

 λ

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$

 \bar{E}

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS = 1963=A

 $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{S}}$

TR 82099

BR 88360

۸

0 N

I-

 $ADA13205$

 G

L0 ..

E

ROYAL AIRCRAFT **ESTABLISHMENT**

 \ast

Technical Report **82099**

October **1982**

A STUDY OF NORMAL SHOCK-WAVE TURBULENT BOUNDARY-LAYER INTERACTIONS AT MACH NUMBERS OF 1.3, 1.4 AND 1.5

by

W. **G.** Sawyer Carol **J.** Long

 \ast

Procurement Executive, Ministry of Defence **CS** Fernborough, Hants

- - - - - i

~UNLIMITED 8 08 17 037

 \mathbf{E}

UDC 532.526.4: 533.6.011.72

ROYAL A **I** RCRAFT ESTABL I SHMENT

Technical Report 82099 Received for printing 27 October 1982

A STUDY OF NORMAL SHOCK-WAVE TURBULENT BOUNDARY-LAYER INTERACTIONS AT MACH NUMBERS OF 1.3, 1.4 AND 1.5

by

W. G. Sawyer Carol J. Long

SUMMARY

This Report presents the results of a study of seven flows involving the interaction between a normal shock wave and a two-dimensional turbulent boundary layer. The measurements were made at free-stream Mach numbers of 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 and at Reynolds numbers based on an effective streamwise run of 10×10^6 to 30×10^6 . The results were obtained from comprehensive traverses with both pitot and static probes.

Standard boundary-layer integral parameters based on wall and measured static pressures are presented, together with velocity profiles and the Mach number distribution over the interaction region.

An investigation has been made of the 'law of the wall' and the 'law of the wake' under the influence of strong normal pressure gradients.

LIST OF CONTENTS

 $\frac{1}{2}$

للوابي

66078

 \mathbf{f}

1 INTRODUCTION

A series of experiments 14has been undertaken in the RAE Bedford 3ft x3ft wind tunnel to investigate the interaction of a normal shock wave and a turbulent boundary layer at nominal upstream Mach numbers of **1.3,** 1.4 and **1.5** over a Reynolds number range based on the undisturbed boundary-layer momentum thickness at the start of the inter**a**ction of 12×10^3 to 34×10^3

This Report deals with the measurements made at a series of stations upstream and downstream of the interaction using conventional pitot and static probes traversed normal to the flat wall.

The series of experiments was planned because of the lack of knowledge **of** the interaction between normal shock waves and turbulent boundary layers at high Reynolds numbers and the need to predict the development of the boundary layer through and beyond the interaction region as, for example, in the flow over supercritical aerofoils.

A number of investigations have been reported over the past two decades and broadly speaking three techniques have been used to produce the interaction.

The first and moat commonly used technique (Fig 1a) in supersonic tunnels is to position a shock generator with downstream choking **flip** over a flat plate so that the steady normal shock wave formed **by** the shock generator interacts with a turbulent boundary layer grown from the leading edge of the flat plate. This is the technique edness, et₇ et₇ and the controller control of the set of the set of the Root and Kool

The second technique^{8,9} is used in transonic wind tunnels and involves mounting a two-dimensional bump on the wind tunnel wall so that the shock-wave boundary-layer interaction approximates to that on an aerofoil (Fig **1b).** More recently, small supercritical aerofoils have been tested¹⁰ and in fact these two experiments have been combined by Burdges **11who** let the aerofoil into the tunnel floor and bled away the floor boundary layer under its leading edge.

Gadd¹² and more recently Mateer, Brosch and Veigas¹³ used a third technique which was to hold the normal shock wave steady in a supersonic tube **by** the adjustment of a conical choke downstream of the working section as in Fig 1c. The turbulent boundary layer under consideration was allowed to grow naturally along the tube wall.

For the present experiment the facility which was available was the RAE 3ft \times 3ft transonic-supersonic wind tunnel. The arrangements of Fig Ia or **lb** could have been employed, but it was argued that if the tunnel floor was used, then the measuring techniques would be simpler, a higher Reynolds number could be obtained, and the interference effects of the wall boundary layers should be less than in the technique of Fig Ia where the test boundary layer is of smaller thickness than the interfering wall boundary layers. The simple technique was therefore used of holding a shock wave across the test section, set up to run at supersonic speed, **by** means of an adjustable sonic throat which was situated far downstream of the test section. The technique is in fact similar to that of Fig **1c.**

The 3ft \sim 3ft wind tunnel has a good Reynolds number capability (up to 12 \times 10⁶/m tor continuous running) is easily accessible for non-intrusive measurements and, above i ll, is easy to modify it the working section region having removable supersonic liners and downstream wooden fairings. A further advantage is that the pressure distribution in the working section is not only similar to that over a supercritical aerofoil but also the dime~nsions and Reynolds numbers approximate to full-scale conditions. **A** ninth scale **(in -4** in) model of the tunnel is also available and this proved invaluable for the development of the experiment.

Fhe most time-consuming aspect of the development has been providing a suitable downstream sonic throat to control the shock-wave position and to keep it acceptably steady. However it was also necessary to design and manufacture a new raised false tunnel floor (to house submerged boundary-layer traverse mechanisms and to raise the boundarylayer interaction region into view above the bottom of the schlieren windows) which would match the three alternative half-nozzle blocks used to generate the required free-stream Mach numbers and which form the upper wall.

During the period of time taken to manufacture the new floor and the necessary associated equipment, two interim experiments were made, the first² using a conventional boundary-layer pitot rake and the second using non-intrusive laser-Doppler measurements. The first experiment differed in another important aspect from the present one in that the pitot rake was attached to the tunnel floor in a single, fixed, position and the shock wave moved fore-and-aft of the rake.

For the present experiment the location of the shock wave was fixed for each condition tested and measurements were made with probes which could be traversed both normal to the tunnel floor and streamwise. Measurements of the static pressure distribution along the floor were also made.

DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIMENT

2.1 Mechanical arrangement

The general arrangement of the experiment is shown in Fig 2. The unmodified parts of the $3ft \times 3ft$ wind tunnel are shown shaded.

In its standard form, the 3ft \times 3ft wind tunnel has a working section with a fixed lower liner and interchangeable upper liners which are matched to the lower liner to give **0.1** incremental steps in Mach number between **1.3** and 2.0. One of the major modifications made to the tunnel was the provision of a new raised bottom liner together with a false floor (Fig **3).** This false floor contained two pitot traverse mechanisms so that a region close to the floor centre line could be investigated from approximately **0.8** m ahead of the schlieren window centre line to 3m downstream using a total horizontal traverse movement of little more than 2 m. Because of the interest in the free-stream Mach number range of **1.3** to **1.5,** the new bottom liner was designed to match the M **=** 1.4 upper liner and the consequent slight mismatch with the M **= 1.3** and M **= 1.5** upper liners had to be accepted. Although raising the floor **by 152** imm had the advantage of bringing the shock-wave interaction region into full view through the schlieren windows, it reduced the height of the working section so that the tunnel was no longer square in cross

section. There was however no particular disadvantage in this because the asymmetrical nozzle which generated the supersonic flow inevitably resulted in boundary layers which were not the same on all four walls.

The other major item of redesign as described in Ref 2 involved the careful fairing of the existing 'spoiler door' arrangement* in the diffuser section to give an adjustable second throat. **By** adjusting the throat, the normal shock wave could be placed in the desired location wi-hin the view through the tunnel windows. Any subsequent small progressive movement of the shock wave could then be corrected **by** adjusting the tunnel compressor speed. Initially there was a large random movement of the normal shock wave but this was reduced to about 20 mm **by** the careful fairing of the shape of the second throat. The mean position of the normal shock wave was checked both visually and **by** means of a differential pressure transducer connected between a wall static pressure hole under the shock wave and a reference tapping near the working section sonic throat.

The region between the working section and diffuser was faired to give smooth sidewall and roof contours. The geometry of the fairing was such as to give an expanding passage, the cross sectional area at the diffuser entry increasing to **1.067** times the area of the working section over a distance of **3660** mm. In the region of the interaction, the standard taper of 0.004 m/m was maintained on the top liner. This is normally combined with a similar taper on the lower liner to allow for boundary-layer growth on all four tunnel walls. However, for this experiment, the taper on the false floor was approximately 0.003 m/m.

The traverse mechanism together with a twin pitot probe is shown in Fig 4. Two identical traverse mechanisms were supported **1800** mm apart from a slide which was approximately **6** m long and sufficiently flexible to submerge, at its upstream end, below the liner surface approximately **I** m ahead of the schlieren window centre line, and at its downstream end to retract into a covered channel between the spoiler doors in the diffuser section. Any leaks around the slide were sealed **by** two pvc tubes which inflated when the slide was stationary as shown in Fig **3. A** chain drive was used to move the slide in the streamwise direction. **A** total streamwise distance of **3800** mmn could be covered using the tandem boundary layer traverses. The slide was positioned **100 mm** to the port of the row of static pressure holes on the tunnel centre line and the probes were cranked so that vertical traverses could be made half way between the slide and the tunnel centre line. In this way it was hoped to reduce the various interferences, namely, **of** the probe on the wall static pressure holes, of the slight irregularity of the slide on the probe measurements, and of the probe stem on the probe measurements.

Repeatability of the probe position was t0.02 mm vertically and **±3** mm horizontally.

Details of the static probes can be seen in Fig **5.** The pitot probes were designed to be fairly short in order to avoid vibrations in the expected **highly** turbulent flow. The same overall dimensions were then retained for the twin static probes. With hindsight, the twin static probes might have been lengthened to diminish the interference

*Used in normal testing for controlling the tunnel shock wave during starting or stopping the tunnel.

₽

caused by the supporting structure because the vertical positional accuracy is not quite as important for these probes as for the pitot probes. However this was not done and large corrections had to be applied to the static pressure measurements especially at transonic Mach numbers. These corrections are described in the Appendix.

All the probes were electrically insulated from their vertical traverse mechanisms so that a touch indicator could be used to set the pitot datum at the surface of the false floor. The streamwise datum was set by aligning the tip of a pitot probe or the holes in a static probe with a line marked on the surface of the false floor.

Pressure measurements were made with differential transducers (Druck) of range \cdot 69 kN/m² in two D-type scanivalves placed outside the tunnel shell. The transducers were calibrated against a Texas Instrument 0-203 kN/m² absolute quartz Bourdon-tube pressurecontroller. Corrections were made to the primary slopes and zeros of these calibrations for each data point, by comparing the transducer outputs with reference pressures applied to the first and last pairs of scanivalve ports.

2.2 Experimental measurements

2.2.1 Pitot measurements

Measurements were made at three nominal Mac'i numbers, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 at Reynolds numbers of approximately **10** x **10 6/m** (the maximum continuous running value permitted for the experiment) and 3.5 x **106/m.** An intermediate Reynolds number was also included for $M = 1.5$. Details of the test conditions are given in Table 1.

Traverses normal to the floor were made using the twin-pitot probe over a large number of stations f om 0.7 m ahead of the normal shock wave to approximately 3 m downstream of the normal shock wave. In most cases, a vertical distance of 200 mm was covered. The forward pitot was removed while measurements were being made with the rear one, and a flush plug was used to fill the hole left in the slide.

2.2.2 Floor static pressure measurements

Measurements of the static pressure distribution on the floor were made with only the rear pitot in place, set at its furthest downstream position. These measurements were used to calculate the wall reference static pressure for each pitot or static pressure probe traverse.

2.2.3 Reversed pitot measurements

Measurements were also made with a single reversed pitot probe (rather similar in shape to static probe B (Fig 5) but reversed) for conditions of separated flow which occurred for M **=** 1.5. Separation was indicated by the forward-pointing pitot recording a lower pressure than the corresponding wall static pressure hole. The measurements were made with the tip of the reversed pitot in the same streamwise position as the normal pitot tube. Although the flow was probably disturbed by either probe, a simple correction was made to both sets of results as described under section 3.1.

