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SUMMARY

This report is concerned with developing a theoretical calculation method for the three-dimensional interaction between a laminar boundary layer and a shock wave, in the case when a constant transverse velocity is imposed, parallel to the shock plane.

The phenomenon is studied on an adiabatic axi-symmetric body consisting of a hollow circular cylinder with a flare. The transverse velocity is generated by the rotation of the body about its axis of symmetry which is aligned in the main flow direction.

The calculation procedure is derived from the two-dimensional integral method of Lees and Reeves. The required relationships between boundary layer integral properties are obtained from similar solutions of compressible axial flow on a rotating cylinder.

It has been established using this theory that a transverse velocity of 10% of the main flow velocity produces a reduction of static pressure in the interaction region of about 2%. This result agrees with wind tunnel measurements made at $M = 2.21$. On the basis of this agreement, theoretical predictions are made for interactions with larger transverse velocities. It is found that, when the transverse velocity reaches 100% of the main flow velocity, a 10% increment in pressure is predicted.
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INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of shock wave-boundary layer interaction is frequently encountered on high-speed vehicles (air intakes, flaps, etc.). In hypersonic flow the boundary layer is often laminar and therefore sensitive to the impingement of a shock wave. Regions of separated flow are formed which modify appreciably the distributions of surface pressure and heat transfer.

Shock wave-boundary layer interactions are generally three-dimensional in character, and therefore complex to study. Theoretical and experimental work has thus tended to concentrate on the two-dimensional problem. The two-dimensional theory has reached an advanced stage, and a large body of experimental results is available.

Only recently, attention has been turned to cases of more practical interest. The important problem of three-dimensional interactions in corners has been treated. The analysis of the flow on a lifting surface fitted with a fin (see sketch) is also very interesting. The interaction between the swept, normal shock wave and the boundary layer on the lifting surface is purely three-dimensional. The present study is concerned with interactions having certain important characteristics in common with this type of interaction.

As a first approximation, it is possible to resolve the main stream velocity into its two components u and v, normal and parallel to the shock surface. In fact, it is possible to approach the general three-dimensional problem by the study of interactions produced on a flat plate of infinite span, fitted with a trailing edge flap and placed in sweep to the undisturbed stream (fig. 1a). The use of such a model in a wind
tunnel presents serious difficulties because of end effects, which are particularly large in separated flows.

For this reason we have proposed and constructed, for the experimental part of this research, an apparatus consisting of a body of revolution upon which a transverse velocity is produced by spinning the model about its axis of symmetry, which is aligned with the undisturbed stream. Thus, by analogy with the classic two-dimensional flat plate-ramp configuration, we have used a model consisting of a hollow circular cylinder followed by a flare (fig. 1c).

In the present report, a theoretical study is made of the effect of a constant transverse velocity upon the interaction phenomenon, for the purpose of comparison with experimental results. This is an extension to the case with spin of the theoretical study by Horton of interactions on a fixed hollow cylinder-flare configuration.

The method presented here is based on the two-dimensional integral approach of Lees and Reeves, as more recently improved by Klineberg. The former method was programmed for an IBM 1130 computer by Gautier, this programme having been later adapted by Riethmuller according to Klineberg's modifications. Horton later transformed this programme to treat interactions on axi-symmetric bodies without spin. We here develop the necessary modifications to treat the case with spin.

The first section of this report develops the equations governing interactions with constant transverse velocity. The choice of coordinate system is discussed and the basic boundary layer equations are presented. The transformation of these basic equations to final integral form is discussed. Also, similar solutions for flow over a spinning cylinder are derived, which are used to calculate relations between parameters occurring in the integral equations governing interactions.
The method of numerical solution of the integral equations is discussed in the second section. We briefly discuss the method of calculation of the axi-symmetric external inviscid flow established by Horton \(^{11}\), based upon the second-order shock-expansion method of Syvertson and Dennis \(^{14}\), which is directly applicable in the present case. Initial and final conditions for the integration of the equations are discussed, the initial conditions being derived from the analytic solution for weak interaction with spin given by Horton \(^{29}\) in an accompanying report. We finally recall the iteration and interpolation procedures.

The results of some calculations by the method are presented and discussed in the third section. They are firstly compared with calculations of Horton for the case of a fixed model, and the predicted effect of transverse velocity is noted. Comparison with measurements made without and with spin exhibit similar qualitative behaviour and the same order of magnitude effects. The theory is then used to predict the effect of larger transverse velocities than were obtained experimentally.
1. ANALYSIS

1.1 The basic equations

We discuss in this paragraph the reasons for the choice of the coordinate system used to write the equations governing boundary layer development on a spinning axisymmetric body. The analogy between the energy equation and the momentum equation for the flow in the circumferential direction is shown. The relation existing between the temperature and the velocity components in the boundary layer is deduced, for the adiabatic case.

1.1.1 Choice of coordinate system, and the basic equations

As for interactions on two-dimensional and non-spinning axisymmetric bodies, we assume that the general boundary layer equations, derived from the concept of Prandtl, are applicable in the case of separated as well as attached flow.

The three-dimensional boundary layer equations are often written in an orthogonal curvilinear coordinate system along and normal to external streamlines. Cooke and Hall discuss the use of this system in detail.

In the present case, it is however simpler to use orthogonal axes fixed in space as shown in the diagram (cf. Mager), such that \( s \) is measured along a generator, \( y \) is the circumferential transverse coordinate and \( z \) is measured normal to the surface. The corresponding velocity components in the boundary layer are \( u, v, w \) respectively.
being the transverse velocity component due to the rotation of angular velocity $\Omega$. $r_w(x)$ is the local radius of the body.

The system of boundary layer equations in this system of axes is, for Prandtl number $Pr = 1$:

1. Continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} (\rho r u) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\rho r w) = 0 \quad (1)$$

2. Axial momentum equation

$$\rho \left[ u \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + w \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} - \frac{v^2}{r_w} \frac{dr}{ds} \right] = - \frac{\partial p}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \mu \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \right) \quad (2)$$

3. Transverse momentum equation

$$\rho \left[ u \frac{\partial (r v)}{\partial s} + w \frac{\partial (r v)}{\partial z} \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \mu \frac{\partial (r v)}{\partial z} \right) \quad (3)$$

4. Energy equation

$$\rho \left[ u \frac{\partial H}{\partial s} + w \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \mu \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right) \quad (4)$$

The boundary conditions are

$$z = 0, \quad u = w = 0, \quad v = \Omega r_w \quad \text{and} \quad H = H_w \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$z \rightarrow \infty, \quad u \rightarrow u_e, \quad v \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad H \rightarrow H_e = C_T e + \frac{1}{2} u_e^2$$

According to the boundary layer approximation, $\frac{\partial p}{\partial s} = 0$ so that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial s} = \frac{dp}{ds}$, whilst by symmetry, derivatives with respect to $y$ are zero ($\frac{\partial}{\partial y} = 0$).

