

Project THEMIS
Technical Report No. 10

AN
EFFECTIVE-VISCOSITY MODEL FOR TURBULENT
WALL BOUNDARY LAYERS

by
J. C. Anyiwo
R. N. Meroney

Prepared under
Office of Naval Research
Contract No. N00014-68-A-0493-0001
Project No. NR 062-414/6-6-68 (Code 438)
U. S. Department of Defense
Washington, D. C.

"This document has been approved for public release
and sale; its distribution is unlimited."

Fluid Dynamics and Diffusion Laboratory
College of Engineering
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado



U18401 0576053

June 1971

CER70-71JCA-RNM63

ABSTRACT

Existing effective viscosity models which have been very valuable in the mean field closure method for turbulent boundary layer computation have shown certain undesirable limitations for certain realistic but general boundary layer flows. The more general flows usually involve non-negligible considerations of pressure gradients and such wall conditions as roughness, curvature and aspiration or transpiration in varying degrees of importance. The effects of these external and wall influences have, unfortunately, been underplayed by most existing effective viscosity models.

The present model of the effective viscosity is developed for a general flow and has shown remarkable agreement with experimentation, without being any more complex than existing models.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Abstract	ii
	Table of Contents	iii
	List of Figures	iv
	Nomenclature	v
1.	Introduction	1
2.	The Effective Viscosity in Wall Boundary Layers.	6
3.	Comparison with Experimental Results	12
4.	Concluding Remarks	14
5.	References	15, 16
6.	Appendix	17
7.	Figures.	19

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Some Eddy-viscosity models.
2. Skin friction and shape factor predictions.
3. Velocity profile prediction.
4. Shear stress prediction.
5. Effective viscosity for Moses Flow, Case 6.
6. The coordinate system.
7. Velocity Profile: Moore and Harkness.

NOMENCLATURE

A, A ₊	: Turbulence functions in Van Driest and Smith eddy viscosity models.
F	: Pressure gradient parameter $(= \frac{\nu}{U_1^2} \frac{dU_1}{dx})$
g, ϕ	: Functions.
k, k _s	: Roughness height; Nikuradse' roughness scale.
λ, λ_0	: Mixing length, value at wall.
p	: Pressure.
r ₀	: Wall radius of curvature.
R	: Roughness parameter $(= \frac{U_\tau k_s}{\nu})$
R _{δ^*}	: Displacement thickness Reynolds number.
U ₁ , U ₁ ⁺	: Free stream velocity, U ₁ /U _{τ} .
U _{τ}	: Friction velocity $(= \sqrt{\frac{\tau_0}{\rho}})$
u, u ⁺	: Streamwise velocity, u/U _{τ}
v ₀ , v ₀ ⁺	: Vertical velocity, v ₀ /U _{τ} at the wall.
x	: Streamwise space coordinate.
y, y ⁺	: Transverse space coordinate, $\frac{U_\tau y}{\nu}$
δ, δ^+	: Boundary layer thickness, $\frac{U_\tau \delta}{\nu}$
δ^*	: Displacement thickness
$\delta_\lambda, \delta_\lambda^+$: Viscous sublayer thickness, $\frac{U_\tau \delta_\lambda}{\nu}$
μ	: Molecular viscosity
ν	: Kinematic viscosity
ν_e	: Effective viscosity $(= \nu + \epsilon)$
ν_a	: Apparent viscosity in rough wall flows.
ρ	: Density
γ	: Intermittency factor
τ	: Shear stress

η, η^* : Transverse dimensionless space coordinate
(y/δ), y/δ^*

ε : Eddy-viscosity in turbulent flows.

κ : Von-Karman constant.

1. INTRODUCTION

The use of an effective viscosity assumption provides closure for the turbulent boundary layer equations of motion for enhanced mathematical treatment. Boussinesq introduced and assumed a linear relation, of the same form as the Newtonian Law of friction, between the Reynolds shear stress and the mean velocity gradient. The coefficient in this linear relation has since become known as eddy-viscosity. Although the concept of the eddy-viscosity, and worse still, a scalar eddy-viscosity, is physically unsound, it nevertheless allows reliable and useful predictions to be made for most types of flows. One is thus compelled to ignore the lack of physical rigor.

An effective viscosity may therefore be defined as the sum of the kinematic molecular viscosity, and the eddy viscosity.

$$\text{i.e.} \quad \nu_e = \nu + \epsilon \quad 1.1$$

If, further, it is assumed that the effect of wall roughness is very similar to the effect of the molecular viscosity on the flow, so that an apparent kinematic viscosity, ν_a , may be defined, then:

$$\nu_e = \nu_a + \epsilon \quad 1.2$$

The form of equation (1.2) may then be used to reduce the turbulent boundary layer momentum equations to a form similar to the laminar case, which is closed and soluble by some mathematical techniques. The form of the eddy-viscosity is difficult to establish especially near the wall.

Many models of the eddy-viscosity have been introduced for the wall region of the boundary layer. Reichardt⁵, for instance, assumed the following:

$$\frac{\epsilon}{\nu} = \kappa (y_+ - \delta_1^+) \tanh \frac{y^+}{\delta_\ell^+} \quad 1.3$$

on the basis that in the boundary layer, the eddy-viscosity, ϵ , increases with y^{+3} as $y^+ \rightarrow 0$, and changes monotonically into a linear function of y^+ as the region beyond the overlap region is approached, Deissler⁶ tried to take account of a turbulence diminishing toward the wall and suggested the relation:

$$\frac{\epsilon}{\nu} = au^+ y^+ [1 - \exp (- au^+ y^+)] \quad 1.4$$

Where, a , is a numerical constant. This relation gives an eddy viscosity which is proportional to y^{+4} in the inner wall region. Van Driest⁷, on the basis of a modified Prandtl's mixing length, suggested the following form

$$\epsilon = \kappa^2 y^2 [1 - \exp (- y^+ / A)]^2 \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right| \quad 1.5$$

