RECEIVED
LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY

APR 20 1978

LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION**For Reference**

Not to be taken from this room

Energy and Environment Division **Turbulent Heat Transport In
Two-And Three-Dimensional
Temperature Fields***Don Sarath Abesiri Samaraweera*

Ph.D. thesis

March 1978

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory University of California/Berkeley

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. W-7405-ENG-48

— LEGAL NOTICE —

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

0 0 0 0 4 9 0 1 9 8 2

TURBULENT HEAT TRANSPORT
IN TWO-AND THREE-DIMENSIONAL
TEMPERATURE FIELDS

by

Don Sarath Abesiri Samaraweera

B.Sc.(Eng.), M.Sc.(Eng.), D.I.C.

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Faculty of Engineering of the

University of London

March 1978

Department of Mechanical Engineering,
Imperial College of Science and Technology,
London SW7 2BX.

ABSTRACT

This Thesis presents a fundamental numerical study of turbulent heat and mass transport processes in two-and three-dimensional convective flows. The model of turbulence employed is of the type referred to as a second-order closure. In this scheme transport equations for all non-zero components of the Reynolds stress tensor, for the isotropic dissipation rate of turbulent kinetic energy, for all non-zero scalar flux tensor components and for the mean square scalar fluctuations are solved by a finite difference method along with the mean momentum and mean enthalpy (or concentration) equations. The model used for the stresses has been developed in an earlier work. In the present study parallel ideas were utilised in obtaining a model for turbulent heat and mass transfer processes.

The study has focused especially on the problem of non axis-symmetric convective heat and mass transport in pipes, which arises when the boundary conditions are not axis-symmetric. The few available experimental data on such situations have indicated anisotropy in effective diffusivities. To expand the available data base an experiment was conducted to obtain heat transfer measurements in strong three-dimensional heating conditions.

Numerical procedures, especially suitable for incorporation of second-order turbulent closure models have been developed. The effect of circumferential conduction in the tube material, (which is influential in the asymmetric heating data currently available) was accounted for directly by extending the finite difference calculations into the pipe wall.

The principal goal of predicting three-dimensional scalar transfer has been achieved. The predictions of the mean temperature field are in much closer agreement with experiment than an earlier study using

isotropic diffusion coefficients. The prediction of free shear flows have been only partially successful. The present model does not fully account for the variation in effective Prandtl number, among free shear flows observed in experiments. The prediction of wall flows indicate that the turbulent time scales of velocity and scalar fields are not proportional in the vicinity of adiabatic (or impermeable) surfaces. The implications of this result for the further refinement of the model is discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with pleasure and sincere thanks that I acknowledge the sound guidance provided by Professor B.E. Launder during the course of my research work. His active interest and amazing appetite for progress had a considerable influence on the completion of this work. His constructive criticism and understanding during the write-up period, and also the kind hospitality shown by his family, especially during our early days in Davis, California, are much appreciated.

Dr. M.M. Gibson is thanked for the guidance provided by him during Professor Launder's absence from Imperial College. Later in University of California at Davis, during the summer of '77, Professors J.W. Baughn and M.A. Hoffman supervised my experimental investigation. They are thanked for providing their expertise on those lines.

I also thank my colleagues: Dr. G.J. Reece and Mr. D. Bryant, for providing their computer codes for my use which helped me a great deal in developing the present versions; Mr. S. El-Tahry, Drs. R. Schiestel, B.I. Sharma and S.A. Syed, for the pleasant and useful discussions we had; Mr. A. Giesbrecht and A. Mokhtarani, for their contributions towards the completion of my experimental work within a short time.

The computations reported here were performed at the University of London computer centre, Imperial College computer centre, University of California at Davis computer centre and at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory computer centre. The help given by their consulting staff is much appreciated.

The Tea Research Institute of Sri Lanka is gratefully acknowledged for granting post graduate study leave which enabled me to carry out the work described in this Thesis.

Support for the research has been provided by the United Kingdom Science Research Council through grant No. B/RG/78011 and by Division of Basic Energy Sciences of the U.S. Department of Energy. This support is gratefully acknowledged.

My wife, Damayanthi, for whom I am especially thankful provided constant encouragement throughout the course of the work and finally took over the challenging task of typing my scribbles.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	4
Contents	6
List of Tables	12
List of Figures	13
Nomenclature	19
<u>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</u>	27
1.1 Introduction	27
1.2 Equations of Fluid Motion and Scalar Transport	29
1.3 Closure Levels	32
1.3.1 Mean-Field Closure Models	34
1.3.2 Turbulent Transport Models	35
1.3.3 Higher Order Closures	37
1.3.4 Other Closures	37
1.4 Evaluation of Available Models	38
1.4.1 Eddy Viscosity Models	38
1.4.2 Eddy Diffusivity Models and Turbulent Prandtl (or Schmidt) Number	40
1.4.3 Reynolds Stress Models	43
1.4.4 Scalar Flux Models	44
1.5 Present Contribution	45
1.5.1 Theoretical Contribution	45
1.5.2 Choice of Turbulence Model	45
1.5.3 Path for Verification of the Turbulence Model	46
1.5.4 Numerical Contribution	48
1.5.5 Experimental Contribution	50

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2: TURBULENCE MODEL</u>	51
2.1 Introduction	51
2.2 Reynolds Stress Equation and its Trace	52
2.2.1 The Viscous Destruction Term	54
2.2.2 The Diffusion Term	55
2.2.3 The Pressure-Strain Term	58
2.2.4 Wall Effects on the Pressure-Strain Term	62
2.3 Transport Equation for Isotropic Dissipation Rate	67
2.4 The Scalar Flux Equation	71
2.4.1 The Diffusion Term	73
2.4.2 The Pressure-Scalar Gradient Correlation	74
2.4.3 Wall Effects on the Pressure-Scalar Gradient Term	79
2.5 The Transport Equation for Scalar Fluctuations	83
2.6 A Summary of the Models to be Investigated	85
2.7 Modelled Equations in Cartesian Tensor Form	90
2.7.1 Reynolds Stress Equations	90
2.7.2 Isotropic Dissipation Rate Equation	91
2.7.3 Scalar Flux Equations	92
2.7.4 Scalar Fluctuation Equation	93
<u>CHAPTER 3: NUMERICAL PROCEDURES</u>	94
3.1 Introduction	94
3.2 The Patankar-Spalding Procedure for Two-Dimensional Boundary Layers	96
3.2.1 Main Features	96
3.2.2 Treatment of Turbulent Shear Stress and Scalar Flux	98
3.2.3 Instability in Solution and a Possible Remedy	99

	<u>Page</u>
3.3 Description and Application of the Three-Dimensional (θ , r , z) Boundary Layer Procedure	101
3.3.1 Finite Difference Grid	102
3.3.2 Derivation of Finite Difference Equations	103
3.3.3 Assembly of Finite Difference Terms	105
3.3.4 Finite Difference Equation for Velocity Components and SIMPLE Algorithm	106
3.3.5 The Case of Axi-Symmetric (or Plane- Symmetric) Confined Flow	110
3.4 An Ideal Grid	111
3.5 Staggered Grid Arrangement for (θ - r - z) Procedure: for Three-and Two-Dimensional Scalar Transport in a Two-Dimensional Hydrodynamic Field	113
3.5.1 Staggered Grid Arrangement for (x - ψ) Procedure	114
3.6 Cell Layout and Boundary Conditions	115
3.6.1 Wall Boundary Condition	116
3.6.2 Symmetric Axis (or Plane) Boundary Condition	119
3.6.3 Free-Stream Boundary Condition	119
3.7 Treatment of Conducting Wall in the Numerical Procedure	121
<u>CHAPTER 4: REVIEW OF EXPERIMENTAL DATA</u>	124
4.1 Introduction	124
4.2 Data Required and Criteria for Assessment	126
4.2.1 Criteria for Assessment of Data	128
4.3 Characteristics of Free Shear Flows	129
4.3.1 Integral Forms of Mean Equations	129
4.3.2 Definition of Self Similarity and Decay Laws	130
4.3.3 Expressions for Shear Stress and Scalar Flux for Self Similar Flows	134

	<u>Page</u>
4.4 Review of Data for Free Shear Flows	136
4.4.1 Plane Jet	136
4.4.2 Plane Mixing Layer	138
4.4.3 Plane Wake	141
4.5 Characteristics of Flows Affected by Walls	144
4.5.1 Turbulent Prandtl Number in the Near-Wall Logarithmic Region	145
4.6 Review of Data for Wall Flows	147
4.6.1 Flat Plate Boundary Layer	147
4.6.2 Pipe Flow	150
4.7 Review of Data on Three-Dimensional Scalar Transport	152
<u>CHAPTER 5: EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION</u>	157
5.1 Preliminary Considerations	157
5.1.1 Aim of the Experimental Investigation	157
5.1.2 Facilities Available and Level of Measurements	158
5.1.3 Method of Obtaining Circumferentially Non-Uniform Heating Rates	158
5.1.4 Choice of Tube Material	160
5.1.5 Choice of Fluid	161
5.2 Experimental Equipment	162
5.2.1 Design of the Tube	162
5.2.2 Thermocouple Installation	164
5.2.3 Power Measurement	165
5.2.4 Flow Measurement	165
5.3 Preliminary Measurements	167
5.3.1 Verification of Uniformity of the Silver Coating	167

	<u>Page</u>
5.3.2 Uncertainties in Measurements	168
5.4 Experimental Results	170
<u>CHAPTER 6: PREDICTION OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL SCALAR TRANSPORT</u>	171
6.1 Introduction	171
6.2 Prediction of Free Shear Flows	172
6.2.1 The Plane Jet	172
6.2.2 The Plane Wake	175
6.2.3 The Plane Mixing Layer	176
6.2.4 Conclusions	179
6.3 Flat Plate Boundary Layer	181
6.3.1 Hydrodynamic Predictions	182
6.3.2 Scalar Transport Predictions	184
6.4 Pipe Flow	188
6.4.1 Hydrodynamic Predictions	188
6.4.2 Scalar Transport Predictions	189
6.4.3 Conclusions	191
<u>CHAPTER 7: PREDICTION OF THREE-DIMENSIONAL SCALAR TRANSPORT</u>	193
7.1 Introduction	193
7.2 Verification of the Three-Dimensional Solution Procedure	195
7.2.1 Check for Numerically Induced Asymmetry in Scalar Field	195
7.2.2 Check for the Conservation of Mean Scalar	196
7.2.3 Check for Grid Independence of the Solution	197
7.3 Comparison of Predicted Results with Experimental Data	198
7.4 Conclusions	206

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER 8:</u> <u>CONCLUDING REMARKS</u>	207
8.1 Achievements and Limitations of Present Work	207
8.2 Suggestions for Future Work	210
References	212
Figures for Chapters (1) - (8)	220
 <u>APPENDIX A:</u> A Form for the Near-Wall Effect Function in Cylindrical Geometry	 294
 <u>APPENDIX B:</u> Simulation of the Diffusive Transport of $\overline{u_i c}$ and $\overline{c^2}$	 296
 <u>APPENDIX C:</u> Derivation of the Exact Equation for Pressure-Scalar Gradient Correlation	 299
 <u>APPENDIX D:</u> Modelled Reynolds Stress and Scalar Flux Equations in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates	 302
 <u>APPENDIX E:</u> Derivation of Finite Difference Equation for Variables Stored in Staggered (x - Ψ) Grid	 309
 <u>APPENDIX F:</u> Computer Program for the Solution of Two-and Three-Dimensional Scalar Transport Problem	 316
F.1 Introduction	316
F.1.1 Base Case	317
F.1.2 The Grid System	317
F.2 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols	319
F.3 Description of Subroutines and Common Block	328
F.4 Listing of the Computer Program	338
Figures for Appendices (A) - (F)	386

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 2.1 : Hydrodynamic models used in the present study	86
Table 2.2 : Scalar transport models investigated in the present study	88
Table 3.1 : Variable locations in an ideal grid	112
Table 4.1 : Data reviewed and their relative importance	127
Table 4.2 : Decay Laws	133
Table 4.3 : Self similar shear stress and scalar flux relations	135
Table 4.4 : Scalar measurements in plane jets	137
Table 4.5 : Scalar measurements in plane mixing layers	139
Table 4.6 : Scalar measurements in plane wake	142
Table 4.7 : Scalar measurements in smooth flat plate boundary layers	148
Table 4.8 : Three-dimensional scalar experiments in fully developed pipe flows	153
Table 7.1 : Measuring stations for Quarmby and Anand's experiments	198
Table D.1 : Modelled Reynolds stress equations in cylindrical polar coordinates	303
Table D.2 : Modelled scalar flux equations in cylindrical polar coordinates	306
Table F.1 : Listing of FORTRAN symbols	319
Table F.2 : Contents of comdeck COMALL	329

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 3.1 : Control volumes in Patankar-Spalding method	220
Figure 3.2 : Conventional grid arrangement	220
Figure 3.3 : Grid layout in the cross stream	221
Figure 3.4 : Cell mass balance	221
Figure 3.5 : Three orthogonal views of control volumes with ideal orientation of stress and fluxes (A Cartesian non expanding grid is shown here for clarity)	222
Figure 3.6 : Idealised grid system for three-dimensional boundary layer flows	223
Figure 3.7 : Modified grid system for the present problem	224
Figure 3.8 : Typical grid pattern in the near-wall region	225
Figure 3.9 : False-source term technique	225
Figure 3.10 : Treatment of a conducting thick wall	226
Figure 4.1 : Notation for velocity and scalar field configurations	227
Figure 5.1 : Adhesive tape strips	229
Figure 5.2 : Silver coating on the tube	229
Figure 5.3 : Electrical connections to the silver coating	229
Figure 5.4 : Thermocouple arrangement around the tube	230
Figure 5.5 : Thermocouple circuit	230
Figure 5.6 : Electrical power circuit	231
Figure 5.7 : Heat flux variation (ideal)	232
Figure 5.8 : A more plausible heat flux variation	232
Figure 6.1 : The plane jet in stagnant surroundings: Mean velocity profiles	233
Figure 6.2 : The plane jet in stagnant surroundings: Shear stress profiles	233
Figure 6.3 : The plane jet in stagnant surroundings: Turbulence intensity profiles	234

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 6.4 : The plane jet in stagnant surroundings; Mean temperature profiles	235
Figure 6.5 : The plane jet in stagnant surroundings; Cross-stream heat flux profiles	235
Figure 6.6 : The plane jet in stagnant surroundings; The ratio of streamwise to cross-stream scalar fluxes	236
Figure 6.7 : The plane jet in stagnant surroundings; Turbulent Prandtl number profiles	236
Figure 6.8 : The plane wake; Mean velocity profiles	237
Figure 6.9 : The plane wake; Shear stress profiles	237
Figure 6.10 : The plane wake; Turbulence intensity profiles	238
Figure 6.11 : The plane wake; Mean temperature profiles	239
Figure 6.12 : The plane wake; Cross-stream heat flux profiles	239
Figure 6.13 : The plane wake; The ratio of streamwise to cross-stream scalar fluxes	240
Figure 6.14 : The plane wake; Turbulent Prandtl number profiles	240
Figure 6.15 : The plane wake; Streamwise heat flux profiles	241
Figure 6.16 : The plane wake; Temperature fluctuations	241
Figure 6.17 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$: Mean velocity profiles	242
Figure 6.18 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$: Shear stress profiles	243
Figure 6.19 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$: Turbulence intensity profiles	244
Figure 6.20 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$: Mean temperature profiles	245
Figure 6.21 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$: Cross-stream scalar flux profiles	245
Figure 6.22 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$: The ratio of streamwise to cross-stream scalar fluxes	246
Figure 6.23 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$: Turbulent Prandtl number profiles	246

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 6.24 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: Mean velocity profiles	247
Figure 6.25 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: Shear stress profiles	247
Figure 6.26 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: Mean temperature profiles	248
Figure 6.27 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: Cross-stream scalar flux profiles	248
Figure 6.28 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: The ratio of streamwise to cross-stream scalar fluxes	249
Figure 6.29 : The plane mixing layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: Turbulent Prandtl number profiles	249
Figure 6.30 : Flat plate boundary layer: Mean velocity profiles	250
Figure 6.31 : Flat plate boundary layer: Shear stress profiles	250
Figure 6.32 : Flat plate boundary layer: Turbulence intensity profiles - comparison of two near-wall effect models	251
Figure 6.33 : Flat plate boundary layer: Turbulence intensity profiles - comparison of two near-wall functions	252
Figure 6.34 : Flat plate boundary layer: Turbulence intensity profiles - comparison of two diffusion modes	253
Figure 6.35 : Flat plate boundary layer: Shear correlation coefficient - comparison of two diffusion models	254
Figure 6.36 : Flat plate boundary layer - step in wall heat flux: Mean temperature profiles	255
Figure 6.37 : Flat plate boundary layer - step in wall heat flux: Temperature defect profiles	256
Figure 6.38 : Flat plate boundary layer - step in wall heat flux: Turbulent Prandtl number profiles	257
Figure 6.39 : Flat plate boundary layer - step in wall heat flux: Cross-stream heat flux profiles	258
Figure 6.40 : Flat plate boundary layer - step in wall heat Flux: Streamwise heat flux profiles	259

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 6.41 : Flat plate boundary layer - step in wall heat flux: Temperature fluctuations profiles	260
Figure 6.42 : Fully developed pipe flow: Mean velocity profiles	261
Figure 6.43 : Fully developed pipe flow: Shear stress profiles	261
Figure 6.44 : Fully developed pipe flow: Turbulence intensity profiles - comparison of two near-wall effect models	262
Figure 6.45 : Fully developed pipe flow: Turbulence intensity profiles - comparison of two diffusion models	263
Figure 6.46 : Fully developed pipe flow: Mean temperature profiles	264
Figure 6.47 : Fully developed pipe flow: Cross-stream heat flux profiles	264
Figure 6.48 : Fully developed pipe flow: Streamwise heat flux profiles	265
Figure 6.49 : Fully developed pipe flow: Turbulent Prandtl number profiles	265
Figure 6.50 : Fully developed pipe flow: Concentration profiles downstream of a short mass transfer region	266
Figure 6.51 : Turbulent Schmidt number profiles downstream of a short mass transfer section in the wall - pipe flow	267
Figure 7.1 : Comparison of streamwise development of near-wall concentration levels in QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] experiment	268
Figure 7.2 : The angular variation of (a) wall heat fluxes, (b) wall temperature and (c) Nusselt number, $Nu_w, X/D$, BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment, $Re = 40500$	269
Figure 7.3 : The angular variation of (a) wall heat fluxes, (b) wall temperature and (c) Nusselt number, $Nu_w, X/D$, BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment, $Re = 16800$	270
Figure 7.4 : Non-dimensional temperature contours: Black and Sparrow's experiment, $Re = 40500$	271

$$\frac{C - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}}$$

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 7.5 : Non-dimensional temperature $\frac{C - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}}$ contours: Black and Sparrow's experiment, $Re = 16800$.	272
Figure 7.6 : Non-dimensional temperature profiles in BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment, $X/D = 52$	273
Figure 7.7 : Streamwise development of Nusselt numbers at several angular locations - BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment, $Re = 40500$	274
Figure 7.8 : Streamwise development of Nusselt number at several angular locations - BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment, $Re = 16800$	275
Figure 7.9 : Heat flux through the outer and inner surface of the tube, (a) $Re \approx 20000$, (b) $Re \approx 40000$, (c) $Re \approx 90000$	276
Figure 7.10 : Temperature profiles at the outer surface of the tube wall : Present experimental situation; Both halves heating, $Re \approx 20000$	277
Figure 7.11 : Temperature profiles at the outer surface of the tube wall: Present experimental situation; Both halves heating, $Re \approx 40000$	278
Figure 7.12 : Temperature profiles at the outer surface of the tube wall: Present experimental situation; Both halves heating, $Re \approx 90000$	279
Figure 7.13 : Streamwise variation of Nusselt number: Present experimental investigation, Both halves heating, $Re \approx 20000$	280
Figure 7.14 : Predicted non-dimensional temperature $\frac{C - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}}$ Contours: Present experimental situation; Both halves heating, $Re \approx 40000$	281
Figure 7.15 : Variation of (a) heat fluxes and (b) local Nusselt number, around the tube wall, $Re \approx 20000$	284
Figure 7.16 : Temperature profiles at the outer surface of the tube wall: Present experimental situation, $Re \approx 20000$	285
Figure 7.17 : Variation of (a) heat fluxes and (b) local Nusselt number, around the tube wall, $Re \approx 40000$	286
Figure 7.18 : Temperature profiles at the outer surface of the tube wall: Present experimental situation, $Re \approx 40000$	287
Figure 7.19 : Variation of (a) heat fluxes and (b) local Nusselt number, around the tube wall, $Re \approx 90000$	288

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 7.20 : Temperature profiles at the outer surface of the tube wall: Present experimental situation, $Re \approx 90000$	289
Figure 7.21 : Predicted non-dimensional temperature contours: Present experimental situation: Only right half heating, $Re \approx 40000$	290
Figure 7.22 : Ratio of diffusivity of heat in tangential to radial direction: Prediction of Black and Sparrow's flow, $Re = 40500$	293
Figure 7.23 : Ratio of diffusivity of heat in tangential to radial direction: Prediction of present experiment, $Re \approx 40000$	293
Figure A.1 : Near-wall geometries	386
Figure E.1 : Staggered grid in ω -space	387
Figure F.1 : Calculation Domain	388
Figure F.2 : Grid and related dimensions	389

NOMENCLATURE

A	: Coefficient in equation (3.3)
A^Φ	: Coefficient in the finite difference equation for ϕ (equation (3.16))
a	: Area of a control volume surface
a_{lj}^{mi}	: Fourth-order tensor defined in equation (2.13)
B	: Coefficient in equation (3.3)
B_c	: Coefficient in logarithmic law for scalar (equation (4.15))
b	: Non-dimensional radius, also as in equation (2.39)
b_{ij}	: Anisotropy of the stress tensor (i and $j = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
b_{ij}^{mi}	: Fourth-order tensor defined in equations (2.20) and (2.21)
b^Φ	: Coefficient in linearised source term (equation (3.15))
C	: Time averaged value of scalar property, also, coefficient in equation (3.3)
$\hat{C}$	: Instantaneous value of scalar property
C_c	: Coefficient in modelled velocity-velocity-scalar correlation (equation (2.45))
C_{c1}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ic1} (equation (2.48))
C'_{c1}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ic1} (equation (2.61))
C_{c1w}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ic1w} (equation (2.67))
C_{c2}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ic2} (equation (2.58))
C_g	: Coefficient in modelled velocity-scalar-scalar correlation (equation (2.77))
C_{g2}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϵ_c (Table (2.2))
C_s	: Coefficient in modelled triple velocity correlation (equation (2.6))
C'_s	: Coefficient in modelled triple velocity correlation (equation (2.8))
C_{s1}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij1} (equation (2.11))
C_{slw}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ijlw} (equation (2.21))

C_{s2}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij2} (equation (2.17))
C_{s2w}	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij2w} (equation (2.21))
C_{ϵ}	: Coefficient in modelled form of $u_k \epsilon'$ (equation (2.34))
$C_{\epsilon 1}$	: Coefficient in modelled production of ϵ (equation (2.33))
$C_{\epsilon 2}$	: Coefficient in modelled destruction term of ϵ (equation (2.33))
C^{Φ}	: Coefficient in linearised source term (equation (3.15))
C_T	: Friction temperature or friction concentration
$\overline{c^2}$	: Time averaged value of scalar fluctuation squared
c_{ni}^m	: Third-order tensor defined in equation (2.51)
c_p	: Specific heat of fluid
D_{c1}	: A gradient diffusion model for scalar flux (Table (2.2))
D_{c2}	: A gradient diffusion model for scalar flux (Table (2.2))
D_{c3}	: Tensor invariant model for scalar flux (Table (2.2))
D_{ij}	: A production of Reynolds stress like term (equation (2.16))
D_{s1}	: Tensor invariant diffusion model for stresses (Table (2.1))
D_{s2}	: Gradient diffusion model for stresses (Table (2.1))
d	: Suffix denoting the down-stream location
d_{li}^m	: Third-order tensor defined by equations (2.66) and (2.67)
E	: Coefficient in logarithmic law of the wall for velocity (equation (3.30))
E_c	: Coefficient in logarithmic law of the wall for scalar (equation (3.31))
f	: Near-wall effect function in modelling ϕ_{ij} and ϕ_{ic} terms, also, dimensionless velocity profile (Section (4.3.2))
g	: Dimensionless cross-stream velocity (Section (4.3.2))
g_i	: Gravitational vector ($i = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
h	: Dimensionless shear stress (Section (4.3.2))
j''	: Flux through a boundary

K_f	: Thermal conductivity of fluid
K_w	: Thermal conductivity of tube wall
k	: Turbulent kinetic energy
L	: Convection through boundaries (Appendix (E))
l	: Mixing length
l_ϵ	: Dissipation length scale
m	: Mass flow rate, also, dimensionless mean scalar (Section (4.3.2))
Nu	: Nusselt number
n	: Exponent in decay of turbulence, also, dimensionless cross-stream scalar flux (Section (4.3.2))
n_a	: Unit normal vector ($a = x, y, z$)
P	: Time averaged value of pressure, also, production of turbulent kinetic energy
$\hat{P}$	: Instantaneous value of pressure
P_c	: Production of scalar fluctuations (Section (2.7.4))
Pe	: Peclet number
P_{ic}	: Production of scalar fluxes (Section (2.7.3))
P_{ij}	: Production of Reynolds stress tensor (equation (2.15))
Pr	: Molecular Prandtl number
Pr_t	: Turbulent Prandtl number
p	: Fluctuations in pressure, also, pressure and dimensionless streamwise scalar flux (Section (4.3.2))
p'	: Pressure correction
q	: Dimensionless difference between streamwise and cross-stream normal stress (Section (4.3.2))
$\dot{q}''$	: Wall flux of C
R	: Radius of pipe, also, ratio of time scales of turbulent scalar and velocity fields
R_{cw1}	: A near-wall effect model for ϕ_{ic} (Table (2.2))
R_{cw2}	: A near-wall effect model for ϕ_{ic} (Table (2.2))

R_{c1}	: A model for pressure-scalar gradient correlation (Table (2.2))
R_{c2}	: A model for pressure-scalar gradient correlation (Table (2.2))
Re	: Reynolds number
R_i	: Inner radius of tube
R_o	: Outer radius of tube
R_{sw1}	: Launder et al. near-wall model (Table (2.1))
R_{sw2}	: Gibson-Launder near-wall model (Table (2.1))
R_{s1}	: Launder et al. isotropic model (Table (2.1))
R_{s2}	: Launder et al. Simple model (Table (2.1))
r	: Radius
S	: Time averaged generation of C per unit volume, also, spreading parameter in a wake (equation (4.12))
$\hat{S}$	: Instantaneous generation of C per unit volume
S_{ci}	: Surface integral term in equation (2.47)
S_i	: Surface integral term in equation (C.9)
S_{ij}	: Surface integral term in equation (2.9)
S_{ik}	: Surface integral term in equation (C.10)
S^Φ	: Source of Φ in equation (3.9)
Sc_t	: Turbulent Schmidt number
St	: Stanton number
T	: A period of time (equation (1.5)), also Transport coefficient of Φ (Appendix(E))
T_i	: Diffusion term in equation (2.41) (equation (2.44))
T_{ij}	: Diffusion term in equation (2.2) (Section (2.2.2))
t	: Time variable
U	: Streamwise mean velocity
U_i	: Time averaged velocity component ($i = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\hat{U}_i$	: Instantaneous value of velocity component ($i = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)

