Acoustic bubble sizing by combination of subharmonic emissions with imaging frequency
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The non-linear response of a bubble to an acoustic field results in the scattering of sum- and difference-frequencies when two frequencies are incident. This has in the past been used to size bubbles, since it is only when the pump frequency, \( \omega_p \), is near the bubble resonance that the non-linear effects are observed. In addition, the subharmonic frequency emitted by the bubble can combine with the imaging frequency, \( \omega_i \), to produce scattered signals at \( \omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2) \). In this study, the ability of these signals to accurately size and resolve bubbles, both singly and in arrays, has been studied.
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A gas bubble in a liquid may be forced into volume pulsations by an acoustic field. The equations describing the bubble motion are highly non-linear, one of the commonest being the Rayleigh–Plesset equation

\[
R \ddot{R} + \frac{3}{2} \dot{R}^2/2 = \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \left\{ (P_0 + 2\sigma/R_o - P_v) (R_o/R)^2 - 2\sigma/R - 4\mu \ddot{R}/R - P_o - P(t) \right\}
\]

(1)

where \( R \) is the bubble radius and \( R_o \) its equilibrium value; \( \sigma, \rho \) and \( \mu \) are, respectively the surface tension, density and viscosity of the liquid; \( P_0 \) is the hydrostatic pressure; \( P(t) \) is the time-varying pressure component (i.e. the driving term); \( P_v \) is the vapour pressure within the bubble; and \( \kappa \) is the polytropic index of the gas. The value of \( \kappa \) lies between 1 and \( \gamma \), the ratio of the specific heats at constant pressure and volume, depending on whether the gas behaves isothermally, adiabatically or in some intermediate manner. When the surface tension and viscosity terms in the Rayleigh–Plesset equation are deemed negligible and \( P(t) \) is set to zero, the formulation approximates to an unforced bubble, at a frequency

\[
v_f = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi R_o} \right)(3\kappa P_v/\rho)^{1/2}
\]

(2)

This equation was first derived by Minnaert who assumed simple harmonic oscillation of the bubble wall. For air bubbles in water under atmospheric pressure, Equation (2) reduces to

\[
v_f R_o \approx 3 \text{ Hz m}
\]

(3)

Equation (2) allows bubbles to be sized by measurement of the frequencies they emit when mechanically excited. Bubble sizing has also been attempted by the use of incident acoustic signals, utilizing resonance excitation, Doppler techniques and the stimulation of the second harmonic, but these techniques all have limitations. For example, the signal scattered from a small, resonance bubble in resonance excitation can be weaker than the signal from a larger, non-resonant bubble. It may be difficult to distinguish a cluster of small bubbles from a single large one using Doppler. Spatial resolution is poor with second harmonic generation.

Bubble sizing has a wealth of applications, including investigations into decompression sickness, contrast echocardiography and the monitoring of pressure fluctuations and of the sodium coolant in nuclear reactors. Attempts have been made to detect bubbles acoustically in high pressure vessels and in canine cardiovascular systems.

Newhouse and Shankar introduced the technique of bubble sizing using the scattered signals when a bubble is insonated with a pump frequency \( \omega_p \) and an imaging frequency \( \omega_i \). When \( \omega_i \) is near the bubble resonance, the amplitude of oscillation of the bubble wall is large and the bubble behaves non-linearly. The general response, \( Y \), of a bubble (for example, its wall motion or the scattered signal from it) may therefore be expressed as a power series

\[
Y(t) = \xi_1 P(t) + \xi_2 P^2(t) + \xi_3 P^3(t) + \xi_4 P^4(t) + \ldots
\]

(4)

where \( \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \) and \( \xi_4 \) are constants. If the driving pressure is \( P(t) = P_p \cos \omega_p t + P_i \cos \omega_i t \), then the quadratic term in Equation (4) gives rise to signals at \( \omega_i \pm \omega_p \). The further \( \omega_p \) is from the bubble resonance, the more the bubble is like a linear oscillator and the smaller the quadratic contribution. Shankar et al. therefore took the appearance of the \( \omega_i + \omega_p \) frequencies to indicate that \( \omega_p \) equaled the bubble resonance, and so had a measure of the bubble size.

A stable bubble driven in an intense acoustic field also emits a subharmonic at half the driving frequency when the bubble is driven near resonance. In the present study, the combination of this subharmonic (at \( \omega_p/2 \))...
with an incident imaging frequency, \(\omega_i\), generated signals at \(\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)\). The sharpness of the \(\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)\) response was compared with that of the \(\omega_i \pm \omega_p\) frequencies, and the relative abilities of the two sets of signals to elucidate bubble resonance and size were assessed. Acoustic measurements of bubble size obtained in this manner were then used to estimate the value of the polytropic index of air, helium and propane in these processes. Finally, the techniques were used to resolve acoustically bubble arrays.