2.2.4 Static probe measurements

Before the static pressure measurements in the boundary layer were begun, the static probes were calibrated in the centre of the slotted transonic working section of

6

the tunnel over a Mach number range of 0.4 to 1.2 and similar free-stream Reynolds numbers to those encountered in the main experiment. Each probe was held at the end of its stem furthest away from the probe tip **by** a specially manufactured sting. Static probe B was also calibrated while supported at the near end of its stem to check for support interference. This appeared to be negligible. The probe measurements were compared with wall static pressures obtained from a tunnel calibration referred to a 3⁰ conical static head probe. This probe has been described in Ref 14 and within the limits of the required accuracy was assumed to have no static pressure errors.

The real problem which arose when using static probes in an environment which invoked the problems **.).** transonic flow combined with pressure gradielits, wall interference cifecic, and the presence **of** boundary layers, lay in obtaining sufficient calibration data in a tunnel which could not be used between M **= 0.88** and M **= 1.3** while modified to take the false floor and traverse mechanisms.

However some information was forthcoming from twin static probe calibrations made through the floor boundary layer between M **= 0.66** and **0.88** at similar Reynolds numbers to the main experiment. Additional information was obtained during the actual shock-wave boundary-layer interaction experiment from the static and pitot probe traverses ahead of the interaction, while further data were available from traverses **I** to **3** m downstream **of** the normal shock wave at M **= 1.3.** In all these cases it was assumed that there was no static pressure variation normal to the wall through each vertical boundary-layer traverse, and that the pressure was equal to the estimated wall value. Because the freestream calibration showed no apparent Reynolds number effects, data at the highest Reynolds number from the experiment were used.

Time limitations meant that nearly all the boundary layer static traverses were made with the twin-static probe rather than the single probes and the static investigation was omitted for $M = 1.4$ at a Reynolds number of $3.5 \times 10^{6}/m$. Single static probes were in fact used only as a check on the validity of the results obtained from the twin probe. Traverses were made in rather different streamwise positions from those made with the pitot probes and each traverse contained about half the measurements made using the pitot.

2.2.5 Shock-wave position

A careful check was made of the shock-wave position using the output from the shock-position transducer and readings were only taken while the shock wave was within prescribed limits. Subsequently, during the analysis of the results, the average position of the norma] part of the shock wave was ascertained from the large number of schlieren photographs taken for each set of tunnel conditions. This was necessary because there was an interval of a year between making the static pressure measurements and the pitot measurements. It was difficult to reset the shock wave in the same position, and so corrections had to be applied to make both sets of results compatible.

3 REDUCTION OF **DATA**

The data have been reduced as follows to produce the boundary layer profiles of Table 2 and the integral parameters of Table **3.**

3.1 Boundary-layer profiles

These have been tabulated against y (the equivalent height of the pitot or static tube above the wall) where for pitot measurements

$$
y = h + 0.15 d \tag{1}
$$

and for static measurements

$$
y = h \tag{2}
$$

where $h = height of probe centre line above floor$ and $d =$ diameter of probe.

The profiles have been derived

- (a) assuming constant wall static pressure applied throughout each traverse,
- (b) using measured static pressures after correction (see Appendix).

Standard formulae were used to calculate Mach numbers, velocities and densities from the pitot and static results. Total temperature was assumed constant across the boundary layer except at the wall where a recovery factor of 0.89 was used. Wall static pressures were calculated for each traverse position by linear interpolation of the floor static measurements made with the front pitot removed and the rear pitot as far downstream as possible.

The flow was assumed reversed when the pitot pressure was lower than the wall static pressure. In such cases measurements were also made with the pitot tube reversed in direction. The Mach number was taken as the mean derived from the two sets of measurements. When the pitot tube was effectively facing downstream, it was assumed that the pressure recorded was that for a base with a pressure coefficient of -0.6 . The wall static pressure was used for both sets of calculations in the reversed flow region.

Unit Reynolds numbers were calculated using the following formula based on Sutherland's law for viscosity

Re/m =
$$
\frac{M_{\delta}P_{\delta}}{T_{\delta}^2}
$$
 (T_o + 110.4) × 47.91 × 10³ (3)

where subscript **6** denotes conditions at the edge of the boundary layer

p is the static pressure in N/m^2

and T is the temperature in K.

A further patameter, namely p_i/p_{t_0} has been presented where p_i is an estimated static pressure in the 'equivalent inviscid flow' (see Ref 15). The static pressure p_i is that in the equivalent inviscid flow which is defined as the flow external to the shear layers continued as a: inviscid flow to the wall bounding the real flow with the growth of the viscous layer represented by transpiration at the boundary. **p**_i has been non-dimensionalised by dividing by the tunnel total pressure p_{t_0} .

An estimate of p_i/p_{t_0} has been attempted in the region ahead of the normal shockwave. Here, the flow at the edge of the boundary layer is supersonic and influence lines of constant p/p_{t_0} following Mach lines may be constructed back to the wall from the edge of the viscous region. An estimate of p_i/p_{t_0} as a function of y for each traverse can then be made from the carpet of influence lines which are assumed straight and inclined at the Mach angle μ plus the flow inclination at $\delta_{0.999}$ (the distance from the wall where $U/U_{\zeta} = 0.999$) viz

$$
\nu + \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{V}{U}\right)_{\delta}
$$

where $\left(\frac{V}{U}\right)_{\lambda} = \frac{d\delta^*}{dX} - (\delta_{0.999} - \delta^*) \frac{d}{dX} \left(\ln(c_{\lambda}U_{\delta})\right)$ (41)

and **V** is the vertical component of velocity

- U is the horizontal component of velocity
- **6*** is the displacement thickness
- **P** is the density.

It will be noted (see section 4.4) that there is a supersonic region at the edge of the boundary layer behind the normal shock wave for $M = 1.5$. However estimates of P_i/P_{t_0} have not been included for this region because they become discontinuous in the region of the shock wave.

3.2 Integral parameters

Boundary-layer thickness parameters were obtained by trapezoidal integration. Velocity profiles were faired between the wall and the pitot position corresponding to 0.8 mm from the wall by applying East's prediction of the law of the wall¹⁶ in compressible boundary layers as a 20 point curve.

East's prediction is based on an incompressible law of the wall combined with a compressibility factor. For this experiment Cole's law of the wall¹⁷ has been used with the constants recommended at the Stanford conference¹⁸ namely

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\tau}} = 5.62 \log \frac{yU_{\tau}}{v_{S}} + 5.0 , \qquad (5)
$$

where U_{τ} is the friction velocity.

The form of East's prediction which is faired into Cole's law of the wall is

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\tau}} = \frac{1}{F} \sin \left[F \left\{ 2K \ln \left(y^{\star 2} \frac{K}{D} + 1 \right) + D \left(1 - e^{-y^{\star}/D} \right) \right\} \right] , \qquad (6)
$$

where the compressibility factor

$$
F = M_{\tau} \sqrt{\frac{r(\gamma - 1)}{2}} = \frac{U_{\tau}}{\sqrt{T_{w}}} \times 0.021033 ,
$$

D = 8.73(1 + 45F²) ,

$$
y^* = y \frac{U_{\tau}}{V_{w}},
$$

K = 0.41 ,

r being the recovery factor, and suffix w denoting wall values.

A value of U_{τ} was obtained at $y \approx 0.8$ mm using equation (6) and values of U/U _r were then calculated for 20 equispaced values of y between 0 and 0.8 mm.

A linear variation was assumed between $y = 0$ and 0.8 mm for reversed flow.

The following definitions of the integral quantities have been used as first proposed by Myring¹⁹ and later incorporated in East's modified momentum integral equation¹⁵.

They are (where suffices i and w denote equivalent inviscid flow quantities and wall values respectively)

$$
\overline{\delta} = \frac{1}{\rho_{i\mathbf{w}} U_{i\mathbf{w}}} \int_{0}^{\delta} (\rho_{i} U_{i} - \rho U) dy , \qquad (7)
$$

$$
\tilde{\theta} = \frac{1}{\rho_{i\mathbf{w}} U_{i\mathbf{w}}^2} \int_0^{\rho} \left\{ \left(\rho_i U_i^2 - \rho U^2 \right) - U_{i\mathbf{w}} (\rho_i U_i - \rho U) \right\} dy , \qquad (8)
$$

 $H = \frac{3}{6}$, shape parameter **H** = $\frac{9}{4}$, (9)

shape parameter
$$
\overrightarrow{H} = \frac{1}{\overline{\theta} \rho_{i\mathbf{w}} U_{i\mathbf{w}}} \int_{0}^{\rho} \rho (U_i - U) dy
$$
 (1.0)

The integral parameters were calculated for three different distributions of static pressure across the boundary layers as described in the following paragraphs.

3.2.1 Static pressure constant and equal to the measured wall pressure

Equations (7) , (8) , (9) and (10) reduce to the familiar standard integrals when static pressure is constant across the boundary layer giving

$$
\mathbf{10} \\
$$

۲.
م

$$
\text{displacement thickness} \qquad \delta^{\star} = \int_{0}^{\delta} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon U}{\rho_{\delta} U_{\delta}} \right) dy \quad , \qquad (1)
$$

momentum thickness
$$
\theta = \int_{0}^{\delta} \frac{\rho U}{\rho_{\delta} U_{\delta}} \left(1 - \frac{U}{U_{\delta}}\right) dy
$$
 (12)

shape factor
$$
H = \frac{\xi^*}{\hat{H}}
$$
, (13)

shape factor
$$
\overline{H} = \frac{1}{\hat{v}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left(1 - \frac{v}{U_{\xi}} \right) dy
$$
 (14)

The energy thickness was also evaluated:
$$
\delta_{\mathbf{E}} = \int_{0}^{\alpha} \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial s} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\mathbf{U}}{\mathbf{U}_s}\right)^2\right] dy
$$
 (15)

3.2.2 Static pressure variation as me3sured

Equations (7), (8), (9) and (10) can be used in an 'intermediate form' as in Cook. McDonald and Firmin²⁰, In this form the boundary layer defect thicknesses are refurred to a fictitious potential flow having the same static pressure distribution as that for the actual viscous flow and a total pressure equal to that at the edge of the boundary layer (p_{t_1}) .

Thus for example

$$
M_p = \sqrt{5\left[\left(\frac{P_{t_1}}{P}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} - 1\right]}
$$
 (16)

where
$$
p_{t_1} = p_\delta \left(1 + 0.2 M_\delta^2 \right)^{3.5}
$$
 (17)

The revised integral quantities are as follows:

displacement thickness
$$
\delta^* = \frac{1}{\rho_w \frac{U}{W}} \int_{0}^{\delta} (\rho_p U_p - \rho U) dy
$$
, (18)

momentum thickness
$$
\theta = \frac{1}{\rho_w v_w^2} \int_0^6 \left\{ \left(\rho_p v_p^2 - \rho v^2 \right) - v_p (\rho_p v_p - \rho v) \right\} dy , \quad (19)
$$

 $\overline{11}$

shape factor
$$
H = \frac{\delta \star}{\dot{v}}
$$
,

shape factor
$$
\overline{H} = \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{1}{\rho_w U_w} \int_{0}^{1} \rho_p (U_p - U) dy
$$
 (20)

3.2.3 Equivalent inviscid static pressure together with measured static pressure

 $\overline{5}$, \overline{e} , H and H have already been defined by equations (7), (8), (9) and (10).