U_T	: Friction velocity
u	: Suffix denoting the upstream plane
$\overline{u^2}$	: Streamwise component of Reynolds normal stress
u_i	: Fluctuations in velocity ($i = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\overline{u_i c}$	: Time averaged components of scalar flux ($i = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\overline{u_i c^2}$	: Time averaged correlation of velocity-scalar-scalar ($i = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\overline{u_i u_j}$	: Time averaged components of Reynolds stress (i and $j = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\overline{u_i u_j c}$	: Time averaged correlation of velocity-velocity-scalar (i and $j = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$	: Time averaged triple velocity correlation (i, j and $k = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\overline{u_i u_j u_k u_l}$	: Quadruple velocity correlation
$\overline{u_k \epsilon'}$	: Time averaged correlation between velocity and dissipation fluctuations ($i = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
$\overline{uc}$	: Streamwise scalar flux
$\overline{uv}$	: Reynolds shear stress
V	: Cross-stream velocity
$\overline{v^2}$	: Cross-stream component of Reynolds normal stress
$\overline{vc}$	: Cross-stream scalar flux
W	: Streamwise mean velocity in θ, r, z coordinates
$\overline{w^2}$	: Transverse component of Reynolds normal stress
X_i, x_i	: Displacement vector ($= x, y, z$ or $i = \theta, r, z$ or $1, 2, 3$)
X_0	: Distance to the virtual origin
x_2	: Cross stream direction
y	: Distance in cross-stream direction
y^+	: Non dimensional distance away from a wall
y_0	: Effective distance to the wall (equation (A.3))
z	: Distance in z -direction

GREEK SYMBOLS

α	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij2} (equation (2.14))
α_c	: Coefficient in the linear form of c_{ni}^m (equation (2.55))
α'_c	: Coefficient in the linear form of d_{li}^m (equation (2.68))
β	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij2} (equation (2.14))
β_{ab}	: Wall-effect tensor in Daly-Harlow model (a and $b = x, y, z$) (equation (2.23))
β_c	: Coefficient in the linear form of c_{ni}^m (equation (2.55))
β'_c	: Coefficient in the linear form of d_{li}^m (equation (2.68))
Γ	: Diffusion coefficient
Γ_i	: Diffusion coefficient of Φ in the direction- i
Γ_t	: Turbulent diffusivity of scalar property
Γ^Φ	: Kinematic diffusivity of scalar property
γ	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij2} (equation (2.19))
δ	: Characteristic length for the hydrodynamic field
δ_c	: Characteristic length for the scalar field
δ_{ij}	: Kronecker delta ($= 1$ for $i = j$, $= 0$ for $i \neq j$)
ϵ	: Dissipation rate of turbulent kinetic energy
ϵ_c	: Dissipation rate of scalar fluctuations
ϵ_{ij}	: Dissipation tensor (i and $j = x, y, z$ or θ, r, z or $1, 2, 3$)
ζ	: Weighting factor in hybrid difference formula (equation (3.13))
ζ_w	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij2w} (equation (2.22))
η	: Coefficient in modelled form of ϕ_{ij2} (equation (2.14)), also, dimensionless distance for hydrodynamic field
η_c	: Dimensionless distance for scalar field
κ	: The von Kármán constant
κ_c	: Coefficient in the logarithmic law for C
λ	: Ratio of free stream velocities in a mixing layer

μ	: Dynamic viscosity of fluid
ν	: Kinematic viscosity of fluid
ν_t	: Turbulent viscosity
ν_c	: Coefficient in the linear form of c_{ni}^m (equation (2.55))
ν_c'	: Coefficient in the linear form of d_{ni}^m (equation (2.68))
ξ_i	: Cartesian components of position vector ($i = x, y, z$), also, the weighting factor in equation (3.11)
Π	: Net flux of Φ in equation (3.13)
π	: Angle of 180° expressed in radians
ρ	: Density of fluid
σ_t	: Turbulent Prandtl number or Schmidt number
τ	: Characteristic time scale of decay of turbulence
Φ	: Any dependent variable
$\overline{\Phi}$	: Interpolated value of variable Φ at regular grid node
ϕ_{ic}	: Pressure-scalar gradient correlation
ϕ_{ic1}	: Turbulent part of ϕ_{ic}
ϕ_{ic2}	: Mean strain of ϕ_{ic}
ϕ_{ic1w}	: Turbulent part of the near-wall effects of ϕ_{ic}
ϕ_{ic2w}	: Mean strain part of the near-wall effects of ϕ_{ic}
ϕ_{ij}	: Pressure-strain correlation
ϕ_{ij1}	: Turbulent part of ϕ_{ij}
ϕ_{ij2}	: Mean strain part of ϕ_{ij}
ϕ_{ij1w}	: Turbulent part of the near-wall effects of ϕ_{ij}
ϕ_{ij2w}	: Mean strain part of the near-wall effects of ϕ_{ij}
Ψ	: Stream function
ψ	: Near-wall effect function in equation (2.25)
Ω	: Weighting factor (Appendix (E))
Ω_c	: Equals $\frac{C_c^k}{\epsilon}$ (Appendix (D))

Ω_s : Equals $\frac{C_s^k}{\epsilon}$ (Appendex (D))
 ω : Non dimensional stream function (equation (3.1))

OTHER SYMBOLS AND NOTATIONS

$D( )$: Diffusion of ( )
 $\frac{D}{Dt}( )$: Substantial derivative equals $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}( ) + U_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}( )$
 E : 'Exterior' boundary
 eff : Effective
 I : 'Interior' boundary
 (I) : I th grid position in θ -direction or ω -direction
 $(I+i)$: $(I+i)$ th grid position in θ -direction or ω -direction
 $(i = +1, +\frac{1}{2}, -1, -\frac{1}{2} \text{ etc. })$
 i : Inside surface of the tube
 (J) : J th grid position in r -direction
 $(J+j)$: $(J+j)$ th grid position in r -direction
 $(j = +1, +\frac{1}{2}, -1, -\frac{1}{2} \text{ etc. })$
 (K) : K th grid position in z -direction
 $(K+k)$: $(K+k)$ th grid position in z -direction ($k = +\frac{1}{2}$ and $-\frac{1}{2}$)
 o : Outer surface of the tube, also, characteristic value
 tot : Total
 $turb$: Turbulent
 $wall$: At the wall
 $\Sigma( )$: Summation of ( )
 $\Delta( )$: Increment in ( )
 $+$: Position on the higher side of displacement component
 $-$: Position on the lower side of displacement component
 $,$: e.g. $f_{,i}$ means the covariant differential of f with respect to direction- x_i

CHAPTER 1INTRODUCTION1.1 Introduction

Most fluid flows and heat transfer processes of practical interest to engineers involve turbulence. Methods for quantitative evaluation of turbulent flows are thus needed for optimum designing of the equipment involved. Before the advent of large electronic computers, this need was met by experimental investigations of the gross flow characteristics and empirical correlation of the same. The applicability of such information was limited and could at best provide broad guide-lines for the flow evaluation. Analytical and semi-empirical methods available to the designer were based mainly on intuitive ideas on turbulence phenomena. These again had limited applicability. No general analytical solution of the equations governing fluid and heat flow processes are available to date, but the numerical solution of these equations, facilitated by the advent of computers, has become a reality. During the last two decades a considerable proportion of fluid dynamic and heat transfer researchers have directed their efforts on numerical solution of the flow and heat-transfer equations; considerable success has been achieved. Now, with the ever increasing computational capability, it has become possible to embark into the investigation of increasingly complex flow situations, including three-dimensional flows.

It has long been assumed that the Navier-Stokes equations which comprise a closed set of equations for instantaneous velocity and pressure field govern the motion of both laminar and turbulent flows. For a laminar flow, with a set of well defined boundary conditions, these Navier-Stokes equations, at least in principle, can be numerically

solved to any required degree of accuracy. In the case of turbulent flows, meaningful results for the instantaneous velocity and pressure fields from a numerical procedure can be expected only if the numerical discretisation is finer than the smallest scales of turbulence.

This would demand computer storage and time, several orders of magnitude larger than the capabilities of present day computers. An alternative approach based on an averaged form of the governing equations together with a model of the statistical parameters appearing in them is utilised in the numerical analysis of turbulent flows; this approach is well within the capabilities of modern computers.

1.2 Equations of Fluid Motion and Scalar Transport

Since the equations are needed in their general three-dimensional form, the Cartesian tensor notation is used for compactness, ignoring the distinction between covariant and contravariant tensors and using the repeated-suffix summation convention so that

$$a_i b_i \equiv a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2 + a_3 b_3 .$$

Further, the compact comma suffix notation is used for differentiation, so that

$$f_{,i} \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} .$$

For a Newtonian fluid of uniform density ρ and kinematic viscosity ν , the Navier-Stokes equations derived from Newton's second law applied to a unit control volume, in the absence of body forces, take the form,

$$\hat{u}_{i,t} + (\hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j)_{,j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \hat{p}_{,i} + \nu \hat{u}_{i,jj} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\hat{u}_i$ is the component of velocity in the direction x_i , $\hat{p}$ is the pressure and t is the time variable.

For an incompressible fluid, the continuity equation assumes the form,

$$\hat{u}_{i,i} = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

The instantaneous momentum equations obtained by applying (1.2) in (1.1) are,

$$\hat{u}_{i,t} + \hat{u}_j \hat{u}_{i,j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \hat{p}_{,i} + \nu \hat{u}_{i,jj} . \quad (1.3)$$

Correspondingly, the low-speed transport of heat or passive matter

is describable by the following equation.

$$\hat{C}_{,t} + \hat{U}_j \hat{C}_{,j} = \hat{S} + \Gamma \hat{C}_{,jj} \quad (1.4)$$

where $\hat{C}$ is the passive scalar (e.g. enthalpy, concentration of a chemical species etc.), Γ is the kinematic diffusivity of the property and $\hat{S}$ is the generation of $\hat{C}$ per unit volume (for example, by chemical reaction) at the point considered.

Now taking the statistical average of variables $\hat{U}_i$, $\hat{C}$ and $\hat{P}$ with respect to time, obtain

$$U_i = Lt_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+T} \hat{U}_i dt \quad \text{etc..} \quad (1.5)$$

Here the equation (1.5) should be convergent and independent of t_0 . Further, T denotes a period of time larger than the time scale of the slowest fluctuations and smaller than the time scale over which significant variations in the averaged quantities occur. Equation (1.5) implies that the fluctuations u_i etc. of the variables defined by,

$$u_i = \hat{U}_i - U_i \quad \text{etc.} \quad (1.6)$$

should satisfy,

$$0 = Lt_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+T} u_i dt \quad \text{etc..} \quad (1.7)$$

Now substituting (1.6) in the instantaneous equations (1.3) and (1.4) with the above definitions yields,

$$U_{i,t} + U_j U_{i,j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} P_{,i} + \nu U_{i,jj} - (\overline{u_i u_j})_{,j} \quad (1.8)$$

and

$$C_{,t} + U_j C_{,j} = S + \Gamma C_{,jj} - (\overline{u_j c})_{,j} \quad (1.9)$$

The equations for mean momentum (1.8), differ from the equations for the instantaneous momentum due to the appearance of the fluctuating velocity correlation tensor, $\overline{u_i u_j}$, known as turbulent or Reynolds stress. Similarly (1.9) has additional dependent variable, $\overline{u_j c}$, representing the turbulent scalar flux in direction x_j . Thus differences between the laminar fluid flows and passive scalar transport to that of their turbulent counterparts should be solely attributed to the effects of the turbulent stresses and fluxes. In laminar flows equation (1.3) with the continuity relation (1.2) form a closed set which in principle may be solved; this in turn allows the solution of (1.4). To solve equations (1.8) and (1.9), however, additional equations or expressions are needed determining $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and $\overline{u_j c}$. The provision of a model for these correlations forms a significant fraction of this thesis.

1.3 Closure Levels

In order to solve the mean momentum and mean scalar equations in turbulent motion one needs to have some information regarding the correlations $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and $\overline{u_j c}$. It is this information that is supplied in a turbulent closure model. At the practical level most proposals for turbulence closures have been on Boussinesq's idea of a "turbulent viscosity". He suggested in 1877 that the local turbulent shear stress (i.e. the cross correlation of fluctuating velocities) could be expressed as the product of the turbulent (eddy) viscosity and the local mean velocity gradient, a clear analogy with laminar stresses. The turbulent viscosity was considered to be a function of the flow field rather than a property of the fluid. Thus, in a simple shear flow where $U_1 = U_1(x_2)$,

$$-\overline{u_1 u_2} = \nu_t U_{1,2} \quad , \quad (1.10)$$

the minus sign ensuring that momentum is diffused down the velocity gradient as in laminar flow. The idea of a turbulent viscosity was conceived to deal with situations where only one shear stress component exists. In practice there are many relatively simple but important flows where such a situation prevails. Implied in (1.10) is the notion that the turbulent shear stress vanishes in the absence of a gradient in mean velocity.

As a tensorial extension of (1.10) one may write

$$\overline{u_i u_j} = -\nu_t (U_{i,j} + U_{j,i}) + \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \overline{u_m u_m} \quad (1.11)$$

which relates all the components of the stress tensor to the mean strain field and the turbulent kinetic energy. In (1.11) the turbulent viscosity ν_t is a scalar quantity. The term $\frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \overline{u_m u_m}$ to the right hand side of (1.11) accounts for the fact that, in the absence of mean strain, the normal stresses do not vanish and that they are equal in magnitude.

Even for weak turbulent shear flows this is not exactly true.

Alternatively, considering the turbulent viscosity as a second-order tensor, one may write,

$$-\overline{u_i u_j} = (\nu_t)_{ik} (U_{j,k} + U_{k,j}) \quad (1.11a)$$

or even assuming a fourth-order tensor for the turbulent viscosity,

$$-\overline{u_i u_j} = (\nu_t)_{ijkl} (U_{k,l} + U_{l,k}) \quad (1.11b)$$

The components of the turbulent viscosities in (1.11a) and (1.11b), however, should satisfy the conditions imposed by the incompressibility of fluid and symmetry of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ tensor.

The scalar counterpart of equation (1.10) is the definition of eddy diffusivity of heat or matter given by,

$$-\overline{u_2 c} = \Gamma_t C_{,2} \quad (1.12)$$

The tensorial extensions of the equation (1.12) can be written in forms parallel to (1.11) and (1.11a).

In practice it is often the ratio of eddy viscosity and eddy diffusivity, denoted by turbulent Prandtl number, that is used in describing the scalar fluxes. This quantity

$$Pr_t = \frac{\nu_t}{\Gamma_t} \quad (1.13)$$

should merely be considered as the ratio of diffusivities in a direction where non-zero mean gradients are present, or else if Pr_t is considered as a tensor, then it's components should be permitted to take finite, infinite or indefinite magnitudes.

1.3.1 Mean-Field Closure Models

In mean-field closure models, the turbulent stresses and scalar fluxes are expressed by algebraic expressions containing mean quantities only. Most of these models are based on the eddy viscosity-eddy diffusivity concept described in the previous section. An example of an algebraic formula for the turbulent viscosity is provided by Prandtl's mixing length hypothesis,

$$\nu_t = l^2 U_{1,2} \quad . \quad (1.14)$$

Here again in order to find ν_t , the mixing length l , should be prescribed. For example in wall boundary layer flows, the mixing length l may be expressed by two separate expressions covering the "inner" and "outer" regions. These expressions have been extensively tested mainly for turbulent wall boundary layer flow calculations where it seem to perform very well. Numerous empirical and intuitive formulae are available which include various physical effects like that of low Reynolds number, the transition region, compressibility, mass transfer, pressure gradient, transverse curvature etc. on the behaviour of the wall boundary layer. A useful account of this is given by REYNOLDS and CEBECI [1].

The corresponding closure of the scalar equation is generally achieved by specification of Pr_t as a function of geometrical and flow parameters. Several formulations of eddy viscosity generalized to three-dimensional compressible and incompressible wall layers are also given in [1].

In the case of free shear layers it is the specification of ν_t (assumed constant at any section in the shear flow) rather than the mixing length l , that is common. Some empirical formula for ν_t , as functions of characteristic flow parameters, which will give best agreement with self preserved mean profiles in simple free shear flows can be found in [1].

1.3.2 Turbulent Transport Models

In turbulent transport models one or more additional partial differential equations will be supplied. These partial differential equations will implicitly or explicitly determine the shear stress $\overline{u_1 u_2}$ and scalar flux $\overline{u_2 c}$. These closure models can further be classified according to the number of additional partial differential equations considered for determining ν_t .

(a) One-Equation Models

Usually a transport equation for the turbulent kinetic energy forms the basis of one-equation models. Now, instead of ν_t being related to mean flow quantities, it is expressed in terms of turbulent velocity and length scales as

$$\nu_t \propto k^{\frac{1}{2}} l \quad . \quad (1.15)$$

Further, in order to solve the partial differential equation for turbulent kinetic energy a length scale has to be prescribed in approximating the dissipation term. As with zero-equation models the length scale is prescribed here with prior knowledge of behaviour of the flow.

(b) Two-Equation Viscosity Models

The use of an additional turbulence partial differential equation for the length scale l or a related variable eliminates the need for prescribing one to facilitate solution of turbulence kinetic energy equation. Transport equations for several length scale related quantities were studied by researchers, a summary of this is given in LAUNDER and SPALDING [2]. The most successful one which is now tested in a vast range of flow conditions is the transport equation for the isotropic dissipation rate ϵ . (The modelling of this equation supplementary to the Reynolds stress model is given in the next Chapter).

Even at the level of one-and two-equation models the closure of the mean scalar equation is done by prescribing the scalar diffusivity, or more often, the turbulent Prandtl number.

(c) Stress and Flux Transport Models

At all the levels of closure mentioned before, the shear stress is expressed by way of the Boussinesq expression (1.11), where the shear stress is made to respond at once to changes in the mean strain field. This is not correct in most fluid flow situations. Thus the need for a model which is capable of predicting a non-equilibrium flow arises. Reynolds stress models in which transport equations for the Reynolds stress tensor components are solved is the simplest model which is capable of doing this. The solution of partial differential equations for the Reynolds stress components has been suggested by CHOU [3], ROTTA [4] and later by many others. The partial differential equation for the Reynolds stress tensor can be obtained by differentiating and then manipulating the equation for the fluctuating component u_i of the velocity vector. The resultant transport equation for $\overline{u_i u_j}$ contains contributions from various physical processes; if these are modelled correctly then all components of the stress tensor $\overline{u_i u_j}$ can be estimated. This will allow the determination of the mean velocity field without recourse to the notion of an effective viscosity.

Parallel to the Reynolds stress equations it is possible to formulate partial differential equation for the scalar flux tensor, thus obviating the need for an effective diffusivity model. The partial differential equation for the scalar flux tensor can be derived starting from transport equations for the fluctuating velocity u_i and the fluctuating component of scalar c .

1.3.3 Higher Order Closures

In the transport equation for the components of the Reynolds stress tensor there appears the triple correlation $\overline{u_i u_j u_l}$ which represents the contribution of the transport by the fluctuating velocity of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ in direction x_l . One may either approximate this quantity in terms of the Reynolds stress and mean velocity field (as in a second-order closure), or alternatively one may obtain from the solution of transport equation for $\overline{u_i u_j u_l}$. Models which incorporate solution of partial differential equations for this correlation are called third-order closures. Correspondingly, it is possible to formulate the partial differential equation for the components of the correlation $\overline{u_i u_j c}$ whose gradients appear in the transport equations for the scalar fluxes.

Likewise, it is possible to generate transport equations for higher and higher order correlations but the modelling of the contributing terms become more and more abstract due to lack of experimental evidence to understand their behaviour.

1.3.4 Other Closures

At least one method which needs mention here is the three-dimensional time-dependent numerical computation of the large scale turbulence. Here only the small scale turbulence is modelled, the large scale turbulence being obtained from the time-dependent numerical solutions.

1.4 Evaluation of Available Models

In this section the capabilities and limitations of available hydrodynamic and scalar transport models described in the previous section are evaluated. This is done by comparing expected performance of a given model with corresponding evidence from experiments.

1.4.1 Eddy Viscosity Models

In local-equilibrium flows the generation and destruction of the components of the Reynolds stress tensor are nearly equal, the mean and turbulent transport being negligible. In self preserving shear flows these two quantities, although not equal to each other, are proportional; the constant of proportionality being a function of non-dimensional cross-stream distance only. In these flows it is possible to obtain simple relations between Reynolds stress components and the components of the mean-rate-of-strain tensor. The eddy viscosity model is a generalisation of this possibility. Thus in local-equilibrium regions and in self preserving flows, the eddy viscosity models with correctly chosen empirical constants can be expected to perform satisfactorily. Indeed in the calculation of wall boundary layers where the near-wall region outside of the viscous layer is in local equilibrium, the eddy viscosity formulation with empirical corrections is known to give satisfactory results for a variety of physical and boundary conditions. (see Ref [5], Chapter 6)

Similarly, in the calculation of self preserving flows, for example the plane or radial jet, Prandtl mixing length formula can be employed to obtain satisfactory agreement with experimental observations. The relationship between the mixing length and the width of the respective flow, however, needs to be adjusted if the rate of spread of the flow is to be predicted correctly. This heavy reliance on empirical formulae

is one of the major weaknesses in the mixing length models even in predicting equilibrium or self preserving flows.

The one-equation models have some capability of representing the dependence of shear stress on flow history. Although it is a major step towards the true representation of the flow behaviour, the need to prescribe a turbulence length scale, in order to model the dissipation term, greatly reduces its usefulness in flow calculations. Since accurate prior knowledge of the turbulence length scale is not always available the empiricism associated with the mixing length models becomes apparent in these schemes as well. Further, due to the neglect of transport effects on the length scale itself, the advantages of a one-equation model over a mixing length model are limited.

Two-equation models incorporate the transport effects of length scale (often a length-scale-related quantity of the form $k^a l^b$) into the turbulence model. Thus, they may be expected to perform satisfactorily in both developing as well as developed flows. RODI and SPALDING [6] reported that with a single set of constants it is possible to make satisfactory predictions of the spreading rates of plane mixing layer, plane jet and radial jet. The predictions of LAUNDER et al. [7] show satisfactory agreement in a large variety of free shear flows, in many cases significant improvements over predictions from the mixing length hypothesis are obtained.

It appears however, that the effective viscosity concept is inadequate for describing some turbulent flow situations. In these situations often the transport effects on the Reynolds stresses are dominant. For example in flow through an annulus or in an asymmetric duct or in a wall jet, the maximum velocity surfaces do not coincide with the zero shear stress surfaces. This phenomenon can not be accounted for with an effective viscosity formulation. The secondary motion that

develops in corners of straight axis ducts due to cross stream gradients of Reynolds stresses is another class of flow where isotropic eddy viscosity models are inadequate. The concept also fails to allow satisfactory prediction of flows with influential body forces; gravitational effects on turbulence is an example. The direct effect of the mean velocity tensor on the stress tensor diminishes with increasing influence of the body forces on the turbulent structure; hence the eddy viscosity model becomes less relevant in representing the turbulent stresses.

1.4.2 Eddy Diffusivity Models and Turbulent Prandtl (or Schmidt) Number

The eddy diffusivity models have widely been applied in parallel with eddy viscosity models, in calculating scalar transfer problems. Again the eddy diffusivity formulation is a generalisation of the possibility that in local-equilibrium regions and in self preserving flows there exist some simple relation between the scalar flux tensor and the gradients of the mean scalar tensor. In flow regions where both hydrodynamic and scalar fields are in local equilibrium, i.e. when the transport effects are negligible in both shear stress equations as well as in scalar flux equations, the effective diffusivity and simple formulations for turbulent Prandtl number can be expected to give satisfactory agreement with experiments. The velocity and scalar fields close to the wall (the so-called "semi-logarithmic region") is one where one may assume local-equilibrium structure and where an eddy diffusivity formulation should perform satisfactorily. The review paper by KADER and YAGLOM [8] clearly indicate that in the semi-logarithmic regions of a variety of wall flow geometries under a large range of Reynolds numbers and molecular Prandtl (or Schmidt) numbers, the implied turbulent Prandtl (or Schmidt) number is indeed a constant in the range of 0.9. The predictions of PATANKAR and SPALDING [9] and others, of wall boundary

layers with prescribed turbulent Prandtl number of 0.9 show good agreement with experiments.

There are numerous engineering applications, however, where the scalar field is far from fully developed or self preserved. Correspondingly, several experimental investigations aimed at examining the diffusivity in developing flows has shown considerable disagreement with the idea of constant Pr_t (or Sc_t).

BLOM's [10] investigation of wall boundary layer with a step in wall temperature indicated clearly that the turbulent Prandtl number is a function of both streamwise and lateral distances. His temperature profiles show that an assumption of Pr_t of 0.9 would substantially in error at least in the developing region of the boundary layer.

QUARMBY and QUIRK's [11] measurements of temperature and concentration profiles downstream of a short heated (or porous) section in a pipe, again imply that the turbulent Prandtl number is far from constant across the flow. In their flow situations the transport effects play a significant role in determining the scalar field.

The eddy diffusivity models which incorporate prescribed Pr_t (or Sc_t) variations across the flow can not be expected to give satisfactory agreement in predicting flows such as that of Quarmby and Quirk or that of Blom, where the transport effects are important.

The turbulent flow situations where the effect of buoyancy on the turbulent structure is significant, the eddy diffusivity model becomes less relevant. In such situations the turbulent Prandtl number is known to vary considerably with relative effect of the buoyancy forces. For example in stably stratified flows the turbulent Prandtl number increases sharply with increase in Richardson number (which is a measure of the negative of the production of turbulent kinetic energy due to buoyancy as a fraction of production due to mean shear). Thus,

satisfactory predictions of buoyancy influenced flows with the use of eddy diffusivity models will certainly require some ad-hoc corrections.

In asymmetrically heated shear flows, the zero heat flux plane may not coincide with the plane of zero temperature gradient. For example, the study of slightly heated two-dimensional jet expanding into a plane mixing layer by FULACHIER et al. [12] indicate the presence of a region where the temperature gradient and the lateral heat flux are of the same sign. In this region, the production of temperature fluctuations is negative. Their spectral analysis of lateral heat flux in the negative production region confirm the fact, that the high frequency components are related to the local gradient, whereas, the low frequency components are related to the larger eddies. An eddy viscosity/diffusivity hypothesis which assume a simple relation between local properties can not accommodate these complex effects.

In three-dimensional scalar transport, diffusivities need not be isotropic. Certainly the measurements of three-dimensional heat transfer in pipes by QUARMBY and QUIRK [11], indicate that the tangential diffusivity of heat is much larger than the radial diffusivity in regions close to the tube wall. Similar experiments by BLACK and SPARROW [13] suggest the same. An eddy diffusivity model, if employed, needs considerable empiricism in order to predict this behaviour.

1.4.3 Reynolds Stress Models

Unlike eddy viscosity models, in Reynolds stress models the transport effects of the Reynolds stress tensor are incorporated directly. Thus, this model in principle, can be expected to give a satisfactory representation of the turbulence in flows with and without influential transport effects. Of course there is an additional task of modelling several unknown correlations which appear in the transport equation for $\overline{u_i u_j}$. Since the solution of the partial differential equations produce the stress components explicitly their incorporation in the mean velocity equation is now directly possible. Therefore, in principle, none of the restrictions associated with the eddy viscosity formulation apply to Reynolds stress model. For example, the effects of buoyancy, effects of asymmetry, the secondary flow generation due to gradients in stresses in three-dimensional ducts etc. are all within the capabilities of a Reynolds stress model.

