Increasing the complexity of glottal flow models: in-vitro validation for steady flow conditions
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Quasi one-dimensional glottal flow descriptions predict vocal folds oscillations characteristics which are qualitatively relevant to in-vitro and in-vivo experimental data. The current paper considers the resolution of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations in order to obtain a refined description of the flow phenomena adapted to more realistic glottal geometry. The pressure and flow rate predictions obtained from quasi one-dimensional flow models and the resolution of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations are examined for steady flows within a rigid glottis. The models predictions are validated against in-vitro measurements performed on rigid constriction replicas comparable to the geometrical conditions of the glottis and mounted in a suitable set-up. The confrontation between the experimental and computed data tends to show that the accuracy of the estimated pressures increases with the complexity of the flow model whereas the inverse tendency can be observed for the estimated flow rates. A focus is made on the flow separation point which is predicted by the resolution of the Navier-Stokes equations and appears to be a crucial parameter of the quasi one-dimensional flow models. The use of a variable separation criterion obtained from the 2D flow modeling in the quasi one-dimensional models makes the different models predictions more similar.

1 Introduction

During phonation, the forces exerted by the airflow coming from the lungs on the vocal folds are linked to the pressure drop within the glottis which is driven by the subglottal pressure and depends on the geometrical configuration of the glottal channel. Flow models based on steady Bernoulli’s equation and assuming flow separation near the outlet of the glottal constriction allow to provide a physical explanation of the self-sustained oscillating behavior of the vocal folds. Several studies including in-vitro experiments show that Bernoulli flow model coupled with simplified lumped models can approximate oscillations characteristics, such as oscillation threshold pressure, to a fair extent [9, 8]. However, Bernoulli flow description implies several assumptions which can lead to drastic approximations irrelevant for glottal flow modeling. The main flow property neglected in Bernoulli flow model is the viscosity of the fluid. Indeed viscous effects can be predominant to determine the flow characteristics especially when the gap between the vocal folds is very narrow [3]. The availability of faster computation facilities made possible glottal flow simulation with more sophisticated models based on the resolution of the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations [4]. Therefore CFD techniques allow the study of more complex flow phenomena such as flow separation and jet formation downstream the glottal constriction. More recently, CFD and turbulent flow models have also been used for glottal flow modeling in order to approach the complex reality of the flow behavior in the human upper airways [2]. The choice of the flow model has a major influence on the properties of the oscillating system in physical phonation models. CFD methods provide a more accurate description of the flow but the computation cost is still high and seems not suitable for physical phonation models application such as voice synthesis. In that perspective, quasi one-dimensional flow model represent a trade-off between the computation time and the accuracy of the estimated flow characteristics. Indeed, assuming that the flow properties vary only in one dimension allows to reduce the computations while viscosity and unsteadiness can be taken into account with corrective terms in the Bernoulli flow description. In return, quasi one-dimensional flow models are unable to predict flow separation which is determined by an ad-hoc criterion. It has been shown that simplified 1D models can provide realistic predictions compared to in-vitro flow measurements but their accuracy remains strongly dependent on the choice of the separation criterion [3]. Therefore, it seems interesting to use CFD in order to verify that more advanced flow models improve the accuracy of the predictions. Two-dimensional flow modeling can also be used to determine the separation criterion inherent to the flow models based on Bernoulli’s equation. This paper presents the comparison between simulations of steady laminar flow within a constriction obtained from quasi one-dimensional models and numerical resolution of the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations. The validity of the theoretical models predictions is tested against in-vitro measurements performed on glottal constrictions mounted in a suitable experimental set-up. This study mainly deals with the predictions of the pressure profiles along the constriction walls, and particularly the pressure at the minimum constriction height, and the volume flow rate. Since the determination of these quantities with 1D models depends on the flow separation point, the choice of the separation criterion is discussed. At first, quasi one-dimensional models are formulated and the numerical flow simulations approach is presented. The experimental set-up is then described. Finally, in-vitro measurements and the corresponding models predictions are compared and the models accuracy is discussed.

2 One-dimensional flow models

Under the assumptions of one-dimensional, laminar, fully inviscid, steady and incompressible flow, one-dimensional Bernoulli’s equation can be used to estimate the pressure within a constriction. For a rectangular glottal geometry with area \( A(x) = l_x h(x) \), the pressure profile along the flow direction \( x \) can be determined as:

\[
p(x) = p_0 - \frac{1}{2} \rho \Phi^2 \left( \frac{1}{h(x)^2} - \frac{1}{h_0^2} \right)
\]