Equivalent inviscid static pressures were estimated as described in section 3.1 for traverse positions ahead of the normal shock. Equivalent inviscid Mach numbers were obtained from these pressures, and the total pressure calculated at the edge of the boundary layer (equation (17)) so that

$$
M_{i} = \sqrt{5 \left[\left(\frac{P_{t_{i}}}{P_{i}} \right)^{2} - 1 \right]}
$$
 (21)

 f_i and U_i were obtained from M_i using a temperature recovery factor of unity while the values of ρ and U were identical to those in section 3.2.2 (being calculated from the measured pitot and static pressures).

Linear interpolation was used to obtain ρ_i and U_i for the 20 points between the wall and $y \approx 0.8$ mm.

1.3 Skin friction

Three estimates of skin friction are given.

The first estimate C_{f_p} has been deduced by considering the pitot tube when in contact with the wall to be a Preston tube and applying Patel's²¹ calibration as formulated by Head and Vasanta Ram^{22} and transformed for compressible flow by the method of Fenter **²³** and Stalmach

The second and third estimates emerge directly from U_{τ} which was calculated by fitting East's law of the wall (equation (6)) to the pitot reading for $y \approx 0.8$ mm. The second estimate was obtained assuming constant wall static pressure to apply across the boundary layer and the third was obtained using measured static pressures. Because at $y = 0.8$ mm wall static pressure applied for both cases, the differences are entirely due to the boundary layer edge conditions obtained from the different static pressures.

It will be noted that several values of C_f are missing from Table 3 and these omissions occur where reversed flow is indicated at M = 1.5.

4 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

4.1 The general characteristics of the flow

4.1.1 Shock-wave patterns

Fig 6a shows the vertical cross sections of the main interactions traced from schlieren photographs. Typical photographs have been reproduced in Fig **6b.** For completeness, the calculated boundary layer thickness $(6_{0.995})$ and the start of the measured reversed flow regions at M **= 1.5** have been added to the diagrams. The progression from the pattern at M **= 1 .3** of a single normal shock wave distorted **by** the influence **of** corpression curves emanating from the thickening of the upstream boundary layer, to the established triple shock system with the shear layer emanating from the point of bifurcation at M **= 1.5,** is well illustrated. The increase in size of the shock system with reduction in Reynolds number can also be seen.

The main interaction region has been described in detail by East³ and the present results at high Reynolds numbers agree with his at M **= 1.3** and 1.4. However there is a discrepancy between the sets of results at M **= 1.5.** The shock bifurcation point for the present experiments is at **180 mmi** from the floor compared with a value, presumed to be erroneous, of **215** zmm given **by** East.

4.1.2 Flow visualisation

After the completion of the traverse measurements the interaction region was examined **by** oil flow*.

Photographs of the surface oil flow were taken for all three Mach numbers at a Reynolds number of 10 × 10⁶/m. These photographs, reproduced in Fig 7, were taken after shutting down the tunnel and removing the roof and therefore suffer from slight blurring. The viewpoint looks downstream. The photographs reveal mild three-dimensional effects for M **= 1.3** and M **=** 1.4 but a much more complex pattern for M **1.5** when the flow is separated. The photograph for M **= 1.5** is shown in more detail in Fig **8** together with an attempted interpretation of the wall streamlines.

The nature of the flow in this case appears to be such that there is flow along the arch of a vortex connecting a position on the port side, denoted **by** B in Fig **8,** to a position denoted **by A** on the starboard side. Thus in a sense **A** is an attachment node and B a separation node. It should be remarked that whilst the srreamwise ex-ent **of** this region is roughly 300 mm the probe measurements suggest its depth to be only 7 mm.

Near the tunnel centre line between the two vortex patterns, the flow is tolerably, two-dimensional except in the immediate regions of the saddle points at the start and end of the separation region.

Presumably because of the non-uniform boundary-layer thickness on the tunnel side wall arising from the flow field associated with the assymetrical nozzle, the separation line on the sidewall is swept and a single vortex node only of separation type is formed.

^{*}The oil-flow mixture was an amalgam of the following in the ratio of 4 cc Vitrea F2, to 2 cc Limea 931, to 3 cc TiO₂, to 2 drops of oleic acid.

The vortex arising from this node is presumed to create the strong convergence towards the tunnel centre line occurring in the corner regions downstream of the interaction. The lines D in Fig 8 have the appearance of separation lines but may in fact indicate only a locally strong convergence of the boundary layer.

4.1.3 Momentum balance

Momentum balance calculations have been made using a rearranged form of East's 15 .

$$
\frac{d\vec{\theta}}{dx} + (H + 2 - M_{iw}^2) \frac{\vec{\theta}}{U_{iw}} \frac{dU_{iw}}{dx} - \frac{\tau_w}{\rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2}
$$
\n
$$
= -\frac{1}{2c_{iw} U_{iw}^2} \frac{d}{dx} \left\{ \rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2 \left(\frac{d^2 \vec{\xi}}{dx^2} + \kappa \right) (\vec{\theta} + \vec{\delta})^2 \right\} + \kappa (\vec{\theta} + \vec{\delta}) \frac{d\vec{\delta}}{dx}
$$
\n
$$
+ \frac{1}{\rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2} \frac{d}{dx} \left\{ K \rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2 \vec{\theta} \left(\frac{\vec{\mu} - 1}{\vec{\mu}} \right) \right\} + \frac{M_{iw}^2 \vec{\theta} V_{iw}}{U_{iw}^2} \frac{dV_{iw}}{dx} .
$$
\n(22)

The last term has been neglected in the analysis because it is small and in any case cannot be evaluated with any reliability. The remaining terms in the right hand side of the equation are:

Q) the normal pressure gradient effect arising from the wall and stream curvature; (2) the approximation to the direct effect of wall curvature on the flow momentum; J the approximation to the normal stress terms.

The integral parameters, H, \tilde{H} , θ and δ are defined in equations (7) to (10) while $c_{i\mathbf{w}}^{\dagger}$, $\mathbf{U}_{i\mathbf{w}}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{i\mathbf{w}}$ are respectively the equivalent inviscid values of density, horizontal component of velocity and Mach number at the wall.

The surface curvature κ is zero for this example leaving

$$
\frac{d\overline{\theta}}{dx} + \left(H + 2 - M_{iw}^2\right) \frac{\overline{\theta}}{U_{iw}} \frac{dU_{iw}}{dx} - \frac{\tau_w}{\rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2}
$$
\n
$$
= -\frac{1}{2\rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2} \frac{d}{dx} \left\{\rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2 \frac{d^2\overline{\delta}}{dx^2} (\overline{\theta} + \overline{\delta})^2 \right\} + \frac{1}{\rho_{iw} U_{iw}^2} \frac{d}{dx} \left\{ K_{\rho_{iw}} U_{iw}^2 \overline{\theta} \left(\frac{\overline{H} - 1}{\overline{H}}\right) \right\}.
$$
\n(23)

After multiplying throughout by $\psi_{i\mathbf{w}}^2$ and rearranging, the equation becomes

14

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\left(\rho_{i\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{U}_{i\mathbf{w}}^{2}\overline{\theta}\right) = \tau_{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{H}\rho_{i\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{U}_{i\mathbf{w}}\overline{\theta}\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{U}_{i\mathbf{w}}}{\mathrm{d}x} + \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\left(\mathrm{f}\rho_{i\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{U}_{i\mathbf{w}}^{2}\overline{\theta}\right) ,\qquad (24)
$$

where $f = f_1 - f_2$,

$$
f_1 = 0.072 \left(\frac{\overline{R} - 1}{\overline{H}} \right), \text{ and is the contribution due to the normal stress,}
$$

and
$$
f_2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2 \overline{\delta}}{dx^2} \frac{1}{\overline{H}} (\overline{R} + \delta^2) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2 \overline{\delta}}{dx^2} (1 + H)(\overline{\theta} + \overline{\delta}) \text{ and is the contribution due to the stream curvature}
$$

If suffix 0 represents the conditions at the start of the interaction, then dividing through by $\rho_{jw_0}v_{iw_0}^2\bar{v}_{iw_0}$ and integrating, results in the form of the momentum integral equation used in the momentum balance calculations shown in Fig 9:

$$
\left[\frac{\rho_{i\omega}v_{i\omega}^{2}}{\rho_{i\omega_{0}}v_{i\omega_{0}}^{2}\bar{\theta}_{0}} - 1\right] = \int_{x_{0}}^{x} \frac{c_{f}}{2} \frac{\rho_{e}v_{e}^{2}}{\rho_{i\omega_{0}}v_{i\omega_{0}}^{2}\theta_{0}} dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{u_{i\omega_{0}}}\frac{\rho_{i\omega}^{-\bar{\theta}}}{\rho_{i\omega_{0}}\bar{\theta}_{0}} d\left(\frac{v_{i\omega}}{v_{i\omega_{0}}}\right)^{2} + \left(\frac{f\rho_{i\omega}v_{i\omega}^{2}}{\rho_{i\omega_{0}}v_{i\omega_{0}}^{2}\bar{\theta}_{0}} - f_{0}\right)
$$

...... (25)
In Figs 9 and 11 $\left(\frac{\rho_{i}U_{i\theta}^{2}}{\rho_{i}U_{i\theta}^{2}} - 1\right)$ is called the left hand side while the remainder $^{\sf o}$ iw $_0^{\sf u}$ iw

of the expression is called the right hand side. The numbered terms are identified later (in Fig 12) as the contributions due to

$$
\begin{array}{cc}\n\textcircled{4} & \text{skin friction} \\
\textcircled{5} & \text{sim}\n\end{array}
$$

(pressure gradient.

Both sides of equation (25) were calculated using the alternative assumptions of section 3.2 which were (for traverses across the boundary layer):

- (a) static pressure constant and equal to the measured wall pressure;
- (b) static pressure as measured;
- (c) equivalent inviscid static pressure together with measured static pressure. The equivalent inviscid static pressure was calculated for traverses ahead of the shock wave only.

Fig 9 shows the comparison between the left hand side and the right hand side of equation (25) plotted against the streamwise position. The calculations were made using assumption (c). It will be seen that the momentum balance is good over the main interaction region and only becomes significantly in error at approximately 800 mm downstream of the normal shock wave. Downstream of this point, the left hand side actually reduces foi Mach numbers ahead of the interaction of 1.4 and 1.5. This indicates a flow divergence and it is interesting to calculate its magnitude.

L5

In terms of equation (22) Green et a^2 showed that a flow divergence could be accounted for by subtracting the local rate of divergence $\frac{1}{\theta}(\frac{d\phi}{dz})$ from the right hand side. This quantity represents the rate of the deviation relative to the nominal flow direction with respect to distance Z perpendicular to the flow but parallel to the surface.

In equation (25) this divergence takes the form

$$
\int\limits_{X_0}^{X}\frac{{^\rho}i\textbf{w}^U\overset{2}{i}\textbf{w}^{\overline{\theta}}}{^\rho} \frac{d\varphi}{\omega_0^U\overset{2}{i}\textbf{w}_0^{\overline{\theta}}}\frac{d\varphi}{dz} \, \, \text{d}x
$$

and this can be added to the left hand side. It is therefore easy to make an estimate of $d \phi/dz$.

This estimate is shown in Fig lOa-c in degrees per metre. For points further downstream of the normal shock wave than 300 mm the figures show a flow divergence of $7^{\circ}/m$ at $M = 1.3$ rising to $15^{\circ}/m$ at $M = 1.5$ (equivalent to 7° and 15° over the tunnel width). The wild fluctuations within the main interaction region are of course due to the rapidly changing conditions and the close streamwise spacing of the traverse positions.

Assumptions (a), (b) and (c) were used to provide comparisons of both sides of the momentum integral equation as shown in Fig **II.** There appears little to choose between the momentum balance using any of these assumptions. However it is possible to see some improvement using assumption (b) rather than (a). If the region ahead of the shock wave is examined there is again some improvement if calculation assumption (c) is used.

Fig 12 shows the individual contributions to the right hand side of equation (25).