The assumption has been made that the boundary layer thickness, $\delta$, is small compared with the local body radius, $r_w$. Thus transverse curvature effects are neglected, and $r = r_w$ throughout the boundary layer.
The flow on such a body has been studied by Illingworth 17, Chu and Tifford 18 and Schlichting 19.

1.1.2 Relation between temperature and velocity

Chu and Tifford 18 have pointed out the similarity between the equations of $y$-momentum (3) and of energy (4). A particular solution of the energy equation has the form

$$H = C_T + \frac{1}{2} (u^2 + v^2) = K'_1 + K'_2 r_w \Omega v$$

(6)

where $K'_1$ and $K'_2$ are constants. From the outer boundary condition (5), it follows that

$$K'_1 = H_e$$

In the case of an adiabatic wall considered here

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial z} = 0$$

we may find $K'_2$ simply, since

$$C_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = 0 = (r \Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (K'_2 - 1))$$

(7)

where $C_p$ is taken to be a constant. Hence, unless $\frac{\partial v}{\partial z} = 0$, which is not of practical importance, we have

$$K'_2 = 1$$

Then we may put relation (6) in the form

$$\frac{T}{T_e} = 1 + \frac{1}{2C_p T_e} (u^2 - u_e^2 - v^2 + 2r_w \Omega v)$$

or using perfect gas relations

$$\frac{T}{T_e} = 1 + \frac{Y-1}{2} M e^2 \left(1 - \frac{u^2 + v^2}{u_e^2} + \frac{2r_w \Omega v}{u_e^2}\right)$$

(8)

$T$ is the static temperature, $M$ is the Mach number and the suffix $e$ refers to conditions in the external isentropic flow.
In the case of zero rotation \((\Omega = v = 0)\) this reduces to the well-known Busemann integral.

Relation (8) will be used, in conjunction with the perfect gas law, to relate density to velocity in the boundary layer, as will be seen in section 1.2.

1.2 Mathematical treatment of the equations

The similarity, pointed out in the preceding section, between the equations of y-momentum and energy suggests that, for the calculation of an interaction on an adiabatic spinning model, one may calculate the transverse momentum by a method similar to that used by Klineberg to solve the energy equation in the non-adiabatic two-dimensional case.

The problem will thus be treated by the simultaneous solution of four differential equations:

1. The axial momentum equation,
2. The transverse momentum equation,
3. The axial moment-of-momentum equation,
4. The equation coupling the boundary layer and external inviscid flows.

The axial moment-of-momentum equation is obtained by multiplying equation (2) by 2\(u\) to give:

\[
2\rho u^2 \frac{du}{ds} + 2\rho uw \frac{du}{dz} - 2\rho uv^2 \frac{1}{r_w} \frac{dr_w}{ds} = 2\rho u e \frac{du}{ds} + 2u \frac{3}{\delta} (\mu \frac{3u}{\delta})
\]

(9)

This equation is necessary only when the system of equations is cast into integral form, by integration across the boundary layer with respect to \(z\), as we shall do.

The coupling equation, first used by Crocco and Lees \(^{20}\), simply equates the inclination to the wall of the external inviscid flow, \(\theta\), to the slope of a streamline at the edge of the boundary layer, and is obtained by integration of the continuity equation from \(z = 0\) to \(\delta\) :
\[
\tan \theta = \frac{v_e}{u_e} = \frac{d\delta_s}{ds} - (\delta_s - \delta_s^w) \frac{d}{ds} (\ln \rho_e u e_r w) \tag{10}
\]

However, using the same reasoning as Ref. 11, we neglect the last term to give

\[
\frac{d\delta^w_s}{ds} = \tan \theta \tag{11}
\]

so that the slope of the external flow is put equal to the displacement surface slope. This is the coupling equation used by Horton 11 for the case of zero spin, and is applicable without modification to the case with spin since the external flow relations are not affected by spin, and the effective displacement thickness is the axial component \(\delta_s^w\).

The calculation of interactions on a spinning body thus requires the solution of four basic equations (2), (3), (9) and (11). The method of solution is similar to that originally conceived by Lees and Reeves 1 for the two-dimensional case. Diagram 1 shows schematically the steps of a calculation.

We shall describe the principal steps in the second section. The mathematical developments which follow are given in detail in ref. 21.

1.2.1 Integral form of the equations

Equations (2), (3) and (9) are integrated across the boundary layer from \(z = 0\) to \(\delta(x)\), the outer boundary layer edge, and the \(w\)-component of velocity is eliminated using eq. (1). The coupling equation, (11), is already in integral form. The resulting integral equations are

1. Axial momentum integral equation

\[
\frac{d}{ds} (\rho_e u^2 e) + \delta_s^w \rho_e \frac{du_e}{ds} + \rho_e u^2 (\theta + \theta_y) \frac{1}{r_w} \frac{dr_w}{ds} = \mu_w \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \tag{12}
\]
2. Transverse momentum integral equation

\[ \frac{d}{ds} (\rho \, u \, u^2 \, e) + 2 \rho \, u \, u^2 \, e \, \frac{l}{r} \, \frac{dr}{ds} = \mu_w \left( \frac{\partial v}{\partial z} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (13) 

3. Axial moment-of-momentum integral equation

\[ \frac{d}{ds} (\rho \, u \, u^2 \, e) + 2(\delta - \delta_u) \rho \, u \, u^2 \, e \, \frac{du}{ds} + \rho \, u \, u^3 (\theta^2 + 2 \theta) \, \frac{l}{r} \, \frac{dr}{ds} \]

\[ = 2 \int_0^\delta \mu \left( \frac{3u}{\partial z} \right)^2 \, dz \]  \hspace{1cm} (14) 

4. Coupling equation

\[ \frac{d \delta^w}{ds} = \frac{\theta}{u} = \tan \theta \]  \hspace{1cm} (15) 

The boundary layer integrals are defined as follows

\[ \delta_s = \int_0^\delta (1 - \frac{\rho u}{\rho_u e}) \, dz \]  - axial displacement thickness

\[ \delta_u = \int_0^\delta (1 - \frac{u}{u_e}) \, dz \]  - axial velocity thickness

\[ \theta_s = \int_0^\delta (1 - \frac{u}{u_e}) \, \frac{\rho u}{\rho_u e} \, dz \]  - axial momentum thickness

\[ \theta_y = \int_0^\delta \frac{\rho v^2}{\rho_u e} \, dz \]  - transverse momentum thickness

\[ \theta_{sy} = \int_0^\delta \frac{\rho uv}{\rho_u e} \, dz \]  - cross momentum thickness
\[ \sigma_s^m = \int_0^\delta (1 - \frac{u^2}{u_e^2}) \frac{p u}{\rho u_e} \, dz \quad \text{axial kinetic energy thickness} \]

\[ \sigma_{s y}^m = \int_0^\delta \frac{p u v^2}{\rho u_e^3} \, dz \quad \text{cross kinetic energy thickness} \]

1.2.2 Transformed equations - final system

In the original theory of Lees and Reeves \(^1\) the integral equations are written in the 'incompressible plane' (S,Z) with the aid of the Stewartson \(^2\) transformation. That is, the transformed equations had exactly the same form as those corresponding to an incompressible flow. It is, however, more convenient to leave the s-ordinate untransformed. The Stewartson scalings applied to the velocity \(u\) and the normal ordinate \(z\) are then

\[ \frac{dZ}{dz} = \frac{a_\infty e}{a_\infty^3} \, dz \quad \text{and} \quad U = \frac{a_\infty^3}{a_e} \, u \quad (17) \]

In the external flow we then have \(U_e = \frac{a_\infty u_e}{a_e}\), so that the axial velocity ratio remains invariant:

\[ \frac{U}{U_e} = \frac{u}{u_e} \quad (18) \]

Likewise, the transverse velocity ratio \(\frac{v}{v_0}\) is invariant under the transformation, where \(v_0 = \Omega r_w\).