**Experimental details**

The experiment is performed in a polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) tank (25 \(\times\) 25 \(\times\) 50 cm\(^3\)), filled with water and lined with acoustic absorber (Figure 1). A 3.35 MHz continuous-wave imaging signal was generated at 0.05 W cm\(^{-2}\) by a Therasonic 1030 ultrasound generator (Electro-Medical Supplies) through an acoustic window. The pump signal was produced in the water tank by a submerged 85 mm Mylar cone speaker (Radio Spares type 471) via a paralleled amplifier (Quad type 405-2). The voltage applied to the speaker was kept constant for each separate bubble; however it was varied between bubbles in the range 1.00–5.23 V\(_{\text{rms}}\) to obtain a large scattered signal.

Shankar et al.\(^8\) measured the frequency of the scattered sum- and difference-signals. However since the sum- and difference-frequencies are generally about 1000 times the pump frequency, to obtain a 1% accuracy in the pump (and therefore in the measurement of the bubble resonance) would require a stability of 0.001% in the imaging frequency if the sum and difference components were measured in the manner described by Shankar et al. In the present experiment, the audio pump frequency was measured directly using a frequency counter, to prevent drift in the frequency of the signal sources from introducing a systematic error.

To prevent direct coupling between the speaker and the transducer, their axes were angled at 135\(^\circ\) in the same horizontal plane. The bubble, blown underwater by a drawn glass pipette, was held on a wire of diameter 0.5 mm at the intersection of the transducer axes. To aid attachment of the bubble, the wire was coated with a thin film of paraffin wax. With no bubble present, the control experiment showed that sound was not scattered non-linearly by the wire alone.

A needle hydrophone (Dapco NP10-3) detected the scattered megahertz acoustic signal, which was then processed by a spectrum analyser (Marconi Instruments type TF 2370). The active element of the needle hydrophone was 10 mm radially away from the bubble and at the same height. The hydrophone had been calibrated for this directional mode. An example of the analyser output can be seen in Figure 2; the \(\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)\) pressures were averaged, as were the values of \(\omega_i \pm \omega_p\). For each setting of the pump frequency, the spectrum analyser swept across the whole of the monitored frequency range. The pump frequency was then increased by between 20 and 50 Hz, as required and the whole spectrum measured afresh.

An estimate of the bubble size could be gained by microscopy for comparison with acoustic measurements of the bubble radius. A weighted average of the long and short axes of the bubble was taken for those bubbles distorted from the spherical. The response curves for the \(\omega_i \pm \omega_p\) and the \(\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)\) signals were compared for single bubbles, whose sizes were then measured by microscopy; the plot of resonance frequency against size could then be compared with the theoretical predictions of Equation (2) and conclusions drawn regarding the polytropic index of air, helium and propane. Helium has a wide range of potential values for \(\kappa (1 \, \text{to} \, 1.63)\) so that the extent to which the process is isothermal or adiabatic should be clear from the results. Propane has a narrow range of \(\kappa (1 \, \text{to} \, 1.13)\); by reducing the uncertainty caused by \(\kappa\), the other sources of error in the result can be examined.

An array of four bubbles (Figure 3 illustrates the geometry of the experiment) was acoustically resolved using the scattered \(\omega_i \pm \omega_p\) and \(\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)\) signals. Finally, high speed photography was used to image the bubble on the wire at 6000 frames per second (f.p.s.) using a Hadland Hyspeed camera.

**Results**

Figure 4 shows a typical response curve for the \(\omega_i \pm \omega_p\) and \(\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)\) signals emitted from single air bubbles. The bubble used for the graph in Figure 4b had a

![Figure 1](image-url)  
**Figure 1** Apparatus used to insonate a bubble with two frequencies

![Figure 2](image-url)  
**Figure 2** Typical output of the spectrum analyser, with frequency measured along the bottom. From left to right, the peaks correspond to the frequencies \(\omega_i - \omega_p\), \(\omega_i - (\omega_p/2)\), \(\omega_i + \omega_p\), \(\omega_i + (\omega_p/2)\), \(\omega_i - \omega_p\). The value of \(\omega_p\) is 4.960 kHz
measured radius of $0.645 \pm 0.005$ mm. In both graphs the peak corresponding to the $\omega_i \pm \omega_p$ (+) and the $\omega_i + (\omega_p/2)$ (▲) response is clearly sharper. Beyond the range of the plots, the scattered signals were at the level of the noise. Data from many such curves are used in Figure 5 to test Equation (2), by plotting the bubble resonance frequency against the optically measured radius. These data points should lie between the predicted limits of $\kappa = 1$ and $\kappa = \gamma$, marked as lines on the graph for each gas: the solid lines correspond to $\kappa = 1$ (the isothermal case), $\kappa = 1.13$ (propane), $\kappa = 1.4$ (air) and $\kappa = 1.63$ (helium).

Figure 6 compares the response curves at $\omega_i + \omega_p$ and $\omega_i + (\omega_p/2)$ for the linear array of four bubbles illustrated in Figure 3. Finally, Figure 7 shows the bubble on the wire, subjected to the acoustic field: the bubble wall is modulated by oscillating ripples. It is these ripples which cause the surface of the bubble to 'shimmer', as seen by the naked eye, when the pump frequency approaches the bubble resonance.