4.2 Edge Mach numbers and boundary layer parameters

Fig 13a-c shows the development of the Mach number at the edge of the boundary layer, M_{δ} , the boundary-layer displacement thickness, ϵ^* , the shape factor H, defined by equation (13), the boundary layer thickness, **60.995 ,** the skin friction coefficient C_{f_p} (section 3.3), and the shape factor \bar{H} defined by equation (14), all plotted against the longitudinal distance X from the normal part of the shock wave. The results in Fig 13 were calculated assuming constant static pressure, p_w, across the boundary layer normal to the tunnel wall. Further graphs of M_{x} , $5*$, H and \overline{H} (Fig 14a-c) show the effect of using measured static pressures to calculate these parameters. The longitudinal region covered by these figures is from 500 **mm** ahead to 500 mm downstream of the normal shock wave. Outside this region it was assumed that the static pressures were constant normal to the wall and equal to the static pressures used in the first set of calculations (see Fig 15a&b and the Appendix).

Overall there appears to be little effect of variation of Reynolds number on the shape factors and the normalised variation of δ^* and $\delta_{0.995}$. A separation bubble occurs under the interaction region at M = **1.5** and its extent is indicated by the zero values of C_{f_p} . The bubble size decreases slightly with increase in Reynolds number.
The shape of the bubble can, however, be seen in the plots of Mach number distribution, The shape of the bubble can, however, be seen in the plots of Mach number distribution, Fig 16a-f, and will be described in section 4.4.

The results agree broadly with those obtained in Ref 2 where a fixed pitot rake was used on the standard tunnel floor. However discrepancies begin to creep in **I** m downstream of the normal shock wave where in Ref 2 the Mach number at the start of the interaction was affected **by** the proximity of the tunnel throat. The results from Ref 2 at M **= 1.5** were much more sensitive to Reynolds number in the interaction region and this was probably due to pitot-rake interference. One other point should be noted (and it can be seen in nearly all the following figures) and that is that the rehabilitation process behind the normal shock wave has not been completed after **3** m. This distance is equivalent to at least 400 times the undisturbed displacement thickness ahead of the interaction. It can be seen in Fig 13a-c that the edge Mach numbers, shape factors and boundary layer thicknesses have not yet reached their asymptotic values at the furthest downstream traverse positions.

4.3 Measured static pressures

Static pressure distributions normal to the wall are plotted on scale diagrams of the main interaction region in Fig 15a&b as the difference from the corresponding wall static pressure non-dimensionalised **by** dividing **by** the undisturbed stagnation pressure. Zero values are located at the appropriate streamwise station.

As described in the Appendix, the static pressure results have usually been made to merge into the appropriate wall values at floor level, however wall static values have been assumed to apply throughout the separated region in the absence of reliable local values. Static pressures recorded very close to the shock wave may have been affected **by** its movement and so local pressure gradients may have been reduced.

The diagrams show the expected static pressure variation throughout the main interaction region. The static pressures are fairly constant across the inner part of the shear flow and then decrease outwards across the compression region ahead of the normal shock wave to free-stream values. Behind the main shock wave they increase from one fairly constant level near the wall to a second level behind the normal part of the shock wave.

4.4 Mach number distribution

Mach number contours are plotted in Fig 16a-f over the main interaction region and over the whole of the region investigated downstream of the normal shock wave (note the change of streamwise scale). Measured pitot and the corrected static pressures were used to calculate Mach numbers and the figures result from linear interpolations of Mach number profiles in the vertical direction and from horizontal plots of Mach numbers at constant distances from the wall, **y.**

The results are therefore dependent on the accuracy of the corrected static pressure measurements and the interpolation procedures which are affected most critically **by** the smearing effect of the slightly unsteady shock wave. However the results in the interaction region are broadly confirmed **by** the laser-Doppler anemometer measurements **of** East³ and the results of Kooi['] at $M = 1.4$. A particular feature is the development of the supersonic tongue beneath the downstream shock wave for $M = 1.5$.

If East's and the present results at a Reynolds number of **10** x **106 /m** are compared in slightly more detail, the Mach number contours are in good agreement ahead of the normal shock wave if due allowance is made for the smearing effect of the unsteady shock wave (see above). Very similar supersonic tongues may be seen behind the shock wave and they continue downstream (in both experiments) for **100** mm near the edge of the boundary layer. East's results at M **= 1.5** do not cover the full extent of the supersonic tongue but show that it is more extensive than at M **=** 1.4. In fact the present experiment confirms that it persists near the edge of the boundary layer for 400 mm downstream of the shock wave while at a Reynolds number of 3.5×10^6 /m it persists for 600 mm.

It is difficult to be specific about the shape of the supersonic tongue immediately downstream of the trailing shock wave, but the present results agree well with Kooi⁷ who also used pitot and static pressure measurements. The rear shock wave appears to terminate at the edge of the boundary layer so that supersonic flow appears to exist above the boundary layer behind a normal shock wave.

There is evidence to suggest that the thin shear layer formed downstream of the shock bifUrcation point is still intact **3** m behind the normal shock wave, and even at **M= 1.3** there is no sign that the inviscid flow has recovered sufficiently to provide a uniform Mach number contour across the tunnel.

The other point of interest is the separation region at M **= 1.5.** There appears to be a small decrease in the overall dimensions of the separation bubble with increase in Reynolds number. In fact the length of the separation bubble is reduced from **300 mm** at $Re/m = 3.5 \times 10^6$ to 200 mm at $Re/m = 10 \times 10^6$ while the height is reduced slightly from just over **9** mm at the lowest Reynolds number to **7** nmn at the highest Reynolds number. This result is in disagreement with Sawyer ϵt a,² where a much greater reduction in bubble size was indicated although as stated in section 4.2 the conditions were somewhat different.

4.5 Boundary-layer velocity profiles

4.5.1 General

Boundary-layer profiles are shown in Fig 17a-f plotted on a scale diagram of the main interaction region together with an extended diagram on a compressed scale showing the whole region of measurement behind the normal shock wave.

The figures indicate the general characteristics of the boundary-layer development. They show the progression from the undisturbed state through the leading compression which influences the shape of the outer part of the boundary layer, through the subsequent separation or near-separation region, to the final recovery towards a zero-pressuregradient form for the profiles. It can be seen even on the small scale diagrams that the profiles are still disturbed after a distance of nearly **3** m downstream of the normal shock wave, or approximately 400 times the undisturbed displacement thickness.

4.5.2 Logarithmic velocity profiles

Representative velocity profiles are plotted in the logarithmic form adopted **by** Winter and Gaudet²⁵ as $\left(U/U_i^i\right)$ against $log(yU_i^i/v_\delta)$ where U_i^i is the equivalent

18

'0

incompressible friction velocity. Values of U_{τ}^{i} were derived from the skin friction coefficient C_{fp} using the formula

$$
v_{\tau}^{i} = v_{\delta} \left(\frac{c_{f_p}}{2} \right)^{i} \left(1 + 0.2 M_{\delta}^{2} \right)^{i} . \tag{26}
$$

Cf_p was obtained by treating the pitot tube when in contact with the wall as a Preston tube and using the calculation method described in section 3.3.

The results are plotted separately for three regions. Fig 18 shows the undisturbed velocity profiles just ahead of the interaction region. These profiles were used to define the undisturbed conditions of Table **1.** The profiles far downstream of the interaction region are shown in Fig 19. Fig 20 shows typical profiles just downstream of the main interaction region.

4.5.3 The law of the wall

Figs 18 to 20 show typical 'law of the wall' fits for small values of y (the distance from the wall). The law of the wall is defined in the form adopted by Winter and Gaudet 25 as

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\tau}^{\mathbf{i}}} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{yU_{\tau}^{\mathbf{i}}}{\nu_{\xi}} \right) + \phi(0) \quad , \tag{27}
$$

which may be expressed as

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\tau}^{\frac{1}{2}}} = A \log \left(\frac{yU_{\tau}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V_{\delta}} \right) + B \quad . \tag{28}
$$

The results have been compared with Winter and Gaudet's incompressible law of the wall

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\tau}^1} = 6.05 \log \left(\frac{yU_{\tau}^1}{v_{\delta}} \right) + 4.05 , \qquad (29)
$$

and with Coles' incompressible form (equation (5))

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\tau}} = 5.62 \log \left(\frac{yU_{\tau}}{V_{\delta}} \right) + 5.0
$$

Coles' incompressible law of the wall is usually applied to compressible flow by making use of the Van Driest 26 transformation. It was therefore necessary to confirm that the transformations of Van Driest and Winter and Gaudet gave similar results when applied to the compressible profiles of the preaent experiment. Two profiles were checked and are plotted using both transformations in Figs 18 and 19. The first profile had a free-stream Mach number of 1.54 and was in the undisturbed region ahead of the

interaction region, while the second profile had a free-stream Mach number of **0.83** and was from a pitot traverse made 2759 mm downstream of the normal shock wave. It can be seen that both transformations gave identical values **of A** and B although the wake components were very different at the free-stream Mach number of 1.54 (Fig **18).** Because both transformations gave identical values of **A** and B Coles' incompressible law of the wall has been presented in the form adopted **by** Winter and Gaudet.

It would appear from Fig **18** that within the data scatter there is little to choose between the forms of the law of the wall due to Coles and due to Winter and Gaudet.

The average fit made to all the profiles ahead of the interaction region is

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\frac{1}{2}}} = 6.16 \log \frac{yU_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{v_{\delta}^{2}} + 3.6
$$
 (30)

which is somewhat closer to the latter.

However behind the normal shock wave (Figs **19** and 20) the average **fit** becomes

$$
\frac{U}{U_{\tau}^{\frac{1}{2}}} = 4.77 \log \frac{yU_{\tau}^{1}}{v_{\delta}} + 6.6
$$
 (31)

which is quite different from equation **(30).**

Equations **(30)** and **(31)** were obtained **by** fitting the best straight lines (using the method of least squares) to the linear logarithmic regions close to the wall and averaging the results ahead of, and downstream of, the normal shock wave. Straight line fitting was not attempted when there were less than eight measured points in the linear region, or when the pitot traverse results contained reversed flow. The two traverse positions that were closest to the wall were omitted when fitting best straight lines.

Fig 21 shows the variation of **A** and B with streamwise position for each undisturbed free stream condition. It demonstrates most clearly the reduction in **A** accompanied **by** an increase in B for the boundary-layer traverse positions downstream of the normal shock wave. There does not seem to be any consistent variation of **A** and B with Reynolds number.

It would appear therefore that either large perturbations or normal pressure gradients affect the law of the wall, in a way which implies an increase in the eddy viscosity.

4.5.4 Departures from equilibrium and the law of the wake

An attempt has been made to demonstrate violent departures of the flow from equilibrium **by** extracting from the measurements the parameters used to describe the equilibrium locus in integral models of turbulent boundary layers. The analysis is further extended in terms of the character and magnitude of the wake component.

In order to deal with separated flows, East, Smith and Merryman²⁷ redefined the usual parameters

21

$$
G = \frac{\overline{H} - 1}{\overline{H}} \sqrt{\frac{2}{C_f}} \quad , \tag{32}
$$

$$
\Pi = -\frac{2\delta^{\star}}{C_f U_{\delta}} \frac{dU_{\delta}}{dX}
$$
 (33)

as
$$
E_{f}^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{G^{2}} \quad , \tag{34}
$$

and

$$
E_p^i = \frac{\Pi}{c^2} \quad , \tag{35}
$$

thus removing the difficulty created as the skin friction coefficient passes through zero and becomes negative. With an empirically derived allowance for compressibility, the parameters become

$$
E_{f} = \frac{1 + 0.04M_{\odot}^{2}}{G^{2}}
$$
 (36)

$$
E_p = \frac{\Pi}{G^2} \left(1 + 0.04 M_{\delta}^2 \right) \quad . \tag{37}
$$

In Fig 22, the loci for the measured boundary layer developments are compared with the equilibrium locus

$$
E_{f} = 0.024 - 0.8E_{p}
$$
 (38)

which is substantiated **by** experiment for attached flow and tentatively assumed in Ref **27** to remain valid in separated flow.