In addition to relations (17) and (18) we use the Chapman viscosity law

\[ \frac{\mu}{\mu_\infty} = C \frac{T}{T_\infty} \quad (19) \]

and the perfect gas law

\[ p = \rho RT \quad (R = C_p - C_v) \]
Since under the boundary layer approximation \( \frac{3p}{\rho z} = 0 \), this relation gives

\[ \frac{\rho_T}{\rho e} = 1 \quad (20) \]

We may combine equations (20) and (8) to give the relation between density and velocity. In transformed variables this is

\[ \frac{\rho e}{\rho} = 1 + m \left( 1 - \frac{U^2}{U_e^2} \right) + K_1 m_{\infty} \left( \frac{1+m}{1+m_{\infty}} \right) (2 \frac{v}{v_0} - \frac{v_e^2}{v_0^2}) \]

where \( m = \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_e^2 \)

\[ m_{\infty} = \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_{\infty}^2 \quad (21a) \]

and \( K_1 = \frac{V_0}{U_{\infty}} \) is the spin parameter, where \( V_0 = \omega r_w \quad (21b) \)

Using the above relations, equations (12) to (15) become:

1. Transformed axial momentum integral equation

\[ \kappa \frac{d\delta^{*x}}{d\kappa} + \delta^{*x} \frac{d\kappa}{d\kappa} + \{(2\kappa + 1) + K_2 (2 - \kappa y)\} \left( \frac{\delta^{*x}}{Me} \right) \frac{dMe}{ds} \]

\[ = \frac{BC}{R} \frac{M_{\infty}}{Me} P - \{ \kappa + K_3 \delta_x \} \left( \frac{\delta^{*x}}{r_w} \right) \frac{dr_w}{ds} \quad (22) \]

2. Transformed transverse momentum integral equation

\[ \kappa \frac{d\delta^{*y_i}}{d\kappa} + \delta^{*y_i} \frac{d\kappa}{d\kappa} + \kappa \left( \frac{d\delta^{*y}}{ds} \right) \frac{\delta^{*y}}{Me} \frac{dMe}{ds} \]

\[ = \frac{BC}{R} \frac{M_{\infty}}{Me} \frac{P}{\kappa} - 3\kappa \left( \frac{\delta^{*y}}{r_w} \right) \frac{dr_w}{ds} \quad (23) \]
3. Transformed axial moment-of-momentum integral equation

\[ J \frac{d\delta^{i}}{ds} + \delta^{i} \frac{dJ}{ds} + (3J + 2K_{2}(2\omega_{xy} - J)\kappa) \frac{\delta^{i}}{ds} \frac{d\omega}{ds} \]

\[ = \frac{\beta C}{R} \frac{M}{Me} R - \{J + 2K_{3}J\kappa\} \frac{\delta^{i}}{r_{w}} \frac{dr_{w}}{ds} \]

(24)

4. Transformed coupling equation

\[ F \frac{d\delta^{i}}{ds} + Fy \frac{d\delta^{i}}{ds} + \delta^{i} \frac{d\kappa}{ds} + (f + f'\kappa) \frac{\delta^{i}}{ds} \frac{d\omega}{ds} - K_{3}\delta^{i} \frac{d\kappa}{ds} \]

\[ = \frac{\beta C}{R} \frac{M}{Me} h - 2Fy \frac{\delta^{i}}{r_{w}} \frac{dr_{w}}{ds} \]

(25)

with \( \beta = \frac{a_{e}p_{e}}{a_{e}p_{e}} \), \( \frac{\delta^{i}}{r_{w}} \frac{dr_{w}}{ds} \)

\( K_{2} \) and \( K_{3} \) are, like \( K_{1} \), spin parameters being defined by

\[ K_{2} = \frac{m_{e}K_{1}}{1+m_{e}} \]

\[ K_{3} = \frac{l+m_{e}}{m_{e}} K_{2} \]

(26)

The transformed integral thicknesses are defined by

\[ \delta^{i}_{si} = \int_{0}^{\delta i} (1 - \frac{U}{U_{e}}) dZ, \quad \theta^{i}_{si} = \int_{0}^{\delta i} \frac{(1 - \frac{U}{U_{e}})}{U_{e}} dZ \]

\[ \delta^{i}_{yi} = \int_{0}^{\delta i} \frac{v}{v_{0}} dZ, \quad \theta^{i}_{yi} = \int_{0}^{\delta i} \frac{v^{2}}{v_{0}} dZ \]

(27a)
whilst the ratios between these quantities are defined by

\[ m_i \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \delta_i^*} = \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial \delta_i^*} \]
\[ m_e \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \delta_e^*} = \frac{\partial y_e}{\partial \delta_e^*} \]
\[ m_i \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \delta_i^*} = \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial \delta_i^*} \]
\[ m_e \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \delta_e^*} = \frac{\partial y_e}{\partial \delta_e^*} \]

(27b)

Also

\[ P = \left[ \frac{\partial (U/U_e)}{\partial (Z/\delta_i^*)} \right]_w \]
\[ P_y = -\left[ \frac{\partial (v/v_0)}{\partial (Z/\delta_i^* y_i)} \right]_w \]

(27c)

\[ R = \frac{2}{\delta_i^*} \int_0^{\delta_i^*} \left[ \frac{\partial (U/U_e)}{\partial (Z/\delta_i^*)} \right]^2 dZ \]

\[ f = \xi \left( \frac{m_e}{1+m_e} \right) \gamma - 1 + 2 + \frac{3\gamma - 1}{\gamma - 1}, \quad f_y = K_2 \left( \frac{3\gamma - 1}{\gamma - 1} \right) (2 - \xi_y) \]

\[ F = \xi + \frac{1+m_e}{m_e}, \quad F_y = K_3 (2 - \xi_y) \]

(27d)

\[ h = \frac{m_i}{C} \frac{Me}{m_e} \frac{1}{1+m_m} \left( \frac{1+m_e}{1+m_m} \right) \tan \theta \]

The set of four first-order ordinary differential equations (22) to (25) may be solved if uni-parametric families of profiles of \( U/U_e \) and \( v/v_0 \) are assumed, when the four unknowns become \( \delta_i^*, \delta_e^*, a, b \), where \( a \) and \( b \) are the profile parameters.