where $A = 26$ for the zero pressure gradient flow along a smooth wall. This relation also approaches the wall as y^{+4} . The more familiar recent additions to the eddy-viscosity models for the inner wall region are the models due to G. Mellor and A.M.O. Smith and their colleagues. Mellor et al.^{3,14} argued that in the wall region, the eddy-viscosity is a universal function of y , $\frac{\partial u}{\partial y}$, and the molecular viscosity, ν , which can be represented by the functional curve

$$\frac{\epsilon}{\nu} = \chi^4 / (\chi^3 + \bar{A}^3) \quad 1.6$$

where $\chi = \frac{\kappa y}{\nu} \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{\rho}}$, and \bar{A} is a constant ($= 6.9$). The form of equation (1.6) is as yet the most satisfactory form of the eddy-viscosity introduced for the wall region, and except in severe cases, it is only very slightly affected by pressure gradients and wall conditions.

Smith et al.,^{1,2} modified the Van-Driest model in the inner wall region obtaining an analytical relation for the general variation of the turbulence function A .

$$\varepsilon = \kappa^2 y^2 [1 - \exp (-y^+/A_+)]^2 \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right| \quad 1.7$$

$$\text{where } A_+ = 26 \left\{ -\frac{FU_1^{+3}}{V_o^+} \left[\exp (11 \cdot 8V_o^+) - 1 \right] + \exp (11 \cdot 8V_o^+) \right\}^{-1/2}$$

In the outer region of the boundary layer, not many changes have been made to Clauser's original assumption of a constant eddy viscosity, ($\frac{\varepsilon}{U_1 \delta} = 0.018$). Mellor et al.,¹⁴ assumed a constant value of $\frac{\varepsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = 0.016$, which they said could be modified by the curvature of the wall in the following manner:

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = 0.016 \left[1 - A^* \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} \right] \quad 1.8$$

where A^* is a numerical constant.

Smith et al.,² modified their outer region constant eddy viscosity with an intermittency factor and thus obtained:

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = 0.0168 [1 + 5.5\eta^6]^{-1} \quad 1.9$$

Most other researchers in this field have simply chosen a constant in the neighborhood of 0.018 which satisfied their particular kind of flow.

In the overlap region of the turbulent boundary layer, Smith et al.² applied the constraint of continuity of the eddy-viscosity from the wall outward. Their wall eddy viscosity function however approximates a linear function of y^+ in this region. Mellor et al.¹⁴ assumed that the eddy viscosity in the overlap region must be some universal

function of y , $\frac{\partial u}{\partial y}$, and $U_1 \delta^*$ (chosen as a suitable scaling parameter), and obtained the following linear function:

$$\frac{\epsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = \chi / R_{\delta^*} \quad 1.10$$

Earlier, Rotta⁸ had assumed that the mixing length at $y = 0$ is not necessarily zero (especially in rough-wall flows) but has some finite value ℓ_0 . Hence the applicable mixing length in the transition region should be $\ell = \ell_0 + \kappa y$.

$$\text{i.e. } \frac{\epsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = (\ell_0 + \kappa y)^2 \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right| / U_1 \delta^* \quad 1.11$$

Most of the models introduced here have been obtained essentially on the basis of wide experience with turbulent boundary layers, leading to intuitive guesses that satisfy some boundary constraints and approximate turbulence characteristics on a large scale. In fact, all the wall eddy-viscosity models, including the one presented herein, are curve fits scaled on suitable wall region parameters. Fortunately the wall region boundary layer is virtually insensitive to external influences, so that curves for the eddy-viscosity obtained in that region give the illusion of a universal character.

In the overlap region of the turbulent boundary layer, the dimensionless eddy-viscosity ($\epsilon/U_1 \delta^*$) appears to be a linear function of y^+ as assumed by all the models. The influence of external and wall conditions on the eddy-viscosity in this region is only quantitative, linearity still being maintained, as the overlap region is virtually a constant shear stress region.

All the models except that of Smith et al.,^{1,2} assumed a constant value for the non-dimensional eddy-viscosity in the outer region of the

boundary layer. Clearly the eddy-viscosity is not a constant in this region but decreases far from the wall across the zone of intermittency. When corrected for intermittency, a sizeable portion of the outer boundary layer shows a fairly constant value for $\epsilon/U_1 \delta^*$. Hence the assumption of a constant outer region eddy viscosity will not be expected to have a large influence on predictions of velocity profiles except in the outermost region where, anyway, the vertical gradient, $\partial u/\partial y$, of the velocity is usually very small. In predicting shear stress distributions; in diffusion problems and generally in problems involving large gradients of mean quantities as in the atmosphere, the use of a constant outer eddy viscosity should be noticeably erroneous. Moreover, all experimental data indicate that the outer region eddy viscosity is not only intermittency controlled but is also quantitatively dependent on streamwise pressure gradients and wall condition. The reader is referred to the data of Moffat et al.,¹¹ and Fraser¹⁰. This is obvious also from an examination of the boundary layer momentum equations for the outer region. Only in the simple case of fully developed channel and pipe flows can a constant eddy-viscosity be compatible in the outer boundary layer.

2. THE EFFECTIVE VISCOSITY IN WALL BOUNDARY LAYERS

Having reviewed the developments in boundary layer eddy viscosity modelling, we will now try to establish a satisfactory functional form for the effective viscosity in the wall boundary layer. The effective viscosity was defined as:

$$\nu_e = \nu_a + \varepsilon \quad 2.1$$

where, ν_a , is the apparent kinematic molecular viscosity due to wall roughness.

It is clear that what we are trying to do by defining, ν_a , is to increase the effective viscosity close to the rough wall. In that case, we can alternatively effect all such changes via the eddy viscosity. If the roughness geometry is such that an equivalent Nikuradse¹² sand roughness height, k_s , can be meaningfully defined (i.e., flow effects and turbulence mechanism are preserved, under the transformation) then we may define an augmented dimensionless vertical distance.

$$\chi = \frac{\kappa(y + k_s)}{\nu} \sqrt{\tau/\rho} \quad 2.2$$

Certainly, if we cannot mathematically model the roughness geometry by some transformation which preserves turbulence mechanism, we cannot hope to obtain a mathematical model of the roughness influence on an effective viscosity. Perry and Joubert¹³ discuss an alternative approach to modelling the apparent viscosity.