Among the applications of this type of model, HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [14] obtained satisfactory predictions of several shear flows including a strongly asymmetric channel flow, using a three-equation (Reynolds shear stress-turbulent kinetic energy-and its dissipation rate) model of turbulence. LAUNDER et al. [15] showed further capabilities of Reynolds stress models by solving for all non-zero stress components in several two-dimensional shear flow situations.

1.4.4 Scalar-Flux Models

Corresponding to the capabilities of Reynolds stress models, the scalar-flux level of closure appears capable of giving satisfactory representation of several flow situations where the eddy diffusivity formulation is inadequate. Often transport effects of scalar transfer are even more predominant than those on the flow field. Therefore the use of a scalar-flux model may be required even when the hydrodynamic field is in local equilibrium. In modelling scalar flux equations, however, accurate knowledge of the stress tensor, particularly the normal stresses are required. Therefore the scalar-flux models are often associated with Reynolds stress models which are capable of determining the normal stress components accurately.

1.5 Present Contribution

1.5.1 Theoretical Contribution

The aim of the present theoretical investigation is to devise and verify a model of turbulence capable of predicting convective heat and mass transport in three-dimensional temperature and concentration fields. Emphasis will be placed in obtaining a closure simple enough for practical calculations yet with least amount of empiricism.

1.5.2 Choice of Turbulence Model

The most crucial feature of the flow that this investigation attempts to understand and formulate is the non-isotropic diffusivity in three-dimensional scalar transfer. The experimental evidence of BLACK and SPARROW [13] and QUARMBY and QUIRK [11] clearly indicates that the anisotropy of the diffusivity is quite significant and increases as the wall is approached. The data of [11] suggest that in fully developed turbulent pipe flow the circumferential diffusivity near the wall is more than three times as large as the radial one. As mentioned in Section (1.4.2) the experimental findings of BLOM [10] and QUARMBY and QUIRK [11] suggest that the diffusivity in two-dimensional flow is not constant in either the streamwise or lateral directions. So in three-dimensional flows the diffusivity of a scalar can be expected to vary in all three directions.

If an eddy diffusivity model is to be used in this investigation without any ad-hoc modifications, it would produce only an isotropic diffusivity effect. On the other hand if the directional bias of the diffusivity is to be incorporated in some way, far too much information from the same experimental situation that the investigation is trying to simulate, will have to be given as an input to the model. Even though this could lead to satisfactory prediction of the flows concerned, it would not amount to more than a sophisticated curve fit. The contribution

of such an investigation towards the understanding of convective turbulence transport would be very small.

The scalar flux transport model, however, solves for the component fluxes in all three directions and the anisotropy of the scalar diffusivity will be an output rather than an input as in the eddy diffusivity model. Further the model would ideally be a general one, applicable in two- and three-dimensional free shear flows as well as those affected by a wall and would not contain ad-hoc modifications. A scalar flux model has therefore been chosen for the closure of the mean scalar equation.

For the hydrodynamic closure the Reynolds stress models have shown a greater range of applicability than eddy viscosity models. Even though an eddy viscosity model with suitably chosen empirical constants is adequate to predict the mean flow features of the flow situations considered, the component of the stress tensor which are required in the scalar transport modelling can not be obtained with sufficient accuracy from that model. Therefore the Reynolds stress model was chosen as the mean flow closure model. This would enable the proposed numerical scheme to be extended to solve fully three-dimensional hydrodynamic as well as scalar fields where the eddy viscosity models have had only modest success.

1.5.3 Path for Verification of the turbulence Model

For the purpose of establishing the validity of the turbulence model it is necessary to make systematic computations in flow geometries where accurate experimental data are available. First the flow geometries should be identified with their known physical characteristics. It is well known that the structure in near-wall turbulence is vastly different from that away from a wall. Large gradients in mean velocity and large anisotropies in the turbulent stress tensor are the main characteristics

in flows affected by walls, whereas free shear flows are characterised by only moderate gradients and anisotropies. Further, in near-wall regions, the length scales associated with turbulence increase in size with increase in distance to the wall. In regions remote from the influence of walls, on the other hand, the turbulence length scale is more or less constant in size. It will be seen in the following chapter that present modelling directions clearly distinguish the wall effects in simulating pressure interaction correlations in the stress and scalar flux equations.

Thus, the turbulence model is first tested in free shear flows. In the present investigation the plane mixing layer, the plane jet and the plane wake are simulated and predictions obtained of their hydrodynamic and scalar fields. Even though they are all self-preserving flows they cover a large range of turbulent production/dissipation rates. Thus, a model capable of satisfactorily predicting all these flow situations can be expected to perform well in many more free shear flows.

The turbulent model is next applied to wall affected flows such as boundary layers, channel and pipe flows. Here the near-wall-effect parts of the pressure interaction correlations are included in the model. All other terms and coefficients in modelled terms are kept unchanged from the forms employed in predicting free shear flows. In the near-wall regions it is these additional terms that are under test, whereas away from the walls where turbulent transport is influential, it is mainly the diffusion models that are being scrutinized.

As for investigating three-dimensional scalar transport problems the turbulence model is virtually unchanged from the above.

1.5.4 Numerical Contribution

The present numerical investigation has been aimed at providing numerical schemes for solving problems of two-and three-dimensional turbulent scalar transport in two-dimensional boundary layer type flow field, using second-order closure models.

As the first step in verifying the turbulence model, calculations were made in two-dimensional situations with the use of numerical procedure of PATANKAR and SPALDING [9] modified so as to facilitate efficient calculation of second order turbulence variables. After a considerable amount of testing it was decided to incorporate a staggered grid arrangement for turbulence variables so as to remove some numerical instabilities found in the conventional finite difference grid arrangement. All free shear flow calculations and flat plate boundary layer calculations were performed with this numerical scheme.

Development, testing and use of a numerical scheme capable of solving variables in a three-dimensional marching fashion forms the remainder of the present numerical contribution. This basic solving scheme is a three-dimensional marching numerical scheme used by others (SYED [16] and BRYANT [17]) in simulating free shear flows. The contributions by the writer are the following.

- (a) Modification of the three-dimensional numerical scheme so as to allow economical calculation of two-dimensional situations. This was an obvious step as the present calculations considered only two-dimensional flow fields. The modifications were made to facilitate the solution of both two-and three-dimensional situations with only a small number of modifications.
- (b) The simplification described later in Section (3.3.5), valid for two-dimensional internal flow calculation was incorporated. For example, in a laminar flow situation, this requires only

a single partial differential equation (instead of three equations) to be solved to obtain the velocity field.

- (c) Incorporation of second-order closure model set out in a staggered grid scheme (in place of the two-equation model in the original program). As pointed out later in Section (3.5) for two-dimensional flow problems, it is convenient and sufficient to calculate all turbulence variables in a grid shifted only in the cross-stream direction.
- (d) Calculation of channel and pipe flow hydrodynamic and scalar transport problems in two-dimensional form.
- (e) Solution of three-dimensional scalar transport problems. Here the solution of corresponding two-dimensional hydrodynamic flow fields were obtained first and then frozen, before making three-dimensional calculations. Simultaneous calculation of hydrodynamic and scalar fields can however be made with little modifications to the computer code.
- (f) Finally, in order to allow proper account to be taken of circumferential conduction in thick-walled tubes subjected to three-dimensional heat-transfer, the numerical scheme was extended to include the tube wall as well the flow in the tube. This facilitates simulation of experimental situations where the heat source is applied externally.

1.5.5 Experimental Contribution

The present experimental program has aimed at providing a set of data for the circumferentially non symmetric heat transfer problem. With the limited facilities and time available for exploration, measurements were made only of the outer surface of the tube wall. In three-dimensional heat transfer situations, circumferential conduction is unavoidable. In the present investigation it was minimised by choosing a glass tube. Thus this experiment should closely resemble a three-dimensional mass transfer situation where circumferential conduction is absent. Further it should provide the turbulence model a stringent test than other available three-dimensional heat transfer situations (e.g. BLACK and SPARROW [13]).

CHAPTER 2TURBULENCE MODEL2.1 Introduction

It was decided in the previous chapter that the Reynolds stresses and the turbulent scalar fluxes needed for the closure of mean velocity and mean scalar equations in the present investigation could best be obtained by solving transport equations for those variables. In this chapter those transport equations are presented. As there are several unknown terms in those equations they have to be modelled in terms of other known variables. In Section (2.2) a model for the Reynolds stress transport equation is formulated. The transport equation for the isotropic dissipation

$$\varepsilon = \nu \left(\overline{u_{i,j} u_{j,i}} \right) \quad (2.1)$$

is presented in Section (2.3) and its modelling discussed. Section (2.4) contains the modelling of the scalar flux equation and Section (2.5) deals with the scalar fluctuation equation. The chapter concludes by presenting in Sections (2.6) and (2.7), a summary of the models and the transport equations in modelled form.

2.2 Reynolds Stress Equation and its Trace

An exact equation for the transport of the components of the Reynolds stress tensor can be derived from the Navier-Stokes equations, equation (1.3). By multiplying equation (1.3) by u_j and adding the same equation with suffixes i and j interchanged and time averaging the sum, one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \overline{u_i u_{j,t}} + U_k \overline{u_i u_{j,k}} &= - (\overline{u_i u_k} U_{j,k} + \overline{u_j u_k} U_{i,k}) \\
 \text{Convection} & \quad \text{(a) Production} \\
 & - 2\nu \overline{u_{i,k} u_{j,k}} \\
 & \quad \text{(b) Dissipation} \\
 & - (\overline{u_i u_j u_k} - \nu \overline{u_i u_{j,k}} + \frac{p}{\rho} (\delta_{kj} \overline{u_i} + \delta_{ki} \overline{u_j}))_{,k} \\
 & \quad \text{(c) Diffusion} \\
 & + \frac{p}{\rho} (\overline{u_{i,j}} + \overline{u_{j,i}}) \\
 & \quad \text{(d) Redistribution}
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

In deriving equation (2.2) fluctuations in body forces are omitted. This limits the equation (2.2) to flows unaffected by the gravitational forces. Gravitational effects on turbulence transport is discussed in LAUNDER [18].

The equation (2.2) contains mainly two types of terms, those expressible as spatial gradient terms always represent transport of the conserved quantity from one place to the other, as such their integrals over the whole flow volume are zero; whereas the integrals of other terms over the whole flow volumes are generally non-zero.

The trace of the equation (2.2) may be written

$$\begin{aligned}
 k_{,t} + U_k k_{,k} &= - \overline{u_i u_k} U_{i,k} - \nu \overline{u_{i,k} u_{i,k}} \\
 & \quad \text{(a) Production} \quad \text{(b) Dissipation} \\
 & - (\overline{ku_k} - \nu k_{,k} + \frac{p}{\rho} \overline{ki u_i})_{,k} \\
 & \quad \text{(c) Diffusion}
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$k = \frac{1}{2} \overline{u_i u_i} \quad (2.4)$$

is the turbulent kinetic energy. Terms in equations (2.2) and (2.3) represent the contributions from different physical effects to the maintenance of the corresponding transported quantity. The redistribution term (d) in equation (2.2) does not have a corresponding term in (2.3) because it vanishes by continuity. Thus, it represents only an exchange between the components of turbulent kinetic energy.

The left hand side of (2.2) and (2.3) represent the transport due to mean motion of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and k respectively. The time derivative terms are zero in statistically stationary flows. In the present investigation these time derivatives are neglected though their inclusion when necessary would not require any further approximations in the turbulence model.

The term (a) of equation (2.2) whose integral over the whole flow volume is non-zero will generally have the same sign as $\overline{u_i u_j}$; it represents the generation of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ by interactions of the turbulent motion with the mean-rate-of-strain field. In equation (2.3), the production term (i.e. term(a)) represents the rate at which turbulence is generated by shear interaction which equals the amount of energy transferred from the mean flow to turbulence. The flow regions where the $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and its production are of opposite sign such as velocity maximum region in a wall jet are often marked by large transport effects.

The term (b) of equation (2.2) represents the destruction of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ due to viscous action. In the normal stress terms, they are negative definite and provide mechanism of turbulent kinetic energy dissipation, (b) in equation (2.3).

Term (c) in equations (2.2) and (2.3) represent the transport of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and k due to three distinct actions. They are transport by velocity fluctuations in the direction x_k , transport due to fluctuations in pressure field and transport by viscous action.

Term (d) in equation (2.2) is the mean product of fluctuating pressure and the fluctuating strain fields, and is called the pressure-strain term. It's effect on normal stress components is clearly to diminish the differences between them. In the shear stress equation this term acts as a sink term.

In the present form, the equation (2.2), contains a number of turbulence correlations whose determination is necessary prior to it's employment in a closure model. Those terms, namely the destruction, diffusion and pressure-strain terms are modelled as described in the following sections.

2.2.1 The Viscous Destruction Term

It is a well established experimental fact that the turbulence is dissipated by small scale eddies i.e. at high wave numbers. Further, spectral measurements of turbulent components clearly indicate (see for example LAWN [19] or HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [20]) that at high wave numbers the turbulence is isotropic. Thus, at high Reynolds numbers where the dissipating wave number range is remote from that of the energy-producing wave number range, the dissipation process can be considered isotropic, i.e.

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} \epsilon \quad (2.5)$$

where ϵ is the dissipation rate of turbulent kinetic energy given by (2.1).

The transport equation for ϵ can be derived starting from the equation for velocity fluctuations. This is done in Section (2.3).

2.2.2 The Diffusion Term

The diffusion term in equation (2.2) is

$$T_{ij} = - (\overline{u_i u_j u_k} - \nu \overline{u_i u_j} + \frac{p}{\rho} (\delta_{kj} \overline{u_i} + \delta_{ki} \overline{u_j}))_{,k}$$

The first term is the triple velocity correlation which has to be found algebraically or via a partial differential equation for its transport equation. Some components of $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$ are measurable and their gradients are found to be significant. The second term of T_{ij} represents the transport of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ due to viscous action. At high Reynolds numbers this term is small and hence generally neglected but it's inclusion if needed is straight forward. Little is known about the diffusion due to pressure fluctuation interaction. LUMLEY [21] has pointed out that the separation of transport and redistribution parts of the pressure interaction in the Reynolds stress equation is not unique. He argues that the correct form of the redistribution term is

$$- \frac{1}{\rho} (\overline{p_{,i} u_j} + \overline{p_{,j} u_i}) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{\rho} \delta_{ij} (\overline{p u_k})_{,k}$$

and the corresponding transport part is

$$- \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{\rho} \delta_{ij} (\overline{p u_k})_{,k}$$

Thus, there is no pressure transport of shear stress. Anyway, the measurements by HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [20] in asymmetric plane channel indicated that the term $\frac{d}{dx_2} (\overline{p u_2})$ in the turbulent kinetic energy equation is small compared to other terms appearing in that equation. Due to lack of any other experimental evidence, the transport term due to pressure interaction is neglected here.

This leaves the triple correlation to be modelled in order to determine T_{ij} . A transport equation for $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$ had been proposed by CHOU [3], KOLOVANDIN and VATUTIN [22] and others. This equation contains quadruple velocity correlation and pressure-stress correlations. As the turbulent transport terms in the stress equations are of relatively minor importance in most of the flows considered, it is found inappropriate to adopt such an elaborate treatment of $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$. Thus, an algebraic formulation of $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$ is attempted by direct reference to the terms in the transport equation for $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$. HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [14] obtained the following formulation for $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$.

$$-\overline{u_i u_j u_k} = C_s \frac{k}{\epsilon} (\overline{u_i u_l} \overline{u_j u_{k,l}} + \overline{u_j u_l} \overline{u_k u_{i,l}} + \overline{u_k u_l} \overline{u_i u_{j,l}}) \quad (2.6)$$

The assumptions made in obtaining the above formulation are:

- (a) flow is at high Reynolds number - viscous terms are negligible,
- (b) the triple correlations are small and have Gaussian properties and thus following MILLIONSHTCHKOV [23]:

$$\overline{u_i u_j u_k u_l} = \overline{u_i u_j} \overline{u_k u_l} + \overline{u_i u_k} \overline{u_j u_l} + \overline{u_i u_l} \overline{u_j u_k} \quad (2.7)$$

- (c) the terms of the form $\overline{u_i u_j u_l} U_{k,l}$ are comparatively small and hence neglected,
- (d) the pressure stress correlation can be modelled as proportional to $-\frac{\epsilon}{k} \overline{u_i u_j u_k}$.

and (e) convective transport of $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$ is neglected.

All except assumption (c) are either asymptotically exact or are necessary for closure at this level. At least in two-dimensional boundary layer flows, assumption (c) is not necessary although its employment greatly simplifies the algebra. The measurements of HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [20] in asymmetric plane channel indicated that assumption (c) was reasonable

in their flows. Therefore equation (2.6) is chosen as the model for $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$ in the present study. The coefficient C_s has to be found by reference to established experimental data.

An alternative model is that suggested by DALY and HARLOW [24] where the first two terms of equation (2.6) are omitted. Thus

$$-\overline{u_i u_j u_k} = C'_s \frac{k}{\epsilon} (\overline{u_k u_l} \cdot \overline{u_i u_j}) \quad (2.8)$$

Equation (2.8) is not compatible in its symmetry properties, only the left side being independent of the order of the indicies i, j and k . LAUNDER et al. [15] employed the equation (2.8) in predicting several free shear flows and found satisfactory behaviour. REECE [25] made prediction of plane wall flows using both (2.7) and (2.8) and found no advantage to employing the more numerically complicated form (2.7). It can be seen from the diffusion transport term of turbulent kinetic energy, that for consistency, the coefficient C'_s should be about $1.8 C_s$. The computer optimised values of $C_s = 0.11$ and $C'_s = 0.20$ obtained by Reece quite closely tally with the above.

In the present investigation forms (2.7) and (2.8) are compared in axisymmetric wall flows..

2.2.3 The Pressure-Strain Term

The main characteristic feature of the pressure-strain term $\overline{\frac{p}{\rho} (u_{i,j} + u_{j,i})}$ is its redistributive effect on normal stresses (see HINZE (Ref. [26], pp 323-328)).

The appearance of pressure in the pressure-strain term can be eliminated following CHOU [3], by first formulating a Poisson equation for the fluctuating pressure and multiplying by the fluctuating strain. On averaging, there results

$$\overline{\frac{p}{\rho} (u_{i,j})} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int \left[\overline{(u'_{l,m}, u'_{l,m} u_{i,j})} + 2 \overline{u'_{l,m} u'_{m,l} u_{i,j}} \right] \frac{dVol}{(X-Y)} + S_{ij} \quad (2.9)$$

$$\phi_{ij} = \phi_{ij1} + \phi_{ij2} + S_{ij} \quad (2.10)$$

where, terms with and without a prime relate to values at X and Y respectively. The term S_{ij} is a surface integral having significance only in flows affected by the presence of rigid walls. Equation (2.9) suggests that the pressure-strain correlation originates, apart from wall effects, from two distinct effects. The first part ϕ_{ij1} is generated purely from turbulence interactions, whereas the second part ϕ_{ij2} relates to interactions between turbulence and mean rate of strain.

In non-isotropic homogeneous flows with negligible mean strain the turbulence decays towards an isotropic state. The process ϕ_{ij1} is the only one in (2.9) that can promote an equalising of the normal stress components and a diminishing of shear stress components. With this in mind ROTTA [4] proposed the following plausible form:

$$(\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ji})_1 = -C_{s1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_i u_j} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} k \right) \quad (2.11)$$

where C_{s1} is assumed to be a constant which determines the rate of return to isotropy and the quotient $\frac{k}{\epsilon}$ is the characteristic decay time of the turbulence. If isotropy is to be established the constant C_{s1} should

take a value greater than unity. It is the form (2.11) that is adopted in the present investigation.

Though some workers, for example DALY and HARLOW [24], have neglected the part ϕ_{ij2} in their modelling of the pressure-strain term, CROW [27] has pointed out that the effects of ϕ_{ij2} may even be larger than ϕ_{ij1} under conditions of rapid distortion. Following ROTTA [4] ϕ_{ij2} is expressed as

$$\phi_{ij2} = U_{l,m} \alpha_{lj}^{mi} \quad (2.12)$$

where

$$\alpha_{lj}^{mi} = - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{Vol} \frac{\partial u'_m}{\partial \xi_l} \frac{u_i}{\partial \xi_j} \frac{dVol}{(X-Y)} \quad (2.13)$$

and the ξ s are the Cartesian components of the position vector $(X-Y)$.

Equation (2.12) is a rigorous consequence of (2.9) when the inhomogeneities of the turbulence are only minor and the second and higher order derivatives of the mean velocity are negligible. Rotta pointed out that the fourth-order tensor α_{lj}^{mi} should satisfy certain symmetry and mass conservation constraints. The most general fourth-order tensor satisfying these constraints and comprising only linear combination of Reynolds stresses is given in LAUNDER et al. [15]. With that tensor form, the mean strain part of the pressure-strain correlation can be written

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ji})_2 &= -\alpha (P_{ij} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} P) \\ &\quad - \beta k (U_{i,j} + U_{j,i}) \\ &\quad - \eta (D_{ij} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} P) \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$P_{ij} \equiv - (\overline{u_i u_k} U_{j,k} + \overline{u_j u_k} U_{i,k}) \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$D_{ij} \equiv - (\overline{u_i u_k} U_{k,j} + \overline{u_j u_k} U_{k,i}) \quad (2.16)$$

and

$$P \equiv \frac{1}{2} P_{kk}$$

is the production of kinetic energy. The coefficients α , β and η can be expressed by relations containing a single constant C_{s2} as

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \frac{1}{11} (C_{s2} + 8) \\ \beta &= \frac{1}{55} (30 C_{s2} - 2) \\ \eta &= \frac{1}{11} (8 C_{s2} - 2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

This is the form of ϕ_{ij2} that will be used in the present investigation.

The following inferences are useful to note:

- (a) in isotropic turbulence subjected to sudden distortion,
equation (2.14) reduces to

$$(\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ji})_2 = 0.4 k (U_{i,j} + U_{j,i}) \quad (2.18)$$

which is same as derived by CROW's [27] detailed analysis

- (b) the degenerate form,

$$(\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ji})_2 = -\gamma (P_{ij} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} P) \quad (2.19)$$

of the equation (2.14) can be considered as a parallel of

equation (2.11). Here the action of mean strain is to

isotropize the production tensor P_{ij} whereas the action of

ϕ_{ij1} was to isotropize the stress tensor. NAOT et al. [28]

proposed the form (2.19) as a replacement for ϕ_{ij1} , whereas

here it is considered in addition to the ϕ_{ij1} term. Here

again for sudden distortion in isotropic turbulence requires

γ to take a value 0.6.

In the present investigation both forms, i.e. equation (2.14) and equation (2.19), are employed as the model for ϕ_{ij2} and compared.

The present model for ϕ_{ij} is exactly the same as that used by LAUNDER et al. [15] in predicting a variety of wall and free shear flows. Previous to that HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [14] modelled the mean strain part ϕ_{ij2} in terms of non-linear combinations of Reynolds stress. Through their choice for C_{s1} of 2.8 they had found it necessary to include non-linear terms in ϕ_{ij2} in order to predict correctly the stress levels of nearly homogeneous shear flow data of CHAMPAGNE et al. [29].

The model of ϕ_{ij} given here still has two coefficients to be determined. C_{s1} and C_{s2} (or C_{s1} and γ). The ideal information to evaluate these coefficients are that of CHAMPAGNE et al. [29], where the transport effects are negligible in the stress equations. Further, the production and dissipation of kinetic energy are in equilibrium leading to simple algebraic relations for the relative magnitudes of the Reynolds stresses. Noting the inability of the "redistribution of production" model (equation (2.19)) to predict the difference between the magnitudes of lateral and transverse normal stresses, for best possible agreement with the data of CHAMPAGNE et al. the coefficients of ϕ_{ij} models can be obtained as,

- (a) $C_{s1} = 1.5$ in equation (2.11) and $C_{s2} = 0.4$ in equation (2.14)
or (b) $C_{s1} = 1.8$ in equation (2.11) and $\gamma = 0.6$ in equation (2.19).

2.2.4 Wall Effects in the Pressure-Strain Term

In modelling the ϕ_{ij} term in flows unaffected by walls the surface integral S_{ij} in equation (2.9) was neglected. The influence of this term on ϕ_{ij} must be included in modelling the wall region. When ϕ_{ij} is affected by a single flat wall the surface integral can be eliminated from equation (2.9) and the resultant equation expressed as:

$$u_{i,j} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \left(\overline{(u_{lm} u_{lm})} u_{i,j} + 2(U'_{1,2}) (\overline{u'_{2,1} u_{i,j}}) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{X-Y} + \frac{1}{X-Y^*} \right) dV \quad (2.20)$$

where suffixes 1 and 2 stand for streamwise and lateral flow directions and Y^* is the image of point Y with respect to the wall. As with equation (2.9), it can be inferred from equation (2.20) that the near-wall effect of ϕ_{ij} also arises from two effects, one due to turbulent interactions and the other due to mean velocity gradients. Thus, as a framework for devising a model of the near-wall effects, one is led to write

$$(\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ji})_w = \left[C_{slw} \frac{\epsilon}{k} (\overline{u_i u_j} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} k) + U_{l,m} (b_{lj}^{mi} + b_{li}^{mj}) \right] f\left(\frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2}\right) \quad (2.21)$$

where the function $f\left(\frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2}\right)$ has the effect of diminishing $(\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ji})_w$ with increasing distance from the wall. The fourth order tensor should have the following properties.

(a) In order to be redistributive, $b_{li}^{mi} = 0$.

(b) Since the relative levels of the transverse component

(i.e. the component parallel to the wall and normal to the flow direction) of the Reynolds stress in free flows and in wall flows are more or less equal, the component b_{13}^{23} should be small. In fact it is assumed zero.

Applying those properties, LAUNDER et al. [15] obtained the ϕ_{ijw} as

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ji})_w = & C_{s1w} \frac{\epsilon}{k} (\overline{u_i u_j} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} k) \\ & + C_{s2w} (P_{ij} - D_{ij}) \\ & + \zeta_w k (U_{i,j} + U_{j,i}) f(\frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

In order to obtain the numerical values for the coefficients C_{s1w} , C_{s2w} and ζ_w reference is made to near-wall flows. There the transport terms in the stress equations are again negligible. Therefore it is possible to obtain algebraic expressions for the relative stress levels in that region. Further, if the near wall effect function $f(\frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2})$ is defined so that it takes a numerical value of unity in near-wall region, then the numerical values for the coefficients in equation (2.22) can be obtained as $C_{s1w} = 0.5$, $C_{s2w} = 0.06$ and $\zeta_w = 0$.

An alternative model was suggested by DALY and HARLOW [24] who were the first to recognise the need for a separate near-wall contribution in pressure-strain modelling. They proposed that ϕ_{ijw} be modelled as

$$\phi_{ijw} \propto (\overline{u_l u_j} \beta_{il} + \overline{u_i u_l} \beta_{jl} - \frac{2}{3} \overline{u_l u_m} \beta_{lm} \delta_{ij}) \quad (2.23)$$

where the wall-effect tensor β_{ab} is of importance for the enhancement of anisotropy near a wall. The last term of equation (2.23) ensures the redistributive property of ϕ_{ijw} . In this form equal amounts of energy is transferred from the turbulent stress component normal to the wall, to streamwise and transverse components.