We assume, following Lees and Reeves 1, that 'similar solutions' of the Falkner-Skan 23 type (see section 1.3) of the basic equations (1) to (4), including lower branch reversed flow solutions of the type found by Stewartson 24, give an
adequate representation of the relationship between integral quantities. Again following Lees and Reeves, the profiles are 'unhooked' from the Falkner-Skan pressure gradient parameter $\beta$, whilst, in a manner analogue with Klineberg's treatment of the nonadiabatic two-dimensional case, the axial and transverse $(a$ and $b$) profiles are decoupled from each other.

The axial velocity profile parameter, $a$, is defined by

$$a = \left[ \frac{\beta(U/U_e)}{\beta(Z/\delta_i)} \right] v$$

for attached flow

$$a = \left[ \frac{Y}{\delta_i} \right] \frac{U}{U_e} = 0$$

for separated flow

The transverse velocity profile parameter, $b$, is defined in a similar way to Klineberg's enthalpy profile parameter, and is, for both separated and attached flow

$$b = -n \cdot 99 \left[ \frac{\beta(v/v_0)}{\beta(Z/\delta_i)} \right] v$$

where $n \cdot 99$ is the value of the Falkner-Skan ordinate at the boundary layer edge.

The quantities defined in equations (27b) and (27c) may be expressed as polynomials in the variables $a$ and $b$, so that $\phi = \phi(a)$, $\phi_y = \phi_y(b)$, $\phi_y = \phi_y(a, b)$, $P = P(a)$,

$$P_y = P_y(b),$$

etc. Also $\frac{d\phi}{ds} = (\frac{d\phi}{da})(\frac{da}{ds})$, $\frac{d\phi_y}{db} = (\frac{d\phi_y}{db})(\frac{db}{ds})$, etc.

For numerical integration by, for example, the Runge-Kutta method, the system of equations (22) to (25) in the variables $\xi^*$, $M_e$, $a$ and $b$ may be put in the form
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta^e_{\text{Si}}}{\delta s} &= \frac{N_1}{D} \\
\frac{\delta^e_{\text{Si}}}{\delta s} &= \frac{N_2}{D} \\
\frac{\delta^e_{\text{Si}}}{\delta s} &= \frac{N_3}{D} \\
\frac{\delta^e_{\text{Si}}}{\delta s} &= \frac{N_4}{D}
\end{align*}
\]

(30)

with

\[N_1 = D1C7 + D3C9 + B2C5\]

\[N_2 = D1C10 + B2C3 - D5C9\]

\[N_3 = B1C1 - D2C10 - B3C3 - D4C7 + B4C5 + D6C9\]

\[N_4 = - B2C1 - D3C10 + D5C7\]

\[D = D1C1 + D3C3 + D5C5\]

with

\[B_1 = a_{44}b_3 - a_{34}b_4\]

\[B_2 = a_{43}b_3 - a_{33}b_4\]

\[B_3 = a_{42}b_3 - a_{32}b_4\]

\[B_4 = a_{31}b_4 - a_{41}b_3\]

\[C_1 = a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}\]

\[C_3 = a_{11}a_{24} - a_{14}a_{21}\]

\[C_5 = a_{14}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{24}\]

\[C_7 = a_{22}b_1 - a_{12}b_2\]

\[C_9 = a_{24}b_1 - a_{14}b_2\]

\[C_{10} = a_{11}b_2 - a_{21}b_1\]

and

\[a_{11} = \mathcal{K}\]

\[a_{12} = \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{da}\]

\[a_{13} = 0\]

\[a_{14} = (2\mathcal{K}+1)+K_2(2-x/\mu_y)\mathcal{K}\]

\[a_{21} = J\]

\[a_{22} = \frac{dJ}{d\mathcal{K}} \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{da}\]

\[a_{23} = 0\]

\[a_{24} = 3J+2K_2(2T_1-T_2)a(a)\]

\[a_{31} = a(a)T_1\]

\[a_{32} = T_1 \frac{da}{da} + a(a) \frac{3T_1}{\frac{da}{da}}\]
\[ D_1 = a_{33}a_{44} - a_{34}a_{43} \]
\[ D_2 = a_{32}a_{44} - a_{34}a_{42} \]
\[ D_3 = a_{32}a_{43} - a_{33}a_{42} \]
\[ D_4 = a_{31}a_{44} - a_{34}a_{41} \]
\[ D_5 = a_{31}a_{43} - a_{33}a_{41} \]
\[ D_6 = a_{31}a_{42} - a_{32}a_{41} \]

\[ a_{33} = \frac{\partial T_1}{\partial b} \]
\[ a_{34} = a(a) T_1 \quad (= a_{31}) \]
\[ a_{41} = F + F_y K \]
\[ a_{42} = F_y \sigma(b) \frac{\partial a}{\partial a} + \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial a} \]
\[ a_{43} = F_y a(a) \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial b} - K_3 \frac{\partial Y}{\partial b} \]
\[ a_{44} = f + f_y K \]

and

\[ b_1 = K_P - Q b_{11} \]
\[ b_2 = K_R - Q b_{22} \]
\[ b_3 = K_P y - Q b_{33} \]
\[ b_4 = K_h - Q b_{44} \]

\[ b_{11} = \theta + K_3 \frac{\partial Y}{\partial y} K \]
\[ b_{22} = J + 2K_3 T_2 a(a) \]
\[ b_{33} = 3T_1 a(a) \]
\[ b_{44} = 2F_y K \]

(31)

\[ K = \frac{\beta C}{R} \frac{M_u}{M_e} \]
\[ Q = \frac{\delta^s_i}{r_w} \frac{dr_w}{ds} \]

\[ a(a), \sigma(b), T_1(a, b) \text{ and } T_2(a, b) \] will be defined in the following chapter.

1.3 Similar solutions for a spinning cylinder - Polynomials

1.3.1 The similar solutions

We use, to relate the coefficients in equations (22) to (25), the 'similar solutions' (i.e., solutions depending on a single variable \( n \)) for axial flow on a hollow spinning circular cylinder. This procedure again follows the approaches of Lees and Reeves \(^1\) and of Klineberg \(^3\) for related problems.
The boundary layer equations for flow over a spinning circular cylinder are given by equations (1) to (4) with $r \cdot w$ constant. With this condition they are then identical to those obtained by Crabtree 25 for a swept infinite wing. Only the boundary conditions are different.