In the wall region of the boundary layer, perhaps the best way to look at the problem of the eddy-viscosity form is a method used by Meroney¹⁵. Meroney obtained an expression for the Reynolds shear stress distribution near the wall, by a Taylor series expansion of the total flow velocity. If such an expansion is repeated for the wall boundary layer as defined in the present study, one finds that:

$$\overline{u'v'} = \left[4v u_4 - \left(\frac{v_0}{v}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{3!} (v_0 u_1 - U_1 \frac{dU_1}{dx}) \right] y^3 + [5v u_5 - v_0 u_4] y^4 + \dots \quad 2.3$$

where $u_i = \frac{1}{i!} \frac{\partial^i u}{\partial y^i} \Big|_{y=0}$

From (2.3) it is seen that:

$$\epsilon = \left[\frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{v_0}{v}\right)^2 (v_0 - \frac{U_1}{u_1} \frac{dU_1}{dx}) - 4v \frac{u_4}{u_1} \right] y^3 + \left[v_0 \frac{u_4}{u_1} - 5v \frac{u_5}{u_1} \right] y^4 + \dots \quad 2.4$$

It will now be assumed that at the wall where the Taylor series expansion is valid $\frac{\partial^5 u}{\partial y^5}$ is very small and may be dropped from equation (2.4), or in non-dimensional form,

$$\frac{\epsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = \phi_w = \left[\frac{v_0^{+2}}{6\kappa^3} (v_0^+ - F U_1^{+3}) - 4Z \right] \frac{\chi^3}{R_{\delta^*}} + \frac{v_0^+ Z}{\kappa R_{\delta^*}} \chi^4 \quad 2.5$$

where

$$Z = \frac{v^4}{U_1^5 \kappa^3} \left(\frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial y^4} \right)_{y=0} \quad \text{and} \quad F = \frac{v}{U_1^2} \frac{dU_1}{dx} \quad 2.6$$

From equation (2.5) it becomes clear that only the wall conditions have any direct influence on the form of the eddy-viscosity in the wall region. In the absence of wall effects, the eddy-viscosity at the wall is proportional to y^{+3} , but is otherwise proportional to y^{+n} , ($3 < n < 4$). In the transition region of the turbulent boundary layer, the eddy viscosity is directly proportional to χ and may be written as

$$\frac{\epsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = \phi_t = \frac{g}{R_{\delta^*}} \chi \quad 2.7$$

where, g , is a simple functional constant for any particular flow through which pressure gradients and wall conditions quantitatively affect ϕ_t .

Except for the functions, Z and g in equations (2.6) and (2.7), we have now obtained the functional relations for the eddy viscosity at the wall and in the overlap region of the turbulent boundary layer. Since the eddy viscosity function must be continuous from the wall outward, we will now fit an empirical curve to the two relations represented by equations (2.5) and (2.7). On the basis of the power law behavior observed in equation (2.5) and (2.7) we postulate a curve of the form

$$\phi_{w\tau} = \left[\frac{\lambda_1 \chi^4}{(A^3 + \chi^3)} + \frac{\lambda_2 \chi^3}{(A^2 + \chi^2)} \right] \cdot \frac{1}{R_{\delta^*}} \quad 2.8$$

where

$$\lambda_1 = v_o^+ \left[g - A^2 v_o^{+2} (v_o^+ - FU_1^{+3}) / \kappa \right] / (v_o^+ - 4\kappa/A) \quad 2.9$$

$$\lambda_2 = \left[A^2 v_o^{+2} (v_o^+ - FU_1^{+3}) - \frac{(4g\kappa/A - 4Av_o^{+2} (v_o^+ - FU_1^{+3}))}{(v_o^+ - 4\kappa/A)} \right]$$

For the curve of equation (2.8), the function, g , varies with y by about 0.5 about the value unity, such that we can empirically approximate g by

$$g = 1 + 0.031 \times 10^{-3} (v_o^+ \chi^3) \quad 2.10$$

For this value of g , the value of A which consistently gives the best fit for a number of experimental results is $A = 7.2$. Herring and Mellon used a value of $A = 6.9$ in the absence of additional corrections on g . With these estimates, the wall region effective viscosity for the general turbulent wall boundary layer is satisfactorily described by

$$v_e = \frac{1}{R_{\delta^*}} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_1 \chi^4}{[7 \cdot 2^3 + \chi^3]} + \frac{\lambda_2 \chi^3}{[7 \cdot 2^2 + \chi^2]} + 1 \right\} \quad 2.11$$

where

$$\lambda_1 = \left[g - 126v_o^{+2} (v_o^+ - FU_1^{+3}) \right] v_o^+ / (v_o^+ - 0.23)$$

$$\lambda_2 = \left[v_o^{+2} (126v_o^+ - 15 \cdot 6) (v_o^+ - FU_1^{+3}) - 0.23g \right] / (v_o^+ - 0.23) \quad 2.12$$

With reference to the data of Fraser¹⁰, the eddy viscosity profile in the outer region of the turbulent boundary layer shows a distinct trend with the streamwise distance, x , which, however, may be diminished by non-dimensionalizing the eddy diffusivity, ϵ , with $U_1 \delta^*$. A slight trend with x is still noticeable probably because the displacement thickness, δ^* , calculated in the conventional way, does not adequately represent the growth influence of the turbulent boundary layer especially when wall effects and external conditions on the flow are severe. Moreover, the eddy viscosity profile shows definite dependence on the external and wall conditions, i.e., pressure gradients, transpiration, etc., on the flow. Examination of the momentum equation of fluid motion shows that the effects of transpiration, etc., on the eddy viscosity are local, not history-oriented as one would naturally anticipate. The experimental results of Fraser¹⁰ also confirm this.