An integral formulation of the near-wall effect tensor β_{ab} for a flat plate takes the form:

$$\beta_{yy} \propto \frac{1}{y} \quad (2.24)$$

and

$$\beta_{xx} = \beta_{zz} = 0$$

where y is the normal distance to the wall. SHIR [30] considered the Daly-Harlow model and incorporated unit normal vectors to represent the wall effect tensor, as

$$\beta_{ab} = n_a n_b \psi \quad (2.25)$$

where ψ is a decay function which accounts for the diminishing effects away from the wall.

In a recent investigation of ground effects on pressure fluctuations in the atmospheric boundary layer, GIBSON and LAUNDER [31] extended the formulation of DALY and HARLOW [24] to cover the mean strain part $\phi_{ij,2w}$ and gravitational effects of ϕ_{ijw} . (In the Daly-Harlow proposal no near-wall influence on $\phi_{ij,2}$ was present and the gravitational influence was omitted altogether.) In the Gibson-Launder model the near-wall effect of $\phi_{ij,2}$ was considered to be the redistribution of $\phi_{ij,2}$ itself with respect to the wall orientation i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{ij,1w} = & C_{s1w} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} (\overline{u_k u_m} n_k n_m \delta_{ij} - \frac{3}{2} \overline{u_k u_i} n_k n_j - \frac{3}{2} \overline{u_k u_j} n_k n_i) \\ & \times f \left(\frac{l_\varepsilon}{n_l x_l} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{ij,2w} = & C_{s2w} (\phi_{km,2} n_k n_m \delta_{ij} - \frac{3}{2} \phi_{ki,2} n_k n_j - \frac{3}{2} \phi_{kj,2} n_k n_i) \\ & \times f \left(\frac{l_\varepsilon}{n_l x_l} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

The effect of the mean strain part ϕ_{ij2w} is also to redistribute energy from the component normal to the wall, equally between longitudinal and transverse parts. The experimental data of well documented wall flows however do not support this behaviour. There it seems that the energy transfer is essentially from the normal to the longitudinal component only, and that the transverse component is more or less unaffected. The attractiveness of this model is that it is possible to extend the basic idea to cover other effects in pressure redistribution (e.g. gravitational effects). Further, its extension to the case of pressure-scalar gradient distribution term is clear. In the present investigation the Launder et al. model (equation (2.22)) is compared with the Gibson-Launder model (equations (2.26) and (2.27)) in plane and axi-symmetric flows.

The form of the decay factor f in (2.21), (2.26), (2.27) (or β_{ab} in (2.23)) determines the effectiveness of ϕ_{ijw} terms for positions away from the wall. REECE [25] has shown by examining the HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [20] asymmetric channel and KLEBANOFF's [32] flat plate boundary layer data that ϕ_{ijw} terms as a whole should decrease as the inverse of normal distance to the wall. Since the production P_{11} or P decreases inversely with the distance from the wall, l should be more or less constant in the near-wall region. The results of LAUNDER et al. [15] suggest that

$$f \propto \frac{l_\epsilon}{y} \quad (2.28)$$

is an appropriate non-dimensional decay form for a single wall, where l_ϵ is the length scale of energy containing eddies. The length scale l_ϵ can be considered either as $\frac{k^{3/2}}{\epsilon}$ or as $\frac{|\overline{uv}|^{3/2}}{\epsilon}$, though of course they produce slightly different decay functions. If there are two walls present (e.g. channel flow), the effects are assumed to be additive, so that the

factor is revised to read

$$f_{channel} \propto \left(\frac{l_{\epsilon}}{y} + \frac{l_{\epsilon}}{D - y} \right) \quad (2.29)$$

where D is the width of the channel. The above form could account for the slow decay of near wall effects felt in the HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [20] flow and in the symmetric channel flow of COMTE-BELLOT [33].

In the case of a round pipe, the effect of near wall terms should be even more pronounced in positions away from the wall. From geometrical consideration (see Appendix A) of equation (2.28), extended to the case of a circular pipe, the following form emerges:

$$f_{pipe} \propto \frac{l_{\epsilon}}{y_0} \quad (2.30)$$

where

$$y_0 = \frac{R}{\int_0^{\pi} \frac{1 - b \cos \theta}{(1 + b^2 - 2b \cos \theta)^{3/2}} d\theta} \quad (2.31)$$

where $b = r/R$ is the dimensional radius.

LAUFER's [34] pipe flow data however does not show any stress anisotropy near the axis which would suggest that the near wall terms are very small near the axis. More recent measurements by LAWN [19] in pipe flow, on the other hand, suggest substantial anisotropy in stresses which may be either due to wall effects or due to some turbulent transport effects.

2.3 The Transport Equation for Isotropic Dissipation Rate

The exact transport equation for $\varepsilon \equiv \nu \overline{u_{i,l} u_{i,l}}$ has been presented by many workers (see for e.g. HARLOW and NAKAYAMA [35]) and it takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{\varepsilon_t + U_k \varepsilon_k}_A = & \underbrace{- 2\nu U_{i,k} (\overline{u_{i,l} u_{k,l}} + \overline{u_{l,i} u_{l,k}})}_B \\ & \underbrace{- 2\nu (\overline{u_{i,l} u_{k,l} u_{i,k}})}_C - \underbrace{2\nu^2 (\overline{u_{i,kk} u_{i,ll}})}_D \\ & \underbrace{- 2\nu (\overline{u_{i,l} u_k}) U_{i,lk}}_E \\ & \underbrace{- \overline{u_k \varepsilon'}}_F - \underbrace{\frac{2\nu}{\rho} (\overline{p_{,l} u_{k,l}})_{,k}}_G + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \nu \varepsilon_{,kk}}_H \quad (2.32) \end{aligned}$$

Terms F, G and H represent the transport of ε in direction x_k due to turbulent interaction, pressure fluctuation and viscous action respectively. Term E is negligible in the fully turbulent region. The terms B, C and D represent the sources and sinks of dissipation rate ε .

HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [14] considered the term B as the generation term in (2.32) and C and D as the sink terms. LUMLEY and KHAJEH-NOURI [36] on the other hand argued that the term B is negligible and that the terms C and D together represent the generation minus destruction of ε . The final forms of generation minus destruction of ε , arrived by [14] and [36] however are similar. It is

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{K} (- C_{\varepsilon 1} \overline{u_i u_j} U_{i,j} - C_{\varepsilon 2} \varepsilon) . \quad (2.33)$$

In formulating the diffusive term in (2.32) the following considerations are applied:

- (a) the viscous transport term, H is negligible at high Reynolds numbers

(b) at the present level of closure the term G should be neglected

(consistent with the practice in closing the $\overline{u_i u_j}$ equation)

(c) an algebraic expression for the term F should be obtained with reference to the transport equation for $\overline{u_k \epsilon'}$.

The transport equation for the correlation $\overline{u_k \epsilon'}$ at high Reynolds numbers can be simplified to an algebraic form by neglecting convective transport of $\overline{u_k \epsilon'}$. HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [14] proposed that for boundary layer flows the algebraic relation can further be simplified to obtain

$$\overline{u_k \epsilon'} = - C_{\epsilon} \frac{k}{\epsilon} \overline{u_k u_l} \epsilon_{,l} \quad (2.34)$$

Thus, the modelled form of equation (2.32) is

$$\epsilon_{,t} + U_k \epsilon_{,k} = - C_{\epsilon 1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \overline{u_i u_j} U_{i,j} - C_{\epsilon 2} \frac{\epsilon^2}{k} - C_{\epsilon} \left(\frac{k \overline{u_k u_l}}{\epsilon} \epsilon_{,l} \right)_{,k} \quad (2.35)$$

The equation (2.35) contains three coefficients which need to be determined.

The exponent of the decay of turbulent kinetic energy in isotropic turbulence is about - 1.1 (see for example COMTE-BELLOT and CORRSIN [37]). For this condition equation (2.35) and the kinetic energy equation (2.3) can be rearranged to the form

$$C_{\epsilon 2} = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \quad (2.36)$$

where n is the decay exponent. Therefore $C_{\epsilon 2}$ takes a value 1.90.

A further relationship between the coefficients in equation (2.35) can be obtained by reference to the constant stress layer adjacent to a wall. There

(a) the convective transport of ϵ is negligible

and (b) production and dissipation of turbulent kinetic energy are equal.

Equation (2.35) then may be reduced to:

$$C_{\epsilon} = \frac{(C_{\epsilon 2} - C_{\epsilon 1}) U_{\tau}^6}{\kappa^2 k^2 u_2^2} \quad (2.37)$$

where κ is the von Kármán constant, and U_τ the friction velocity. The most suitable numerical magnitude for C_ϵ and hence $C_{\epsilon 1}$ via equation (2.37) can only be obtained by computer optimisation with reference to a variety of flow data. LAUNDER et al. [15] arrived at $C_{\epsilon 1} = 1.44$ and hence $C_\epsilon = 0.15$ by computer optimising the ϵ equation in several free and wall boundary layers.

Thus, in the present investigation equation (2.35) with $C_{\epsilon 1} = 1.44$, $C_{\epsilon 2} = 1.90$ and $C_\epsilon = 0.15$ will be used as the model for determining the isotropic dissipation rate ϵ .

An alternative form of dissipation model has been suggested by LUMLEY and KHAJEH-NOURI [36]. They argue that the source of ϵ due to strain applied to the flow cannot come purely from the term B of equation (2.32). Instead they argue that the source of ϵ by strain should be modelled in terms of anisotropy, b_{ij} of the Reynolds stress tensor, where

$$b_{ij} \equiv \left[\frac{\overline{u_i u_j}}{k} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} \right] \quad (2.38)$$

Then they propose

$$(\text{Source} - \text{Sink}) \text{ of } \epsilon = (C'_{\epsilon 2} - C'_{\epsilon 1} b^2) \frac{\epsilon^2}{k} \quad (2.39)$$

where

$$b^2 = b_{ij} b_{ij}$$

Reynolds [38] has shown that in the case of a two-equation model of turbulence, where b^2 should be found from the constitutive relation (1.11), equation (2.29) may be re-expressed as:

$$(\text{Source} - \text{Sink}) \text{ of } \epsilon = (C'_{\epsilon 2} - C^*_{\epsilon 1} \frac{P}{\epsilon}) \frac{\epsilon^2}{k} \quad (2.40)$$

which is the same as the form (2.33) obtained by many others e.g.

LAUNDER et al. [15].

OWEN [39] treated terms C and D in equation (2.32) as the (source, sink) terms and modelled the difference between them with reference to the decay of grid turbulence. His equation for isotropic dissipation rate, therefore lacked a positive source term but satisfied equation (2.37) to obtain a large diffusion coefficient ($C_\epsilon = 0.64$). He made numerical predictions of pipe flows with this model for ϵ using a near-wall boundary condition of dissipation rate equal to the production of kinetic energy. The absence of a positive source term here was compensated by large diffusive leakage of ϵ . His model would have been completely unsatisfactory for free flows without a generation term in ϵ equation.

2.4 The Scalar Flux Equation

The correlation $\overline{u_i c}$ represents the rate of transport in direction x_i of the scalar C by turbulent velocity fluctuations. The exact transport equation for $\overline{u_i c}$ can be obtained by multiplying the instantaneous scalar, $(C+c)$ equation (1.4) by u_i component and adding it to the x_i component of the Navier-Stokes equation (1.3) multiplied by c . The time averaged form of the sum is

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{u_i c}_{,t} + U_k \overline{u_i c}_{,k} &= - (\overline{u_i u_k} C_{,k} + \overline{u_k c} U_{i,k}) + \frac{\overline{\rho' c}}{\rho} g_i \\ \text{Convection} &\quad \text{(a) Generation} \\ &\quad - (\Gamma + \nu) \overline{c_{,k} u_{i,k}} \\ &\quad \text{(b) Dissipation} \\ &\quad - (\overline{u_i u_k c} - \Gamma \overline{u_i c}_{,k} - \nu \overline{c u_{i,k}} + \frac{\overline{p c}}{\rho} \delta_{ik})_{,k} \\ &\quad \text{(c) Diffusion} \\ &\quad + \frac{\overline{p}}{\rho} c_{,i} \\ &\quad \text{(d) Pressure interaction} \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

This equation is valid for incompressible flows with small gradients in mean scalar C so that the fluctuation in the molecular viscosity and molecular conductivity are negligible. The fluctuations in density of the fluid too is assumed negligible in all terms except the gravitational term i.e. the second term on the right hand side of equation (2.41). A more general form of the exact equation for the transport of $\overline{u_i c}$ can be found in RUBESIN and ROSE [40].

In the present investigation only the transport of passive scalars is considered i.e. a hydrodynamic field completely unaffected by the scalar field. Under this condition the gravitational term in (2.41) will be neglected. LAUNDER [18] deals with the modelling of the gravitational terms in the Reynolds stress and scalar flux equations for active scalar transport situation.

Term (a) represents the generation of $\overline{u_i c}$ due to the interaction of turbulence with mean gradients. It is interesting to note that gradients of mean velocity contribute to the generation of scalar fluxes. The widely adopted Boussinesq type formula does not contain this contribution of the mean velocity field. It must be noted that, however, in two dimensional boundary layer flows the contribution of the production due to mean velocity is negligibly small. In the case of developing flows where the streamwise scalar fluxes are important, the presence of these production terms may be significant.

An order of magnitude analysis of the dissipation correlations, as presented by TENNEKES and LUMLEY [41], yields

$$\nu (\overline{c_{,k} u_{i,k}}) \sim O (Re_{turb}^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad (2.42)$$

and

$$\Gamma (\overline{c_{,k} u_{i,k}}) \sim O (Pe_{turb}^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \quad (2.43)$$

In the present study the turbulent Reynolds number is assumed to be high. If the analysis is confined to fluids with close to unity Prandtl numbers, the dissipation terms (b) can be considered negligible. If the Prandtl number of the fluid differs markedly from unity then one of the above terms will become significant and should be retained in the analysis. OWEN [39] concluded that inclusion of these dissipation terms are necessary only for low Reynolds number flows of fluids with Prandtl number differing substantially from unity.

Apart from the above, (2.41) contains the pressure-scalar gradient correlation (d) and the diffusive transport term (c) which need to be modelled in terms of known variables before (2.41) can be used in a closure model for the mean scalar equation. In the following subsection models for these terms will be presented.

2.4.1 The Diffusion Term

The diffusion term in equation (2.41) is

$$T_i \equiv - (\overline{u_i u_k c} - \Gamma \overline{u_i c}_{,k} - \nu \overline{c u_i}_{,k} + \frac{\overline{p c}}{\rho} \delta_{ik})_{,k} \quad (2.44)$$

The first term of the right hand side of (2.44) represents the diffusive transport of $\overline{u_i c}$ due to fluctuations in velocity. The experimental measurements of some of the components can be found in the literature and their gradients are found to be significant. The second and third terms represent diffusion of $\overline{u_i c}$ due to molecular action and these terms are generally neglected along with dissipative correlations mentioned in Section (2.4). There is no information available about the magnitude of the diffusion term due to pressure fluctuations. So, parallel to the neglect of the pressure diffusion term in the Reynolds stress equation, pressure diffusion is neglected in the $\overline{u_i c}$ equation too.

This leaves the triple correlation $\overline{u_i u_k c}$ to be modelled. In order to obtain an algebraic relation for $\overline{u_i u_k c}$, reference is made to the transport equation of $\overline{u_i u_k c}$ given for example in KOLOVANDIN and VATUTIN [22]. In appendix (B) it is shown that with some simplifying assumptions the correlation $\overline{u_i u_k c}$ can be written as,

$$-\overline{u_i u_k c} = C_c \frac{k}{\epsilon} (\overline{u_k u_l} \overline{u_i c}_{,l} + \overline{u_i u_l} \overline{u_k c}_{,l} + \overline{u_l c} \overline{u_i u_k}_{,l} + \overline{u_i u_k u_l} c_{,l}) \quad (2.45)$$

As OWEN [39] and LAUNDER [42] have done, in the present investigation only the first two terms of (2.45) will be included as the model for $\overline{u_i u_k c}$.

The coefficient C_c in (2.45) can only be determined by computer optimisation. Its value is expected to be around 0.11, which is the magnitude of computer optimised diffusion coefficient in the stress model.

The diffusion models suggested by other workers are often simplified versions of (2.45). WYNGAARD and COTE [43] retained only the first of the terms in (2.45) with a coefficient of 0.15, whereas DONALDSON et al. [44] effectively expressed the stress components in terms of turbulent kinetic energy to suppose that

$$-\overline{u_i u_k c} \propto \frac{k^2}{\epsilon} (\overline{u_k c}_{,i} + \overline{u_i c}_{,k}) \quad (2.46)$$

LUMLEY and KHAJEH-NOURI [36] suggest that when gravitational effects are present the buoyant transport term is an order of magnitude larger than that due to scalar flux gradients. Further for unstratified conditions their model will have a term $\frac{k^2}{\epsilon} \delta_{ik} \overline{u_l c}_{,l}$, in addition to the form suggested by LAUNDER [42] and OWEN [39].

In LUMLEY [45], a suggestion is made for the incorporation of a term like $\overline{u_i c (k^2/\epsilon)}_{,k}$ in order to account for the spatial variation in the transport coefficient. The third term in (2.45) has more or less this effect.

2.4.2 The Pressure-Scalar Gradient Correlation

The pressure-scalar gradient correlation $\overline{\frac{p}{\rho} c}_{,i}$ is the counterpart of the pressure-strain correlation in the stress equation. This term provides the mechanism which limits the growth of the scalar fluxes. The exact equation for the correlation can be obtained by multiplying the Poisson equation for fluctuating pressure by the gradient of scalar fluctuations. On averaging the product one obtains (see Appendix (C) for details):

$$\overline{\frac{p}{\rho} c}_{,i} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \overline{(u'_m u'_n)_{,nm} c}_{,i} \frac{dVol}{(X-Y)} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \overline{u'_{n,m} (u'_n c)_{,i}} \frac{dVol}{(X-Y)} + S_{ci}$$

$$\phi_{ic} = \phi_{ic1} + \phi_{ic2} + S_{ci} \quad (2.47)$$

where the prime superscripts on the right hand side of (2.47) refers to quantities evaluated at Y .

Following CHOU [3] who showed that the surface integrals in the velocity correlations are negligible in positions away from free boundaries. the surface integral S_{ci} is included for further examination in near-wall situations only. Equation (2.47) would contain an additional term, if gravitational effects were included in the velocity equations. The first two terms on the right hand side of (2.47) fall on two categories, one dependent only on fluctuating quantities ϕ_{ic1} and the other ϕ_{ic2} dependent on the interactions of the mean strain field.

The most widely used form of the turbulent part ϕ_{ic1} is based on Rotta's linear-return-to-isotropy approximation of the pressure-strain correlation. Here the effect is expressed as a linear function of the component scalar flux, i.e.

$$\phi_{ic1} = - C_{c1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_i c} \quad . \quad (2.48)$$

Strictly the time scales for this process should depend on both hydrodynamic turbulence time scale $\frac{k}{\varepsilon}$ and the scalar turbulence time scale $\frac{\overline{c^2}}{2\varepsilon_c}$. At least in local equilibrium flows these two time scales can be assumed proportional, hence the use of $\frac{k}{\varepsilon}$ is preferred over inclusion of two yet unknown quantities $\overline{c^2}$ and ε_c . This form of ϕ_{ic1} was suggested by MONIN [46] and then by LAUNDER [18], LUMLEY [47], DONALDSON et al. [44] and others. Equation (2.48) is the model for ϕ_{ic1} used in the present investigation.

In modelling the mean strain part of the pressure-scalar gradient correlation ϕ_{ic2} , the same steps taken in modelling ϕ_{ij2} are followed. It is assumed that any inhomogeneities in the flow do not make a major contribution to the integral ϕ_{ic2} . Therefore ϕ_{ic2} can be expressed as,

$$\phi_{ic2} = U_{n,m} c_{ni}^m \quad (2.50)$$

where

$$c_{ni}^m = - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{Vol} \frac{\partial^2 \overline{u_m^c}}{\partial \xi_n \partial \xi_i} dVol \quad (2.51)$$

where ξ 's are the Cartesian components of the position vector (X-Y). The third order tensor c_{ni}^m should satisfy the symmetry constraint,

$$c_{ni}^m = c_{in}^m \quad (2.52)$$

Further, in order to satisfy the conservation of mass principle, equation (2.47) indicates that,

$$c_{mi}^m = 0 \quad (2.53)$$

Also, applying Green's theorem to the integral in (2.51), away from boundaries,

$$c_{ii}^m = 2 \overline{u_m^c} \quad (2.54)$$

Equation (2.54) suggests that a linear combination of scalar fluxes may be suitable for expressing c_{ni}^m . Thus the form

$$c_{ni}^m = \alpha_c \delta_{ni} \overline{u_m^c} + \beta_c \delta_{mi} \overline{u_n^c} + \gamma_c \delta_{mn} \overline{u_i^c} \quad (2.55)$$

should satisfy the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_c &= \gamma_c \\ 0 &= \alpha_c + \beta_c + 3\gamma_c \\ 2 &= 3\alpha_c + \beta_c + \gamma_c \end{aligned} \quad (2.56)$$

implied by equations (2.52) - (2.54). Therefore the mean strain part of ϕ_{ic} can be written as

$$\phi_{ic2} = 0.8 \overline{u_m^c} U_{i,m} - 0.2 \overline{u_m^c} U_{m,i} \quad (2.57)$$

LAUNDER [42] and later LUMLEY [47] arrived at these expressions following more or less similar arguments as given here.

An alternative formulation has been proposed by LAUNDER [18] in which the sole effect of ϕ_{ic2} was considered to be to reduce the effect of generation of $\overline{u_i c}$ by mean gradients. This is parallel to the idea of redistribution of stress production as given in (2.19). Here,

$$\phi_{ic2} = C_{c2} \overline{u_m c} U_{i,m} \quad (2.58)$$

Note that in two-dimensional boundary layer flows (2.58) does not contribute to the equation for lateral scalar flux, whereas (2.58) has a contribution of $-0.2 \overline{uc} \frac{\partial U}{\partial y}$. OWEN [39] adopted this model for his calculation of scalar transport in pipe flows. In the present investigation, equation (2.58) is employed as the model for ϕ_{ic2} . Equation (2.57) will also be used as a comparison model in free shear flows.

An alternative form of a model has been suggested by LUMLEY and KHAJEH-NOURI [36], where the explicit appearance of mean strain terms were excluded from the analysis. Briefly, their method was, first to consider the $\overline{\frac{c}{\rho} p_{,i}}$ (consideration of $\overline{\frac{p}{\rho} c_{,i}}$ would lead to the same result) as a function of the form

$$-\overline{\frac{c}{\rho} p_{,i}} = F + \overline{u_i c}, \overline{u_i u_j}, \epsilon, \text{ gravitational terms } \quad (2.59)$$

and then to make a Taylor series expansion to obtain

$$-\overline{\frac{c}{\rho} p_{,i}} = - \left(a_1 + a_2 b_{ij} + a_3 \Pi + a_4 b_{ij}^2 + \text{gravitational terms} \right) \times \frac{\overline{u_i c}}{\tau} \quad (2.60)$$

where

$$\tau \propto \frac{k}{\epsilon}; \quad b_{ij} = \frac{\overline{u_i u_j}}{k} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij};$$

$$b_{ij} = b_{ik} b_{jk} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi = b_{ij} b_{ji}.$$

In the present investigation a model consisting of only the first two terms in (2.60) is considered as an addition to ϕ_{ic2} form (2.57) and not as Lumley and Khajeh-Nouri proposed as a replacement for ϕ_{ic2} i.e.

$$\phi_{ic1} = - C_{c1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_i c} - C'_{c1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} b_{il} \overline{u_l c} \quad (2.61)$$

Now in order to find the numerical values for the coefficients in the models of ϕ_{ic} described above, the local equilibrium forms of the scalar flux equations in free shear flows are considered. In these flows one should aim to get a Prandtl number of about 0.6 - 0.7 and a ratio of the scalar fluxes in streamwise to the lateral direction of about 1.2. (WEBSTER's [48] data indicate a value of 1.1 for this ratio; however, his measured levels of $\frac{\overline{u^2}}{\overline{v^2}}$ are about 25% lower than the accepted level and hence his $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ is likely to be rather too low.)

(a) Redistribution Model, i.e. Equations (2.48) and (2.58)

Under local equilibrium conditions in a two-dimensional flow one obtains

$$C_{c1} = \frac{\overline{v^2}}{k} \left[\frac{k}{\overline{uv}} \right]^2 \sigma_t \quad (2.62)$$

With stress levels from the nearly homogeneous shear data of CHAMPAGNE et al. [29], and with $\sigma_t = 0.65$, C_{c1} is obtained as equal to 2.9.

The streamwise scalar flux equation in local equilibrium conditions reduces to

$$\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} = \frac{1}{C_{c1}} \left[\frac{k}{\overline{uv}} \right] \left(\sigma_t + 1 - C_{c2} \right) \quad (2.63)$$

With a scalar flux ratio of 1.2 this implies that C_{c2} should be about 0.5, which is the value used by OWEN [39].

(b) Quasi-Isotropic Model

If the equation (2.48) is used for ϕ_{ic1} , along with the given quasi-isotropic model (2.57), clearly incompatible magnitudes for C_{c1} will be obtained from the two flux equations. Therefore in adopting the quasi-isotropic relation the non-linear form (2.61) for ϕ_{ic1} will have to be used. The resulting flux equations in local equilibrium form are

$$0 = \sigma_t \left[\frac{\overline{v^2}}{k} \right] \left[\frac{k}{\overline{uv}} \right]^2 - C_{c1} - C'_{c1} b_{12} \left[\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} \right] - C'_{c1} b_{22} + 0.2 \left[\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} \right] \left[\frac{k}{\overline{uv}} \right] \quad (2.64)$$

and

$$0 = \sigma_t \left[\frac{k}{\overline{uv}} \right] + 0.2 \left[\frac{k}{\overline{uv}} \right] - C_{c1} \left[\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} \right] - C'_{c1} b_{11} \left[\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} \right] - C'_{c1} b_{12} \quad (2.65)$$

On substituting numerical values for σ_t , $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ and stress levels the coefficients C_{c1} and C'_{c1} can be obtained as 4.3 and - 3.2 respectively.

2.4.3 Wall Effects on the Pressure-Scalar Gradient Term

The surface integral term neglected in the analysis subsequent to equation (2.47) can be expected to have a considerable effect in near-wall flows. As in Section (2.2.4), this surface integral can be eliminated by manipulating the equation (2.47). The resultant form is

$$\frac{\overline{p}}{\rho} c_{,i} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \left[\frac{(u'u')}{mn} c_{,mn,i} + 2 \frac{U'}{1,2} \frac{u'c}{2,1,i} \right] \left[\frac{1}{X-Y} + \frac{1}{X-Y^*} \right] dV \quad (2.66)$$

where, suffices 1 and 2 stand for the streamwise and lateral directions respectively. Further, Y^* is the image of Y with respect to the wall.