(1)

where \( p_0 \) is the upstream pressure, \( \rho \), the fluid density, \( \Phi \), the volume flow rate and \( h_0 \), the subglottal height. The volume flow rate is assumed to be constant along the constriction, i.e. \( \Phi = \phi(x)A(x) = \phi(x)h(x)l_x = constant \). Bernoulli law is unable to predict flow separation and turbulent jet formation downstream of the
minimum aperture $A_g = h_g l_g$. This phenomenon resulting from very strong viscous pressure losses [2] must be taken into account in order to predict a pressure drop across the constriction with the one-dimensional Bernoulli equation (1) [7]. In literature, the area associated with flow separation $A_s$ is empirically chosen as 1.1, 1.2 or 1.3 times the minimum glottal constriction area $A_g$, i.e. $A_s = c_s A_g$ with $c_s > 1$ the ad-hoc separation coefficient [6, 5]. For a rectangular area, it is therefore assumed that flow separation occurs at position $x = s$ where the constriction height becomes $h_s = c_s h_g$ as indicated in Fig. 1. Consequently, Eq. (1) only holds down to the separation point after which the pressure is considered equal to the downstream pressure. Viscous effects also influence the pressure distribution within the constriction, especially for small Reynolds numbers and then cannot be neglected for small constriction apertures. In order to account for viscosity, a pressure term is added to Eq. (1) defining Poiseuille coefficient $\frac{p}{\rho}$ as:

$$p(x) = p_0 - \frac{1}{2} \rho \frac{\Phi^2}{l_g} \left( \frac{1}{h(x)^2} - \frac{1}{h_g^2} \right) - 12 \frac{\mu}{l_g} \int_0^x \frac{dx}{h(x)^3} \tag{2}$$

where $\mu$ is the dynamic viscosity of the fluid.

In this paper, one-dimensional flow models (1) and (2) are used to predict the pressure at the minimum constriction height $p_g = p(x = g)$ and the volume flow rate $\Phi$ with the pressure difference $p_0 - p_g$, the constriction height profile $h(x)$ and the separation coefficient $c_s$ as inputs.

3 Two-dimensional simulation

Numerical flow simulations in two dimensions have been performed with the software ADINA CFD [1].

3.1 Flow model

The equations under consideration are the Navier-Stokes and continuity equations for steady, incompressible, laminar flow. The fluid material used is air with constant thermodynamic and mass transport properties so that the governing equations for the flow domain are expressed as:

$$\rho (v \cdot \nabla v) - \mu \nabla^2 v + \nabla p = 0 \tag{3}$$

$$\nabla \cdot v = 0 \tag{4}$$

Finite Element Method (FEM) is used for spatial discretization of the problems which are solved with sparse solver. The flow domain is covered by about 70000 3-nodes planar elements. The mesh is denser in the constriction, and especially along the border walls as shown in Fig. 2, since most of the pressure and velocity variations occur in this part of the geometry. This also allows to have a fine description of the profiles along the wall in order to obtain precisely the flow separation point in the diverging downstream part of the constriction. Though the jet after flow separation should be turbulent, laminar flow model is used since the flow is expected to be laminar in the constriction up to the separation point.

3.2 Boundary conditions

The boundary conditions applied for the geometry description are presented in Fig. 2. No-slip wall condition is used for the walls surrounding the flow domain. The flow problem is considered as symmetric since steady laminar flow model is used. This assumption allows to avoid Coanda effect and forces the jet to be straight. Thus, half of the geometry is modeled and slip wall condition is used for the symmetry line. The inlet pressure is defined with the upstream pressure $p_0$ and zero-pressure condition is applied to the outlet in order to completely determine the pressure solution.

4 Experimental set-up

The experimental set-up is schematically depicted in Fig. 3. Steady flow is provided by a valve controlled air supply [A] connected to a pressure tank of 0.75 m$^3$ [B] enabling to impose an airflow through the rigid vocal fold replica [D,E]. An upstream pipe [C] of 95 cm is used to prevent from turbulent flow at the replica position. Pressure transducers (Endevco 8507C or Kulite XCS-093) are positioned in pressure taps upstream of the replica [F] and at the minimum constriction height of the constriction [G] allowing to measure the upstream pressure $p_0$ and the pressure at the minimum constriction height $p_g$. The volume flow rate $\Phi$ is measured (TSI 4000) upstream of the constriction [H]. The in-vitro con-

Geometries of the rigid vocal fold replicas. Uniform (a) and round (b) constriction.

5 Results and discussions

5.1 Uniform constriction

A uniform constriction is particularly interesting to evaluate the quasi one-dimensional models performance independently of the choice of the separation coefficient. The channel is indeed straight and flow separation always occurs at the end of the constriction so that \( c_s = 1 \). As shown in Fig. 5a and 6a, Bernoulli model predicts the pressure within the uniform constriction is always equal to the downstream pressure regardless the upstream pressure whereas Poiseuille model is able to predict positive pressures \( p_g \) at the minimum constriction height. Thus for very narrow gap, as in Fig. 5a, Poiseuille model predictions match quasi perfectly the experimental pressure measurements, with a mean error less than 2\%. For this case, 2D flow model predicts the \textit{in-vitro} pressure data with a mean error about 30\% and so this more advanced model appears to be less accurate with respect to measurements. For larger apertures, all the models predictions become less accurate, as shown in Fig. 6a. Thus, the mean prediction errors for Poiseuille and 2D models are respectively about 60\% and 40\%. Concerning quasi one-dimensional model, accounting for viscosity appears to be crucial to approach pressure measurements. For very small apertures, viscous effects become predominant for the determination of the pressure within the constriction so that Poiseuille model is fully capable to predict the measured pressures. The relative error between the pressure measurements and the 2D model predictions appears to always be in the range 30-40\% regardless the upstream pressure and the minimum constriction height whereas the relative error observed for Poiseuille model increases as the minimum constriction height increases.