In the orthogonal system of parallel curves Fig. (6), the vorticity transport equation for two-dimensional fluid motion can be reduced to the following approximate form, for the outer boundary layer:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[\frac{u}{(1-cy)} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{cuv}{1-cy} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{cu^2}{1-cy} \right) \\ = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{1}{1-cy} \right) + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \left[v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} - \overline{u'v'} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\overline{cu'v'}}{1-cy} \right) \end{aligned} \quad 2.13$$

where $c(=1/r_0)$ is the wall curvature, and is positive for concave curvature. In the absence of pressure gradients and wall effects, the outer region eddy viscosity is adequately represented by

$$\frac{\epsilon}{U_1 \delta^*} = 0.016 \times \text{An Intermittency factor.}$$

In that case, if we assumed a suitable power-law velocity profile, Eq. (2.13) can be analyzed further to yield the following outer region effective viscosity profile (See Appendix for analytical details):

$$\phi_0 = \frac{v_e}{U_1 \delta^*} = 0.016 \gamma (1+\eta \frac{a\delta^*}{r_0}) \left[1 + \left(b \frac{V_0}{U_1} - dFR_{\delta^*} + m \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} - h\delta^* \frac{d}{dx} (1/r_0) \right) f(\eta) \right] \quad 2.15$$

where $\gamma = \text{an intermittency factor } (=1/(1+5.5\eta^6))$ and a, b, d, m and h are numerical constants.

For the cases of interest, the streamwise gradient of curvature is usually very small compared to the remaining terms in Eq. (2.15). Hence we finally obtain by comparison with experimental data of Fraser¹⁰, that:

$$\phi_0 = 0.016 \gamma (1+a\eta \frac{\delta^*}{r_0}) \left[1 + \left(2.8 \frac{V_0}{U_1} - FR_{\delta^*} + m \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \right) f(\eta) \right] \quad 2.16$$

where $f(\eta) \approx 500 \sinh(\eta)$, and $a \approx 12.1$.

Interestingly, Eq. (2.16) reduces to a form previously suggested by Mellor et al.,³ (except for an additional δ^*/r_0 factor), in the absence of pressure gradient and wall transpiration. The constant, m , has not been evaluated in the present work because adequate curved wall data were not available to the present authors. In the continuing research on analytical boundary layer predictions, the results of a mean turbulent closure method will be regressed to compute the constant, m , and to modify the present model for cases of thermally stratified flows.

3. COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Prior to the formulation of the present effective viscosity model, the most satisfactory effective viscosity model in turbulent wall boundary layer computation appears to be that due to Herring and Mellor¹⁴. The forms of the Herring-Mellor model and the present model are compared against the experimental measurements of Moffat et al.,¹¹ in Fig. 1. The boundary layer studied by Moffat et al., is due to a highly accelerated flow with wall transpiration. It seems obvious that the Herring-Mellor model is most satisfactory only for simple flat-plate flows without mass transfer at the wall. When pressure gradients and wall transpiration may be considered, the Herring-Mellor model under-estimates the viscosity of the flow especially in the inner wall region and the outermost region of the turbulent boundary layer. The present model is an exact solution in the inner wall region but suffers negligible deviation in the lower overlap region. This deviation is a result of attempting to asymptote the wall region solution to a linear solution in the overlap region. The matching point between the inner wall and the overlap solutions fluctuates with the type of flow and is not exactly fixed by the present curve fit. However, apart from this small deviation in the overlap region of the boundary layer, the present model shows a much more satisfactory fit to the experimental results of very general types of flows. Further illustration of the superiority of the present effective viscosity model over previous models is obtained from the direct use of the models in boundary layer computations. The computer program of Herring and Mellor³ was used for all computations, with modifications only in the effective viscosity models.

The example used is the incompressible boundary layer flow studied by Moses¹⁶, which was used at the Stanford Symposium on the "Computation of Turbulent Boundary Layers." The first portion of the flow is in an adverse pressure gradient. Subsequently, the pressure gradient is removed and the layer relaxes to conditions of nearly zero pressure gradient. Comparisons with Moses' data are shown in Figs. (2) and (3), where theoretical skin friction, shape factor and mean velocity profiles are plotted against the data points. While the present method gives an almost exact fit to the experimental data points in all cases, the model of Herring and Mellor shows definite deviations (up to 15%) especially in the skin friction distribution and in the outer region of the mean velocity distribution. Figure (4) shows most clearly the difference between the two models. The Herring-Mellor model shows marked deviations in the wall and outermost boundary layer regions.

The present effective viscosity model has also been used for the compressible turbulent boundary layer of Moore and Harkness¹⁷, and has shown very good agreement with experiment, Fig. 7.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We may now conclude that if a scalar eddy viscosity is assumed to be a valid concept in wall turbulent boundary layer theory, then such an eddy viscosity has the following characteristics:

It is a continuous function of y which approaches the wall surface as a power function, y^{+n} , of the vertical distance y from the wall. If the external and the wall conditions on the boundary layer flow are unimportant $n \rightarrow 3$, but $n \rightarrow 4$ as the effects of the flow environment become important.

Away from the wall the eddy viscosity function is a linear function of y , soon reaching a maximum and then gradually decreasing to zero very far from the wall. Even in the region away from the wall, the eddy viscosity function is at least quantitatively dependent on the conditions at the wall and in the free stream.

For moderate roughness, it appears that when an equivalent Nikuradse sand roughness height can be meaningfully defined, the influence of roughness can adequately be modelled as an apparent y - shift effect.

Finally, a mean velocity field closure method which predicts the turbulent boundary layer downstream of a known station should yield very close predictions, as the iterative scheme of such a method usually corrects slight errors in the effective viscosity assumption. Moreover, the dimensionless effective viscosity appears to be a function of the local boundary layer parameters and is history-oriented only through such parameters.