Here again, the turbulent and mean strain parts can be identified and modelled in a manner exactly parallel to that of the wall effects on the pressure-strain correlation. In a general form this can be written as,

$$\phi_{icw} = \left[-C_{c1w} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_i^c} + U_{l,m} d_{li}^m \right] f \left[\frac{l_\varepsilon}{x_2} \right] \quad (2.67)$$

The function f has the effect of diminishing ϕ_{icw} with increasing distance away from the wall. The general third-order tensor d_{li}^m comprising linear combination of scalar fluxes is

$$d_{li}^m = \alpha'_c \delta_{li} \overline{u_m^c} + \beta'_c \delta_{mi} \overline{u_l^c} + \nu'_c \delta_{ml} \overline{u_i^c} \quad (2.68)$$

This tensor should satisfy the symmetry requirement $d_{li}^m = d_{il}^m$ and the mass conservation constraint $d_{mi}^m = 0$. They lead to

$$\beta'_c = \nu'_c \quad \text{and} \quad 0 = \alpha'_c + 4\beta'_c \quad (2.69)$$

Thus the resultant form for the wall effect on pressure-scalar gradient correlation is

$$\phi_{icw} = \left[-C_{c1w} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_i^c} - 4\beta'_c \delta_{li} \overline{u_m^c} U_{l,m} + \beta'_c \delta_{mi} \overline{u_l^c} U_{l,m} \right] f \left[\frac{l_\varepsilon}{x_2} \right] \quad (2.70)$$

An alternative near-wall model has been suggested by GIBSON and LAUNDER [31] which parallels their near-wall pressure-strain model. The turbulent and mean strain parts of their model are

$$\phi_{iclw} = C_{c1w} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_k^c} n_{kj} f \left[\frac{l_\varepsilon}{n_j x_j} \right] \quad (2.71)$$

and

$$\phi_{ic2w} = C_{c2w} \phi_{kc2} \frac{n_k n_i}{f} \left\{ \frac{l_\epsilon}{n_j x_j} \right\} . \quad (2.72)$$

In the present investigation this near-wall model is used along with equations (2.48) and (2.58). The form in equation (2.70) is employed as a comparison model.

Now, in order to find the numerical values for the unknown coefficients (two in each model) in these near-wall forms attention is turned to turbulent scalar characteristics in wall flows. As will be seen later in Chapter (4), the turbulent Prandtl number and the ratio of levels of scalar fluxes in the streamwise direction to that of lateral flow direction in two-dimensional flows are about 0.9 and 2.0 - 2.5 respectively.

(a) Gibson- Launder Model

Equations (2.58) and hence (2.72) do not contribute to the lateral scalar flux equation in two-dimensional boundary layers, thus the coefficient C_{clw} in (2.71) must be chosen in order to get a turbulent Prandtl number of 0.9. With near-wall stress levels, the local equilibrium form of $\overline{v\epsilon}$ equation imply a C_{clw} of 0.75. Equation (2.71) and (2.72) do not contribute to the streamwise scalar flux equation, therefore C_{c2w} in (2.70) can not be found in two-dimensional flows. Further it means that the streamwise scalar flux equation is unchanged in the near-wall region. This implies a ratio $\overline{u\epsilon}/\overline{v\epsilon}$ of about 2.0 which agrees reasonably well with the experimental data though is perhaps a little low.

(b) Isotropic Model

When equation (2.70) is employed in the local equilibrium regions, the scalar flux equations for the lateral and streamwise directions can be written in algebraic forms as,

$$0 = - \frac{\overline{v^2}}{\overline{uv}} \sigma_t + (C_{c1} + C_{c1w}) \frac{\overline{uv}}{k} + \beta'_c \frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} \quad (2.73)$$

and

$$0 = - \sigma_t - (1 - C_{c2}) + (C_{c1} + C_{c1w}) \frac{\overline{uv}}{k} \frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} - 4\beta'_c \quad (2.74)$$

With the above mentioned near-wall stress levels and scalar characteristics, these two equations can be solved to obtain

$$C_{c1w} = 0.25 \text{ and } \beta'_c \approx 0.06 .$$

2.5 The Transport Equation for Scalar Fluctuations

The variable representing the level of scalar fluctuation is taken as $\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2}$, which corresponds to the turbulent kinetic energy $k = \frac{1}{2} \overline{u_i^2}$. The transport equation for $\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2}$ can be obtained by multiplying the instantaneous scalar ($C+c$) equation by the fluctuation $\frac{1}{2}c$. On time averaging the result yields

$$(\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2})_{,t} + U_k (\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2})_{,k} = \overline{u_j c} C_{,j} - \Gamma \overline{c_{,j} c_{,j}} - (\overline{u_j \frac{1}{2}c^2} - \Gamma \overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2}_{,j})_{,j} \quad (2.75)$$

Convection = Generation - Dissipation - Diffusion .

In order to solve (2.75) models have to be supplied for the dissipation and diffusion terms in this equation.

The time scale of turbulence associated with the scalar turbulence is $\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2}/\epsilon_c$ where $\epsilon_c = \Gamma \overline{c_{ij} c_{ij}}$. The assumption that there is a constant ratio between the time scales of the scalar field and the hydrodynamic field yields

$$\epsilon_c = \frac{\epsilon \overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2}}{k R} \quad (2.76)$$

where R is the time scale ratio. The magnitude of R , if it is a constant, should be evident from the decay of turbulence behind a heated grid as the ratio of decay exponents is equal to the ratio of time scales. The survey of scalar fluctuation decay data compiled by LIN and LIN [112] however show a large variation in decay exponents. They imply time scale ratio between the extremes 1.26 to 0.35 .

In computer modelling SPALDING [49] used a value of 0.5 whereas LAUNDER [18] used a value of 0.8 in predicting buoyant free shear flows. In the present study a value of 0.5 is used for the time scale ratio in (2.76).

The more appropriate method of course is to solve for ϵ_c via its

transport equation, an attempt similar to solving ε the dissipation of turbulent kinetic energy. Current modelling ideas have followed lines similar to that used in closing the ε equation. Here however the presence of two time scales k/ε and $\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2}/\varepsilon_c$ complicates the modelling a great deal. OWEN [39] has suggested a model for ε_c , but his equation containing no positive source term is clearly incorrect.

As for the modelling of diffusive transport of $\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2}$ reference is made to the transport equation for $\overline{u_j c^2}$. The algebraic expression obtainable with the level of assumptions used in modelling $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$ of $\overline{u_i u_j c}$, is,

$$-\frac{1}{2} \overline{u_j c^2} = C_g \frac{k}{\varepsilon} \left(\overline{u_k u_j} (\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2})_{,k} + \overline{u_k c} \overline{u_j c}_{,k} + \overline{u_j u_k c}_{,k} \right) . \quad (2.77)$$

WYNGAARD [43] omitted the last terms in (2.77) thus retaining the usual gradient diffusion form. In the present investigation too only the gradient form is retained

$$-\frac{1}{2} \overline{u_j c^2} = C_g \frac{k}{\varepsilon} \left(\overline{u_k u_j} (\overline{\frac{1}{2}c^2})_{,k} \right) . \quad (2.78)$$

2.6 A Summary of the Models to be Investigated

The turbulence models discussed in previous sections of this chapter are summarised here. Table (2.1) corresponds to the hydrodynamic closure models whereas Table (2.2) refers to the scalar transport models. The different models are identified here with different code names and the methods used in obtaining unknown coefficients that appear in modelled terms are mentioned.

Term	Model				How Determined
	Name	Description	Equation of its First Mention	Coefficient and Value Used	
Pressure-velocity gradient correlation ϕ_{ij}	R_{s1}	LAUNDER et al. [15] isotropic model	(2.11) and (2.14)	$C_{s1} = 1.5$ and $C_{s2} = 0.4$	Normal stress levels in nearly homogeneous shear flow
	R_{s2}	LAUNDER et al. [15] simple model;	(2.11) and (2.19)	$C_{s1} = 1.5$ and $C_{s2} = 0.6$	
		also in [31]	(2.11) and (2.19)	$C_{s1} = 1.8$ and $C_{s2} = 0.55$	
Near-wall effects on ϕ_{ij}	R_{sw1}	LAUNDER et al. [15] model	(2.22)	$C_{s1w} = 0.5$ and $C_{s2w} = 0.06$	Near-wall stress levels
	R_{sw2}	GIBSON-LAUDER [31] model	(2.26) and (2.27)	$C_{s1w} = 0.5$ and $C_{s2w} = 0.3$	
Turbulent diffusion	D_{s1}	Tensor invariant model	(2.6)	$C_s = 0.11$	Computer optimisation
	D_{s2}	Gradient diffusion model	(2.8)	$C'_s = 0.2$	

Table 2.1 Hydrodynamic Models Used in the Present Study

(contd.)

Term	Model				How Determined
	Name	Description	Equation of its First Mention	Coefficient and Value Used	
Energy dissipation rate equation		LAUNDER et al. [15] model	(2.33)	$C_{\epsilon 1} = 1.44$	Computer optimisation
			(2.33)	$C_{\epsilon 2} = 1.90$	Decay of grid turbulence
			(2.34)	$C_{\epsilon} = 0.15$	Consistency with Von Kármán constant and near-wall stress levels

Table 2.1 Hydrodynamic Models Used in the Present Study

0000490-87024

Term	Model				How Determined
	Name	Description	Equation of its First Mention	Coefficient and a Tentative Value	
Pressure-scalar gradient correlation in flux equation ϕ_{ic}	R_{c1}	1) Linear destruction	(2.48)	$C_{c1} = 2.9$	Prandtl number of 0.65 in free flows
		2) Redistribution of production (due to mean velocity gradients) tensor	(2.58)	$C_{c2} = 0.4$	Flux ratio of 1.2 in free flows
	R_{c2}	1) Non-linear destruction	(2.61)	$C_{c1} = 4.0$ and $C'_{c1} = -3.2$	
		2) Quasi-isotropic model	(2.57)	exact term known	
Near-wall effects on ϕ_{ic}	R_{cw1}	Isotropic model	(2.70)	$C_{c1w} = 0.25$ and $\beta'_c = 0.06$	Prandtl number of 0.885 in near-wall flows
	R_{cw2}	1) A modified linear destruction term	(2.71)	$C_{c1w} = 0.75$	
		2) Modified linear destruction term	(2.72)	C_{c2w} = not applicable in two-dimensional boundary layers	Flux ratio of 2.05 in near-wall flows

Table 2.2 Scalar Transport Models Investigated in the present Study

(contd.)

Term	Model				How Determined
	Name	Description	Equation of its First Mention	Coefficient and a Tentative Value	
Diffusive transport of fluxes	D_{c1}	Gradient diffusion	(2.45)	$C_c = 0.20$	Similarity with existing stress model coefficients
	D_{c2}	Gradient diffusion		$C_c = 0.11$	
	D_{c3}	Tensor invariant type		$C_c = 0.11$	
Diffusive transport of $\frac{\tau}{c^2}$		Gradient diffusion	(2.78)	$C_g = 0.11$	Similarity with kinetic energy equation
Destruction of scalar fluctuations		Constant time scale ratio type	(2.76)	$C_{g2} = \frac{1}{R} = 1.3 \rightarrow 2.0$	Levels of scalar fluctuations Computer optimisation

Table 2.2 Scalar Transport Models Investigated in the Present Study

2.7 Modelled Equations in Cartesian Tensor Form

2.7.1 Reynolds Stress Equations

The conservation equations for the Reynolds stresses are

$$\frac{D}{Dt} (\overline{u_i u_j}) = P_{ij} + \phi_{ij} - \epsilon_{ij} + D (\overline{u_i u_j}) \quad (2.79)$$

where,

(a) the convection,

$$\frac{D}{Dt} (\overline{u_i u_j}) = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \right] \overline{u_i u_j}$$

(b) the production,

$$P_{ij} = - \left[\overline{u_i u_k} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_k} + \overline{u_j u_k} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_k} \right]$$

(c) the pressure-strain correlation,

for free flows,

$$\phi_{ij} = \phi_{ij1} + \phi_{ij2}$$

and for wall flows,

$$\phi_{ij} = \phi_{ij1} + \phi_{ij2} + \phi_{ij1w} + \phi_{ij2w}$$

where

$$\phi_{ij1} = - C_{s1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} (\overline{u_i u_j} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} k) \quad \text{Models } R_{s1} \text{ and } R_{s2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{ij2} = & - \left(\alpha \left(P_{ij} - \frac{2}{3} P \delta_{ij} \right) + \beta k \left(\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \eta \left(D_{ij} - \frac{2}{3} P \delta_{ij} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad \text{Model } R_{s1}$$

$$\text{or} \quad \phi_{ij2} = - \gamma \left(P_{ij} - \frac{2}{3} P \delta_{ij} \right) \quad \text{Model } R_{s2}$$

$$\phi_{ij1w} = C_{slw} \frac{\epsilon}{k} (\overline{u_i u_j} - \frac{2}{3} k \delta_{ij}) f + \frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2} \quad \text{Model } R_{sw1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{or} \quad \phi_{ij1w} = & C_{slw} \frac{\epsilon}{k} (\overline{u_k u_m} n_k n_m \delta_{ij} - \frac{3}{2} \overline{u_k u_i} n_k n_j \\ & - \frac{3}{2} \overline{u_k u_j} n_k n_i) f + \frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2} \end{aligned} \quad \text{Model } R_{sw2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{ij2w} &= C_{s2w} (P_{ij} - D_{ij}) f + \frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2} & \text{Model } R_{sw1} \\ \text{or } \phi_{ij2w} &= C_{s2w} (\phi_{km2} n_k n_m \delta_{ij} - \frac{3}{2} \phi_{ki2} n_k n_j - \frac{3}{2} \phi_{kj2} n_k n_l) & \\ &\times f + \frac{l_\epsilon}{x_2} & \text{Model } R_{sw2} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$P = \frac{1}{2} P_{mm}$$

and

$$D_{ij} = - \left[\overline{u_i u_k} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_j} + \overline{u_j u_k} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_i} \right]$$

(d) the dissipation,

$$\epsilon_{ij} = \frac{2}{3} \epsilon \delta_{ij}$$

(e) the diffusion,

$$D(\overline{u_i u_j}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} C_s \frac{k}{\epsilon} \left[\overline{u_k u_m} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_j}}{\partial x_m} + \overline{u_i u_m} \frac{\partial \overline{u_j u_k}}{\partial x_m} + \overline{u_j u_m} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_k}}{\partial x_m} \right]$$

Model D_{s1}

$$\text{or } D(\overline{u_i u_j}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} C'_s \frac{k}{\epsilon} \left[\overline{u_k u_m} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_j}}{\partial x_m} \right] \quad \text{Model } D_{s2}$$

2.7.2 Isotropic dissipation rate equation

The conservation equation for the dissipation rate is

$$\frac{D}{Dt}(\epsilon) = C_{\epsilon 1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} P - C_{\epsilon 2} \frac{\epsilon^2}{k} + D(\epsilon) \quad (2.80)$$

where

(a) the convection,

$$\frac{D}{Dt}(\epsilon) = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + u_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \right] \epsilon$$

and

(b) the diffusion,

$$D(\epsilon) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} C_\epsilon \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left[\overline{u_k u_l} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial x_l} \right]$$

2.7.3 Scalar Flux Equations

The conservation equation for scalar fluxes are

$$\frac{D}{Dt}(\overline{u_i c}) = P_{ic} + \phi_{ic} + D(\overline{u_i c}) \quad (2.81)$$

where

(a) the convection,

$$\frac{D}{Dt}(\overline{u_i c}) = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \right] \overline{u_i c}$$

(b) the production,

$$P_{ic} = - \left[\overline{u_k c} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_k} + \overline{u_k u_i} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_k} \right]$$

(c) the pressure-scalar gradient correlation,

for free flows

$$\phi_{ic} = \phi_{ic1} + \phi_{ic2}$$

and for wall flows

$$\phi_{ic} = \phi_{ic1} + \phi_{ic2} + \phi_{ic1w} + \phi_{ic2w}$$

where

$$\phi_{ic1} = - C_{c1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_i c} \quad \text{Model } R_{c1}$$

$$\text{or} \quad \phi_{ic1} = - C_{c1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_i c} - C'_{c1} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} b_{il} \overline{u_l c} \quad \text{Model } R_{c2}$$

$$\phi_{ic2} = C_{c2} \overline{u_k c} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_k} \quad \text{Model } R_{c1}$$

$$\text{or} \quad \phi_{ic2} = 0.8 \overline{u_k c} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_k} - 0.2 \overline{u_k c} \frac{\partial U_k}{\partial x_i} \quad \text{Model } R_{c2}$$

$$\phi_{ic1w} = - C_{c1w} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_i c} f + \frac{l_\varepsilon}{x_2} \quad \text{Model } R_{cw1}$$

$$\text{or} \quad \phi_{ic1w} = - C_{c1w} \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \overline{u_m c} n_m n_i f + \frac{l_\varepsilon}{x_2} \quad \text{Model } R_{cw2}$$

$$\phi_{ic2w} = \left[-4\beta'_c \delta_{li} \overline{u_m^c} \frac{\partial u_l}{\partial x_m} + \beta'_c \delta_{mi} \overline{u_l^c} \frac{\partial u_l}{\partial x_m} \right] f \left(\frac{z}{x_2} \right)$$

Model R_{cw1}

$$\text{or } \phi_{ic2w} = -C_{c2w} \phi_{mc2} n_m n_i f \left(\frac{z}{x_2} \right)$$

Model R_{cw2}

(d) the diffusion,

$$D(\overline{u_i^c}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} C_c \frac{k}{\epsilon} \left(\overline{u_k u_l} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i^c}}{\partial x_l} \right) \quad \text{Model } D_{c1}$$

$$\text{or } D(\overline{u_i^c}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} C_c \frac{k}{\epsilon} \left(\overline{u_k u_l} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i^c}}{\partial x_l} + \overline{u_i u_l} \frac{\partial \overline{u_k^c}}{\partial x_l} \right) \quad \text{Model } D_{c2}$$

$$\text{or } D(\overline{u_i^c}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} C_c \frac{k}{\epsilon} \left(\overline{u_k u_l} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i^c}}{\partial x_l} + \overline{u_i u_l} \frac{\partial \overline{u_k^c}}{\partial x_l} + \overline{u_l^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_k}}{\partial x_l} \right) \quad \text{Model } D_{c3}$$

2.7.4 Scalar Fluctuation Equation

The conservation equation for mean square scalar fluctuations is

$$\frac{D}{Dt} \left(\frac{\overline{c^2}}{2} \right) = P_c - \epsilon_c + D \left(\frac{\overline{c^2}}{2} \right) \quad (2.82)$$

where

(a) the convection,

$$\frac{D}{Dt} \left(\frac{\overline{c^2}}{2} \right) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \right) \frac{\overline{c^2}}{2}$$

(b) the production,

$$P_c = -\overline{u_k^c} \frac{\partial C}{\partial x_k}$$

(c) the dissipation,

$$\epsilon_c = C_{g2} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \frac{\overline{c^2}}{2}$$

(d) the diffusion,

$$D \left(\frac{\overline{c^2}}{2} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} C_g \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_l u_k} \frac{\partial \overline{c^2/2}}{\partial x_l} \right)$$

CHAPTER 3

NUMERICAL PROCEDURES

3.1 Introduction

The conservation equations for mean and turbulent quantities presented in the previous chapter can be solved using finite difference numerical methods. In general those equations are three-dimensional, unsteady and elliptic. In engineering practice, however, there are many statistically stationary or steady flows which are of interest. Further there are many important situations where the flow is of boundary layer type, i.e. with at least one direction having negligible diffusive fluxes. In the present analysis the attention is limited to steady flows of boundary layer type. Although the present calculations are limited to incompressible constant property flows, the numerical procedures to be discussed can be generalised easily to variable-property flows.

PATANKAR and SPALDING [9] presented a numerical procedure for the solution of partial differential conservation equations for steady two-dimensional, axi-symmetric boundary layer flows. This procedure is probably the most widely tested numerical scheme, designed to solve the above equations, available to date. In Section (3.2), the main features of this procedure and its application to the solution of mean and turbulent conservation equations are presented. The problems encountered, e.g. instabilities, their possible causes and cures are discussed there.

The procedure used to predict three-dimensional boundary layers is an outgrowth of the two-dimensional elliptic numerical method of GOSMAN and PUN [50]. This procedure incorporates displaced grids for velocity and pressure, employed by HARLOW and WELCH [51]. Here, as in CARETTO et al. [52], a guess-and-correct procedure is used for the

velocity field. The correction of the velocity field is obtained through a linearised pressure-velocity relation which in turn satisfies continuity. This procedure with an obvious simplification to the case of two-dimensional internal flows is discussed in Section (3.3).

The remainder of the chapter is concerned with adaptations to the basic structure of the codes that the writer has introduced to facilitate the introduction of a second-order closure.

In Section (3.4), a finite difference staggered grid suitable for the application of a second order closure-model in a fully three-dimensional flow situation is described. The aim here has been to stagger the variables so that when they appear in the mean equations, requires a minimum of interpolation. This is expected to eliminate the instabilities encountered in using numerical procedures outlined in previous sections.

The idealised grid arrangement described in Section (3.4) is simplified in the Section (3.5), so that, it is economically applied to the solution of three-dimensional scalar transport problem in two-dimensional boundary layer flow situation. It is seen here that this modified grid arrangement simplifies the calculation of generally more predominant terms in the mean as well as in the turbulence equations.

In Section(3.6) the limitations of cell layout and the application of the boundary conditions are discussed. The inclusion of a solid wall into the domain of the three-dimensional calculation procedure is discussed in Section (3.7). This allows circumferential conduction to be taken into account in instances where it is necessary.

3.2 The Patankar-Spalding Procedure for Two-Dimensional Boundary Layers

3.2.1 Main Features

The Patankar-Spalding procedure for the solution of conservation equations for two-dimensional boundary layer flows is widely used by research workers and in industry and is well documented in [9].

Accordingly only the main features will be mentioned here.

(a) The Coordinate System:

In this procedure the boundary-layer equations are transformed to x - ω coordinate system, where x is the displacement coordinate in the main flow direction and ω is the dimensionless stream function, given by

$$\omega = \frac{\Psi - \Psi_I}{\Psi_E - \Psi_I} \quad (3.1)$$

The stream function is defined so that Ψ is a constant along a stream line and

$$d\Psi = \rho U r dy \quad (3.2)$$

The edge stream functions Ψ_I and Ψ_E are chosen as functions of x , so that all the important variations in the dependent variables takes place within their limits, i.e. ω values between zero and unity; this practice assures an efficient and flexible grid layout.

(b) The Difference Equation:

The finite difference forms of the conservation equations are obtained by integrating the partial differential equations over control volumes. (see Fig. 3.1) Being a boundary layer procedure, the control volumes at a given x -level are defined so as to cover only upto the immediate forward x -level. In ω -space, the control volumes are defined by known discrete

ω -levels, so that a given number of control volumes occupy the ω -space between I and E boundaries. For the purpose of integration it is assumed that in the ω -direction, the dependent variable Φ varies linearly with ω between grid points. For convenience it is assumed that, in the x -direction, the variation of Φ is stepwise and it is the downstream level that is prevailing over the control volume. The individual terms of the conservation equation are integrated over the control volumes so as to obtain difference equations for each control volume. The resulting equations are of the form

$$\Phi_d = A \Phi_{d+} + B \Phi_{d-} + C \quad (3.3)$$

where Φ_{d+} and Φ_{d-} are the values of Φ_d 's at adjacent control volumes in ω -space. (The suffix d stands for the downstream level.) The coefficients A , B and C are explicitly evaluated with known Φ 's at upstream x -level.

(c) Treatment of Diffusion Terms:

In the published version of the numerical procedure the diffusion terms of the momentum and heat transport equation are arranged to suit gradient diffusion models. Thus the incorporation of an "eddy diffusivity" model of turbulent transport is straight forward. In order to incorporate a Reynolds stress-Scalar flux closure, modifications are needed. The following sub section outlines alternative approaches.

3.2.2 Treatment of Turbulent Shear Stress and Scalar Flux

Consider a control volume whose edge values of ω are $\omega_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\omega_{+\frac{1}{2}}$ (see Fig. (3.1)). The total shear stress at the edge $\omega_{+\frac{1}{2}}$ is given by

$$\tau_{\frac{1}{2}} = \left[\mu \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right)_d - \rho \overline{uv} \right]_{+\frac{1}{2}} . \quad (3.4)$$

With a gradient diffusion model, this is expressed as,

$$\tau_{\frac{1}{2}} = \left[\mu_{eff} \left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right)_d \right]_{+\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3.5)$$

where μ_{eff} is the effective viscosity obtained by

$$\mu_{eff} = \mu + \mu_{turb} \quad (3.6)$$

and the turbulent viscosity μ_{turb} is obtained via a constitutive relation.

With a Reynolds stress closure, however, equation (3.4) can be evaluated directly. Thus the turbulent shear stress term can be incorporated either,

- (a) by constructing a pseudo-viscosity and applying equation (3.5)
- or (b) as a source term in the momentum equation.

If the effective viscosity method is to be pursued, the turbulent viscosity μ_{turb} is calculated by

$$\mu_{turb,+\frac{1}{2}} = - \frac{(\rho \overline{uv})_{+\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (y_{+1} - y)}{(U_{+1} - U)_u} \quad (3.7)$$

Equation (3.7) is not satisfactory in regions of small velocity gradient unless measures are introduced to counteract instabilities. Alternatively the net diffusion due to turbulent shear stress can be written as,

$$\left(\frac{\partial \tau_{turb}}{\partial y} \right) = - \frac{(\rho \overline{uv})_{+\frac{1}{2}} - (\rho \overline{uv})_{-\frac{1}{2}}}{y_{+\frac{1}{2}} - y_{-\frac{1}{2}}} . \quad (3.8)$$

unlike equation (3.7), this equation can be incorporated unconditionally, even in regions where the mean gradient is negligibly small. Especially in flows with regions where the eddy diffusivity concept is not valid, e.g. maximum velocity region is a wall jet, equation (3.8) is satisfactory, whereas equation (3.7) is not.

3.2.3 Instability in Solution and A Possible Remedy

Several workers (e.g. REECE [25], MORSE [53]) making numerical computations of boundary layer flows using second-order closure models employed the Patankar-Spalding procedure for their calculations. In those investigations, the turbulent variables were evaluated at the same grid points as those of mean variables. In the present investigation as well, a large number of calculations were performed with that grid arrangement. It was sometimes seen however that numerical instability occurred and that, when it did, the numerical scheme seemed apparently contained no mechanism for damping it. The following hypothetical situation will clarify how this happens.

Consider a mean velocity profile as shown in Fig. (3.2) and suppose there is a perturbation in this profile at grid point (I) (dash lines), so that the velocity is now $U_{(I)} + \delta U_{(I)}$. Since the shear stresses are calculated at points ($I-1$), (I), ($I+1$) etc., velocity gradients have to be interpolated in order to calculate production and other terms due to mean gradients. Thus, the velocity gradient across the cell (I) is in fact unchanged whereas gradients across cells ($I+1$) and ($I-1$) are changed slightly. Thus, the resultant shear stress at (I) is unchanged whereas at ($I+1$) and ($I-1$) the shear stress will have changed in the right direction. Now since the interpolated values of shear stresses are needed for inclusion in mean velocity equation the net effect would be to change the velocity profile towards the stable solution but at a too low response level.

In order to ensure full exchange of information between mean velocity and shear stress equations, which are interlinked via their gradients, the scheme must be able to feel correct gradients created by the perturbation. POPE and WHITELOW [54] and ANDRÉ [55] proposed schemes which had staggered grid arrangements where the shear stress nodes are shifted by a half a grid node spacing from the mean velocity nodes. This idea has previously been used by CHORIN [56] and in PATANKAR and SPALDING [57] numerical procedures, with respect to the velocity and pressure nodes.

In a staggered grid arrangement the shear stress values are calculated at points $(I-\frac{1}{2})$, $(I+\frac{1}{2})$ etc., shifted half a grid spacing away from $(I-1)$, (I) , $(I+1)$ etc.. Now the production type terms of difference equations at $(I-\frac{1}{2})$ and $(I+\frac{1}{2})$ directly feel the total perturbation. The shear stress at $(I+\frac{1}{2})$ will be rapidly raised while that at $(I-\frac{1}{2})$ will fall. The velocity cell at (I) , therefore, will experience a restorative force which will cause the perturbation to diminish.