The equations for self-similar boundary layer flow on the spinning cylinder of Falkner-Skan type, are 21:

$$f''' + ff'' + \beta (1 - f'^2 + \omega (2g - g^2)) = 0$$
$$g'' + fg' = 0$$

(32)

for an external velocity distribution in the Stewartson plane of the form $U_e = C_1 S^m$, where $S$ is the transformed axial ordinate. $\beta$ is related to the exponent $m$ by $\beta = 2m/m+1$. Primes indicate ordinary differentiation with respect to the similarity variable $\eta$ defined by

$$\eta = \left( \frac{U_e}{v_\\infty S} \frac{m+1}{2} \right)^{1/2} z$$

(32a)

whilst $f(\eta)$ is directly related to a stream function $\psi$ given by

$$\psi(S,z) = (v_\\infty U_e S \frac{2}{1+m})^{1/2} f(\eta)$$

such that $f' = \frac{U}{U_e}$. The function $g(\eta)$ is defined as $g = \frac{v}{v_0}$, and the boundary conditions are

$$n = 0; \quad f = f' = 0, \quad g = 1$$
$$n = \infty; \quad f' = 1, \quad g \to 0$$

(33)

The quantity $\omega$ appearing in the first of equations (32) is defined by

$$\omega = \left( \frac{Y-1}{2} \right) M_0^2,$$

(34)

where $M_0 = \frac{v_0}{a_t}$, and $a_t = (\gamma R T_t)^{1/2}$, $T_t$ being the total temperature of the isentropic external flow.
In the case of incompressible flow, $\omega \to 0$ and the axial profile $f'$, determined from the first of equations (32), becomes independent of the transverse profile $g$. Coupling between the axial and transverse flows thus only occurs when compressibility effects are important.

The system (32), with the boundary conditions (33), has been solved numerically for a range of values of $\beta$ and $\omega$. The computer programme used was derived from that given by Klineberg for the calculation of similar solutions for two-dimensional flow with heat transfer. The IBM 1130 computer at VKI was used.

The boundary conditions are given at two 'points' - three conditions are known at the wall $\eta = 0$, and two at the exterior of the boundary layer $\eta = \infty$. To solve the 5th order system, numerical integration starting at $\eta = 0$ is made using estimates for $(f'')_\eta = f''_w$ and $(g')_\eta = g'_w$, and these values are iterated to satisfy the known outer boundary conditions $f'(\infty) = 1$, $g(\infty) = 0$.

Figure 2 shows $f''_w$ and $g'_w$ as functions of $\beta$ for various values of $\omega$. Figure 3 shows velocity profiles for various values of $\beta$ and $\omega$. The effect of rotation ($\omega$) on the $f'$ and $g$ profiles for a value $\beta = 2.0$ is similar in nature to the effect of sweep for $\beta = 1.0$ shown by Reshotko and Beckwith. That is, for large rates of spin ($\omega = 0.23$ and $0.64$) we observe an overshoot in the axial velocity profile ($f' > 1$) in the outer part of the boundary layer. Cohen and Reshotko observed the same effect in the case of a heated surface. They give the physical explanation that when the wall is strongly heated, the density in the boundary layer is reduced and the fluid is accelerated more rapidly than in the exterior. Reshotko and Beckwith give the same explanation for the overshoot which they observe, remarking that the additional heating is produced by the trans-

*For the experimental conditions considered here ($r_w = 10$ cm, $T_t = 300^\circ$K), these values of $\omega$ correspond to 40 and $60 \times 10^3$ RPM. Values of RPM quoted henceforth refer to these conditions.
verse wall stress. If this explanation is accepted, it is applicable also in the present case.

1.3.2 Calculation of polynomial functions

The polynomials in \( a, b, \) and \( (a,b) \) representing the integral quantities defined by relations (27b) and (27c) are calculated by a curve-fit procedure resembling that used by Klineberg \(^3\), starting with a sufficient number of similar solution values, both for attached and separated flows. To each value of \( \beta \) there correspond two similar solution profiles, \( f' \) and \( g \), and two parameters \( a \) and \( b \) characterising these profiles (section 1.2.2). Knowing these profiles, we may calculate \( \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_y, \) etc. for each value of \( a \) and \( b \).

We note that the variables \( n \) and \( Z \) are related by a factor of proportionality such that

\[
dn = dZ \frac{n}{Z} \quad \text{(cf eq. (32a))}
\]

whence

\[
\delta s_i = \int_0^{n_{.99}} (1- \frac{U}{U_e}) dZ = \frac{Z}{n} \int_0^{n_{.99}} (1-f') dn
\]
\[
\theta s_i = \int_0^{n_{.99}} (1- \frac{U}{U_e}) \frac{U}{U_e} dZ = \frac{Z}{n} \int_0^{n_{.99}} (1-f') f' dn
\]

We therefore have that

\[
\mathcal{H} = \frac{\int_0^{n_{.99}} (1-f') f' dn}{\int_0^{n_{.99}} (1-f') dn} = a \int_0^{n_{.99}} (1-f') f' dn
\]

where \( a = \frac{1}{\int_0^{n_{.99}} (1-f') dn} \) \quad (34)

Also put \( \sigma = \int_0^{n_{.99}} g dn \)
Similarly the quantities $\psi_{sy}(a,b)$ and $J_{sy}(a,b)$ may be expressed as

$$\psi_{sy} = \frac{T_1}{\sigma}, \quad J_{sy} = \frac{T_2}{\sigma},$$

where

$$T_1 = \int_{n=0}^{n=99} fg \, dn, \quad T_2 = \int_{n=0}^{n=99} fg^2 \, dn \quad (34a)$$

The functions $\psi(a)$, $\psi_y(b)$ and $T_1(a,b)$ are shown in figures 4a, b and c. The continuous line indicates the polynomials (attached and separated) resulting from the curve-fits for $\omega = 0.0045$, whilst the open circles indicate the discrete points obtained from the similar solutions. For this small rotational speed, the polynomial of $\psi(a)$ is almost identical with that of Klineberg for zero heat transfer. The curves of $T_1(a,b)$ are analogous to those of Klineberg ($T(a,b)$) with wall cooling (Klineberg's $T$ is not defined for zero heat transfer). This resemblance is explained by the fact that the $f'$ profiles are almost identical in the two cases, and the transverse velocity profiles and enthalpy profiles resemble each other if the boundary conditions are suitably transformed.

The full circles on figures 4a, b, and c represent discrete similar solution values for a large transverse flow velocity ($\omega = 0.64$, $n = 60,000$ RPM). We note that the points lie very close to the polynomials established for small transverse velocity. Thus, although the effect of large rotation is to modify, for example, both $\psi$ and $a$ to a marked extent, for a given value of $\beta$, nevertheless the functional relation between $\psi$ and $\beta$ remains almost unchanged. This property of the equations has been explained analytically in ref. 28, where it is shown that a change in $\omega$ has precisely the same effect as a related change in $\beta$, when $\beta$ is small. Specifically, profiles with spin $\omega$ and pressure gradient $\beta_1$ are identical with zero spin profiles with pressure gradient $\beta$, with $\beta_1 = \beta/(1+\omega)$. Numerically, it is found that for larger values of $\beta$
this relation is modified by a multiplicative factor depending upon \( \beta \). Only for highly accelerated flows does the equivalence break down.