**Discussion**

The scattered $\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)$ signal tends to be sharper than the $\omega_i \pm \omega_p$ signal, making it a better tool for the resolution and sizing of bubbles. The maximum is usually greater and the half-height width (averaged over the 23 resonance curves used to develop Figure 5) is $40 \pm 20\%$ that of the $\omega_i \pm \omega_p$ curves. The uncertainty in measurements of bubble resonance using this technique is between 0.5 and 2%$^{19}$. The $\omega_i \pm (\omega_p/2)$ scattering would be expected to be sharper, since it is a non-linear effect of higher order than the scattering of the $\omega_i \pm \omega_p$ frequency, and so would fall off as one moves away from resonance faster than the sum and difference scattering do. An alternative view is that the damping of the subharmonic is less: its decay time is longer, so that in the frequency domain its spread will be less. Although no analysis of the damping of non-linear combination frequencies is available, Eller$^{20}$ calculated the damping of forced radial oscillations for a
bubble insonated by a single frequency. The damping of any subharmonic signal is not discussed. However, it is interesting to compare the damping of the bubble of 4.90 bubble insonated by a single frequency. The damping of 4.90 kHz (resonance) and at 2.45 kHz (the frequency of the subharmonic of the resonance). Following Eller’s calculation, small amplitude pulsations of the bubble can be expressed as

\[ \frac{d}{dt} + \frac{b}{m} + \frac{k}{m} = -P_{A} e^{\omega_{p}t} \tag{5} \]

where \( \epsilon \) is the change in volume and \( m \) the effective mass of the bubble. The right-hand side of Equation (5) represents the acoustic driving term. The damping term, \( b \), is the sum of thermal, viscous and radiation components. Eller provided expressions for calculating the damping constant, \( d \), where

\[ d = \frac{\omega_{b}}{k} \tag{6} \]

For an air bubble of radius 0.645 mm in water, the damping constant at 4.90 kHz has a value of \( 4.40 \times 10^{-2} \). At an insonation frequency of 2.45 kHz, the value equals \( 4.35 \times 10^{-2} \). A decay time can be represented by \( 1/(\omega d) \), and so decay times for the bubble are 0.74 and 1.49 ms at insonation frequencies of 4.90 and 2.45 kHz, respectively. The factor of \( \approx 2 \) difference in decay times arises almost entirely from the change in \( \omega_{b} \), since the value of \( d \) varies here by only \( \approx 1\% \). Similar calculations for the range of bubble sizes studied suggest that \( d \) does not vary by more than a few per cent for insonation at the resonance, and at half the resonance, frequency. The decay time at half-resonance will therefore tend to be twice that for insonation at resonance [equation (6)] and this might well explain why the spread of the \( \omega_{i} \pm (\omega_{p}/2) \) signal is \( 40 \pm 20\% \) that of the \( \omega_{i} \pm \omega_{p} \) signal.

The non-linear scattering from the bubble produced signals not just at \( \omega_{i} \pm \omega_{p} \) and \( \omega_{i} \pm (\omega_{p}/2) \), but also at combination frequencies of the imaging signal and superharmonics of the pump. Though these tended to be even sharper than the \( \omega_{i} \pm (\omega_{p}/2) \) response, their low amplitude made them unsuitable for sizing purposes. They are not visible in Figure 2 as they lie outside the range of the frequencies illustrated.

This technique can be used to indicate bubble coalescence or fragmentation through a comparison of the response curves for both increasing and decreasing values of pump frequency. The value of \( \kappa \) for this process can be estimated from Figure 5. Best-fit lines to the data give values for \( \kappa \) of 1.05 ± 0.04 for air, 1.15 ± 0.11 for helium and 0.995 ± 0.034 for propane. All, therefore, tend towards the isothermal.

The four-bubble array illustrated in Figure 3 was successfully resolved (Figure 6). Using \( \kappa = 1.05 \) the peaks at 4.65 and 4.38 kHz correspond to bubble radii of 0.61 and 0.64 mm, respectively, indicating that this system is capable of resolving bubbles differing in radius by only 30 \( \mu \)m. This represents the resolution of two bubbles whose radii differ by 5%.

Conclusions

When a bubble is subjected to an audio pump signal, \( \omega_{p} \), and a megahertz imaging signal, \( \omega_{i} \), the scattered acoustic signals contain additional frequencies that become increasingly strong as the pump approaches the bubble resonance. In particular, signals are present at \( \omega_{i} \pm \omega_{p} \) and \( \omega_{i} \pm (\omega_{p}/2) \), the latter tending to a sharper response and so being more suitable for bubble sizing and resolution. The technique has been used to resolve bubbles (of radii \( \approx 0.6 \) mm) a distance of 5 mm apart, differing in radius by \( \approx 5\% \). It is, therefore, a promising method for bubble sizing.
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