The above argument is satisfactory in regions of flows where the mean velocity (or scalar) and the corresponding flux are strongly linked to one another, i.e. having a predominant production due to mean shear term in the shear stress equation. In a weakly linked flow, for example a flow region with dominant diffusion effects, any instabilities in the mean profile will not be strongly felt by the corresponding flux equation so that the instability would vanish only very slowly. Even in such regions, however, the staggered grid can be helpful although to a lesser extent.

3.3 Description and Application of the Three-Dimensional (θ, r, z) Boundary Layer Procedure

The general form of the conservation equations written out in Section (2.7) can be reexpressed here as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{r\partial\theta} \left[\rho U_{\theta}^{\Phi} \right] + \frac{\partial}{r\partial r} \left[r \rho U_r^{\Phi} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[\rho U_z^{\Phi} \right] \\ &= \frac{\partial}{r\partial\theta} \left[\Gamma_{\theta}^{\Phi} \frac{\partial\Phi}{r\partial\theta} \right] + \frac{\partial}{r\partial r} \left[r \Gamma_r^{\Phi} \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial r} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[\Gamma_z^{\Phi} \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial z} \right] + S^{\Phi} \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where Φ stands for any of the dependent variables $U_{\theta}, U_r, U_z, k, \epsilon, \overline{u_i u_j}$ (with $i = 1,3$ and $j = 1,3$), $C, \overline{u_i C}$ (with $i = 1,3$) and $\overline{C^2}$. Here Γ_i^{Φ} stands for the diffusion coefficient of Φ in the direction- i and S^{Φ} stands for the net generation of Φ per unit volume.

Equation (3.9) can be interpreted in Cartesian coordinates by transforming (θ, r, z) to (x, y, z) using

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{r\partial\theta} ; \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} ; \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} ; \quad r = 1 . \quad (3.10)$$

The following discussion, however is made with respect to the (θ, r, z) form and the Cartesian equivalent is always implied.

For the case of a three-dimensional boundary layer with the main flow in the z direction, the diffusion in that direction is so small compared with convective processes that the term

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[\Gamma_z^{\Phi} \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial z} \right] ,$$

is discarded. Equation (3.9) thus becomes first order (parabolic) in the z coordinate, permitting evaluation of all variables progressively in planes normal to direction- z , with the knowledge of upstream and boundary conditions. It is this form that is solved in this numerical procedure.

3.3.1 Finite Difference Grid

The finite difference grid for this procedure consists of three orthogonal sets of lines of constant θ , r and z . The (θ, r) plane covers the cross-stream and the direction- z coincides with the main flow direction. The control volumes are centered around the grid nodes which are the intersection points of given (θ, r, z) lines. These control volumes cover the whole domain of interest. The general equation being parabolic in the z direction, at a given moment in the calculation, attention is given only to a single z -spacing.

In general, a compromise is sought, between the cost of computation and accuracy of results, in deciding the optimum number of lines to be used in grid formation. Some further limitations apply, under turbulent flow conditions, in laying out of the grid near walls and this is discussed later.

The control volumes defined above are centered around the grid nodes where the pressure is calculated. As in the numerical schemes of HARLOW and WELCH [51] and GOSMAN and PUN [50] the velocity components are evaluated at grid points shifted by half a node-spacing from the pressure grid. This allows a direct estimation of pressure gradients relevant to the velocity component equations. The positions of the dependent variables are denoted by their corresponding grid node numbers. For example $\Phi_{(I,J)}$ refers to the variable Φ at the position where grid lines I (in the θ -direction) and J (in the r -direction) intersect. (see Fig. (3.3))

3.3.2 Derivation of Finite Difference Equations

Only a brief discussion is made here on the derivation of the finite difference equations. Detailed discussion of the topic has been provided by others, see for example SYED [16], BERGELES [58].

The finite difference equations are derived by integrating the partial differential equation (3.8) for Φ , over the control volume centering the point where Φ is required to be calculated. The net total of convection and diffusive fluxes of Φ leaving the control volume is equated to the net generation of Φ within the control volume. For the calculation of total flux of Φ across any surface of the control volume, the value of Φ at that surface has to be approximated. This can be done by weighting the values of Φ at neighbouring locations according to the local flow Peclet number. The one-dimensional analytical solution to the flux equation yields

$$\Phi = \xi \Phi_{(I+1)} + (1-\xi) \Phi_{(I)} \quad (3.11)$$

where $\Phi_{(I)}$ and $\Phi_{(I+1)}$ are Φ 's at grid points at either side of the surface $(I+\frac{1}{2})$ and ξ , the weighting factor is given by

$$\xi = \frac{e^{Pe} - 1}{Pe_{(I+1)} - 1} \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$Pe_{(I+1)} = (\rho U)_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} \cdot (X_{(I+1)} - X_{(I)}) / \Gamma_{(I+\frac{1}{2})}^{\Phi}$$

and

$$Pe = Pe_{(I+1)} \frac{X - X_{(I)}}{X_{(I+1)} - X_{(I)}}$$

The net total flux of Φ in direction I , can now be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_I = & (\alpha \rho U)_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} \left[\zeta_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} \Phi_{(I)} + (1 - \zeta_{(I+\frac{1}{2})}) \Phi_{(I+1)} \right] \\ & - (\alpha \rho U)_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} \left[\zeta_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} \Phi_{(I-1)} + (1 - \zeta_{(I-\frac{1}{2})}) \Phi_{(I)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where

$$\zeta_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} = 1 - \xi_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} + \frac{1}{Pe_{(I+1)}}$$

and

$$\zeta_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} = 1 - \xi_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} + \frac{1}{Pe_{(I-1)}}$$

Here $\alpha_{(I+\frac{1}{2})}$ and $\alpha_{(I-\frac{1}{2})}$ denote the areas of surfaces normal to the direction (I) .

Use of (3.13) would require evaluation of ξ 's which contain exponentials, which are expensive to compute. An alternative form of ζ 's, suggested in [50], is used with little loss of accuracy.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For, } Pe > 2, \quad \zeta &= 1; \\ Pe < -2, \quad \zeta &= 0; \\ |Pe| < 2, \quad \zeta &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2}{Pe} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

The first two expressions mean that when $|Pe|$ is high the flux of Φ across a surface depends solely upon the upwind value. It is the exact solution for $|Pe| \rightarrow \infty$. In the third expression the surface value is taken as the central-difference, arithmetic mean value of the neighbouring Φ 's. It is the exact solution for $Pe = 0$.

The net generation term S^Φ is the only term in equation (3.9) remaining to be considered. The integral of S^Φ is expressed in the following linearised form

$$\int_{Vol(I,J)} S^\Phi dVol = b_{(I,J)}^\Phi \Phi_{(I,J)} + c_{(I,J)}^\Phi \quad (3.15)$$

where $b_{(I,J)}^\Phi$ and $C_{(I,J)}^\Phi$ may be functions of $\Phi_{(I,J)}$. Values $b_{(I,J)}^\Phi$ and $C_{(I,J)}^\Phi$ are not unique, they can be chosen to enhance the stability of the procedure. It will be seen later in (3.33) that $b_{(I,J)}^\Phi$ should in fact be negative, or small and positive, in order to achieve a stable solution.

3.3.3 Assembly of Finite Difference Terms

The finite difference forms of total flux expressions and net generation term derived in Section (3.3.2), when assembled gives

$$\left[\sum A_{(I,J)}^\Phi - b_{(I,J)}^\Phi \right] \Phi_{(I,J)} = A_{(I+1,J)}^\Phi \Phi_{(I+1,J)} + A_{(I-1,J)}^\Phi \Phi_{(I-1,J)} \\ + A_{(I,J+1)}^\Phi \Phi_{(I,J+1)} + A_{(I,J-1)}^\Phi \Phi_{(I,J-1)} \\ + A_{(I,J,u)}^\Phi \Phi_{(I,J,u)} + A_{(I,J,d)}^\Phi \Phi_{(I,J,d)} \\ + C_{(I,J)}^\Phi \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$A_{(I+1,J)}^\Phi = (a\rho U)_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} (\zeta_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} - 1) \\ A_{(I-1,J)}^\Phi = (a\rho U)_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} (\zeta_{(I-\frac{1}{2})}) \quad \text{etc.}$$

and

$$\sum A_{(I,J)}^\Phi = A_{(I+1,J)}^\Phi + A_{(I-1,J)}^\Phi + A_{(I,J+1)}^\Phi + A_{(I,J-1)}^\Phi \\ + A_{(I,J,u)}^\Phi + A_{(I,J,d)}^\Phi$$

The finite difference equation for neighbouring control volumes are kept implicitly connected by taking $\Phi_{(I+1,J)}$ etc. in the right hand side of (3.16) as equal to $\Phi_{(I+1,J,d)}$ etc..

3.3.4 Finite Difference Equation for Velocity Components and SIMPLE Algorithm

Assembled finite difference equation for velocity components U_θ , U_r , U_z can be obtained by replacing Φ in (3.14) by these respective components. Here the pressure gradient terms will appear as part or whole of C^{U_i} terms. Due to the shifted control volume layout,

$$\begin{aligned} C^{U_\theta} &\sim - (p_{(I,J)} - p_{(I-1,J)}) \frac{\Delta X_J}{\Delta X_I} \frac{\Delta X_K}{\Delta X_J} \\ C^{U_r} &\sim - (p_{(I,J)} - p_{(I,J-1)}) \frac{\Delta X_I}{\Delta X_J} \frac{\Delta X_K}{\Delta X_I} \\ C^{U_z} &\sim - (p_{(I,J,d)} - p_{(I,J,u)}) \frac{\Delta X_I}{\Delta X_J} \frac{\Delta X_K}{\Delta X_I} \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

As given in equation (3.8), the gradients of turbulent stresses appearing in U_i equation can too be expressed as a source term. The C^{U_i} may contain a part or whole of that as well. Assuming that those stress terms are known, there still remains the pressure field to be found separately.

In the SIMPLE algorithm of PATANKAR and SPALDING [57], the continuity equation is consulted in order to guess the correct pressure field. The supposition is made that the velocity component is a linear function of the pressure gradient in that direction. Thus

$$U_z = U_z^* + \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial (\Delta p^*)} (\Delta p^*)' \quad \text{etc.} \quad (3.18)$$

where U_z^* is the velocity component in the direction z corresponding to the pressure difference field Δp^* , and $(\Delta p^*)'$ an increment in (Δp^*) which will produce a new value U_z . On examining (3.16) and (3.17) it can be seen that,

$$\frac{\partial U_z}{\partial (\Delta p^*)} = - \frac{\frac{\Delta X_I}{\Delta X_J} \frac{\Delta X_K}{\Delta X_I}}{(A^{U_z}_{(I,J)} - b^{U_z}_{(I,J)})} \quad \text{etc..} \quad (3.19)$$

Suppose the corrected velocity field U_θ , U_r and U_z in (3.18) satisfies the continuity equation, then it can be shown that the increment in pressure at the point (I,J) , necessary to cause this effect, is governed by the equation

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(I,J)}^p p'_{(I,J)} &= A_{(I+1,J)}^p p'_{(I+1,J)} + A_{(I-1,J)}^p p'_{(I-1,J)} \\ &+ A_{(I,J+1)}^p p'_{(I,J+1)} + A_{(I,J-1)}^p p'_{(I,J-1)} \\ &+ A_{(I,J,u)}^p p'_{(I,J,u)} + A_{(I,J,d)}^p p'_{(I,J,d)} \\ &+ m_{(I,J)}^* \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

where

$$A_{(I+1,J)}^p = \rho_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} \left(\frac{\partial U_\theta}{\partial (\Delta p^*)} \right)_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} (\Delta X_J \Delta X_K)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m_{(I,J)}^* &= \left[(\rho U_\theta^*)_{(I+\frac{1}{2},J)} (\Delta X_J \Delta X_K)_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} \right. \\ &+ (\rho U_\theta^*)_{(I-\frac{1}{2},J)} (\Delta X_J \Delta X_K)_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} \\ &+ (\rho U_r^*)_{(I,J+\frac{1}{2})} (\Delta X_I \Delta X_K)_{(J+\frac{1}{2})} \\ &+ (\rho U_r^*)_{(I,J-\frac{1}{2})} (\Delta X_I \Delta X_K)_{(J-\frac{1}{2})} \\ &+ (\rho U_z^*)_{(I,J,d)} (\Delta X_I \Delta X_J)_{(K,d)} \\ &\left. + (\rho U_z^*)_{(I,J,u)} (\Delta X_I \Delta X_J)_{(K,u)} \right] . \end{aligned}$$

$m_{(I,J)}^*$ is the net imbalance for the control volume (I,J) as evaluated by the U_θ^* , U_r^* , U_z^* flow field which resulted from the solution of the finite difference momentum equations.

The pressure correction equation (3.20) is fully elliptic in character, $A_{(I,J,d)}^p$ being non zero. Thus an iterative procedure, which will require a larger computational capability is needed for its solution. If there is a means of correctly guessing the variations in the pressure field in z -direction (so that $p'_{(I,J,d)} = 0$), the pressure correction equation too can be treated as parabolic in the direction- z .

In the shear layers the mean momentum equation in the lateral direction can be written as

$$0 = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} + F_r \quad (3.21)$$

So, in the absence of body forces F_r in r -direction, the pressure gradient in z -direction is given by

$$\left[\frac{dp}{dz} \right] = \left[\frac{dp}{dz} \right]_{\infty} \quad (3.21a)$$

As a boundary condition the right hand side of (3.21a) is known. Therefore correct pressure gradient can be incorporated in the U_z equation, so that the pressure correction $p'_{(I,J,d)}$ is zero. This makes the equation (3.20) parabolic in z -direction for thin shear layers.

For confined flows, the prior knowledge of the total mass flow rate enables one to estimate the error in the assumed streamwise pressure gradient. Linearising the z -direction momentum equation with respect to the pressure gradient $\frac{dp}{dz}$, one obtains,

$$\left[A_{(I,J)}^{U_z} - b_{(I,J)}^{U_z} \right] U_{z(I,J)} = A_{(I+1,J)}^{U_z} U_{z(I+1,J)} + \dots - \frac{dp}{dz} \left(\Delta X_1 \Delta X_2 \Delta z \right) \quad (3.22)$$

Usually $b_{(I,J)}^{U_z}$ is zero, giving

$$U_{z(I,J)} = - \frac{dp}{dz} \frac{\Delta X_1 \Delta X_2 \Delta z}{A_{U_z(I,J)}} + \text{constant}_1 \quad (3.23)$$

Thus the mass flow rate across the control volume at (I,J) , in z -direction is

$$\begin{aligned} m_z &= \rho_{(I,J)} U_{z(I,J)} \Delta X_1 \Delta X_2 \\ &= - \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right) \frac{\Delta X_1 \Delta X_2 \Delta z \Delta X_1 \Delta X_2}{A_{U_z(I,J)}} + \text{constant}_2 \end{aligned}$$

giving

$$\frac{\partial m_z}{\partial \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right)} = - \frac{\Delta X_1 \Delta X_2 \Delta z \Delta X_1 \Delta X_2}{A_{U_z(I,J)}} \quad (3.24)$$

Now,

$$m_{z(I,J)} = m_{z(I,J)}^* + \frac{\partial m_{z(I,J)}^*}{\partial \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right)^*} \Delta \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right) \quad (3.25)$$

where $m_{z(I,J)}^*$ correspond to the pressure gradient $\left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right)^*$. Now summing

up equation (3.25) over the whole cross-stream plane.

$$\sum m_{z(I,J)} = \sum m_{z(I,J)}^* + \Delta \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right) \sum \frac{\partial m_{z(I,J)}^*}{\partial \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right)^*}$$

therefore

$$\Delta \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right) = \frac{\sum m_{z(I,J)} - \sum m_{z(I,J)}^*}{\sum \left(- \frac{\Delta X_1 \Delta X_2 \Delta z \Delta X_1 \Delta X_2}{A_{U_z(I,J)}} \right)} \quad (3.26)$$

giving

$$\left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right)_{\text{corrected}} = \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right)^* + \Delta \left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right) \quad (3.27)$$

Equation (3.25) and (3.27) form a consistent set of corrections to the U_z component and pressure gradient fields. The corrected U_z field from (3.25) will satisfy continuity exactly and $\left(\frac{dp}{dz} \right)_{corrected}$ from (3.27) will be a good assumption for the next calculation step in the z -direction.

3.3.5 The Case of Axi-Symmetric (or Plane-Symmetric) confined Flow

In the previous subsection it was seen that it is possible to obtain a U_z -velocity field (equation (3.25)) which satisfies the overall mass conservation requirement. In a symmetric flow there will be no transverse gradients of any of the variables. Thus, consideration of individual control volume mass-balance with the knowledge of U_z -fields in consecutive z -planes will give expressions for velocities in the lateral direction, (see Fig. (3.4)) such as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \left(\rho U_z \right)_{(I,J,d)} - \left(\rho U_z \right)_{(I,J,d)} \\ & + \left(\rho U_r \right)_{(I,J-\frac{1}{2})} - \left(\rho U_r \right)_{(I,J+\frac{1}{2})} \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

At the symmetric boundary, however, the U_r velocity is zero. Therefore, the equation (3.28) can be successively applied in control volumes away from the axis to obtain the complete lateral velocity field.

Thus, in the case of two-dimensional confined flows, the solution of finite difference equations for the lateral velocity U_r and that for the pressure-correction p' is unnecessary.

3.4 An Ideal Grid

The numerical procedure is employed to calculate, in the order of importance, the mean variables U_i and C , their respective fluxes $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and $\overline{u_j c}$, and other quantities e.g. ϵ etc.. The inevitable errors associated in using interpolation formulae in calculations can be minimised by choosing a grid system where the individual terms in all equations are calculable without extensive interpolations. In fact it is not possible to avoid interpolations entirely. The staggered grid system shown in Fig. (3.5) does allow one to obtain all terms (except the convective terms which require interpolations in any grid system) in the mean equations without interpolation. The variable locations for this grid system is given in Table (3.1).

In this arrangement, however, interpolations are required in calculating terms in all the turbulent equations. Now, in boundary layer flow situations, where, the gradients in main flow direction are much smaller than those in lateral directions, this grid system can be modified to advantage with little loss of accuracy.

Variable		Location
Pressure	p	I, J, K
Mean Velocity	U_{θ}	$I-\frac{1}{2}, J, K$
Components	U_r	$I, J-\frac{1}{2}, K$
	U_z	$I, J, K-\frac{1}{2}$
Shear Stresses	$\overline{u_r u_z}$	$I, J-\frac{1}{2}, K-\frac{1}{2}$
	$\overline{u_{\theta} u_z}$	$I-\frac{1}{2}, J, K-\frac{1}{2}$
	$\overline{u_{\theta} u_r}$	$I-\frac{1}{2}, J-\frac{1}{2}, K$
Mean Scalar	C	I, J, K
Scalar Fluxes	$\overline{u_{\theta} C}$	$I-\frac{1}{2}, J, K$
	$\overline{u_r C}$	$I, J-\frac{1}{2}, K$
	$\overline{u_z C}$	$I, J, K-\frac{1}{2}$
Normal Stress	$\overline{u_{\theta}^2}$	I, J, K
	$\overline{u_r^2}$	I, J, K
	$\overline{u_z^2}$	I, J, K
All Other Scalar Variables e.g. $\epsilon, k, \overline{c^2}$		I, J, K

Table 3.1 Variable Locations in an Ideal Grid

3.5 Staggered Grid Arrangement for (θ - r - z) Procedure for Three-and Two-Dimensional Scalar Transport in a Two-dimensional Hydrodynamic Field

All equations under consideration in the present investigation are parabolic in z -direction. This enables one to refrain from considering a grid system displaced in z -direction. In such a grid system the variables can be located as shown in Fig. (3.6). Here all variables are known in a given plane- u and the finite difference equation can be formulated to obtain new values for the variables at the downstream plane, d .

Further simplification to the grid system is now made by noting that only two-dimensional flow fields without a swirl component in velocity are treated. Consequently, U_θ , $\overline{u_\theta u_z}$, $\overline{u_\theta u_r}$ are all zero. Therefore all mean and turbulent flow variables can be located in a single (r - z) plane.

In the present flow situation the gradients of the shear stress $\overline{u_r u_z}$ are the most important in the U_z equation. The streamwise gradients of normal stresses have only a secondary effect in the U_z equation (through their effect on $\overline{u_r u_z}$). Therefore the location of normal stress control volumes can be made so as to facilitate easier calculation of their source terms. Now it is obvious that, $(I, J - \frac{1}{2})$ point, where the non-zero shear stress $\overline{u_r u_z}$ is located, is the best place for the normal stresses to be located. At this point the major velocity gradient $\frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r}$ can be evaluated without interpolation. Further, the dissipation rate ϵ can also be evaluated at $(I, J - \frac{1}{2})$, so that the calculation of source terms in the ϵ equation as well as those containing ϵ in the stress equations can be made without interpolation.

The scalar field (temperature or concentration etc.) however, being three-dimensional, its important flux variables should be located as in the idealised grid. The streamwise scalar flux whose streamwise gradients

have only an indirect effect. however, is located along with shear stress etc. so that calculation of its source terms becomes straight forward. The variable locations thus displaced to suit the present flow and scalar transport situation are shown in Fig. (3.7) (only non-zero variables are shown).

3.5.1 Staggered Grid Arrangement for $(x-\Psi)$ procedure

Being a two-dimensional boundary layer procedure, the control volumes can be displaced only in direction- Ψ . It can be seen by reasoning similar to that of the previous subsection, that it is useful to shift the control volume for all turbulent quantities in the Ψ -direction by half a grid spacing. The derivation of the general finite difference equation in a shifted $(x-\Psi)$ coordinate system is presented in Appendix (E).

3.6 Cell layout and Boundary Conditions

In both $(x-\psi)$ and $(\theta-r-z)$ numerical procedures cells are generally distributed in order to cover the full domain of interest and in particular, capable of giving closer attention to areas where important variations occur. Since the turbulence model described in Chapter (2) is valid only for high Reynolds number turbulence, it can not be applied in regions very close to the wall where the Reynolds number is small. Therefore limitations do apply in laying out the grid in near-wall regions.

In Fig. (3.8), a typical grid distribution in a near-wall region is presented. Here, A is the node nearest to the wall where mean variables (i.e. U_z and C) are evaluated. As a criterion the distance between the node A and the wall is chosen so that,

$$y_A^+ > 30 .$$

Thus A lies outside of the viscous sublayer and the mean variables at A satisfies the logarithmic laws to be described in the next sub section. Since the lateral velocity gradients in the near-wall region varies inversely with the distance to the wall more grid points should be concentrated in this area. In order to achieve this a non-uniform grid distribution should be employed in the near-wall regions.

The method of applying boundary conditions in the $(x-\psi)$ procedure is given in [9]. The same method can be employed for the variables evaluated in a staggered grid as well.

In applying boundary conditions in the $(\theta-r-z)$ procedure, the false-source technique of GOSMAN and PUN [50] is employed (see Fig. (3.9)). Here, the flux of Φ implied by the boundary condition is first explicitly evaluated. Then this flux, $\dot{J}''$, is supplied to the control volume closest to the boundary in a linearised source form given in (3.15), and further, the finite difference coefficient which connects the boundary value Φ_b to the control volume value Φ is set to zero.

The flux through the boundary $\dot{J}''$ can be calculated with the knowledge of prevailing physical conditions. These are discussed in the following subsections.

3.6.1 Wall Boundary Condition

(a) Mean Velocity Equation

The total stress, τ_{tot} , opposing the turbulent flow of fluid parallel to a rigid wall is used in defining the friction velocity U_τ with

$$U_\tau = \left(\frac{\tau_{tot}}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3.29)$$

This friction velocity is supposed to satisfy the logarithmic "law of the wall",

$$\frac{U_z}{U_\tau} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{y U_\tau}{\nu} E \right) \quad (3.30)$$

where U_z is the velocity component parallel to the wall, at a distance y away from the wall. The von Kármán constant κ is taken as equal to 0.42 and the constant E is taken as 9.85. In the numerical procedures employed here, the friction velocity U_τ is evaluated from (3.30) and the corresponding total stress at the wall is enforced as the boundary condition.

(b) Mean Scalar Equation

Generally as a boundary condition, the wall scalar flux, $\dot{q}''$ or the wall value of the scalar itself C_{wall} is known. In either case it is the wall scalar flux that is enforced as the boundary condition for the scalar equation. When C_{wall} is known, the implied total scalar flux through the wall is calculated

using the logarithmic law for scalar i.e.

$$\frac{C_{wall} - C}{C_\tau} = \frac{1}{\kappa_c} \ln \left(\frac{y U_\tau E_c}{\nu} \right). \quad (3.31)$$

Here C is the magnitude of the scalar at a distance y away from the wall. The constant κ_c is taken as 0.46, and the coefficient E_c , which is a function of molecular Prandtl (or Schmidt) number of the fluid, is chosen from equation (4.18) which represents a consensus of wall flow data. The total scalar flux through the wall

$$\dot{q}_i'' = \rho c_p U_\tau C_\tau \quad (3.32)$$

can now be calculated with U_τ and C_τ obtained from (3.30) and (3.31) respectively.

(c) Shear Stress and Lateral Scalar Flux Equations

The control volume for $\overline{u_r u_z}$ (or $\overline{u_r c}$) closest to the wall is centered at B (see Fig. (3.8)). It is the diffusive flux of $\overline{u_r u_z}$ (or $\overline{u_r c}$) across the surface at A that is required as the boundary condition. Now in order to evaluate the diffusive flux across A , the value of $\overline{u_r u_z}$ (or $\overline{u_r c}$) at A needs to be known. This value is estimated with reference to the relevant mean equation. By integrating the mean momentum U_z equation between the limits $r = r_b$ (i.e. at A) and $r = R$ (i.e. at the wall) one obtains

$$\left(r \overline{u_r u_z} \right)_{r=r_b} = - \left[U_z \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial z} + U_r \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} \right] \int_{r_b}^R r dr + \left[r \nu \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} \right]_{r=R} - \left[r \nu \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} \right]_{r=r_b} \quad (3.33)$$

where

$$\left(r \nu \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} \right)_{r=R} = \tau_{tot} = - R U_\tau^2 .$$

Similarly, the integration of the scalar equation yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(r \overline{u_r c} \right)_{r=r_b} &= - \left(U_z \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} + U_r \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \right) \int_{r_b}^R r dr \\ &+ \left(r \frac{\Gamma}{\rho c_p} \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \right)_{r=R} - \left(r \frac{\Gamma}{\rho c_p} \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \right)_{r=r_b} \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

where

$$\left(r \Gamma \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \right)_{r=R} = \frac{R \dot{q}_i''}{\rho c_p} .$$

The right hand side of (3.33) and (3.34) can be explicitly evaluated. The diffusion coefficient in the equations for turbulence quantities are of the form,

$$constant \times \frac{k \overline{u_r^2}}{\epsilon}$$

which increases linearly with y , in the local equilibrium region since $\epsilon \propto y^{-1}$ and the stresses are constant. Thus the diffusion of $\overline{u_r u_z}$ and $\overline{u_r c}$ through the surface A (see Fig. (3.8)) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{flux of } \overline{u_r u_z} \text{ through } A &= constant \left(\frac{k \overline{u_r^2}}{\epsilon} \right)_B \frac{y_A}{y_B} \frac{(\overline{u_r u_z})_A - (\overline{u_r u_z})_B}{y_A - y_B} \\ \text{and} \\ \text{flux of } \overline{u_r c} \text{ through } A &= constant \left(\frac{k \overline{u_r^2}}{\epsilon} \right)_B \frac{y_A}{y_B} \frac{(\overline{u_r c})_A - (\overline{u_r c})_B}{y_A - y_B} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

The value of the constant is determined from the diffusion model employed.