5. REFERENCES

1. Jaffe, N.A., Lind, R.C. and Smith, A.M.O.: Solution to the Binary Diffusion Laminar Boundary Layer Equations Including the Effects of Second-Order Transverse Curvature, AIAA Journal, Vol. 5, No. 9, Sept., 1967.
2. Smith, A.M.O. and Clutter, D.W.: Solution of the Incompressible Laminar Boundary Layer Equations, AIAA Journal, Vol. 1, No. 9, Sept., 1967.
3. Mellor, G. and Herring, H.: A Computer Program to Calculate Incompressible Laminar and Turbulent Boundary Layer Development, Princeton University, Report No. NASA CR-1564.
4. Luxton, R., Manton, M.J. and Banner, M.L.: On the Concept of Eddy Viscosity, Conference on Thermodynamics and Fluid Mechanics: The Institution of Mech. Engrs., Australia 1967.
5. Reichardt, H.: Z Angew, Math. u. Mech., 20, 297 (1951).
6. Deissler, R.G.: NACA TN 3145, 1954.
7. Van Driest, E.R.: On Turbulent Flow Near the Wall, J. Aero. Sciences, Vol. 23, 1007, 1956.
8. Rotta, J.: Ingr. Arch. 18, 277 (1950).
9. Elrod, H.G.: J. Aero. Sciences, Vol. 24, p. 468 (1957)
10. Fraser, M.: A Study of the Transpired Turbulent Boundary Layer on a Flat Plate, Ph.D. Thesis, M.I.T., Mass. 1964.
11. Moffat, R.J., Loyd, R.J. and Kays, W.M.: The Turbulent Boundary Layer on a Porous Plate: An Experimental Study of the Fluid Dynamics with Strong Favorable Pressure Gradients and Blowing, Report No. HMT-13, Stanford University, May, 1970.
12. Nikuradse, J.: VDI - Forschungsheft, No. 361, 1933.
13. Perry, A.E., and Joubert, P.N.: Rough-Wall Boundary Layers in Adverse Pressure Gradients., J. Fluid Mech., Vol. 17, 1963.
14. Mellor, G.L. and Herring, H.J.: A Study of Turbulent Boundary Layers Models, Part 1, Mean Velocity Field Closure, Report No. 914, Princeton University, Dept. of Aerospace and Mech. Sciences. May, 1970.
15. Meroney, R.N.: Velocity and Shear Distributions in a Transpired Turbulent Boundary Layer, Proc. 10th Midwestern Mech. Conf., Colorado State University, 1967.

5. REFERENCES (cont'd)

16. Moses, H.L.: The Behaviour of Turbulent Boundary Layers in Adverse Pressure Gradients, M.I.T. Gas Turbine Lab. Report No. 73 (1964).
17. Moore, D. and Harkness, J.: Experimental Investigations of the Compressible Turbulent Boundary Layer at Very High Reynolds Number, L.T.V. Research Center Report o-7100/4R-9, (1964).

APPENDIX

The combined momentum equation (2.13), which is essentially the so-called vorticity transport equation is

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{1}{1-cy} \right) + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \left[v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} - \overline{u'v'} \right] \\
 & + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\overline{cu'v'}}{1-cy} \right) \\
 & = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[\frac{u}{(1-cy)} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{cuv}{1-cy} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{cu^2}{1-cy} \right)
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Let $u = \bar{u} \bar{U}$,

$v = \bar{v} \bar{U}$,

$y = \eta^* \delta^*$

If we assume that after correction for intermittency, the dimensionless effective viscosity, $\nu_e/U, \delta^*$, is fairly constant across a large portion of the outer region boundary layer, the left hand side of equation (1) becomes:

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{U_1^2}{\delta^{*2}} \cdot \frac{\nu_e}{U_1 \delta^*} \left[\frac{\partial^3 \bar{u}}{\partial \eta^{*3}} + \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial \eta^{*2}} \right] \tag{2}$$

where $\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{1}{1-cy} \right)$ has been neglected in comparison with other terms in equation (1).

If $\frac{\nu_e}{U_1 \delta^*} = \phi_0$, $\frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial \eta^{*i}} = u_i$, and if:

$$F = \frac{\nu}{U_1^2} \frac{dU_1}{dx} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\delta^*} = \frac{U_1 \delta^*}{\nu}$$

Then, with the following assumptions:

- (i) Terms in $\left(\frac{\delta^*}{r_0}\right)^2$ and higher order are negligible.
- (ii) Terms in $\left(\frac{dc}{dx}\right)$ are small in comparison to other terms in the equations.

equation (1) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\gamma} \phi_0 \left[1 + \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \frac{u_2}{u_3} \right] &= \frac{\delta^*}{u_3} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta^*} \left(\bar{u} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \cdot \frac{\delta^*}{u_3} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta^*} \left(\bar{u} \eta^* \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} \right) \\ &+ FR_{\delta^*} \left[2 \frac{u_1}{u_3} \bar{u} + \frac{\delta^*}{u_3 r_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta^*} (\bar{u}^2 \eta^*) - 2 \frac{\bar{u}^2}{u_3} \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \right] + \frac{1}{u_3} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta^*} \left(\bar{v} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial \eta^*} \right) \\ &- \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \cdot \frac{1}{u_3} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta^*} (\bar{u} \bar{v}) - \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \cdot \frac{\delta^*}{u_3} \cdot \frac{\partial \bar{u}^2}{\partial x} - \frac{\bar{u}^2 \delta^{*2}}{u_3} \cdot \frac{dc}{dx} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