Points to the right and left of the equilibrium locus correspond respectively to stronger and weaker adverse pressure gradients than those appropriate to equilibrium flow. Negative values of E_p represent favourable pressure gradients, while negative values of E_f represent separation.

In Fig 22 the results for each set of test conditions have been plotted using symbols to represent the following regions

- **A** represents equilibrium conditions ahead of the main interaction;
- B represents the strongly adverse pressure gradient under the leading compression (which causes separation at M **= 1.5);**
- **C** represents the rapid recovery just downstream of the normal shock wave;
- **D** represents the remainder of the flow which might be expected to approach equilibrium conditions.

Points on the loci where there are changes from one region to the next are indicated **by** the numerals **I** to **3.**

┙

The loci show that region A is approximately in equilibrium but the rapid rise of E_n while E_f only falls slowly in region B indicates that the boundary layer lags in its response to the strong adverse pressure gradient under the leading compression. In region C, E_n recovers rapidly to the equilibrium locus but then overshoots before returning. E_f only starts to increase after E_n has overshot the equilibrium locus and this again indicates a lag in the response of the boundary layer to a change in pressure radient. The failure of the boundary layer to return to the equilibrium locus far down- **<1ram** in region **D)** may be interpreted as a further indication of the persistently dissuptive effect of the shock-wave boundary-layer interactions on the velocity profiles diready detected in the law of the wall as shown in Fig 21.

On the other hand the wake components of the profiles, remain fairly close to the standard shape as shown in Figs 23 and 24. In these figures the normalised wake components have been plotted in the following way. Fig 23a shows the undisturbed wake .omponents in region A , and the results under the first compression through which it is possible to fit a law of the wall are shown in Fig 23b. Fig 24a-c has been produced by ,-rouping similar normalised wakes into one diagram. In fact Fig 24a&b covers the rapid recovery region C together with the beginning of D, while Fig 24c covers the down-41ream part of region **D .**

According to Winter and Gaudet²⁵ the law of the wake for compressible boundary layers in zero pressure gradients is

$$
\frac{\Delta U}{U_{\tau}^1} = 0.89 \left[1 + \sin \frac{\pi}{0.707} \left(\frac{y}{\delta_{0.999}} - 0.483 \right) \right] \quad . \tag{39}
$$

which after normalisation and allowance for the difference between $\delta_{0.999}$ and $\delta_{0.995}$ tion ome s

$$
\left(\frac{\Delta U}{U_{\tau}^{\mathbf{i}}}\right)_{\mathbf{N}} = 0.5 \left[1 + \sin \frac{\pi}{0.818} \left(\frac{\mathbf{y}}{\delta_{0.995}} - 0.529\right)\right] , \qquad (40)
$$

Finallised wake component $(\Delta U/U^{\mathbf{i}}_{\tau})_{N}$ has been obtained by dividing the wake omponent by the maximum value for each traverse. The shape of the normalised wake compottents has been plotted in Figs 23 and 24. On each figure a curve in the form of v quation (40) is shown with the constants adjusted to fit the particular set of results.

The maximum values of the wake component for each traverse $\left(\Delta U/U_{\tau}^{1}\right)_{\text{max}}$ are plotted Fig **25** against **^Ef** In Fig 25a the results for regions **A** and B ahead of the o rmal shock wave are given while the results downstream of the normal shock wave (in regions C and **D**) are shown in Fig 25b. It will be seen in Fig 25a that apart from the boundary layer profiles that have been perturbed by the leading edge of the strong ompression, the maximum values of the wake components are in good agreement with the locus obtained from the equilibrium family of boundary layers described by East, Sawyer and Nash²⁸. However, in Fig 25b for locations downstream of the disruptive effect of the strong pressure gradient (points in the regions C and **D** downstream of the normal shock wave) the results depart considerably from the equilibrium locus.

The different behaviour upstream and downstream of the shock wave is illustrated further in Fig 26 where calculated values of J and K are plotted against the equilibrium parameter E_f . The values of J and K were obtained by fitting sine waves of the form

$$
\begin{pmatrix}\n\frac{\Delta U}{U} \\
\frac{\Delta U}{U} \\
\frac{\Delta U}{U}\n\end{pmatrix} = 0.5 \left[1 + \sin \frac{\pi}{J} \left(\frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}} - K \right) \right],
$$
\n(41)

Lo the wake components for each boundary layer profile.

It should be noted that because of the quantity of data recorded, the values of $\left(\frac{1}{10}\right)^{11}$ were taken at that y-position of the pitot probe which gave a maximum value rather than estimating the true value by curve fitting. This in part accounts for the spread of values of J . No attempt was made to investigate the region B under the first compression.

However in the undisturbed equilibrium boundary layers of region A , the averaged values of J and K result in a normalised law of the wake

$$
\left(\frac{\Delta U}{U_{\tau}^{\frac{1}{4}}}\right)_{N} = 0.5 \left[1 + \sin \frac{\pi}{0.819} \left(\frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}} - 0.494\right)\right]
$$
 (42)

which is extremely close to Winter and Gaudet's law (equation (40)). The average value of $(LU/U^1)_{\text{max}}$ for region A is 2.23 which is rather higher than Winter and Gaudet's value of **1.78** (equation (39)).

In the region downstream of the shock wave (Fig 26b) the parameters J and K show an appreciable variation with E_f . Thus in this region the velocity profiles cannot be represented by a family having either a standard law of the wall (section 4.5.3) or a standard form of the law of the wake.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Seven flows have been studied involving the interaction of normal shock waves with nominally two-dimensional turbulent boundary layers over a range of Mach numbers of **I.,** to **1.5** and of Reynolds numbers based on an effective streamwise run of 10×10^6 to ³⁰**- 106.** The data extend from 700 mm upstream to 3000 mm downstream of the normal shockwave position. These distances are equivalent to respectively 90 and 400 times the undisturbed boundary layer displacement thickness.

Oil flow investigations on the floor under the main interaction region indicate a highly three-dimensional flow at M **=** 1.5, but the results and momentum balance calculations support the view that this three-dimensionality is confined to the separation region. This region is very shallow having a depth of less than 10 mm and streamwise extent of 300 mm while the flow in the region of the tunnel centre line is tolerably two-dimensional, except in the immediate regions of the saddle points at the start and end of the separation. Further downstream of the main interaction region, the momentum balance calculations indicate a slight flow divergence over the width of the tunnel of between 7° at M = 1.3 to 15° at M = 1.5.

In calculating the momentum balance, use has been made of corrected static pressure measurements and an attempt has been made to follow the recent ideas of matching the teenstream conditions with the viscous layer by defining an equivalent inviscid flow.

A method has been evolved for correcting the static pressure measurements made with the twin static pressure probe used in the experiment, and static pressure distributions ormal to the wall within the main shock-wave boundary-layer interaction are presented. combined with pitot measurements this enables the Mach number distribution to be obtained.

The results agree with the laser measurements of East³ which cover a more limited of. The present experiment has also produced more detail of the separated region. d agreement is also noted with Kool's⁷ results at $M = 1.4$.

All the measurements confirm that the flow has not stabilised after 3 m downstream the normal shock wave (or 400 times the undisturbed displacement thickness). Here the This shear layer which is produced at the bifurcation point of the shock waves at $M = 1.4$ and 1.5 is intact and there are still velocity gradients across the tunnel in the inviscid low. Also the bouldary-layer profiles have not recovered to the equilibrium shapes.

The analysis in terms of the law of the wall and the law of the wake for the region alwad of the interaction agree fairly closely with Winter and Gaudet (equation (29)) and les (equation (5)). However the evidence downstream of the normal shock wave suggests with the law of the wall has been changed by the large perturbations or normal pressure mailents. However a single law of the wall may be used for the whole region behind the ain disturbance.

A normalised version of Winter and Gaudet's law of the wake (equation (40)) prevides a tair estimate for the shape of the normalised wake components ahead of the normal shock tive. The disruptive effects of the normal shock waves appear mainly as changes in magified of the normalised wake components, but the form of the wake component is also anazed.

Apart from the boundary layers immediately affected by the loading edge of the first mpression, the maximum values of the wake function ahead of the normal shock wave have -imilar correlation with the equilibrium function E_f (equation (36)) as the equilibrium analy of flows of East, Sawyer and Nash²⁸. Although the maximum values of the wake and ions downstream of the normal shock wave also correlate with \mathbb{E}_f , they correlate in : quite different way from that expected for equilibrium boundary layers.

Appendix STATIC PRESSURE PROBE CORRECTIONS

A.1 Calibration measurements

As stated previously (section 2.2.4) the corrections to be applied to the static pressure probes were based on limited measurements made in the free stream at transonic speeds together with the results of the calibrations of the twin static pressure probe by traverses through the floor boundary layers at free-stream Mach numbers between **0.66 and 0.88.** Additional information was derived during the actual experiment from the static and pitot traverses ahead of the interaction region at free-stream Mach numbers oi **I.3,** 1.4 and 1.5. Data was also used from the static and pitot traverses made through the boundary layer **I** to 3 m downstream of the normal shock wave at M **⁼**1.3. It was assumed that for all these regions the static pressure for each traverse was constant and equal to the wall value, p_w .

The results of the free-stream calibrations are shown in Fig 27 where the differences between the measured and actual static pressures are presented as pressurecoefficients based on local conditions plotted against Mach number. Alsu (shown dotted) are the calibrations after three stages of smoothing which were used to correct ihe static pressure readings made under the severe velocity gradients of the region investigated (section A.2.2). There was no apparent Reynolds number effect on the calibrations but time limitations precluded much use of the single static pressure probes. The correction method described, therefore applies only to the twin static pressure probe. **No** static measurements were made at $M = 1.4$ for a unit Reynolds number of $3.5 \times 10^{7}/m$.

A.2 The correction method applied to the twin static pressure probe

Fig 28a&b shows typical static pressure measurement errors incurred while making boundary layer traverses with the twin static pressure probe. The boundary layers had Constant static pressures normal to the wall.

The errors have been presented as the differences between the measured and actual static pressures and are shown as pressure coefficients based on local conditions. Thev are plotted against the distance from the wall, y , non-dimensionalised by dividing by the boundary layer thickness $\delta_{0.995}$.

Fig 28a shows typical errors when the maximum Mach number is less than the critical value of 1.098 (the point at which the free-stream calibration errors are shown in Fig 27, to become negligible). The errors have a different character if the maximum Mach number for the traverse is above the critical value as shown in Fig 28b. It is therefore convenient to divide the errors to be corrected into two categories:

- **(i)** when the outer static pressure probe is at a Mach number of less than or equal to 1.098;
- (2) when the outer static pressure probe is at a Mach number greater than 1.098.

لب

Appendix

Ihis is a not unreasonable assumption because the main source of error in the tree-5tream calibrations and the static traverse measurements made away from the influence of the wall, can be shown to be mostly due to the interconnecting stem between the inner and static pressure probes (see Fig 27 and Reed. Pope and Cooksey¹⁹, pp 10.8103). berefore the main correction to be applied to the inner static probe depends on some simate of the mean Mach number over the connecting stem provided the static pressure robes are both at Mach numbers below the critical I.098. If however, the outer static **nVe** is at a Mach number above this critical value, then there is no interference ,-iated with the interconnecting stem in the region of the outer static probe. In A, case a suitable course of action is to use the local Mach number to estimate the - Yreciion due to the interconnecting stem on the pressure measured by the inner static F,'D .

it is now proposed to deal with the errors in more detail by considering the three regions A, B and C indicated in Fig 28 in conjunction with the Mach number of the ater static pressure probe.