(d) All Other Turbulence Equations

In all other turbulence equations, expressions similar to (3.35) are employed in calculating the diffusion fluxes through the surface at A . For all normal stresses and remaining scalar fluxes, their magnitudes at A are taken as simply related to $\overline{u_r u_z}$ and $\overline{u_r c}$ values obtained by equations (3.33) and (3.34) respectively, constants of proportionality are obtained from consensus of near wall data, as discussed later in Section (4.6). The value of dissipation rate at A i.e. ϵ_A is chosen in order to get the diffusive flux as implied by the relation

$$\epsilon = \left| \overline{u_r u_z} \frac{U_T}{\kappa y} \right| \quad (3.36)$$

3.6.2 Symmetry Axis (or Plane) Boundary Conditions

For all variables except the shear stress $\overline{u_r u_z}$ and the scalar flux $\overline{u_r c}$, the boundary condition at $r = 0$ is that of zero gradient, i.e. zero flux through the boundary. The values of $\overline{u_r u_z}$ and $\overline{u_r c}$ at $r = 0$ is in fact zero by definition. In the three-dimensional problems the θ -boundary condition too should be given. In a general problem a gradient of C in the θ -direction can be enforced by supplying the implied scalar flux. In the present investigation, however, two (r - z) planes of symmetry could always be identified. In these cases the transverse scalar flux is zero at the boundary.

3.6.3 Free-Stream Boundary Condition

The (θ - r - z) procedure in its present form has a (r - θ) grid which is invariant in the z -direction. In flows with free boundaries, however, due to the spread of the layer, it is undesirable to employ such a grid

in calculation. For such flows it is useful to have a grid which expands, along with the flow, in the main flow direction. Therefore problems with one or two free stream boundaries are tackled by Patankar-Spalding procedure which has an expanding grid facility. (Problems with free stream boundary were successfully solved with slightly different $(\theta-r-z)$ procedure by SYED [16].) The free stream values of all variables can be evaluated with reference to their respective differential equation by assuming zero lateral gradients for all variables. This will yield equations of the form

$$U \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} = S^{\Phi} \quad , \quad (3.37)$$

which can be rearranged to an explicit form as,

$$\Phi_d = \frac{S^{\Phi} \Delta X}{U} + \Phi_u \quad (3.38)$$

where Φ_d and Φ_u are the downstream and upstream values of Φ respectively. The value Φ_d obtained from (3.38) can be incorporated in the procedure as given in [9].

3.7 Treatment of Conducting Wall in the Numerical Procedure

Investigation of scalar diffusion in internal flows e.g. pipes, under laboratory conditions is common and practically very relevant. BLACK and SPARROW [13], QUARMBY and ANAND [59], CHAN et al. [60], and the present experimental investigation (see Chapter 5) considered three-dimensional scalar diffusion with a variety of wall boundary conditions. While the attainment of a perfectly impermeable wall in a mass transfer experiment presents no difficulties the same is not the case in a heat transfer study. Heat conduction in the pipe wall may significantly modify the idealized boundary conditions particularly when the heat source is applied externally (an arrangement that simplifies the experimental task). Though conduction effects can be minimized by correct choice of materials, in three-dimensional scalar transport investigations they can not completely be neglected. In making predictions of such cases it was thus necessary that the mean scalar transport equation (which is the only variable relevant in the wall scalar transfer) be solved in an area covering both the wall and the inside of tube.

Inclusion of a wall, with finite thickness, does not pose any additional problems in the numerical procedure, because the heat conduction is just a much simplified version of the convection equation. For generality, consider a tube heated by a flux $q''_o(\theta)$ through its outer surface (as in the present experimental investigation) and heated internally, by say an electric current (as in BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment) at the rate of $S^C_{(r,\theta)}$ per unit volume. Due to the circumferential conduction effects in the tube wall the heat flux through the inner wall can not be directly evaluated. The solution of the partial differential equation for C however require following additional relations,

$$(a) \text{ Total heat from outer surface} = q''_o(\theta) R_o \Delta\theta \Delta z \quad (3.39)$$

(b) Generation of heat in wall control volumes

$$= S^C(r, \theta) r^2 \Delta \theta \Delta z \quad (3.40)$$

and

(c) Total heat diffused from the tube to the fluid

$$= \dot{q}_i''(\theta) R_i \Delta \theta \Delta z \quad (3.41)$$

where

$$\dot{q}_i''(\theta) = \left[\Gamma_{wall} \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \right]_{r=R_i} \quad (3.42)$$

and

$$\dot{q}_i''(\theta) = \frac{(C_b - C_A) \rho c_p U_\tau \kappa_c}{\ln(y_{A_c}^+ E_c)} \quad (3.43)$$

These relations of heat flow can be incorporated into the numerical procedure in the following manner. The equation (3.39) is the boundary condition applied to the outermost control volumes, E (see Fig. (3.10)).

The heat generation (3.40) is included in the source form for all wall control volumes. The heat flow relations (3.41) - (3.43) can be incorporated implicitly by expressing them in the finite difference forms, i.e. (3.41) and (3.42) written as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i &= \Gamma_{wall} \frac{R_i \Delta \theta \Delta z}{\Delta r_{Db}} (C_D - C_b) \\ &= A_{(I,J-1)}^C (C_D - C_b) \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

The relevant coefficient $A_{(I,J-1)}^C$ of the control volume at D can be modified as

$$A_{(I,J-1)}^C = \Gamma_{wall} \frac{R_i \Delta \theta \Delta z}{\Delta r_{Db}} \quad (3.45)$$

Similarly the coefficient $A_{(I,J+1)}^C$ of the control volume A , can be modified to read

$$A_{(I,J+1)}^C = \frac{\rho c_p U_\tau \kappa_c}{\ln(y_{A_c}^+ E_c)} R_i \Delta \theta \Delta z \quad (3.46)$$

In the present computational code, however, there is a grid node at b , having zero volume. Therefore its $A_{(I,J+1)}^C$ and $A_{(I,J-1)}^C$ coefficients should be adjusted so that they are equal to the right hand side of (3.45) and (3.46) respectively. This has the effect of solving (3.42) and (3.43) to obtain C_b .

CHAPTER 4

REVIEW OF EXPERIMENTAL DATA

4.1 Introduction

Accurate experimental data are essential for the development of turbulence models. It is these which direct the initial modelling ideas; mathematics follow next. Again, since the turbulence models are not fully analytic, determination of any unknown coefficients can be done only with reference to experimental data. Then in order to check the validity and generality more and more accurate experimental findings are necessary.

Measurements of scalar fields are not as extensively available as those for hydrodynamic fields. Even among those available there are few which are relevant for this Thesis. Moreover, judgement has to be made in order to establish their reliability. An extensive review of free shear flow hydrodynamic data are given by RODI [61]. Here in this chapter, attempt is made to survey free shear flow and wall flow scalar field data in situations covered by this Thesis.

Section (4.2) identifies the kind of data which are useful to have in order to formulate and validate second-order closure models in scalar transport. The basic criteria for assessment of these data are presented next.

Characteristics of free shear flows, mainly with respect to self similarity, are presented in Section (4.3). The expressions for scalar flux in terms of mean scalar and local flow characteristics are obtained for the shear flows under consideration. This further enables one to obtain expressions of the eddy diffusivity ratio between momentum and scalar transport in terms of local characteristics. In Section (4.4) these relationships are used in checking the consistency of available data.

Characteristics and review of two-dimensional wall flows are presented in Section (4.5) - (4.6). This covers the hydrodynamic and scalar transport aspects of the flat plate boundary layer and the circular pipe. The discussion is centered around the logarithmic laws for mean velocity and mean scalar.

The three-dimensional scalar field data are discussed next. The different geometrical arrangements used by experimenters in obtaining three-dimensional scalar fields are given here. The comments made by them on the thermal or mass diffusivity, especially the anisotropy in the near wall region, are mentioned here.

4.2 Data Required and Criteria for Assessment

In order to understand the scalar transport problem in turbulent flows it is useful to have accurate information on the individual terms in both hydrodynamic and scalar equations. Focusing attention solely on the scalar transport equations, Table (4.1) sets out the quantities whose measurements are desirable for better understanding and guidance to the solution of the problem. They are categorised in their order of importance.

Mean scalar field measurements are the most important in understanding the flow situation. They are directly relevant in practical usage and reliability of these measurements is greater than for other quantities. In some flows the scalar flux field is directly expressible in terms of the main scalar field: Section (4.3). Hence these measurements can be used in checking the accuracy of the flux field measurements.

The second-order correlations i.e. the turbulent fluxes $\overline{u_i c}$ and scalar fluctuations $\overline{c^2}$ are very desirable to have, since it is these quantities that a second-order closure will solve for. Direct comparison of predicted correlations is possible only when accurate measurements of these quantities are available. The knowledge of other correlations are useful in modelling terms in the flux and scalar fluctuation equations.

0000490-229-42

Category	Mean Scalar	Second-Order Correlations				Other Correlations										
Quantity	C	$\overline{vc}$	$\overline{uc}$	$\overline{c^2}$	$\overline{wc}$	ϵ_c	$\overline{v^2 c}$	$\overline{wvc}$	$\overline{vc^2}$	$\overline{vwc}$	$\overline{wvc}$	$\overline{wc^2}$	$\overline{w^2 c}$	$\overline{p \frac{\partial c}{\partial y}}$	$\overline{p \frac{\partial c}{\partial x}}$	$\overline{p \frac{\partial c}{\partial z}}$
Equations in which they appear	C	**	*		**											
	**	$\overline{vc}$	*				*			*				*		
	**		$\overline{uc}$					*			*				*	
	**	**		$\overline{c^2}$		**			*			*				
	**				$\overline{wc}$					*			*			*
Remarks				†	In 3-D only					In 3-D only	In 3-D only	In 3-D only	In 3-D only			In 3-D only

† $\overline{c^2}$ interlinks with other equations only when buoyancy is present

Table 4.1 Data Required and Their Relative Importance

4.2.1. Criteria for Assessment of Data

Turbulence measurements of properties of the scalar field are rare in the literature. Often it is only the mean scalar field that is measured, sometimes scalar fluxes and scalar fluctuation correlation are reported and seldom any higher-order correlations. Thus the following criteria will be used mainly for the purpose of establishing credibility of data and understanding their applicability to the present investigation, and not necessarily for making any form of selection between them.

Criterion (a) Hydrodynamic field measurements, if reported, should have high credibility. In the case of free shear flows, reference is made to RODI [61] where an extensive review is given. In the absence of any analytical forms for the turbulent field, data will be assessed in the light of measurements by other workers.

Criterion (b) The mean scalar should be conserved.

NOTE: Most data in the literature are found in non-dimensional forms, often implying satisfaction of this criterion.

Criterion (c) The directly measured scalar flux field should agree with the corresponding fluxes obtained from mean scalar equations.

4.3 Characteristics of Free Shear Flows

4.3.1 Integral Forms of Mean Equations

The general behaviour of a free shear flow depends primarily on the total excess or deficit of momentum and that of scalar present in the layer relative to the external streams. Integrating the momentum equation (1.8) over the whole cross-section of the layer defined by boundaries I and E , for plane flows results in the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_0^{y_E} \left(U (U - U_E) + \overline{u^2} - \overline{v^2} \right) dy + \frac{dU_E}{dx} \int_0^{y_E} (U - U_E) dy \\ + \left[V (U - U_E) \right]_I^E = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

In symmetric flows I is the plane of symmetry; therefore the last term in (4.1) vanishes in those flows. In the present investigation only free shear flows in zero pressure gradient are considered. Hence equation (4.1) reduces to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_0^{y_E} \left(U (U - U_E) + \overline{u^2} - \overline{v^2} \right) dy - V_I (U_I - U_E) = 0 \quad (4.2)$$

Similarly, by integrating the mean scalar equation between boundaries I and E and applying the boundary condition that the external-stream value of the mean scalar, C_E , is constant,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_0^{y_E} \left(U (C - C_E) + \overline{uc} \right) dy - V_I (C_I - C_E) = 0 \quad (4.3)$$

The experimental data for the present investigation should satisfy equations (4.2) and (4.3).

In fully turbulent flow there exists a region of flow over which the direct action of viscosity on the mean flow is negligible. Within this region the mean and turbulent motion are determined by the boundary conditions alone. So that all terms in the mean and turbulent equations vary at the same rate in the streamwise direction. Sometimes there are features in a flow which prevent the occurrence of a self similar form or allowing only an asymptotic self preserving form. In order to find out the relevant form for a given flow condition equations (4.2) and (4.3) should be checked in that flow condition.

4.3.2 Definition of Self Similarity and Decay Laws

Definition of self similarity as given in TOWNSEND [62] is,

"For a particular flow to be self preserving, it is :
necessary that the variation of any quantity over any
plane, $x = \text{constant}$ should be expressible non-dimensionally
through suitable scales of length and velocity, δ and
 U_0 , as a universal function of y/δ . The scales of
length and velocity are functions of x only."

In order to cover the scalar transport problem this definition is extended by prescribing a mean scalar scale C_0 which is a function of x only. It is often the maximum deficits in velocity and mean scalar at a given section that are used as characteristics of that section. As for characteristic length however, one can make a choice to suit the situation. In the present investigation the representative length scales are chosen so that they are easily comparable with available experimental data and that they are easily obtainable from numerical calculation. The Fig. (4.1) shows the characteristic lengths chosen. They are,

(a) For plane jet and plane wake,

$$\delta = \text{distance between centre line and } \frac{U_0}{2} \text{ plane.}$$

(b) For plane mixing layer,

$$\delta = \text{distance between } 0.1U_0 \text{ and } 0.9U_0 \text{ planes.}$$

Often in literature the scalar field measurements are presented with respect to another characteristic length δ_c , given by

(a) For plane jet and plane wake,

$$\delta_c = \text{distance between centre line and } \frac{C_0}{2} \text{ plane.}$$

(b) For plane mixing layer,

$$\delta_c = \text{distance between } 0.1C_0 \text{ and } 0.9C_0 \text{ planes.}$$

Here too δ_c is chosen as the characteristic length for the scalar field, noting that δ_c is directly proportional to δ in all flows.

The self similar forms of variable profiles in the cross-stream can now be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} U &= U_E + U_0 f(\eta) \\ V &= U_0 g(\eta) \\ \overline{uv} &= U_0^2 h(\eta) \\ \overline{u^2} - \overline{v^2} &= U_0^2 q(\eta) \quad \text{etc.} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C &= C_E + C_0 m(\eta_c) \\ \overline{vc} &= U_0 C_0 n(\eta_c) \\ \overline{uc} &= U_0 C_0 p(\eta_c) \quad \text{etc..} \end{aligned}$$

where functions f , g etc. are the non-dimensional variable profiles.

For symmetric flows,

$$\eta = \frac{y}{\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_c = \frac{y}{\delta_c} \quad (4.4)$$

For plane mixing layer,

$$\eta = \frac{(y - y_I)}{\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_c = \frac{(y - y_I)}{\delta_c}$$

The conditions for exact self similarity can be obtained by substituting (4.4) into the mean momentum and mean scalar equations. They are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d\delta}{dx} &= \text{constant} \\
 \frac{U_E}{U_O} &= \text{constant} \\
 \frac{\delta}{U_O} \frac{dU_O}{dx} &= \text{constant} \\
 \frac{d\delta_c}{dx} &= \text{constant} \\
 \frac{\delta_c}{C_O} \frac{dC_O}{dx} &= \text{constant} \quad .
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

The flows under consideration, if and when self similar, should satisfy equation (4.5). Of the three flow situations under consideration experimental data (see Section (4.4)) suggest that the plane jet and the plane mixing layer satisfy (4.5). The plane wake does not satisfy

$\frac{U_E}{U_O} = \text{constant}$, exactly, but found to achieve an approximately self similar form when $\frac{U_E}{U_O} \gg 1$.

Table (4.2) gives the decay laws which can be derived from equation (4.5). To be exact, the power laws given in Table (4.2) should have $(X + X_O)$ as the basis, where X_O is the virtual origin of the flow. This origin is found to depend on the exact conditions of flow generation and is generally estimated by back extrapolating data at known x -locations.

Flow	U_E	δ	U_o	C_o	δ_c
Plane Jet	0	$\propto x$	$\propto x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$\propto x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$\propto x$
Plane Mixing Layer	0	$\propto x$	constant	constant	$\propto x$
	constant	$\propto x$	constant	constant	$\propto x$
Plane Wake	$\frac{U_E}{U_o} \gg 1$	$\propto x^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\propto x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$\propto x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$\propto x^{\frac{1}{2}}$

Table 4.2 Decay Laws

4.3.3 Expressions for Shear Stress and Scalar Flux for Self Similar Flows

The shear stress and scalar flux at the free edge is zero and at a plane of symmetry they change sign. Hence shear stress or scalar flux at any point in the layer can be calculated by integrating their respective mean equations. The expressions thus obtained are tabulated in (4.3).

The shear stress relations were taken from RODI [63].

The expressions for scalar fluxes can readily be transformed to incorporate the characteristic length of the scalar field δ_c and its associated parameter η_c where

$$\delta_c \eta_c = \delta \eta \quad (4.6)$$

Flow	Shear Stress Relation (RODI [63])	Scalar Flux Relation (Present Work)
Plane Jet $U_E = 0$	$h = \frac{d\delta}{dx} \left[\frac{1}{2} f \int_0^\eta f d\eta + \eta q \right] \quad (4.6)$	$n = \frac{d\delta}{dx} \left[\frac{1}{2} m \int_0^\eta f d\eta + \eta p \right] \quad (4.7)$
Plane Mixing Layer $\frac{U_E}{U_I} = \lambda$	$h = \frac{d\delta}{dx} \left[\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right) \left(\eta f - \int_0^\eta f d\eta \right) - \int_0^\eta f^2 d\eta \right. \\ \left. - (f-1) \left[\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right) \int_0^\eta f d\eta + \int_0^\eta f^2 d\eta \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \int_0^\eta q d\eta \right] + m \int_0^\eta f d\eta \right. \\ \left. - \int_0^\eta q d\eta + (\eta + \eta_I) q \right] \quad (4.8)$	$n = \frac{d\delta}{dx} \left[\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right) \left(\eta m - \int_0^\eta m d\eta \right) - \int_0^\eta fm d\eta \right. \\ \left. - (m-1) \left[\left(\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right) \int_0^\eta m d\eta + \int_0^\eta fm d\eta \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \int_0^\eta p d\eta \right] + m \int_0^\eta f d\eta \right. \\ \left. - \int_0^\eta p d\eta + (\eta + \eta_I) p \right] \quad (4.9)$
Plane Wake $\frac{U_E}{U_O} \gg 1$	$h = \frac{U_E}{2 U_O \delta} \frac{d\delta^2}{dx} \eta f \quad (4.10)$	$n = \frac{U_E}{2 U_O \delta} \frac{d\delta^2}{dx} \eta m \quad (4.11)$

Table 4.3 Self Similar Shear Stress and Scalar Flux Relations

4.4 Review of Data for Free Shear Flows

In this section scalar transport data for free shear flows are discussed. The analytical, self similar scalar flux relations derived in the previous section are used here to calculate the shear stress and flux profiles implied by the mean equations. They are compared with measured profiles of $\overline{uv}$ and $\overline{vc}$.

4.4.1 Plane Jet

Table (4.4) shows important flow parameters for some scalar measurements of plane jet. NEWMAN's [64] review suggest a value of 0.11 for the rate of spread $\frac{d\delta}{dx}$ of plane jets. RODI's [61] review show values ranging from 0.102 to 0.11 for the same. Rodi's recommended target velocity profile of a plane jet is that of ROBINS [65] and it has a spreading rate of 0.103. In passively heated jets the value given in DAVIES et al. [66] comes closest to the above. Jet of VAN DER HEGGE ZIJNEN [67] can not possibly be considered passive because of its high temperature difference.

Unfortunately there are no measured cross-stream scalar flux data available for comparison here. The maximas of calculated $\overline{vc}$ profiles show good agreement with each other. The ratio of the spreading rate of scalar field to that of velocity field has a value of 1.40 to 1.46 in all cases except that of Davies et al., JENKINS and GOLDSCHMIDT [68] quote values of 1.41 and 1.40 for this ratio from experiments of REICHARDT [69] and SINGH and UBEROI [70]. The spreading rate ratio found by Davies et al. is even smaller than the value 1.25 generally quoted for round jets. This may imply that the low aspect ratio of 6 in Davies et al.'s experiment is not sufficient to give a fully plane symmetric jet.

Davies et al. made conditionally sampled measurements of mean velocity and temperature fields and found that turbulent fractions of these fields spread at more or less similar rates, 0.155 and 0.140. They

000000-2370-47

Experimenter	Geometry	Flow Range	Reported Variables; Technique	$\frac{d\delta}{dx}$	$\frac{d\delta_c}{dx}$	$\frac{\text{meas. } \frac{vc_m}{U_o C_o}}{\frac{vc_m}{U_o C_o}}$	$\frac{\text{calc. } \dagger}{\frac{vc_m}{U_o C_o}}$	$\frac{(\overline{c^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}_m}{\Delta C}$
VAN DER HEGGE ZIJNEN [67]	D = 0.5cm L = 10 cm and D = 1 cm L = 25 cm	$\Delta C_{jet} = 107^\circ\text{C}$	$U, C,$ hot-wire anemometer	0.096	0.141		0.0295	
JENKINS and GOLDSCHMIDT [68]	D = 1.27cm L = 30.4cm	$Re = 1.43 \times 10^4$ $\Delta C_{jet} =$ a) 1.11°C b) 20.7°C c) 35.0°C	$U, C,$ pitot- static tube and hot wire anemometer	a) 0.088 b) 0.091 c) 0.096	a) 0.123 b) 0.128 c) 0.137		0.0273	
DAVIES et al. [66]	D = 5.1 cm L = 30.5cm	$Re \approx 4.6 \times 10^4$ $\Delta C_{jet} = 14.6^\circ\text{C}$ $\frac{x}{\delta} = 10 \rightarrow 25$	$U, \overline{u^2},$ $C, \overline{c^2},$ hot wire anemometer	0.109	0.125		0.0271	0.18

† see Table (4.3)

Table 4.4 Scalar Measurements in Plane Jets

concluded that the spread of the heated turbulent jet is better represented by a variable associated uniquely with the turbulent fluid and chose the half intermittancy point of U and C fields for comparison. The variation in U and C fields were coincidental. LAUNDER [71] reports that conditionally sampled measurements of JENKINS and GOLDSCHMIDT [68] indicate that for turbulent fluid in plane jet a Prandtl number of 0.40 , virtually uniform across the jet. This is much lower than the implied value of 0.80 in the experiments of Davies et al..

Thus it seems that there is considerable disagreement between experiments as regards to the relative spreading rates of scalar and velocity fields. Since a value of 1.40 - 1.46 from unconditional (conventional) measurements seem more consistent, that value is chosen as the representative one suitable for comparison with numerical predictions.

As for the hydrodynamic field, on the recommendation of RODI [61], ROBINS' [65] velocity profile and BRADBURY's [72] turbulent stresses are considered for comparison with numerical predictions.

4.4.2 Plane Mixing Layer

Table (4.5) lists the experimental conditions and some important flow parameters of scalar field measurements found in literature.

RODI [61] pointed out that the agreement in the spreading rates of the mixing layers he considered with given velocity ratio is rather poor. WATT's [73] velocity field spreading rate lies along the average value for that velocity ratio whereas SUNYACH and MATHIEU's [74] spreading rate is slightly higher than the average level for $\frac{U_E}{U_I} = 0$.

The spreading rates of the scalar field again depends on the ratio between the free stream velocities. The overall Prandtl number of the flow is inversely proportional to the ratios of the squares of spreading rates. Thus Watt's data imply an overall Prandtl number of 0.78 whereas Sunyach and Mathieu's data imply a Prandtl number of 0.5 .

Experimenter	Flow Conditions	Reported Variables and Technique used	$\frac{d\delta}{dx}$	$\frac{d\delta_c}{dx}$	meas. $\frac{\overline{uv}_m}{U_o^2}$	calc. $\frac{\overline{uv}_m}{U_o^2}$	meas. $\frac{\overline{vc}_m}{U_o C_o}$	calc. $\frac{\overline{vc}_m}{U_o C_o}$	$\frac{\sqrt{\overline{c^2}_m}}{C_o}$
WATT [73]	$\frac{U_E}{U_I} = 0.50$	$U, \overline{uv}, \overline{u^2}, \overline{v^2}, \overline{w^2}, C, \overline{c^2},$	0.045	0.051	.0091	.0105	†	.0120	0.112
SUNYACH and MATHIEU [74]	Half plane jet, 4cm × 4.8cm $\frac{U_E}{U_I} = 0$ $\frac{X}{D} = 1.0 \rightarrow 3.0$ $Re_{jet} = 5.25 \times 10^4$ $\Delta T = 54^\circ\text{C}$	$U, \overline{uv}, \overline{u^2}, \overline{v^2}, \overline{w^2}, C, \overline{c^2},$	0.18	0.249	.0140	.0132		.0203	0.135
FIEDLER [75]	Half plane jet, $\Delta T = 26^\circ\text{C}$	$C, \overline{c^2},$							0.210
BROWN and ROSHKO [76]	$\frac{\rho_I}{\rho_E} = \frac{1}{7}, 1 \text{ and } 7$ $\frac{U_I}{U_E} = \sqrt{7} \text{ and } 7$	$U, \rho,$ Pilot + hot wire							

† normalised with respect to maximum value

Table 4.5 Scalar Measurements in Plane Mixing Layers

Again there are no reported heat flux profiles in plane mixing layer found in the literature, Watt has given a heat flux profile normalised with respect to the value at the centre of the layer, The heat flux $\overline{vc}$ calculated from his profiles of correlation coefficient $\overline{vc}/(\overline{v^2} \overline{c^2})^{1/2}$, $\overline{v^2}$ and $\overline{c^2}$ has a maximum of about $0.003U_o C_o$, which is only one quarter of what is implied from his temperature profiles. This raises serious doubts about the accuracy of other variable measurements.

The hydrodynamic field measurements of SUNYACH and MATHIEU [74] are not in good agreement with more consistent data of others (for e.g. BRADSHAW et al. [75]). The measured shear stress has a maximum which is about 40% higher than that of Bradshaw et al. and also the kinetic energy is about double that found in measurements reviewed by RODI [61]. This appears due to the flow being still not fully self similar in turbulent producing central region of the mixing layer.

The temperature fluctuation profiles of SUNYACH and MATHIEU [74] and those of FIEDLER [76] show remarkably similar uniform level over the central 50% of the layer. Fiedler pointed out that the corresponding mean temperature profiles has three inflection points and they in fact coincide with the two maximas and one minimum found near the mid regions of $\overline{c^2}$ profile.

BROWN and ROSHKO [77] studied mixing between different velocity streams with different densities. Mixtures of Nitrogen and Helium were employed to obtain density ratio up to 1:7 and measurements were made of mean velocity and density. In this case density can be treated as the scalar. Their deduced value of the turbulent Schmidt number was only 0.16 in the central regions of the mixing layer which is far lower than values reported for any other turbulent free shear flow.

For comparison with numerical predictions, Watt's data will be used for the case $\frac{U_E}{U_I} \neq 0$ and SUNYACH and MATHIEU [74] and WYGNANSKI and FIEDLER's [78] data for the case $\frac{U_E}{U_I} = 0$.