As $y \rightarrow \infty$, $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \rightarrow \frac{dU_1}{dx}$ so that we can write $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = f(y) \frac{dU_1}{dx}$ such that $f(y) \rightarrow 1$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$. The continuity equation is

$$\frac{1}{(1-cy)} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \frac{cy}{(1-cy)} = - \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \quad (4)$$

whence we can obtain that:

$$\frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial \eta^*} \doteq \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \bar{u} - \left(1 + \eta^* \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \right) f(\eta^*) FR_{\delta^*}$$

and

$$\bar{v} = \bar{v}_0 + \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \int_0^{\eta^*} \bar{u} d\eta^* - FR_{\delta^*} \int_0^{\eta^*} \left(1 + \frac{\delta^*}{r_0} \eta^* \right) f(\eta^*) d\eta^* \quad (5)$$

We shall, further, make the following simplifications:

- (i) $\bar{u} \doteq (A\eta^*)^{1/n}$
- (ii) In the absence of severe wall and free stream influences, the effective viscosity ϕ_0 is satisfactorily approximated by

$$\phi_0 = 0.016 \gamma = \frac{\delta^*}{u_3} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta^*} \left(\bar{u} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial x} \right) \quad (\text{from equation (3)}).$$

With these simplifications, equation (3) reduces to the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\gamma} \phi_o \left[1 + \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} \eta^* \frac{1}{(1/n-2)} \right] &= 0.016 + 0.016 \eta^* \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} \\ &+ \bar{v}_o \frac{\eta^*}{(1/n-2)} \left[1 - \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} \frac{\eta^*}{(1/n-1)} \right] + FR_{\delta^*} \left[1 - \eta^* \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} \right] G'(\eta^*) \\ &+ \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} H'(\eta^*) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_o = 0.016\gamma \left[1 - \frac{(3-1/n)}{(1/n-2)} \eta^* \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} \right] &\left[1 + \bar{v}_o Q'(\eta^*) + FR_{\delta^*} G(\eta^*) \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} H(\eta^*) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Let $\bar{v}_o Q'(\eta^*) + FR_{\delta^*} G(\eta^*) + \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} H(\eta^*) \equiv (b\bar{v}_o - dFR_{\delta^*} + m \frac{\delta^*}{r_o}) f(\eta^*)$

and $n \approx 7$

where b , d , m are numerical constants. Then

$$\phi_o \doteq 0.016\gamma \left[1 + 12 \cdot 1 \eta \frac{\delta^*}{r_o} \right] \left[1 + (b\bar{v}_o - dFR_{\delta^*} + m \frac{\delta^*}{r_o}) f(\eta) \right]. \quad (8)$$

The constants b , d , m and the function $f(\eta)$ can be determined by comparing equation (8) with experimental results. The effect of (FR_{δ^*}) in equation (8) is so small that only for very severe pressure gradients (corresponding to very high β in Reference (3)) is that term of any importance. In that case, d is taken as unity.




Fig.1 - Some Eddy Viscosity Models




Fig. 2 Moses Flow Case 6 (Principal Parameters)




Fig. 3 Moses Flow Case 6 (Velocity Profile)




Fig. 4 Moses Flow Case 6 (Shear Stress Curves)






Fig. 5 Effective Viscosity for Moses Flow, Case 6



a - A Family of Parallel Curves



b - Dimensional Relationships

Fig. 6 Orthogonal Curvilinear Coordinate System




Fig. 7 Velocity Profile : Moore and Harkness

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY <i>(Corporate author)</i> Fluid Dynamics and Diffusion Laboratory College of Engineering, Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado 80521		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE An Effective Viscosity Model for Turbulent Wall Boundary Layers			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES <i>(Type of report and inclusive dates)</i> Technical Report			
5. AUTHOR(S) <i>(Last name, first name, initial)</i> Anyiwo, J. C. and Meroney, R. N.			
6. REPORT DATE June 1971		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 26	7b. NO. OF REFS
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. N00014-68-A-0493		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) CER70-71JCA-RNM63	
b. PROJECT NO. NR 062-414/6-6-68 (Code 438)		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) <i>(Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)</i>	
d.			
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Distribution of this report is unlimited			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Office of Naval Research U.S. Department of Defense Washington, D.C.	
13. ABSTRACT Existing effective viscosity models which have been very valuable in the mean field closure method for turbulent boundary layer computation have shown certain undesirable limitations for certain realistic but general boundary layer flows. The more general flows usually involve non-negligible considerations of pressure gradients and such wall conditions as roughness, curvature and aspiration or transpiration in varying degrees of importance. The effects of these external and wall influences have, unfortunately, been underplayed by most existing effective viscosity models. The present model of the effective viscosity is developed for a general flow and has shown remarkable agreement with experimentation, without being any more complex than existing models.			

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
<p>Turbulent Boundary Layers Two-dimensional flow Effective viscosity</p>						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (*corporate author*) issuing the report.

2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (*either by the originator or by the sponsor*), also enter this number(s).

10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through _____."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through _____."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through _____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (*paying for*) the research and development. Include address.

13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional.

April 1971

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR UNCLASSIFIED
TECHNICAL REPORTS ISSUED UNDER
CONTRACT N00014-68-A TASK 000-414
0493-0001

Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	(12)	Librarian Department of Naval Architecture University of California Berkeley, California 94720
Technical Library Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory Annapolis, Maryland 21402		Professor Israel Cornet Department of Mechanical Engineering University of California Berkeley, California 94720
Professor Bruce Johnson Engineering Department Naval Academy Annapolis, Maryland 21402		Professor M. Holt Division of Aeronautical Sciences University of California Berkeley, California 94720
Library Naval Academy Annapolis, Maryland 21402		Professor E.V. Laitone Department of Mechanical Engineering University of California Berkeley, California 94720
Professor W.R. Debler Department of Engineering Mechanics University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108		Professor P. Lieber Department of Mechanical Engineering University of California Institute of Engineering Research Berkeley, California 94720
Professor W.P. Graebel Department of Engineering Mechanics University of Michigan College of Engineering Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108		Professor J.R. Paulling Department of Naval Architecture University of California Berkeley, California 94720
Professor Finn C. Michelsen Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering 445 West Engineering Building University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108		Professor J.V. Wehausen Department of Naval Architecture University of California Berkeley, California 94720
Dr. Francis Ogilvie Department of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108		Professor E.R. van Driest Virginia Polytechnic Institute and University Department of Aerospace Engineering Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
Professor W.W. Willmarth Department of Aerospace Engineering University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108		Commander Boston Naval Shipyard Boston, Massachusetts 02129
Dr. S.A. Piacsek Argonne National Laboratory Applied Mathematics Division 9700 S. Cass Avenue Argonne, Illinois 60439		Director Office of Naval Research Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02210
AFOSR (REM) 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22204		Commander Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Bremerton, Washington 98314
Professor S. Corrsin Mechanics Department The Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, Maryland 20910		Professor J.J. Foody Chairman, Engineering Department State University of New York Maritime College Bronx, New York 10465
Professor L.S.G. Kovaszny The Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, Maryland 20910		Dr. Alfred Ritter Assistant Head, Applied Mechanics Department Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc. Buffalo, New York 14221
Professor O.M. Phillips The Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, Maryland 20910		