Concerning volume flow rate, Bernoulli model appears to be a good estimator of the measurements. For \( h_g = 0.2 \text{mm} \), though Poiseuille model is the most suitable to predict the measured pressures, it can only predict the measured volume flow rate with a mean error about 80\%, as shown in Fig. 5b, whereas Bernoulli model can predict it within 20\%. For this case, the estimations of the volume flow rate from Poiseuille and 2D models are very similar but when the gap becomes larger, Poiseuille model tends to provide predictions closer to the ones of Bernoulli model. As shown in Fig. 6b, quasi one-dimensional models provide estimations of the volume flow rate with less deviation from the experimental data than the ones given by 2D model. Thus, two-dimensional flow model seems to be unable to predict the measured volume flow rate in a suitable way and accounting for viscosity can result in more inaccurate one-dimensional models estimations.
5.2 Round constriction

The influence of flow separation can be studied with a round constriction since this geometry includes a diverging downstream part. Fig. 7 and 8 show the measurements and models predictions of the pressure at the minimum constriction height $p_g$ (a) and volume flow rate $\Phi$ (b) for the uniform constriction with minimum constriction height $h_g=1.0\,\text{mm}$.

Figure 7: Measurements (+) and models predictions (☐, Bernoulli, ◇, Poiseuille, ◆, 2D Laminar) of pressure at the minimum constriction height $p_g$ (a) and volume flow rate $\Phi$ (b) for the uniform constriction with minimum constriction height $h_g=1.0\,\text{mm}$.

5.2 Round constriction

The influence of flow separation can be studied with a round constriction since this geometry includes a diverging downstream part. Fig. 7 and 8 show the measurements and models predictions of the pressure at the minimum constriction height $p_g$ and the volume flow rate $\Phi$ for the minimum constriction heights $h_g=0.5\,\text{mm}$ and $h_g=1.5\,\text{mm}$. The 1D models predictions presented in these figures are computed with $c_s = 1.2$, which is a value commonly found in literature, and $c_s$ given by 2D simulations. One-dimensional models using $c_s = 1.2$ both fail to reproduce the experimental measurements of $p_g$. The predictions of 2D model are more relevant to the in-vitro data but remain inaccurate with mean errors about 50% for $h_g=0.5\,\text{mm}$ and 30% for $h_g=1.5\,\text{mm}$. In return, as for the uniform constriction, the quasi one-dimensional models predictions of the volume flow rate are closer to the measurements than the ones provided by the 2D model. As shown in Fig. 8b, the 1D models predictions for $h_g=1.5\,\text{mm}$ are very accurate with respect to the experimental data. For narrower gap, they are less accurate but better than the predictions of 2D model.

The separation coefficient $c_s$ is a control parameter of quasi one-dimensional models but it can be deduced from the separation position given by 2D simulations. Thus the separation coefficients obtained for different constriction heights are presented in Fig. 9. First, it can be seen that the approximation $c_s = 1.2$ is not valid for small upstream pressure, i.e. $p_0 < 50\,\text{Pa}$, or for narrow gap such as $h_g=0.2\,\text{mm}$. It also appears that the separation coefficient varies from 1.1 to 1.6 for most of the simulated conditions.

Applying the separation coefficient $c_s$ obtained from 2D simulations does not considerably improve neither 1D models predictions for $h_g=0.5\,\text{mm}$. For $h_g=1.5\,\text{mm}$, the 1D models predictions of $p_g$ become similar to the ones of 2D model as shown in Fig. 8a. Thus, Poiseuille model is able to predict the experimental measurements within 40%. The 1D models predictions of $\Phi$ are also closer to the ones of the 2D model so that they are less accurate.

6 Conclusion

Simplified flow descriptions and numerical simulations are applied to the modeling of airflow within constriction replicas relevant to the glottal flow conditions. Theoretical results are compared to pressure and volume flow rate data obtained experimentally. Despite an error between 30% and 40% relatively to the in-vitro pressure measurements, two-dimensional laminar flow model is more accurate than quasi one-dimensional models. The prediction error rate of 2D model remains in the same range regardless the flow and geometrical conditions whereas 1D models can widely overestimate the pressure drop within the constriction. However, Bernoulli flow model appears to best approximate the volume flow rate measurements. The assumption of a varying separation point appears to be more in accordance with the
physical reality. Then, for 1D flow computations, the separation criterion should be adapted according to the input parameters: the upstream pressure and the minimum constriction height. The use of the separation coefficient obtained by 2D simulation does not necessarily improve the 1D models accuracy with respect to the experimental data. This paper investigate on flow characteristics within the glottal constriction up to the flow separation point. For a more global study of the glottal flow, turbulent models can be introduced to provide a finer description of the jet formation and its influence on the flow within the constriction. Measurements of additional flow properties, such as velocity profiles, can be envisaged in order to complete the in-vitro validation.
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