5.2.1 Region A

The error in this region is treated as arising mainly from wall interference. There owever somie compressibility effect. The errors are presented in law of the wall cerms for correlation purposes (Figs 29 and 30). Fig 29 shows the accumulated errors resulting from the subsonic boundary-layer traverses, while Fig 30 shows the errors : sulting from the undisturbed boundary-layer traverses ahead of the interaction region at :re-sLream Mach numbers of 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5. To calculate the corrections, the errors r egion A may be added to those of region B **.** However because the errors of regions $6 -$ and $6 -$ are based on local conditions rather than the conditions at the edge of the $\frac{1}{2}$ is in iary layer used for region A , the region A errors are multiplied by a factor $(1/\sqrt{N})^2$ to bring them into line.

Thus the corrections needed for the static pressure measurements made in region A \cdots given by

A.2.1.1 Outer static pressure probe $\frac{1}{4}$ 1.098

The measurement errors shown in Fig 29 have been presented as

$$
\left(\frac{P_m^--P_w}{\frac{1}{2}\rho_{\frac{1}{2}}U_{\frac{2}{3}}^2}\right)\frac{1}{C_f}
$$

and plotted against yU_x/v_x . The corrections needed are actually fairly small (for the Mach numbers are low) and so a single correction has been used and this is represented **by** the continuous line in the figure. The correction is given by

Appendix 27

$$
c_{p_{A}} = 15c_{f} \left(\frac{M_{\beta}}{M}\right)^{2}
$$
 when $\frac{yU_{\gamma}}{x} < 644$

$$
c_{p_{A}} = c_{f} \left(\frac{M_{\beta}}{M}\right)^{2} \left[50.37 - 5.469 \ln \left(\frac{yU_{\gamma}}{v_{\beta}}\right)\right]
$$
 when $644 \le \frac{yU_{\gamma}}{v_{\beta}} < 1000$.

$$
c_{p_{A}} = 0
$$
 when $\frac{yU_{\gamma}}{v_{\gamma}} \ge 1000$.

A.2.1.2 Outer static pressure probe at $M \ge 1.098$

Fig 30 shows the pressure measurement errors plotted in similar terms to those used in section A.2.1.1. Here the results are strongly Mach-number dependent. The corrections have been applied on the assumption that the pressure measurement errors in Fig 30 have a linear relation with Mach number for constant yU_x / v_y . The slopes and zero intercepts of this linear variation are then assumed to be entirely dependent upon $yU_{\tau}/v_{\hat{c}}$ and $y_{\hat{c}}$. The corrections which are shown by the continuous lines in Fig 30 are given by

$$
C_{\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{A}}} = \mathbf{F} C_{\mathbf{f}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{M}_{\hat{S}}}{\mathbf{M}} \right)^{2} \left[\mathbf{M} - 0.2725 - 0.1153 \ln \left(\frac{\mathbf{y}^{U}_{\hat{S}}}{\mathbf{y}_{\hat{S}}} \right) \right]
$$

where
$$
F = 19.33 \ln \left(\frac{yU_{\tau}}{v_{\delta}} \right) - 433.5
$$
 when $\frac{yU_{\tau}}{v_{\tau}} \le 7660$
\n $F = 692.7 \ln \left(\frac{yU_{\tau}}{v_{\delta}} \right) - 6456$ when $7660 < \frac{yU_{\tau}}{v_{\delta}} < 11200$
\n $F = 0$ when $\frac{yU_{\tau}}{v_{\delta}} \ge 11200$.

This correction is based on rather limited evidence but the magnitude is small and the probable accuracy of the correction is within $1\frac{1}{2}$ % of the true static pressure.

A.2.2 Regions B and C

The errors in these regions are treated as arising from a combination of shear flow and compressibility effects. It would therefore be expected that there would be an error which would correlate with $y/\delta_{0.995}$ and a larger error due to the geometry of the twin static pressure probe, which would correlate with Mach number. As stated in section A.2 the greater part of the latter error is due to the stem interconnecting the inner and outer static pressure probes, and the necessary correction depends on an estimate **of** Mach number and a form of the free-stream calibration of the twin static probe.

In fact, the average Mach number of the inner and outer static probes is used to give the necessary correction to the static pressure measured by the inner probe, when the outer probe is below the critical Mach number of 1.098. In all other instances the local Mach number is used to obtain the correction needed to the measured static pressure.

28 Appendix and the control of the control

 960.8

This applies to both the inner and outer static probes. The local Mach number is always used for the outer static pressure probe because it is normally in a region where the Mach number gradient normal to the wall is small.

It was found that the free-strcam calibration overcorrected the static pressure measurement errors, and so a compromise calibration was used (shown dotted in Fig 27a) which involved three stages of smoothing. It may be noted from Fig 16a-f that the critical Mach number is only encountered ahead of and in the immediate vicinity of the main interaction region. The location of the point for critical Mach number is close to the wall for stations upstream of the influence of the normal shock wave. The environment is therefore one of severe shear strains and velocity gradients and the smoothing exercise is probably justified as it only affects the free-stream calibration in the region of the critical Mach number.

The form of the corrections is given by

$$
C_{p_B} = \text{fn}\left(M_1, M_0, \frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}}\right)
$$

$$
C_{p_C} = \text{fn}\left(M_0, \frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}}\right).
$$

A.2.2.1 Outer static pressure probe at M **<** 1.098

The corrections are calculated in terms of local density and velocity. The modiiied calibration curves (shown dotted in Fig 27) are used to obtain $(p_m - p/\frac{1}{2}eU^2)$ from fn(M) and the modification to the free-stream calibration due to probe position is shown in Fig **31.**

Thus the total correction is given by

$$
C_{p_B} = \text{fn}\left(\frac{M_1 + M_U}{2}\right) \times 0.94 \left[\text{sin}\left\{0.665\left(\frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}} - 0.15\right)\right\}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

$$
C_{p_C} = \text{fn}(M_U) \times 0.94 \left[\text{sin}\left\{0.665\left(\frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}} - 0.15\right)\right\}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

$$
C_{p_B} = 0 \qquad \text{if } \frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}} < 0.15
$$

A.2.2.2 Outer static pressure probe at $M > 1.098$

$$
C_{p_B}
$$
 = $fn(M_1) \cdot 0.94 \left[sin \left\{ 0.665 \left(\frac{y}{\delta_{0.995}} - 0.15 \right) \right\} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$

Appendix **9**

$$
c_{p_C} = \text{fn}(M_U) \cdot 0.94 \left[\sin \left\{ 0.665 \left(\frac{y}{0.995} - 0.15 \right) \right\} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

$$
c_{p_B} = 0 \qquad \text{if} \qquad \frac{y}{0.995} < 0.15
$$

A.2.3 Total corrections

Inner tube
$$
C_{p_1} = C_{p_1} + C_{p_2} = \frac{P_m - P}{\frac{1}{2}cU^2}
$$

\nOuter tube $C_{p_1} = C_{p_2} = \frac{P_m - P}{\frac{1}{2}cU^2}$.

A.3 Applying the corrections

The following describes how the static pressure corrections are calculated and applied:

- **(I)** Calculate the Mach number at each measuring station from interpolated pitot and wall pressure measurements. Calculate $y/\frac{5}{0.995}$, C_f and $y(U_f/v_s)$.
- (2) Calculate the static pressure corrections and subtract from the measured values.
- (3) Recalculate the new Mach number using the new static pressure and the interpolated pitot measurement.

Steps (2) and (3) are repeated until the difference between the new and old Mach number is less than 0.001. A suitable damping factor is needed to prevent oscillations in the calculation.

(4) Record the corrected Mach number and static pressure.

Fig 32 shows the effect of the correction on static pressures measured ahead and downstream of the interaction region where the static pressures may be expected to be nearly uniform across the boundary layer thickness. It will be seen that the static pressure errors have been reduced to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the true static pressure.

A.4 Transferring the corrected static pressures to the pitot traverse measurements

The final stage of the procedure is to interpolate in the distribution of static pressure to obtain values at the location of the pitot-pressure measurements.

The calculated static pressures for each static pressure traverse are smoothed and transferred to a carpet plot of static pressure against streamwise position as shown in Fig 33. The appropriate static pressures are then transferred from the carpet plot for each pitot traverse. A final stage of smoothing ensures that the final static pressure curves are asymptotic to the wall static pressure within a few millimetres of the tunnel floor.

The corrected static pressure results may be seen in Fig 15a&b.

l,

TEST CONDITIONS Table 1

 $\bar{\psi}$

 $\frac{1.025 \sqrt{1.1 \text{MeV}}}{1.000 \times 1.000 \times 1000 \times 1$

I

ŀ

l

 $\overline{\mathbf{51}}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$

 $\hat{\phi}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 \end{array}$

 \cdot

l

 $\ddot{}$

 $\underline{\mathrm{Lable}}(2)$ to antimacd).

 $\ddot{}$

 \bullet

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 $\ddot{\mathbf{v}}$

Ą $\frac{1}{2}$

i, $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{d^2\omega}{d\omega} =$

 $\mathbb{E}[1] \times \mathbb{E}[000]$ (MORE) in $\mathbb{E}[1]$

14 2020年)
東京大学、1910年) - 1920年) - 14 3000年) - 14 3000年)
東京大学、1910年) - 14 3000年) - 14 3000

P.FTG PLFTG RRURED P
H WIE $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ $\overline{\mathbf{3}}_{\bullet}$ Ê

清爽

震震震震震 爹 覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆着覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆覆置 8. 2012年10月12日,10日11日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日。10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10日12日,10 ●●●11112〜〜〜168度は対しはあためる時の時にある後期間間間間間間間間間間間間間間の場所でもあるようにしまる。 (の) の) はない はんあん あんかんこめきょ あいはない かいそうかい 37

ᆜ

医细胞病

 $\bar{1}$ Ĵ.

 $\bigg\}$

\hbar (NORTHRL)= $1/3$

DLdVd

NERSURED P
M
M

● **2010年 2010年 2010年**

 $\ddot{}$

39

 $\frac{1}{1}$

l,

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ are the set of the contraction of

| .

J.

 $\overline{41}$

 \bullet

 \bar{z}

 $\frac{4}{3}$

نب

 \sim

 $\bar{\phi}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \mid \\ \mid \\ \mid \\ \mid \\ \mid \\ \end{array}$ $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 \sim

 \bullet

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$

 \vert

I

 $\frac{1}{2}$

اب

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{min}_{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{1} \times \mathbf{1} \end{array}$

喜喜事或音重要受受受坚持管管重者竞争意采集保重重发生后后看要考看意采集资源资源增强

8. 演奏演奏演奏演奏演奏 网络阿明斯舞蹈剧团科 网络欧洲黑色欧洲黑色哈哈斯 网络欧洲黑色威廉 化自动自动 医骨折 医骨折 计自动存储器 计自动存储器 计自动编码 计自动编码 计自动编码 计自动编码 计自动编码 计自动编码

19–293 ϵ +
P, Eq

4 0日995-974表
毛毛袋SI(MESSEELP)

 1170

 $\tilde{\epsilon}$

KROKEU P
H
H

 46

 $\ddot{\cdot}$

Eight is sectional.

 $\ddot{\cdot}$

 \blacksquare \blacksquare \blacksquare \blacksquare

 \bar{z}

 $\frac{47}{1}$

ب

 $48\,$

Table 2000

 $\frac{1}{2} + 1 + \frac{1}{2}$

 \perp

 $\ddot{}$

J.

 $\bar{5}0$

 $\overline{}$

 $\underline{\mathrm{tath}}(\underline{\mathbf{e}})$ is continued).