Dr. J.W. Morris
Manager, Material Sciences Section
Advanced Materials Research
Bell Aerospace Company
P.O. Box 1
Buffalo, New York 14240

Professor G.H. Carrier
Department of Engineering and Applied Physics
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Commanding Officer
NROTC Naval Administrative Unit
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor M.A. Abkowitz
Department of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor A.T. Ippen
Department of Civil Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor L.N. Howard
Department of Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor E.W. Merrill
Department of Mathematics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor E. Mollo-Christensen
Room 54-1722
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor N. Newman
Department of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Professor A.H. Shapiro
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Commander
Charleston Naval Shipyard
U.S. Naval Base
Charleston, South Carolina 29408

A.R. Kuhlthau, Director
Research Laboratories for the Engineering Sciences
Thorton Hall, University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Director
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
536 South Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Library
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, California 93555

Professor J.M. Burgers
Institute of Fluid Dynamics and Applied Mathematics
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Professor Pai
Institute for Fluid Dynamics and Applied Mathematics
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20740

Acquisition Director
NASA Scientific & Technical Information
P.O. Box 33
College Park, Maryland 20740

Technical Library
Naval Weapons Laboratory
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448

Computation & Analyses Laboratory
Naval Weapons Laboratory
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448

Dr. C.S. Wells, Jr.
Manager - Fluid Mechanics
Advanced Technology Center, Inc.
P.O. Box 6144
Dallas, Texas 75222

Dr. R.H. Kraichnan
Dublin, New Hampshire 03444

Commanding Officer
Army Research Office
Box CM, Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Professor A. Charnes
The Technological Institute
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Dr. Martin H. Bloom
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Graduate Center, Dept. of Aerospace
Engineering and Applied Mechanics
Farmingdale, New York 11735

Technical Documents Center
Building 315
U.S. Army Mobility Equipment
Research and Development Center
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Professor J.E. Cermak
College of Engineering
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521

Technical Library
Webb Institute of Naval Architecture
Glen Cove, Long Island, New York 11542

Professor E.V. Lewis
Webb Institute of Naval Architecture
Glen Cove, Long Island, New York 11542

Dr. B.N. Pridmore Brown
Northrop Corporation
NORAIR-Div.
Hawthorne, California 90250

Dr. J.P. Breslin
Stevens Institute of Technology
Davidson Laboratory
Hoboken, New Jersey 07030

Dr. D. Savitsky
Stevens Institute of Technology
Davidson Laboratory
Hoboken, New Jersey 07030

Mr. C.H. Henry
Stevens Institute of Technology
Davidson Laboratory
Hoboken, New Jersey 07030

Dr. J.P. Craven
University of Hawaii
1801 University Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Professor E.L. Resler
Graduate School of Aeronautical Engineering
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14851

Professor John Miles
c/o I.G.P.P.
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92038

Director
Scripps Institution of Oceanography
University of California
La Jolla, California 92037

Professor A. Ellis
University of California, San Diego
Department of Aerospace & Mechanical Engineering
La Jolla, California 92037

Dr. B. Sternlicht
Mechanical Technology Incorporated
968 Albany-Shaker Road
Latham, New York 12110

Dr. Coda Pan
Mechanical Technology Incorporated
968 Albany-Shaker Road
Latham, New York 12110

Mr. P. Eisenberg, President
Hydronautics, Inc.
Pindell School Road
Howard County
Laurel, Maryland 20810

Mr. M.P. Tulin
Hydronautics, Inc.
Pindell School Road
Howard County
Laurel, Maryland 20810

Mr. Alfonso Alcedan L., Director
Laboratorio Nacional De Hydraulics
Antigui Cameno A. Ancon
Casilla Jostal 682
Lima, Peru

Commander
Long Beach Naval Shipyard
Long Beach, California 90802

Professor John Laufer
Department of Aerospace Engineering
University Park
Los Angeles, California 90007

Professor J.M. Killen
St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Lab.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Lorenz G. Straub Library
St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Lab.
Mississippi River at 3rd Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Professor J. Ripkin
St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Lab.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Dr. W. Silberman
St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Lab.
Mississippi River at 3rd Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Superintendent
Naval Postgraduate School
Library Code 0212
Monterey, California 93940

Professor A.B. Metzner
University of Delaware
Newark, New Jersey 19711

Technical Library
Naval Underwater Systems Center
Newport, Rhode Island 02840

Professor Dudley D. Fuller
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Professor V. Castelli
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Professor H. Elrod
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Professor J.J. Stoker
Institute of Mathematical Sciences
New York University
251 Mercer Street
New York, New York 10003

Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineering
74 Trinity Place
New York, New York 10006

Engineering Societies Library
345 East 47th Street
New York, New York 10017

Office of Naval Research
New York Area Office
207 W. 24th Street
New York, New York 10011

Miss O.M. Leach, Librarian
National Research Council
Aeronautical Library
Montreal Road
Ottawa 7, Canada

Technical Library
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Panama City, Florida 32401