This result enables a considerable simplification in the interaction calculations to be made, in that the polynomials need only be calculated for one value of \( \omega \) (e.g., \( \omega = 0 \)), and can then be used in interaction calculations for arbitrary \( \omega \). This eliminates the inconvenience of the method of Klineberg for the case of heat transfer, in which it was necessary to recalculate the polynomials for each value of wall enthalpy ratio required.
2. SOLUTION OF THE INTERACTION EQUATIONS

2.1 Calculation of the external inviscid flow

The coupling equation, (25), contains the angle $\theta$ (by virtue of the definition of $h$), which is defined as the inclination of external flow streamlines to the surface. This angle must be related to the Mach number in the external flow by some suitable method.

In the two dimensional case the Prandtl-Meyer relation is used. In the present axisymmetric case this relation is not valid. Horton 11 derived, for the case of interactions on an axisymmetric body without spin, an inverted form of the second order shock-expansion method of Syvertson and Dennis 14.

The calculation of the external inviscid flow over a spinning axisymmetric body is directly derived from that without spin. In fact, the external flow relationships are not affected by body spin, and the effective displacement thickness is $\delta_s$ (the axial component), as mentioned in section 1.2.

A detailed description of this method is given in ref. 11. The validity of the method is shown in fig. 5, where a comparison is made with measurements obtained using a 10° flare, of radius $r_c = 100$ mm. The good agreement indicates the precision of this simple approximate method.

2.2 Initial conditions for the numerical integration

In order to solve the system of equations (30) governing an interaction, it is necessary to know initial values of the independent variables ($\delta_{s10}^Y$, $M_{01}$, $a_0$, $b_0$) to start downstream step-by-step integration.

In the two dimensional case, Klineberg 3 has given analytic expressions for $\delta_{s10}^Y$, $M_{01}$, $a_0$, derived by series expansion of the interaction equations, for both strong and
weak self-induced interaction on a flat plate. These expressions are used at some point \( s = s_0 \), the start of the main interaction, as initial conditions to calculate interactions induced by ramps or impinging shocks.

Horton 11, in the case of an axisymmetric body without spin, used the two dimensional weak-interaction expressions of Klineberg. It was shown that this neglect of axisymmetric effects upstream of the main interaction is unimportant when the body radius is sufficiently large.

In the present case, the additional initial value \( b_0 \) is required, which does not exist in the two dimensional and zero-spin axisymmetric cases. Furthermore, the transverse flow modifies the axial flow parameters. However, we may assume that for small rates of spin the effect of the transverse flow upon the axial flow is weak. Thus in the case of similar solutions for flow over a spinning cylinder (section 1.2.3) the coupling between the two flows occurs, in equations (32), through a term proportional to \( \omega \). For small spin (\( \Omega = 5000 \text{ RPM} \)) this parameter is small (\( \omega = 0.0045 \)). Its effect is therefore weak, and its influence upon the weak interaction should be of analogous importance. Hence, for initial conditions with small spin, it should be possible to use those for the non-spin case (i.e., Klineberg's two dimensional values) for \( \delta_{si}^w \), \( M_e \), and \( a \). The transverse profile parameter \( b \) may be taken, as a first approximation, to have its zero pressure gradient (Blasius') value \( (b_0 = b_B) \), since the weak interaction expansion is an expansion about this condition. This value is given by the similar solutions with \( \beta = 0 \). The use of these initial values gave good results for small spin rates, as we shall see in section 3.

This procedure is not sufficiently accurate when the spin rate becomes large (\( \omega > 0.1 \)). Then it is necessary to derive the full weak interaction expansions, starting with the general equations (22) to (25). This calculation has been carried out by Horton 29. Equations (22) to (25) were first
written in terms of a new independent variable $\bar{X}$, the well-known hypersonic interaction parameter, and a non-dimensional axial displacement thickness $\Delta = R \bar{X}/M_\infty^3$ and Mach number $\dot{M} (=Me/M_\infty)$ were introduced. This led to the system (8) to (11) of ref. 29. Following a similar procedure to that of Kubota and Ko 30, Horton then assumed expansions about the Blasius point of the form

$$M_{WI} = 1 + m_1 \bar{X} + m_2 \bar{X}^2 + \ldots,$$

$$\Delta_{WI} = \delta_0 (1 + m_1 \bar{X} + \ldots),$$

$$a_{WI} = a_0 + a_1 \bar{X} + \ldots,$$

$$b_{WI} = b_0 + b_1 \bar{X} + \ldots,$$

where $\delta_0$, $a_0$, $b_0$ are the values for $\bar{X} = 0$ (zero pressure gradient 'Blasius' values), and WI indicates 'weak interaction'.

After substitution of these expansions into the weak interaction integral equations, and identification of powers of $\bar{X}$, Horton obtains the coefficients

$$\delta_0 = 1.733, \quad a_0 = 1.633, \quad b_0 = 0.470;$$

$$m_1 = -\frac{(\gamma-1)(1+m_\infty)}{4M_\infty(M_\infty^2-1)} \left( (1+K_1^2)m_{11} + (1+K_1^2 + \frac{1}{m_\infty})m_{12} \right),$$

where $m_{11} \equiv \frac{d^2}{\delta_B} = 0.662,$

$$m_{12} \equiv \delta_0 = 1.733,$$

$$a_1 = (1+K_2)a_{11}m_1,$$

where $a_{11} = (1-\frac{1}{\delta_B^2})/\left( \frac{dP}{P \, da} - \frac{1}{R \, da} \right)_B = -3.630$
\[ \delta_1 = (d_{11}(1+K_2) - K_4)m_1, \]

where \( d_{11} = 2 + \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{dR}{da} \right) \) \( a_{11} = 2.111, \)

\[ b_1 = \frac{\delta_1 + \left( \frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{da} \right) a_1 + m_1K_4}{\left( \frac{1}{y} \frac{dP}{db} \right) - \left( \frac{1}{y} \frac{d\sigma}{db} \right) 2.294} \]

\[ m_2 = m_1^2 \left[ \frac{m_\infty}{1+m_\infty} - \frac{1}{2(M_\infty^2-1)} \right] \]

recalling that \( m_\infty, K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) are defined respectively by (21a), (21b) and (26), and where \( K_4 = \frac{3\gamma-1}{\gamma-1} \frac{m_\infty}{1+m_\infty} \).

The numerical values quoted were derived from the polynomials for small spin but, using the arguments of section 1.3.2, are equally valid for arbitrary values of spin.

The substitution of these coefficients into the system (35) enables one to calculate the initial conditions, for \( \chi \) corresponding to \( s_0 \), the start of the interaction, necessary for the integration of system (30). It was thus possible to calculate the interaction on a cylinder-flare model spinning at \( \Omega = 60,000 \) RPM, corresponding to \( \omega = 0.64 \).