 $\bar{5}1$

医皮肤病 医三角 $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n$

 $\underline{\text{Table 2}}$ to outlinued)

 \mathbf{I}

 $\bar{\beta}$

 53

 \sim \sim

contraction to

 \bullet

HONDOR JP 14

 $\tilde{\kappa}$ $\begin{array}{lll} \textbf{H} \textbf{S} \textbf{J} \textbf{R} \textbf{D} & \textbf{P} \\ \textbf{H} & \textbf{U} \textbf{I} \textbf{E} \\ \textbf{H} & \textbf{U} \textbf{I} \textbf{E} \end{array}$ ϵ $\frac{1}{3}$ s. Ê

P1/F10 自身自主工工工工工工工作を目出は社区出発品等の製品の製品的商品機関性以以以以低低的地域的商品,由于工工工工工工工作,各自互相认知的高度需要的公路的的经验的产业业业科科科科科科科

artification of the funda-

ENG PERD

RRURU F
R
R
R

 -56

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum$

 \blacksquare

 \blacktriangleleft

and a series

N CARDINAL J= 1.4

(1) 张刚刚用于配给标志的创新的 化硼酸钠 机双极电动力 化分子分配 化硫酸 化硫酸 医腹泻性 医单角状的 医外科学家 医前列腺 医前角 医前角 医前角 医前角 医前方 医长期性皮肤 医前角性皮肤 医前角性皮炎

的复数网络外交外汇市场地域网络产物以后为电影的医长期时代的的过程计算过程的变换的 医特鲁卡卡尔 医二十二十二十二指数 医外伤气的 医皮炎病 医皮肤细胞的过程

、 1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、1999年19月19日、

的医科目对于 医外侧的 机硫化矿物 经经济的 医心脏病 医心脏性 网络外科学 医神经神经神经神经神经神经神经神经神经神经神经神经 医乙烯丙烯 化多分子 医心包性 计自动自动

 $\sum_{\mathbf{x}}$,

在图例张汉 计机构化机构数据数据 计数据数据 计多角度 医心包炎 医上半身身上半身身上半身身上,身体有点

 9.3×1000

104299-11 0021 9954-146 1480
Pr Mari 255 146000000 Pr

G-126 中
K.1#10 佐村K 6 ×尾RSMED P:

13-144 电() (16-20-31 × 16-29 × 16-295 37 × 16-40 × 16-40 × 16-40 × 16-40 × 16-40 × 16-40 × 16-40 × 16-40 × 16

B MORTHER /= 1.4

 $\mu_{\rm LPE}$

BLA

NEKSURED P
N
Ng

 $\frac{3}{5}$

Ī.

Ê

 ρ

epro

KKKELP
H
H

 $\frac{3}{5}$

s.

ŧ

ុត្តិក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តី ។
ក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តីក្តី

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim

 \bar{z}

58

÷,

 \mathcal{L}

ļ.

I

J,

 $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$ J,

 $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ are continuously in the form

 $\pmb{\cdot}$

l,

Normal

l, $\ddot{}$

60

 $\bar{\tau}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \mathbf{C}

ţ

 $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ is a function

 62

PI/PTO

lable provided

 64

 $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\overline{}$ $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 $\ddot{\cdot}$

 65

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 $\ddot{}$

\$ 医紫菜酸医葡萄糖类医紫菜医黄菜属 **象型重要重要重要重要重要重要**重要重要 **特性染页体的第三次比较过程的成功的现代 电电频变换的 医乳球状的过去式和过去分词**

最简值或以实现高级自动地的阅读方法的现在分词表 医氨基萘医医氨基萘基萘基医氨基苄基萘萘基萘基萘 \$

愚遗表表图集蛊桑d复表患是是是是是是 桑德费恩意气奥桑英莫更是是更更更更要 **Nata Engarantan na** 医医壁 医阴道 医血管 医胃腔 医腹股骨炎

 $\text{OPT}(\text{H1}) \times 1.5$

a=155 単
底作 3 位dff 6 (尾RBJ尾B)

95-361 M
(KERSURED P)

 $\mathbf{g} \times$

BIAN **DLA'd**

¥

66

 $\frac{1}{2}$

Ū.

€

ڐ
ڷؙ

 $\mathcal{G}(\omega)$, and $\mathcal{G}(\omega)$ is a consequent of

 θ compared is 1.5

 \bullet

 $\sqrt{67}$

È

 $\ddot{}$

÷.

 $\tilde{\Theta}_{\rm{max}}$
$\tilde{\tau}0$

 $1ab1c/2\pmod 3$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\pm ab$ be $\langle \mathbb{D} \rangle$ (contributed).

 \bullet

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ \overline{a} i.

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 1.62 ± 1.00 and model

 $\overline{73}$

 $\label{eq:sublevel} \begin{array}{ll} \text{label} \mathbf{c} \geq \mathbf{c} \text{,} \text{ on } \text{t} \text{ mod} \text{)} \end{array}$

955 862 M
MERCHARD P: ŖΨ ទី ទី 25 **19-25** $\frac{1}{2}$ **16-25** $\frac{1}{2}$ **RESISS BILLIBERGE BERBERGE BERBERGE EIN EINE EINE ERFLANDE ORIGINED** $e^{\frac{1}{3}}$ $(4001001) \times 1.5$ $\frac{1}{2}$ ŧ. **로프 크로 중국 중국 프로 프로 중국 프로** 중국 로 단 업 등 특별 등 중국 중국 은 축 등 출 등 통 등 존 등 통 등 통 등 통 - 日日日日日11221448米公川以及及交叉及長外の記文的及外天的改契及網路建立法院建议第3次。 **のうちゅう**1122148年は1111年に次次支援の地域の地域の地域的地域的地域。 ្ធ
ស្ថិ Ê ¥ε PLATO 95-2211
(16000201) pres 영양 $\approx \frac{9}{2}$ \mathbf{r} $\begin{array}{ccc}\n\text{14.33} & \text{14.44} \\
\text{15.45} & \text{15.45} \\
\text{16.45} & \text{17.45} \\
\text{18.45} & \text{19.45} \\
\text{19.45} & \text{19.45} \\
\text{10.45} & \text{19.45} \\
\text{10.45} & \text{19.45} \\
\text{11.45} & \text{19.45} \\
\text{11.45} & \text{19.45} \\
\text{12.45} & \text{19.45} \\
\text{13.45} & \text$ A= 128 PM
RE/Ph- 6 S9418'6 (MERCURED $z^{\frac{w}{2}}$ **SE SUSSUSSISSE SUSSUSSE SE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SUSSUSSE SU** $(000100) = 1.5$ ā. శ క **等为单的图明免税的图明的确确确确确确确确确确确确确确确确确确确确的的图明的 以其北立其行计之公立印制的基础的 化物的物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物物质 经过其北立其行计之公立印** Ê 955-779 MK
MERGUREUP PI PIARD ្ថិ **ង្គាត់ប្រឹង្គនីនី អ្នកនាំគ្និនីទីទីទីខ្ទីចិទ្ធិទីទីទីទីទីទីទីទីទីទីទីទីទី១៦១៦៦០១៦១៦១៦** ផ្តន **ESUED P**
N
N
N
H **19:29?** 2 K

P) KEEL **德雄达到的研究期待到的经过的过程地区进行经过的经过的过程的研究所以的的过程是有效的经过的过程中的重要的,而且也有一个人的生活和自然的过程中的重要的,而且也可以使用的生活的,而且也有一个人的生活的,而且 UBBURED** $\overline{\overline{\overline{z}}}$ $MOMMER \geq 1.5$ ⊭ 71 MI
ቺ/ሎ 6 አገዛያና ነ 8. **를 끌길로 ઢ 초 축 홋 축 경 초 축 경 축 금 측 품 축 축 중 축 청 첫 축 축 첫 청 첫 혁 축 최 국 최 급 급 급 급 급 급 급 급 급 최** 최 $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}$ 第623章
(新500年) ğ eme 毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒毒食食食患毒病毒毒增肥 苦翳 电隔离检测 医阴道 병영 **THE FRAME REFRACTION FRAME REFRACTION COMMUNISTISS COMMUNISTISS COMMUNISTISS COMMUNIST COMMUNIST COMMUNIST COMM 19-29:2 K**₅₁ š à **EIGH N 192 N 193 C 194 D 2 C 194 D 194 D 194 D 195 D 196 D 19 GRANT'S ORIGINED** $\overline{\mathbf{s}}$ $R = 1.5$ ā. \bullet **植具まままままでここする女は公共法院長古馬型教授医院の所示的美術部印2公式決定法定認定部門のままままままでここます。女性公共法院長古馬型教授の大規模の所で的美術部門の公共公立公立公立公式の実施** $\sum_{k=1}^{n}$ ê

 74

predi

1960 Park Countries do

 \bullet

 $\mathbf{\hat{i}}$

DIAIA BLAD

她她说,她就知道她就想她的她说,她就是她的她的人,我们也是我们的人,我们也是她的人,我们也是我们的。 计自动自动 医神经性病 医多角膜 医多角膜 医多角膜 医多角膜 医白细胞 医白蛋白 医白蛋白 医白蛋白 医白蛋白 医白蛋白 医白蛋白 医白蛋白 医白细胞 医白细胞 医白细胞 医白细胞 医白细胞 医白细胞 医内皮脂肪酸

75

Ŷ

 $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$. $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{1}{2}$ are $\frac{1}{2}$

 \blacklozenge

 76

ļ j l and e^{-2} to entrimined)

 \bullet

 $n = 15$

计 2722 楽1
What S 779186 (KBGRED P) 新48 266 016126400 P)
What S 779186 (KBGRED P) 第48 266 016126400 P) NERGURED P
N
M ϵ $\frac{9}{5}$ as
a

PIATO **PATA** និន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្នធ្នូនិន្ទ **SHORADE BORG SEG SEG SELORE BRE SEG SEG SEG SE SERE FEREES SKA 3445565556554 x x 344568833956333656666666888 THE THE BUST CHERRES RESERVED TO A SERIE RESERVED TATALIZATE SARA ALL'ALLA L'ASSE DA LE CRERERE ET L'ASSE EN L'ASSE EN L'ASSE EN L'ASSE EN L'ASSE EN L'ASSE EN L** ●●●11112223468組立环比拉路西西面名の右翼西部西側 風風出位 山川山山山地区 山地 地域 あたりつ こうこうしゅうほうじゅう あいいつ あんな あいい ないのはい あいいせん せいせんせい $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$

 $\underbrace{\text{tanh}(g)}_{\text{c}} \leq 2$, continued)

 \bullet

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{d\Phi}{d\Phi}$ in $\frac{d\Phi}{d\Phi}$, we can have defined a

 $\bar{7}9$

 $\frac{14h\log(2)}{2}$ (continued)

 \bullet

×

 $\ddot{}$

80

 $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{array}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$.

 $\overline{1}$

 $\mathsf{c}(\mathsf{d})\mathsf{d}(\mathsf{d})$ is a subseq.

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \blacksquare
 \blacksquare

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 n components

 $\pmb{\ast}$

 \blacksquare
 \blacksquare

CANADIAN AND COMMUNIST

 \mathfrak{f}

 \mathbf{B} computer is a

 1.40000000×1.5

P/PTG PL/PTG

 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$

 83

说 化实现现实 红红银色 机模型 化化 计数字符 医心理学 计多级 医子宫中的 医中间的 医中间的 医中间的 医中间的 $\begin{smallmatrix} 96.43 & 0.08 & 0.$

2020年のサスジャックは1925年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の1926年の192
1926年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928年の1928

 $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and is and $\frac{1}{2}$

lable 2 (continued)

R ORDHURD = 1.5

 $\hat{\pmb{\epsilon}}$

_ ⊭ ਦੇ

955-1344 MK
(KEGURED P) $\tilde{\epsilon}$ e
E 19–236.6K DEL9
P) ME=8.839 (**FRIED P**
H
ME $\frac{3}{5}$ ≫ 1304 MR.
KE/N+9 30mLPT6 (KERGURED 1400
 $(15$ ē. **Tratagang sebasang kabatagang sebasang sang s** ●■■子!!!~~~~~~~~明けれれ出版艺伎女参のだいめの節 美観出 以び 以次 以次 次次 家願 のうりょうしょうしょう あいはん あたま あみあ あめあ 美味 はいだい いいのが

 $\label{eq:sublevel} \begin{array}{ll} \textbf{lab1e} \geq \text{score[model)} \end{array}$

82099

SUMARY OF BOUNDARY-LAYER PARAMETERS

 \mathbf{z}°

o.

