2 M_{OO} & -Z_{OO} \\ Z_{OT} & \omega^2 M_{OT} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \omega^2 M_{OO} & -Z_{OO} \\ Z_{OT} & \omega^2 M_{OT} \end{bmatrix} \right)
\]  

(12b)

- **Control Law #1** – the elements of the matrix \([\Delta Z]\) are determined as follows:

\[
[\Delta Z]_{i=1} = [W][C] = \begin{bmatrix} W & W \\ -rW & W \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k_p & k_p \\ -k_p & k_p \end{bmatrix} + i\omega \begin{bmatrix} -k_d & k_d \\ -k_d & k_d \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(13a)

\[
[\Delta Z]_{i=1} = Wk_p \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ -1+r & 1-r \end{bmatrix} + i\omega Wk_d \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ -1+r & 1-r \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(13b)

Equation (13b) shows that the control law #1 significantly influences the cross coupling coefficients, whereas the direct coefficient in \(y\) direction is less affected. The direct coefficient in \(x\) direction is kept unaltered by the controller.

- **Control Law #2** – the elements of the matrix \([\Delta Z]\) are determined as follows:

\[
[\Delta Z]_{i=2} = [W][C] = \begin{bmatrix} W & W \\ -rW & W \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} k_{p1} & k_{p2} \\ -r k_{p1} & -r k_{p2} \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(14a)

\[
[\Delta Z]_{i=2} = \begin{bmatrix} Wk_{p1}(1+r) & 0 \\ -Wk_{p2}(1+r) & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(14b)

It becomes evident that by using the control law #2 the direct force coefficients are the only ones affected and the cross coupling coefficients remain unchanged.

Appendix B: Bearing Force Coefficients – Influence of Lubricant Feeding and Loading

Figures 10 and 11 report the changes in the bearing stiffness coefficients due to lubricant supply pressure (mist lubrication between pads) and loading condition under the passive lubrication regime. Figure 10 clarifies that an increase in the lubricant supply pressure does not significantly affect the stiffness coefficients, eliminating the hypothesis of starving...
Figure 10. Identified dynamic stiffness for the ALB under passive lubrication regime. Different feeding pressures. Dotted lines (-): 0.50 bar. Dashed lines (--): 1.50 bar. Solid lines (-): 2.40 bar.

Figure 11. Identified dynamic stiffness for the ALB under passive lubrication regime. Different loading conditions. Solid lines (-): 900 N downward loaded. Dashed lines (--): Light-load condition.

lubrication conditions contributing to a high level of cross coupling coefficients.

Figure 11 shows the bearing stiffness coefficients under two different load conditions, i.e., a) lightly-loaded and b) downward loaded via AMB. It is evident that the loading significantly affects the order of the cross-coupling coefficients compared to the direct ones.

**Notation**

- $A$: Mean value of radius (m)
- $[C]$: Controller transfer function matrix
- $[D_k(i\omega)]$: Bearing damping matrix
- $D_{ij}$: Identified bearing damping
- $d_{ij}$: Theoretical bearing damping
- $[f]$: Generalized external force vector
- $[FRF(i\omega)]$: Theoretical frequency response functions
- $[FRF^*(i\omega)]$: Measured frequency response functions
- $[G]$: System gyroscopic matrix
- $[H_0(i\omega)]$: Bearing complex impedance function
- $i$: Complex unity, $\sqrt{-1}$
- $[K]$: System stiffness matrix
- $[K_{ij}]$: Theoretical bearing stiffness
- $k_{ij}$: Theoretical bearing stiffness
- $[K_p]$: Proportional gain matrix
- $[K_d]$: Derivative gain matrix
- $k_d$: Derivative gain ($V/s/m$)
- $k_p,k_{p1,2}$: Proportional gains ($V/m$)
- $l_{ij}$: Distance between points “$i$” and “$j$” (m)
- $[M]$: System inertia matrix
- $M^S$: Shaft mass (kg)
- $M^R$: Active magnetic bearing rotor mass (kg)
- $M^E$: Excitation bearing mass (kg)
- $P_{sup}$: Oil supply pressure
- $\{q\},\{\dot{q}\},\{\ddot{q}\}$: Generalized displacement, velocity and acceleration coordinate vectors
- $q_{h,i,2}(t)$: High pressure oil flow $1.2 \ (m^3/s)$
- $q_{l}(t)$: Low pressure oil flow ($m^3/s$)
- $q_{r}(t)$: Return oil flow ($m^3/s$)
- $r$: Radius of the servovalve gain “$W_{x4}$”
- $\{S_i\}$: Selector matrix related to the “$i$” DOF
- $u_{1,2}$: Control signal of servovalve 1,2
- $[W]$: Servovalve gain matrix
- $W,W_{ij}$: Servovalve gain ($N/V$)
- $i = x,y$, $j = 1,2$
- $x_P$: Journal horizontal displacement at point P (m)
- $\dot{x}_P$: Journal horizontal velocity at point P (m/s)
- $y_P$: Journal vertical displacement at point P (m)
- $\dot{y}_P$: Journal vertical velocity at point P (m/s)
- $[Z_i],[Z_0]$: Rotor and rotor-bearing system dynamic stiffness matrices
- $[\Delta Z]$: System dynamic stiffness variation
- $\omega$: Excitation frequency ($Hz$)
- $\Omega$: Shaft angular velocity ($rpm$)