2.3 Iteration and interpolation procedures

2.3.1 Iteration procedure

The system of equations (30), integrated numerically with the initial conditions discussed in section 2.2, exhibits a strong instability, as in the two dimensional and zero-spin axisymmetric cases. As the sketch (next page) shows, a solution of either type I (expansion) or type II (compression) results, the latter being the type of present interest. In order to obtain solutions of the desired type, it is necessary to slightly perturb the initial weak-interaction values.
\( M_0, \delta_{si0}, a_0 \) and \( b_0 \), as described by Ko and Kubota\(^3\)\(^4\) and Klineberg\(^3\). Horton\(^2\)\(^9\) has derived the form of the perturbation using an analysis similar to that of Ko and Kubota. The expressions for the perturbed variables are:

\[
M_0 = M_0 (1 + P_1 \epsilon)
\]

where

\[
P_1 = \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \chi} \right)_0 - J_0,
\]

\[
\delta_{si} = \delta_{si0} \left[ 1 + \left( P_2 + K_1^2 (P_2 + P_1) \right) \epsilon \right],
\]

\[
a = a_0 \left( 1 + P_3 (1 + K_1^2) \epsilon \right),
\]

\[
b = b_0 \left( 1 + P_4 (1 + K_1^2) \epsilon \right),
\]

\[
P_2 = 3J_0 - (2\mathcal{H}_0 + 1) \left( \frac{\partial J}{\partial \mathcal{H}} \right)_0,
\]

\[
P_3 = J_0 (1 - \mathcal{H}_0) \left/ \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial a} \right)_0 \right. ,
\]

\[
P_4 = \frac{- (\mathcal{H}_0 (P_1 + P_3) + P_2 \delta (\mathcal{H}_0 \mathcal{S}_Y \mathcal{K})_0)}{\delta a}
\]

\[
= \frac{\delta (\mathcal{H}_0 \mathcal{S}_Y \mathcal{K})_0}{\delta b}
\]

Here, the suffix '0' indicates the weak interaction solution values calculated for the value of \( \chi \) corresponding to the value of \( s_0 \) chosen.
It is necessary to iterate for $s_0$ and $\varepsilon$ to obtain the solution satisfying the boundary conditions far downstream, as indicated in section 2.3.2. The iteration procedure is identical to that described by Riethmuller and Ginoux for the two dimensional case. An initial value of $\varepsilon = -10^{-3}$ is generally suitable, and the position of the start of interaction $s_0$ is iterated to the third decimal place. Then $s_0$ is held constant and further iteration carried out by changing $\varepsilon$. The exact procedure is not critical, because the same solution may be obtained by different combinations of $\varepsilon$ and $s_0$. Thus, referring to the diagram above, starting at $s = s_0^1$ we may obtain solution '1' or '2' depending upon the value of $\varepsilon$; the same solution $\varepsilon_2$ may be obtained starting at $s = s_0^2$ using a value $\varepsilon_2' \neq \varepsilon_2$.

The calculations presented here were carried out using perturbations applied to $M_0$, $\delta_s$, and $a$ according to the two dimensional scheme of Ko and Kubota, whilst keeping $b_0$ unperturbed. The rigorous perturbation equations for flow with spin, equations (36), which were later derived, reduce to these relations for $K_2 = 0$, $P_4 = 0$. This simplified procedure enabled smooth starting of the integration to be made, but necessitated a doubling of the perturbation $\varepsilon$ for large spin rates. The errors introduced into the final results are completely negligible. However, in future calculations the full scheme (36) should be used.

2.3.2 Downstream conditions and interpolation

According to the correctness of the combination of $s_0$ and $\varepsilon$ for a particular solution in the iterative procedure, the solution may or may not pass through a reattachment; in either case a solution is obtained of either type I (expansion) or type II (new compression). Values of $s_0$ and $\varepsilon$ which are too large lead to type I solutions, and values which are too small to type II. A series of tests on $a$, $\Theta$, $\delta_s$, and $M_s$ allow the determination of the type of solution being generated, so that $s_0$ or $\varepsilon$ may be suitably modified for the next iteration.
These tests are described in detail for the two dimensional case by Riethmuller 13, whilst Horton 11 has established the tests necessary for the zero-spin axisymmetric case. The latter may be used in the present case without modification.

When the iteration procedure has resulted in two solutions of opposite type which follow each other closely until some distance downstream of reattachment, an interpolation procedure between solutions similar to that described by Riethmuller 13 for the two dimensional case is used to continue the numerical solution as far downstream as desired, still using the same tests to reject solutions as soon as divergence becomes evident.
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The computer programme for the solution of the system of equations (30) was derived directly from the zero-spin programme of Horton \(^{11}\), which was itself developed from the programme for two dimensional adiabatic interactions written by Riethmuller \(^{13}\). The details of this basic programme are given in ref. 13. We simply remark that it is written in Fortran IV, for use on the IBM 1130 computer of the von Karman Institute.

In the following section we shall discuss the numerical results showing the influence of a transverse flow upon an interaction and we shall compare these predictions with measurements.

3.1 Effect of a weak transverse flow upon the interaction (\(\Omega = 5000\) RPM)

Figure 6 shows the predicted effect of a weak transverse flow upon the static pressure distribution in regions of interaction. The pressure is plotted as a function of \(x\), the axial ordinate, in the non-dimensional form \((p - p_{e0})/p_\infty\), where \(p_{e0}\) is the static pressure at the start of interaction \((x_0)\), and \(p_\infty\) is the static pressure of the undisturbed supersonic stream. This form has been adopted in order to eliminate, as far as possible, errors due to the choice of reference pressure \(^{10}\).

The interaction for the conditions shown in fig. 6a has been verified to be laminar \(^{10}\). The flare causing separation has an angle of 7.5° and is placed at an axial distance of 60 mm from the leading edge. The stagnation pressure is 100 mm Hg and the circumferential velocity of the surface is about 10% of the free stream velocity. For the latter condition the cylinder constituting the upstream part of the model, of radius 100 mm, must turn at 5000 RPM.
The transverse flow has a weak effect upon the pressure distribution in the interaction. It tends to reduce the general level of surface pressure. The effect is most pronounced in the separated flow region. The relative pressure increment, \( \Delta(p/p_\infty)/(p/p_\infty) \), due to spin at the cylinder flare junction is about 1%.

The positions of the separation and reattachment points are almost unaltered by the spin, and the influence of spin upon the position of the start of interaction cannot be discerned.

Figures 6b and 6c show results of calculations for two other configurations, the flare being positioned at 40 and 80 mm from the leading edge, and the stagnation pressure remaining unchanged. The effect of spin is similar, in trend and amplitude, to that in the first case.

### 3.2 Comparison between theory and experiment

\( \Omega = 5000 \text{ RPM} \)

Figures 7a and 7b show comparisons between the results of calculations by the present method and experimental results previously published by Leblanc and Ginoux. The 7.5° angle flare was situated respectively at 60 and 80 mm from the leading edge (7a and 7b), whilst the stagnation pressure was equal to 100 mm Hg. The symbols represent the values obtained experimentally, those for \( \Omega = 5000 \text{ RPM} \) indicating measurements corrected for the centrifugal forces acting upon the air in the pressure leads. The continuous and dashed lines represent the pressure distribution calculated theoretically.

The theoretical prediction of the effect of the transverse flow upon the pressure distributions shows a variation in the same direction and of similar amplitude to that observed experimentally. The pressure is reduced, as a result of spin, particularly in the vicinity of separation and reattachment.
The validity of the theory is thus established for the case of small transverse velocities and, since no restrictive assumptions concerning the magnitude of the transverse velocity have been made in the theory, we may use it to predict the effect of transverse velocities larger than those obtained experimentally. Some results are given in the following section.