 $\overline{87}$

 $\frac{(\text{table})}{(\text{count (med)})}$

ł

 \bullet

 \blacklozenge

 $M_0 = 1.272$ Re/m = 10.2 × 10⁶

 \sim \sim

 $\omega_{\rm{max}}(\omega_{\rm{max}}) = \omega_{\rm{max}}$

82099

 \sim \sim \sim

 $\delta 8$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{1}$

 $Re/m = 3.67 \times 10^6$ $M_0 = 1.373$

82099

 $\overline{}$

 $\pmb{\cdot}$

 $M_0 = 1.386$ $Re/m = 10.0 \times 10^6$

 $\frac{1}{2}$ \sim

 96

 $\frac{1}{4}$

82099

 $\overline{1}$

 $\ddot{}$

అ

 $\overline{}$

 $\overline{}$

 $M_0 = 1.522$ $Re/m = 3.51 \times 10^6$

82099

 $\overline{1}$

 \blacklozenge

 $\pmb{\cdot}$

 $\overline{91}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} \end{array}$

 $\overline{1}$

 \bar{t} $\bar{1}$

 \mathfrak{t}

 $\begin{array}{ccc}\n1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1\n\end{array}$

 \bullet

 $\bar{1}$

Ŧ

 M_0 = 1.531 Re/m = 6.47 × 10⁶

CONSTRAT PN

 $\ddot{}$

 $9₂$

 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 $\cdot =$

Table j (concluded)

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 \end{array}$

 $M_0 = 1.538$ Re/m = 9.96 × 10⁶

CONSTANT PM

 $\ddot{}$

82099

 $\ddot{}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

LIST OF SYMBOLS

 $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$

د.
د د د د مو

 $\zeta_{\rm c} \simeq 1$

82099

94

 \mathbf{L}

 \bullet

LIST OF SYMBOLS (concluded)

 \mathcal{L}

 ~ 5

 \sim

 Δ

Subscripts

Superscript

i equivalent incompressible flow quantities

66078

 \bar{Y} $\ddot{}$

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 \mathbf{I}

-1

i,

 $\ddot{1}$

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS - 1963 - A

 $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\overline{1}$

REFERENCES

وبالمراد

66078

 $\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array}$

96

 $\ddot{}$

REFERENCES (continued)

I

Ŀ

 \sim \sim \sim

REFERENCES (concluded)

 $\ddot{}$

 \rightarrow \rightarrow

Reports quoted are not necessarily available to members of the public or commercial organisations.

98

82099

للمناسب

İ

Fig la-c Three techniques for producing a normal shock-wave boundary-layer interaction

TR 82099

٠.

Fig₂

 \bullet

TR 82099

 $\frac{1}{2}$

TH 82099

 -1

Fig 3 False floor and horizontal traverse mechanism

Fig₃

 $\ddot{}$

Fig 4 Pitot traverse mechanism and twin pitot probe

TR 82099

 $\overline{}$

Fig 4

 $\pmb{\mathcal{N}}$

Fig 5 Details of static probes

Fig 5

TH 82099

 \cdot

 $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$

÷
Fig 6a

 $\ddot{}$

MO 1.27 Re/rn **=** 10.2 **x10**

 M_{\odot} = 1.39 Re/rn **= 10 .0** x **106**

Mo= 1.54 Re/rn **9.96** x **106**

TR 82099 C17727

Fig **6b** Schieren photographs of normal shocicwave boundary-layer interaction

Fig **6b**

Fig₇

 \bullet

Separation node

- Saddle points
-

Fig 8 Oil flow under interaction region at M = 1.5

TR 82099 C17729

 $\ddot{}$

 $\frac{1}{4}$

Fig 8

Fig 9

Fig 9 Momentum balance based on measured $p +$ calculated p_i for $X < 0$

Fig 10a Flow divergence needed to balance momentum integral equation, $M = 1.3$

 \mathbf{r}

EROCH H1

Fig 10a

لم

Fig 10b

Fig 10b Flow divergence needed to balance momentum integral equation, $M = 1.4$

FR 82099

Change of scale **/738** 50 **50 50- 50 - 50- a** Re/m **3.51x10⁶** \cdot **Re/m** = 3.51 x 10⁶
A Re/m = 6.47 x 10⁶ $\begin{array}{ccc} \n\text{deg/m} & & \text{if } \\
\text{deg/m} & & \text{if } \\
\text{diag}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \n\end{array}$ 40 40 *-* 400- 40 **A 301 30***1* **30***1* **30¹** 30**¹** 30**¹** 30 $\ddot{}$ **⁰+** 20 **20- 200** 20 **+ + +** 20 **+ 4 A A +4 +++ ¹⁰- ¹⁰⁰0_** *+ +* **A-** ¹⁰ *+* o **+ +** 4 O \bullet -1000 $\pmb{0}$ 1000 2000 Xmm 0 ^▲ \rightarrow o **& 00 + A** $-10 + 190$ **-10 -10 -- - A** • **A -10 0 +** -20 **--** 20 -- 200 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -- 20 -œ, **-30 -30 -- 300 -30 - -30** -40 -40 **- -40 - -40** \bullet -50 **-- 50 -- 500 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 -- 50 ---531 -529 -692**

1882099

Fig **10c**

لم

Fig 11

(measured p + calculated pi)

TH 82099

Fig 12

Fig 13a

Fig 13a Boundary layer development $(p = p_w)$ M = 1.3

Fig 13a (concid)

 $\overline{\mathbf{r}}$

Fig 13a (concid) Boundary layer development $(p = p_w)$ M = 1.3

TH 82099

 \bullet

Fig 13b

 \sim \sim

Fig **13b** (concid)

ر
مورد مورد مورد

Fig 13c

Fig 13c (concid)

Fig 13c (concld) Boundary layer development $(p = p_w)$ M = 1.5

 \ddotsc

TH 82099

Fig 14a

 \mathbf{r}

Fig 14a Boundary layer development (measured p) $M = 1.3$

TR 820'99

لب

Fig 14b Boundary layer development (measured p) M = 1.4

Fig 14b

гиесян

 $\frac{1}{2}$

Fig 14c

 \bullet

Fig 14c Boundary layer development (measured p) M = 1.5

 \mathbf{r}

Fig 15a Measured static pressures

Fig 15a

TR 82099

 \rightarrow

۱.

Fig **15b**

 \sim

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

Fig **15b** Measured static pressures

TR 82099

 $\omega_{\rm{max}}$

 $\overline{}$

Fig 16a

TH 82099

 \bullet

Fig 16b

 $\ddot{}$

 $\overline{\mathbf{L}}$

Fig 16b Mach number distribution, $M_0 = 1.27$, Re/m = 10.2 x 10⁶

الم
أحسن

Fig 16c

TH 82099

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

Fig 16d

 \blacksquare

 $\pmb{\ast}$

 \overline{C} $\frac{6}{10}$ -0.5 3000 $\frac{8}{10}$ $x \mod x$ 2000 $\overline{0}$ 0.85 $\overline{0}$ 0.2 5 $\overline{0.9}$ 1000 $\overline{0.95}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ **30.5** $200 \frac{0.9 \frac{0.95}{0.95}}{1}$ 1001 \circ $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$

 \mathbf{I}

Fig 16e

E6078 HJ

 $\ddot{}$

 X mm

 2000

 1000

 \circ

Fig 16f

ł,

 $\ddot{}$

ì

18078.81

Fig 17a Velocity profiles, $M_0 = 1.27$, Re/m = 3.66 x 10⁶

FR 82099

 $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$

Fig 17a

Fig 17b

TR 82099

 \rightarrow

600 2500 \times mm Xmm 500 2000 400 1500 300 $\overline{1000}$ 200 $\frac{1}{9}$ ႞ႜၞ \circ \circ $\begin{array}{c|c}\n & x \\
 & \hline\nm m \\
 & 200 \\
 & 0\n\end{array}$ -100 -500 $\frac{1}{2}$ -200

Fig 17c Velocity profiles, M_0 = 1.39, Re/m = 10.0 x 10⁶

Fig 17c

ER 82099

 $\begin{array}{c}\n\overrightarrow{r} \\
\overrightarrow{r} \\
\overrightarrow{r} \\
\overrightarrow{r} \\
\overrightarrow{r}\n\end{array}$

 1001

 $\bar{\mathfrak{t}}$

Fig 17d

 \sim .

Fig 17d Velocity profiles, M_0 = 1.52, Re/m = 3.51 x 10⁶

TH 82099

 \rightarrow

Fig 17e

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

600 Τ X mm $\begin{array}{c}\n 1500 \\
 \text{Xmm} \\
 \end{array}$ 500 400 2000 $300₅$ 1500 ≹ 200 $\frac{1}{2}$ ⅀ 100 $500₅$ \circ -100 $\frac{1}{16}$ -500 $\begin{array}{c}\n\overline{ }\\
\overline{ }\\
\overline{ }\\
\overline{ }\\
\overline{ }\\
\overline{ }\\
\end{array}$ 1001 -200 ₹ -300 $\begin{array}{c}\n\times E \\
\times E\n\end{array}$ 1001

 \circ

Fig 17f

 \mathfrak{f}

 \bullet

E6028 H₁

Fig 18 Logarithmic velocity profiles ahead of interaction (region A) (see Fig 22)

Fig 18

E60Z8 H1

Fig **19** Logarithmic velocity profiles approx **3** m downstream of normal shock-wave (region **D)** (see Fig 22)

FR 82099

Fig **19**

Fig 20 Logarithmic velocity profiles just downstream of normal shock-wave (region C) (see Fig 22)

GROZH H

Fig 20
Fig 21

Fig 22

Fig **23a&b**

Fig **23a&b Wake components** of velocity profile **ahead** of shock-wave

Fig 24a&b

Fig 24a&b Wake components of velocity profiles downstream of shock-wave

Wake components of velocity profiles downstream of shock-wave Fig 24c

Fig 24c

Fig 25a&b

Fig 25a&b Maximum values of wake component

TR 82099

 \mathbf{I}

Fig 26a&b

 $\overline{1}$

(b) Downstream of normal shockwave

Fig 26a&b Constants **J** and K in $(AU/U_T^i)_N = 0.5(1 + \sin \frac{\pi}{J}(y/\delta_{0.995} - K))$

Fig 27a&b

Fig 27a&b Free stream calibration of static probes

FR 82099

 $\pmb{\mathcal{Y}}$

Fig 28a&b

 $\,$ $\,$

Fig 28a&b Typical static pressure measurement **errors**

Fig 29

است

 \bullet

 $\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$

Wall/static interference errors, $\rm\,M_{U} \geqslant 1.098$ Fig 30

Fig 30

TR 82099

Fig **31**

Fig 32a&b

 \blacktriangleleft

Fig **32a&b** Typical corrected static pressures

Fig 33 Smoothed static pressure distribution, $M = 1.5$, Re = 10 x 10⁶/mm

TR 92099

 \bullet

Fig **33**

ب

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Overall security classification of this page

UNLIMITED

As far as possible this page should contain only unclassified information. If it is necessary to enter classified information, the box above must be marked to indicate the classification, e.g. Restricted, Confidential or S

 \bullet

I