Technical Library
Naval Undersea R & D Center
Pasadena Laboratory
3202 E. Foothill Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91107

Dr. Andrew Fabula
Naval Undersea Research & Development Center
Pasadena Laboratory
3202 E. Foothill Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91107

Dr. J.W. Hoyt
Naval Undersea R & D Center
Pasadena Laboratory
3202 E. Foothill Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91107

Professor A. Acosta
Department of Mechanical Engineering
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Professor H. Liepmann
Department of Aeronautics
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Professor M.S. Plesset
Engineering Division
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Professor A. Roshko
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Professor T.Y. Wu
Department of Engineering
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109

Director
Office of Naval Research Branch Office
1030 E. Green Street
Pasadena, California 91101

Naval Ship Engineering Center
Philadelphia Division
Technical Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112

Technical Library
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112

Professor R.C. Mac Camy
Department of Mathematics
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Paul Kaplan
Oceanics, Inc.
Plainview, Long Island, New York 11803

Technical Library
Naval Missile Center
Point Mugu, California 93441

Technical Library
Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory
Port Hueneme, California 93041

Commander
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard
Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801

Commander
Norfolk Naval Shipyard
Portsmouth, Virginia 23709

Professor F.E. Bisshopp
Division of Engineering
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Dr. William A. Gross, Vice President
Ampex Corporation
401 Broadway
Redwood City, California 94063

Dr. H.N. Abramson
Southwest Research Institute
8500 Culebra Road
San Antonio, Texas 78228

Editor
Applied Mechanics Review
Southwest Research Institute
8500 Culebra Road
San Antonio, Texas 78206

Office of Naval Research
San Francisco Area Office
50 Fell Street
San Francisco, California 94102

Library
Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard
Box 400
FPO San Francisco, California 96610

Technical Library
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard
San Francisco, California 94135

Librarian
Naval Ordnance Laboratory
White Oak
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Fenton Kennedy Document Library
The Johns Hopkins University
Applied Physics Laboratory
8621 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Professor E.Y. Hsu
Department of Civil Engineering
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Dr. Byrne Perry
Department of Civil Engineering
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Dr. R.L. Street
Department of Civil Engineering
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Professor Milton Van Dyke
Department of Aeronautical Engineering
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Professor R.C. Di Prima
Department of Mathematics
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12180

Professor J. Lumley
Ordnance Research Laboratory
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16801

Dr. M. Sevik
Ordnance Research Laboratory
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16801

Dr. J.M. Robertson
Department of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61803

Technical Library
Mare Island Naval Shipyard
Vallejo, California 94592

Code 438
Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Code 461
Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Code 463
Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Code 472
Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Code 468
Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Code 473
Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Code 481
Office of Naval Research
Department of the Navy
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Code 2627
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20390 (6)

Library, Code 2620 (ONRL)
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20390 (6)

Code 6170
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 4000
Director of Research
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 8030 (Maury Center)
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 8040
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 031
Naval Ship Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 0341
Naval Ship Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 03412B (L. Benen)
Naval Ship Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 03412 (J. Schuler)
Naval Ship Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20390

Code 2052
Naval Ship Systems Command
Washington, D. C. 20390

Code 6034
Naval Ship Engineering Center
Center Building
Prince George's Center
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Code 6110
Naval Ship Engineering Center
Center Building
Prince George's Center
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Code 6113
Naval Ship Engineering Center
Center Building
Prince George's Center
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Code 6114
Naval Ship Engineering Center
Center Building
Prince George's Center
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Code 6120E
Naval Ship Engineering Center
Center Building
Prince George's Center
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

(3)

Code 6136
Naval Ship Engineering Center
Center Building
Prince George's Center
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Dr. A. Powell
Code 01
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Mr. W.M. Ellsworth
Code OH50
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Central Library
Code L42
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Dr. W.E. Cummins
Code 500
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Mr. S.F. Crump
Code 513
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Mr. R. Wermter
Code 520
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Dr. P. Pien
Code 521
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Dr. W.B. Morgan
Code 540
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Mr. P. Granville
Code 541
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Mr. J.B. Hadler
Code 560
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Dr. H.R. Chaplin
Code 600
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Mr. G.H. Gleissner
Code 800
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Dr. M. Strasberg
Code 901
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Mr. J. McCarthy
Code 552
Naval Ship Research and Development Center
Washington, D.C. 20034

Code 03
Naval Air Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20360

AIR 5301
Naval Air Systems Command
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20360

Code ORD 03
Naval Ordnance Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20360

Code ORD 035
Naval Ordnance Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20360

Code ORD 05413
Naval Ordnance Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20360

Code ORD 9132
Naval Ordnance Systems Command
Washington, D.C. 20360

Oceanographer of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20390

Commander
Naval Oceanographic Office
Washington, D.C. 20390

Chief Scientist (CNM PM-1)
Strategic Systems Project Office
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20360

Technical Division (CNM PM 11-20)
Deep Submergence Systems Project Office
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20360

Dr. A.L. Slafkosky
Scientific Advisor
Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code AX)
Washington, D.C. 20380

Librarian Station 5-2
Coast Guard Headquarters
NASSIF Building
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20591

Office of Research and Development
Maritime Administration
441 G. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20235

Division of Ship Design
Maritime Administration
441 G. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20235

National Science Foundation
Engineering Division
1800 G. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550

Dr. G. Kulin
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234

Science & Technology Division
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540

Chief of Research & Development
Office of Chief of Staff
Department of the Army
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20310

Professor A. Thiruvengadam
Department of Mechanical Engineering
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C. 20017

Professor G. Birkhoff
Department of Mathematics
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

AIR 604
Naval Air Systems Command
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20360

Dr. A.S. Iberall, President
General Technical Services, Inc.
451 Penn Street
Yeadon, Pennsylvania 19050

Professor J.F. Kennedy, Director
Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Professor L. Landweber
Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Dr. Lee Segel
Department of Mathematics
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12180

Code 6101E
Naval Ship Engineering Center
Center Building
Prince George's Center
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782