In order to complete the experimental work reported in ref. 10, we have carried out some tests for the transitional regime. The principal results are given in the Appendix.

3.3 Effect of large transverse flow velocity

Having shown that the polynomial functions used in the theory are universally applicable, whatever the value of the spin parameter $\omega$ provided that it is not greater than about unity (the upper limit has not been determined), we can calculate interactions for different magnitudes of transverse velocity simply by solving the system of equations (30) with various values of the parameter $K_1$.

Figure 8 shows the effect, predicted by the theory, of large transverse velocities upon the pressure distribution in an interaction. The variation of $(p - p_{e_0})/p_\infty$ is shown as a function of x for $p_t = 100$ mm Hg. The transverse flow is produced by spin rates of 5, 30 and $60 \times 10^3$ RPM.

The effect of spin rates of 30 and $60 \times 10^3$ RPM is in the same direction as for $5 \times 10^3$ RPM, but increased in magnitude. For $\Omega = 30 \times 10^3$ RPM, the magnitude is about 4% at the cylinder flare junction and also of the same order in the region of the pressure peak. For $\Omega = 60 \times 10^3$ RPM, the effect becomes very marked - of the order of 5% at separation and 10% at reattachment. The redistribution of pressure due to spin, and therefore the change in loading on the flare, is considerable.
Figure 9 shows the trajectories of the variables \(a(x), b(x), \delta_{si}^H(x)\) of equations (30) for \(\Omega = 0.5\) and \(60 \times 10^3\) RPM, \(\delta = 7.5^\circ\), \(L = 60\) mm and \(p_t = 100\) mm Hg. (The fourth variable \(M_e(x)\), is represented by \(p(x)\) in fig. 6a for the same conditions). The general form of the curves is similar (except for \(b(x)\)) with that obtained and discussed in detail by Lees ad Reeves \(^1\) for the two dimensional case. The transverse velocity profile parameter \(b\) has a variation similar to that of the enthalpy profile parameter \(b\) used by Klineberg \(^3\).

We note the discontinuities in slope of the curves at the cylinder-flare junction, where \(\Theta\) is discontinuous. Also, \(\frac{da}{ds}\) is discontinuous at separation and reattachment because of the difference in definition of this parameter in attached and separated regions.

From the curve of \(a(x)\), it will be seen that separation is retarded and reattachment advanced by the large spin. Also, for \(\Omega = 60 \times 10^3\) RPM, the slope of \(\delta_{si}^H\) is considerably reduced by the spin, which explains the marked reduction in pressure observed in fig. 8.
CONCLUSIONS

The partial differential equations governing boundary layer flow upon a rotating body of revolution in axial flow have been examined. The similarity between the transverse (y) momentum equations and the energy equation leads to a relation, analogous to that of Busemann, between the static temperature and the velocity components u and v in the boundary layer.

This similarity furthermore suggested that the problem of laminar boundary layer - shock wave interactions on such rotating bodies might be solved by a method similar to that used by Klineberg for the calculation of two dimensional interactions with heat transfer, when the energy equation must be solved. To this end, the boundary layer equations have been put in 'integral' form, and have been simplified by means of a compressibility transformation similar to that of Stewartson.

The coefficients occurring in these equations have been established in the form of polynomial functions of two parameters a and b characterising the velocity profiles u and v. To establish these polynomials, 'similar'solutions' for boundary layer flow on a spinning circular cylinder have been calculated. It was found that these polynomials are, to a very close approximation, independent of the spin parameter \( \omega \). This is in contrast with the case of heat transfer treated by Klineberg, in which case it is necessary to calculate the set of polynomials for each value of the wall enthalpy ratio.

The initial conditions for the integration were either the two dimensional adiabatic values of Klineberg (plus b equal to its zero pressure gradient value), in the case of small spin rates, or those calculated by Horton for a spinning cylinder, in the case of large spin rates.

This theory has enabled the effect of a transverse flow upon an interaction to be predicted. Cases were chosen
in which the interaction was known to be entirely laminar. For moderate transverse flow velocities (\( \Omega = 5000 \text{ RPM} \)) the effect is weak. In general, rotation causes an overall reduction in pressure in the interaction region, of the order of 1 to 2% for \( \Omega = 5000 \text{ RPM} \).

Comparison with experimental results obtained in a complementary study shows that the measured effect of spin is in the same direction and of similar amplitude. This agreement demonstrates the validity of the present method of calculation. It is therefore possible to use the theory to predict the effects of larger spin ratio, impossible to achieve with the existing model.

Such calculations were made for spin ratio of 30 and 60\( \times 10^3 \) RPM. The trend observed at 5000 RPM is considerably amplified. The relative pressure increment due to spin, in the regions of separation and reattachment, is about 3% at 30\( \times 10^3 \) RPM and 10% at 60\( \times 10^3 \) RPM.

For the largest rate of spin, separation is retarded and reattachment advanced.
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APPENDIX - EFFECT OF TRANSVERSE FLOW UPON
A TRANSITIONAL INTERACTION

The results of the theory developed in this report have been compared with measurements obtained previously by the first and last authors. It was verified that the interactions in these tests were fully laminar, the theory being applicable only under this condition.

It was desired to complete these measurements by examining the influence of a transverse flow upon a transitional interaction. It was known that, without spin, the effect of change of Reynolds number is of opposite sense according to whether the interaction is laminar or transitional. Would the effect of rotation, also, be in the opposite sense?

The tests were carried out with the 10° flare positioned at 40 mm from the leading edge, a configuration which produces the two types of flow (laminar or transitional) according to the unit Reynolds number.

Figure A1 shows the effect of rotation upon the pressure in the interaction region when the unit Reynolds number of the free stream is small (corresponding to $p_t = 97.2$ mm Hg). We note that the transverse flow produces the same "laminar" trend observed for the 7.5° flare (fig. 6a), with a general reduction in pressure level.

The same experimental configuration has been tested at a higher Reynolds number (corresponding to $p_t = 172.6$ mm Hg). The results are shown in fig. A2. The effect of rotation is now to increase the level of pressure in the region of separation. This trend is thus opposite to that observed in the laminar case.

This result has been confirmed by repeating the tests for the transitional interaction, the 10° flare being placed at 60 mm from the leading edge. The same result was found.
Figure A3 shows the same effect when the flare has an angle of \(15^\circ\), for \(L = 60\) mm.

In conclusion, it appears that the destabilizing effect of spin upon the boundary layer produces changes in pressure near separation in opposite directions depending on whether the interaction is laminar or transitional. Changes of Reynolds number have a similar effect.
Diagram 1 - Schematic diagram of the method of calculation for spinning body

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_w &= r_w(x) \\
    \int_0^\delta m \, dz \\
    r_w &= \text{cst} \\
    \text{Form suitable for integration (Kramer)}
\end{align*}
\]
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