4.4.3 Plane Wake

Plane wake can become approximately self similar for large values of $\frac{U_E}{U_0}$. TOWNSEND [79] appears to be the first one to have conducted detailed measurements in heated and unheated wakes. His results indicate that both mean quantities as well as turbulent structure become nearly self preserving for $(X - X_0)/D > 500$, the former achieving similarity earlier than the latter. Experimental findings of others given in Table (4.6) indicate that self preserving region for the mean variables can start as early as $100D$.

RODI's [61] review recommend Townsend's measurements of the hydrodynamic field as the best in consistency. The spreading parameter for a plane wake,

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{U_E}{U_0} \delta \right) \quad (4.12)$$

in Townsend's case has a value 0.114,[†] and is 10-15% higher than other reported wake data. The spreading parameters of other measurement sets are in good agreement with data sets presented in Rodi's review.

The relative rate of spreads of scalar and velocity fields seem to be in reasonably good agreement with each other. In all cases, the implied overall Prandtl number, which is the inverse of the square of the relative rate of spreads, indicate values in the range 0.6 - 0.7.

Although TOWNSEND's [79] lateral heat flux data have large scatter, agreement with level of flux implied by the mean temperature profile is reasonably good. The measured level of heat flux maximum in FREYMUTH and UBEROI's [80] data and that of FABRIS [81] are too small by 40% and 45%

[†] Rodi has obtained a value of 0.098 from Townsend's data and correspondingly his calculated value of non dimensional shear stress maximum is 0.051. This is in good agreement with Townsend's measured $(\overline{uv}/v_0^2)_{max}$.

Experimenter	Flow Range; Geometry	Reported Variables; Technique	$\frac{U_o}{U_E}$	S	$\frac{\delta_c}{\delta}$	$\frac{\text{meas.}}{\frac{\overline{uv}_m}{U^2}}$	$\frac{\text{calc.}}{\frac{\overline{uv}_m}{U^2}}$	$\frac{\text{meas.}}{\frac{\overline{vc}_m}{U_o C_o}}$	$\frac{\text{calc.}}{\frac{\overline{vc}_m}{U_o C_o}}$	$\frac{(\overline{c^2})_m^{\frac{1}{2}}}{C_o}$
TOWNSEND [79]	$Re = 1360$ circular cylinder $\frac{X}{D} = 80 - 950$	$U, \overline{uv}, \overline{u^2},$ $\overline{v^2}, \overline{w^2}, C,$ $\overline{vc},$	0.093 $- 0.031$	0.114	1.30	0.049	0.059	0.073- 0.086	0.078	
FREYMUTH and UBEROI [80]	$Re = 960$ circular cylinder $\frac{X}{D} = 25 \rightarrow$ 1140 $\frac{X_o}{D} = 40$	$U, C, \overline{vc},$ $\overline{c^2}, \overline{vc^2},$ $\epsilon_c,$	0.0344 at $\frac{X}{D}$ $= 1140$	0.0934	1.22			0.035	0.056	0.403
LA RUE and LIBBY [82]	$Re = 2800$ circular cylinder $\frac{X}{D} = 400, 500$ $\frac{X_o}{D} = 40$	$C, \overline{c^2},$								
FABRIS [81]	$Re = 2400$ circular cylinder $\frac{X}{D} = 200, 400$	$\frac{U}{\overline{vc}}, \frac{V}{\overline{uc}}, \frac{C}{\overline{c^2}},$ $\frac{\overline{vc^2}}{\overline{vc}}, \frac{\overline{uc^2}}{\overline{uc}},$ $\frac{\overline{wvc}}{\overline{v^2 c}},$ Hot wire	0.057 at $\frac{X}{D}$ $= 400$	0.0958	1.26		0.050	0.034	0.061	0.351

Table 4.6 Scalar Measurements in Plane Wakes

respectively. The reason for such a large discrepancy is not clear, at least in FREYMUTH and UBEROI's [80] measurements it is not due to lack of self similarity because their final measuring station is 1140 diameters from the cylinder.

Fabris measured the streamwise heat flux $\overline{uc}$ and in the area of maximum lateral heat flux, the ratio $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ is about 1.4. At the plane of symmetry the value of $\overline{uc}$ is about half the maximum $\overline{uc}$.

The levels of temperature fluctuations in wakes reported here seem to agree reasonably well with each other. LA RUE and LIBBY's [82] $\sqrt{\overline{\theta^2}}$ profile normalized with respect to the value at the axis coincide over most parts of the wake with profiles of Freymuth and Uberoi. The maximum value of $\sqrt{\overline{\theta^2}}$ is 40% higher than the value at the axis.

FREYMUTH and UBEROI's [80] measurements of temperature gradient fluctuations indicate local isotropy over the bulk of the wake. Although they have shown that the terms in temperature fluctuation equation are in balance, the overall accuracy may be rather suspect with the large discrepancy between measured and calculated heat flux profiles.

The measurements of heated wake behind a flat plate made by KOVASZNAY and ALI [83] show some effects of buoyancy. Even though their mean velocity and mean temperature profiles are hardly affected, the shear stress and heat flux profiles across the wake show considerable asymmetry.

For comparison with numerical predictions, TOWNSEND's [62], [79] data will be used. The data of others too will be presented for further comparison.

4.5 Characteristics of Flows Affected by Walls

In flows which are affected by one or more walls, there exist thin layers adjacent to the walls where the viscous stresses are more significant than turbulent stresses. The principle of Reynolds number similarity can only be applied to the fully turbulent region where these viscous effects are negligible. The similarity and dimensional arguments show that (see for example TOWNSEND [62], page 200), in the region of overlap between this viscous layer and the fully turbulent region, the mean velocity takes a universal distribution of the form,

$$U = \frac{U_\tau}{\kappa} \ln \frac{U_\tau y}{\nu} + B \quad (4.13)$$

where

$$U_\tau = \frac{1}{\rho} \tau_{wall}^{1/2} \quad (4.14)$$

κ is the Von Kármán constant and has a value about 0.41 . (Different workers have obtained values between 0.35 and 0.43 from their experiments.) B too is constant and has a value equal to about 5 , again determined from experiments. This is probably the most extensively used expression in wall flows. It has limited validity in adverse pressure gradient flows, while in strong favourable pressure gradient flows considerable deviations occur.

Now, when the mean scalar equation is examined with the similarity and dimensional arguments parallel to previous considerations it can be seen (see for example KADER and YAGLOM [8]) that the mean scalar takes the form

$$(C_w - C) = \frac{C_\tau}{\kappa_c} \ln \frac{y U_\tau}{\nu} + B_c \{Pr\} \quad (4.15)$$

where C_w is the wall value of C , and C_τ is given by

$$C_\tau = \frac{\dot{q}_w''}{\rho c_p U_\tau} \quad (4.16)$$

$\dot{q}_w''$ is the total flux of C through the wall, Here again κ_c is a constant and B_c a function of the molecular Prandtl number of the fluid. The turbulent Prandtl number of the flow in the region where the above logarithmic laws are valid can be obtained as

$$Pr_t = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa_c} \quad (4.17)$$

4.5.1 Turbulent Prandtl Number in the Near Wall Logarithmic Region

In the absence of any analytical forms for the mean velocity and mean scalar profiles, the turbulent Prandtl number can be found with known Reynolds stress and scalar flux only. Like in free shear flows, the stress and flux profiles implied by the mean velocity and scalar profiles can be obtained by integration. A knowledge of streamwise variation of mean variables and the values of wall stress and flux are however needed for the integrations.

In the review paper by KESTIN and RICHARDSON [84], the Prandtl numbers were obtained by the above method. The numerical value of Pr_t close to the wall seems to lie in the region of 0.9 - 0.7, however the dependence of Pr_t on the distance from the wall did not seem to follow any particular pattern. It is clear that if the mean velocity and passive scalar obey some universal logarithmic laws in the near wall region, then in that region the turbulent Prandtl number will come out to be a constant. KADER and YAGLOM [8] compiled heat and mass transfer data in boundary layer, circular pipe and channels and replotted them in semi-logarithmic coordinates in order to obtain Pr_t as from (4.17). Their findings clearly show that Pr_t in the logarithmic region is independent of the flow geometry and molecular Prandtl number of the fluid. Out of twenty one data sets only five were found to give Pr_t outside the range 0.8 - 0.9. Also they

noted that the constant B_c in equation (4.15) is a strong function of the molecular Prandtl number. Some curvefit expressions for B_c are given in [8], for example

$$\begin{aligned} B_c (\text{air} , Pr = 0.7) &= 3.0 - 4.0 \\ B_c (\text{water} , Pr \approx 6.0) &= 30.0 - 40.0 \\ B_c (\text{mercury} , Pr \approx 0.026) &= -8.0 - -10.0 , \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

It is important to note here that a range of 0.8 - 0.9 for Pr_t is representative only in regions where both mean velocity and scalar satisfy respective logarithmic regions, if at all present, can be very thin and will depend on the main stream distance in both the streamwise and cross-stream directions.

Several workers have investigated the effect of molecular Prandtl number on the turbulent Prandtl number. QUARMBY and QUIRK's [11] pipe flow diffusion studies covering a Schmidt number range of 0.7 to 1200 show no detectable effect of Pr on Pr_t .

4.6 Review of Data for Wall Flows

In the external wall flows, the characteristic Reynolds number of the flow does not generally stay constant. Therefore evaluation of shear stresses and scalar fluxes from corresponding mean profiles is possible only if they are known at two or more streamwise locations. Since this evaluation can not be done very accurately using published mean velocity and scalar profiles, no attempt will be made to do so here.

For fully-developed internal flows analytical evaluation of shear stress and scalar flux for fully developed flows can easily be obtained from:

$$\rho \overline{uv} = \tau_w \left(\frac{r}{R} \right) + \mu \frac{\partial U}{\partial r} \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$\overline{vc} = -q_w \frac{R}{r} \frac{1}{\rho c_p} \frac{\int_0^R U r dr}{\int_0^R U r dr} + \frac{\Gamma}{\rho c_p} \frac{\partial C}{\partial r} \quad (4.20)$$

For the developing flows to which attention is given in this thesis, the scalar flux can be evaluated only if the streamwise development of mean scalar profile is fully documented. Here again no attempt will be made to calculate $\overline{vc}$ from previously reported C profiles.

4.6.1 Flat Plate Boundary Layer

As mentioned in Section (4.5.1) there are several investigations of turbulent heat transfer from flat plate boundary layers to be found in the literature. Extensive measurements of mean temperature fields with a variety of wall boundary conditions was reported by REYNOLDS et al. [85]. Following them measurements of turbulent scalar correlations started to appear, Table (4.7) gives some details of such available data for smooth

Experimenter	Boundary Condition	Re_δ	Reported Variables	Near- Wall Pr_t	$\overline{uc}$	$\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$	$\overline{c^2}$	Remarks
JOHNSON [88] and [89]	step in wall temperature		$U, \overline{u^2}, \overline{v^2},$ $\overline{w^2}, \overline{uv}, C,$ $\overline{uc}, \overline{vc}, \overline{c^2},$ $\overline{uv^2}, \overline{v^3},$ $\overline{vw^2}, \overline{vc^2},$	1.0-1.1	$\frac{\overline{uc}_{max}}{U_o \Delta C_o} =$ 5.5×10^{-3}	3.0	$\frac{\overline{c^2}_{max}}{(\Delta C_o)^2} =$ 1.0×10^{-2}	Measurements made at only two locations
BLOM [10] see also [86]	step in wall temperature	$Re_{\delta, max} = 2870$	$U, \overline{u^2},$ $\overline{uv}, C,$ $\overline{c^2}, \overline{vc},$	≈ 0.92				Several measuring locations
ANTONIA et al. [90]	step in wall heat flux	$Re_{\delta, 0} = 3070$	$C, \overline{c^2},$ $\overline{vc}, \overline{uc},$	1.0-1.1	$\frac{\overline{uc}_{max}}{U_\tau C_\tau} =$ 2.1	$\left(\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}} \right)_{max} =$ 2.1	$\frac{\overline{c^2}_{max}}{C_\tau^2} =$ 4.6	U profile not reported

Table 4.7 Scalar Measurements in Smooth Flat Plate Boundary Layers

wall boundary layers. Also the works of FULACHIER and his colleagues (see for example [87]) have presented considerable amount of data for boundary layers with heat and mass transfer.

JOHNSON [88] presented a complete set of second order correlation data in a thin thermal boundary layer growing inside a thick velocity boundary layer. From measurements at two streamwise locations he could calculate the shear stress and heat flux profiles implied by mean profiles. Though his measured $\overline{uv}$ is about 30% less than the values implied by velocity profile, the measured heat flux $\overline{vc}$ is in good agreement with calculated $\overline{vc}$. Because of rather short heating length the temperature profile is probably not fully developed and the turbulent Prandtl number seems rather high at about 1.0 - 1.1.

BLOM [10] made measurements effectively under similar conditions to that of JOHNSON [88]. However he concentrated on fewer variables over a larger heating length. Mean quantities were presented in semi-logarithmic scale. In the semi-logarithmic region the Pr_t had a value of about 0.92.

ANTONIA et al. [90] presented conditionally sampled measurements of scalar correlations in a thin thermal boundary layer created by a step in wall heat flux. They obtained a value of 0.41 for constant κ_c in equation (4.15), implying a Prandtl number of about 1.0. Their wall heat flux calculated from the enthalpy integral equation was about 20% higher than the actual wall flux.

Johnson's value of 3.0 for the ratio of streamwise to lateral heat flux in the near wall region is higher than the values found by others. ANTONIA et al. [90] indicated $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ of 2.1 similar to the value obtained in the rough surface boundary layer experiments of PIMENTA et al. [91]. As seen later this value is consistent with the near wall value of $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ in pipe flows. The correlation coefficient of the streamwise heat flux obtained in Johnson's tests was about 0.75 near the wall and this value is the same as that obtained by Pimenta in his experiments.

For comparison with numerical predictions of heat transfer in the flat plate boundary layer, the data of ANTONIA et al. [90] is employed. They have reported measurements of mean and turbulent scalar variables for several locations along the plate and prediction of this development should be a testing task for the turbulence models.

4.6.2 Pipe Flow

Measured second order turbulent correlations of scalar fields in pipes are so few that some data sets with only mean flow measurements are considered here for comparison with numerical predictions.

The investigation of BREMHORST and BULLOCK's [92] and that of BOURKE and PULLING [93] are the only two known attempts at measuring second order scalar correlations in pipe flows. Both investigations were for fully developed thermal boundary layer inside a pipe. The first presented the mean scalar C , $\overline{c^2}$, $\overline{u^2}$ and $\overline{uc}$ whereas Bourke and Pulling reported radial heat flux, $\overline{c^2}$, C and U . Bourke and Pullings measurements were confined to the inner 70% radius of the pipe and hence its use as a guide for numerical solutions is limited. The non-dimensional streamwise scalar flux $\frac{\overline{uc}}{U_T C_T}$ reported in [90] has a value of about 2.1 in the near-wall region. This is the same as the values found in flat plate boundary layers. The normalised scalar fluctuations $\frac{\overline{c^2}}{C_T^2}$ has a near wall value of 2.5 in [92] whereas flat plate boundary layer investigation of ANTONIA et al. [90] indicated a value of about 4.6.

Quarmby and his colleagues presented several non axis-symmetric scalar transfer measurements in pipes which are discussed in the following section. In order to supplant these works QUARMBY and ANAND [94] presented axis-symmetric mass transfer measurements in fully developed pipe flow. Their experimental investigation was to make measurements of mean concentration at several axial locations downstream of two types of mass

sources. In the first type, Nitrous Oxide gas was made to diffuse through a permeable ring of 1.5 diameters length fitted to the wall of the pipe. The second mass source was a "point" source of Nitrous Oxide at the centre of the pipe so that it diffused towards the wall due to turbulent and viscous action. In all cases the passive scalar was conserved.

A rather suprising aspect of their investigation was that they could satisfactorily predict the concentration profiles at downstream locations by making an assumption of unity turbulent Schmidt number throughout the flow. In the description of the velocity profiles using a mixing length hypothesis, however, they used a von Kármán constant of 0.36, a rather low value. Further their expression for eddy diffusivity made by combining Van Driest expression and a Reichardt formulation is not consistent with the mean velocity profile except in the viscous sublayer. Thus their theoretical calculations, even with a very good final agreement with experiment can not be considered very useful. Moreover on reanalysing the data of [94], QUARMBY and QUIRK [11] found that indeed the variation of turbulent Schmidt number inside the pipe can best be fitted by

$$Pr_{t(z)}^{-1} = 1 + 400z^{-1} \quad (4.21)$$

where z is the non-dimensional radius. This is quite at variance with their previous assumption of unity Sc_t throughout the pipe.

4.7 Review of Data in Three-dimensional Scalar Transport

Several experiments have been reported in which the hydrodynamic field was a two-dimensional thin shear flow type and the scalar field was three-dimensional, although again, boundary layer type. Thus the scalar field had significant scalar fluxes in both directions normal to the mean velocity vector. The aim of these experiments was to find out the extent of anisotropy in the diffusivities of these fluxes. All experiments on this topic reported here were performed in circular pipes with a fully developed velocity field. The only measurements reported are the mean temperature or concentration and wall fluxes; no turbulent correlation measurements appear to have been reported yet. All authors chose to compare their results with theoretical expectations based on assumed diffusivity models.

Table (4.8) summarises the methods employed in order to create and measure the three-dimensional scalar fields. QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] case-b was for diffusion of nitrous oxide from a dimetric line source. In all other experiments the three-dimensional fields were created by circumferentially non-symmetric wall scalar fluxes.

Quarmby and his colleagues chose to investigate three-dimensional scalar transfer from a short length (for example, $1\frac{1}{2}D$ in [59]) of non-zero wall scalar flux. This will create situations where the three-dimensionality of the scalar field is decreasing. Since the asymmetric scalar field at the end of the short section is not fully developed, the scalar transfer situation inside the pipe may be highly influenced by the transport effects. The experimental situation investigated by others [13], however were on situations where the three-dimensionality is maintained. Over large length of such boundary conditions fully developed three-dimensional scalar profiles can be expected to attain. Due to the limited facilities available the works of CHAN et al. [60] and indeed the present experimental investigation were focussed on wall properties only. Still they present challenging data for development of variation in Nusselt numbers.

Experimenter; Type of Scalar Transfer and Fluid	Scalar Input	Re_D	Range of C	Measurements Made and Techniques Used	Conclusions (made by the respective authors) on Diffusivity	Remarks
BLACK and SPARROW [13], also BLACK [95]; Heat transfer; air, $Pr = 0.7$	Self heating, long stainless steel tube with sinusoidal variation in thickness; giving sinusoidal heat flux along the circumference, period = 2π .	7500 - 58000	$\Delta C_{wall,max}$ < $70^\circ F$ $\Delta C_{bulk,max}$ = $43^\circ F$.	1) Outside wall temperature by Chromel-Alumel thermocouples. 2) Total power supply by ammeter × voltmeter. 3) Air flow by ASME orifice. 4) Air temperature by thermocouples as in (1).	Diffusivity ratio of 10 near wall decreasing to unity beyond $y^+ = 20$.	
QUARMBY and ANAND [59]; Mass transfer; nitrous oxide to air, $Sc = 0.77$.	a) Four porous segments in the wall, period = $\frac{\pi}{2}$ length $\approx 1\frac{1}{2}$ Dia. width = $\pi/4$. b) Diametric line source, period = π .	20000 -120000		1) Concentration measurements in flow by infra-red gas analyser. 2) Total contaminant input by rotameter gauges. 3) Flow velocity by pilot tubes.	Diffusivity ratio i.e. Sc_t , unity through the flow domain	

Table 4.8 Three-Dimensional Scalar Experiments in Fully Developed Pipe Flows

0000490-1530-55

(contd)

Experimenter; Type of Scalar Transfer and Fluid	Scalar Input	Re_D	Range of C	Measurements Made and Techniques Used	Conclusions (made by the respective authors) on Diffusivity	Remarks
QUARMBY and QUIRK [11]; a) Heat transfer; air, $Pr = 0.7$	Electrically heated stainless steel strip, period = 2π length ≈ 3 Dia. width $\approx \pi/16$.	10000- 100000	Surface temperature up to 70°C .	1) Temperature by Chromel-Alumel thermocouple probe. 2) Flow of air by pilot tube.	Pr_t in radial direction is about 0.5 near wall varies smoothly to unity at the axis.	Large heat loss through the wall apparent in C profiles.
b) Mass transfer; nitrous oxide to air, $Sc = 0.77$.	Short porous slot in the wall, period = 2π length = $\frac{1}{2}$ Dia. width $\approx \pi/25$.	6000- 170000		1) same as in [59].	Tangential diffusivity is larger than the radial diffusivity near wall. This ratio is unity over most other parts of the flow.	Apparent effect of buoyancy in C profiles.
QUARMBY and QUIRK [96]; Mass transfer; brine to air, $Sc = 760-1200$	Porous segment in the wall period = π length = (not reported) width = $\pi/2$	5230 - 21780		1) Concentration measurement by electrical conductivity probe.	The high Schmidt number has no effect on diffusivity ratios.	

Table 4.8 Three-Dimensional Scalar Experiments in Fully Developed Pipe Flows

(contd)

Experimenter; Type of Scalar Transfer and fluid	Scalar Input	Re_D	Range of C	Measurements Made and Techniques Used	Conclusions (made by the respective authors) on Diffusivity	Remarks
CHAN et al. [60]; Heat transfer; water, $Pr \approx 6.0$.	Stainless steel tube segmentally heated from outside heaters, period = 2π width = π .	10000- 100000	ΔC_{bulk} $< 1^\circ\text{C}$.	1) Outside wall temperature by Chromel-Alumel thermocouples 2) Wall heat flux by microfoil sensors 3) Flow measurements by ASME orifice and by rotameter.		
Present experimental investigation; Heat transfer; air, $Pr = 0.7$	Glass tube segmentally heated from outside by an electrically conducting coating, period = 2π width = π .	20000- 90000	$\Delta C_{wall,max}$ $= 10^\circ\text{C}$ ΔC_{bulk} $< 1^\circ\text{C}$.	1) Outside wall temperature by Chromel-Alumel thermocouples. 2) Total power input by ammeter × voltmeter. 3) Air flow by pilot tube.	see Chapter 7.	For details see Chapter 5.

Table 4.8 Three-Dimensional Scalar Experiments in Fully Developed Pipe Flows

One other aspect which is of interest is the shape of the wall flux profiles. In mass transfer experiments it is possible to create (or assume) rectangular wave shape wall fluxes whereas, in heat transfer experiments, due to circumferential conduction within the tube material the wall flux profiles display an S-shape variation. Thus profiles of the wall material and geometry become important in the numerical predictions of these situations. In the present experiment (see Chapter 5) the three-dimensional heat transfer in a segmentally heated thin glass tube was investigated. Here the objective was to design a three-dimensional heat transfer situation where the circumferential variation of wall heat flux is close to a square wave profile.

CHAPTER 5

EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

5.1 Preliminary Considerations

5.1.1 Aim of the Experimental Investigation

The aim of this experimental investigation was to obtain data for the case of transversely non-symmetric heat transport situation in a wall-affected two-dimensional shear flow. Previous workers e.g. BLACK and SPARROW [13], QUARMBY and ANAND [59], have made measurements in non-symmetrical scalar situations in tubes. Flow in circular tubes has been used for these studies because of its wide practical application. Further, it is a convenient and a simple geometry to investigate under laboratory conditions. For this reason it was adopted as the geometry under study in the present investigation.

In mass transfer experiments it is possible to establish boundary conditions of square-wave form in the circumferential direction. In heat transfer experiments due to circumferential conduction in the tube wall such a situation can not be exactly achieved. However, the present heat transfer experiments were designed to minimise the circumferential conduction in the tube wall. Thus the three-dimensionality of the scalar field obtained is far stronger than that of [13]. It was hoped that this will provide a rather stringent test for the turbulence model employed in numerical calculations. Further the present experiments were carried out at low temperature difference levels (maximum of 1.5°K in bulk temperature rise) and hence can be assumed to be void of any significant property variation.

5.1.2 Facilities Available and the Level of Measurements

As the present investigation was mainly aimed at the theoretical and numerical aspects of the solution of three-dimensional scalar transport situations, only a short, limited period was available for the experimental investigation. At the time of this investigation, the laboratory facilities at the writer's disposal required the exploration be limited to the study of wall heat transfer characteristics for the case of non-symmetric heating of a circular tube. A regulated supply of water and compressed air was available for use as the fluid medium. Previously, CHAN et al. [60] had made investigations using these facilities. Their experimental investigation was conducted to determine the heat transfer characteristics of turbulent flow of water in a circular stainless steel tube with non-uniform boundary conditions.

5.1.3 Methods of Obtaining Circumferentially Non-Uniform Heating Rates

Circumferentially non-symmetric heating is common in practical engineering applications. Under laboratory conditions, however, one has the additional task of quantifying the non-uniformity i.e. one should be able to make measurements of heat fluxes and temperatures around the inner surface of the tube. As in the present investigation, if the measurements are to be made at the outer surface of the tube, then one would like to keep the temperature drop across the tube wall to a minimum. The methods of obtaining and making measurements of non-symmetrical heating, as adopted by previous workers, are the following:

- (a) Heat generated by an electrically conducting tube having a non uniform thickness (as in BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment). Here the heat flux profile through the inner surface of the tube depends on the geometry of the tube, circumferential conduction

and the fluid heat transfer characteristics, As [13] points out, accurate construction of a tube with given non-uniformity in thickness is really a difficult task.

- (b) A tube segmentally heated by an outside source as in CHAN et al. [60]. Here the outside source is placed at a given distance away from the tube. The uniformity of heat flux within the segment, however depends on the uniformity in the gap distance between the tube and the heater. Accurate and reliable measurement of the outer surface temperature of the tube is quite difficult, as found by [60], under these circumstances.

Recently GIESBRECHT [97] explored methods of achieving a constant heat flux boundary condition on long tube lengths. He considered methods of obtaining thin metallic film deposits on tubes. If the tube is of an electrically non-conducting material then the conducting film can be heated by supplying a voltage along its length. The uniformity of the heat flux in this case depends on the uniformity of the metallic film. Thin and uniform coatings of metallic substance can be obtained for example, by vacuum deposition, chemical deposition or by metallic painting. As for getting such deposit on long tubes, Giesbrecht pointed out that metallic painting is the most convenient. His investigation of heat transfer from a yawed cylinder to air with a constant heat flux wall boundary condition seems to indicate the reliability of the method of obtaining metallic film deposit on non conducting (electrically) cylinders. His results for cross-flow tests are in good agreement with previous experiments and his new data for yawed cylinder show excellent self consistency. In the present investigation this method is extended to obtain thin uniform metallic film segments on the tube. It can be expected to give square-wave profiles of heat flux to the cylinder.

5.1.4 Choice of Tube Material

When choosing the tube material for the present experiment, the following criteria were used.

- (a) Once it was decided that the tube be heated at its outer surface by passing a current through the metallic film, the tube had to be made of electrically non-conducting material.
- (b) A one-dimensional consideration of the heat flow in the circumferential direction shows that, the extent of circumferential conduction is proportional to $K_w \frac{t}{R}$, where K_w is the thermal conductivity of the tube material and t the thickness of the tube of mean radius R . So that, if circumferential conduction is to be minimised, the thickness of the chosen tube should be a minimum. The thermal conductivity should also be low to reduce the circumferential conduction
- (c) Since the measurement of temperature is to be made at the outer surface of the tube, it would be best to have only a small temperature drop across the tube material. Again, one-dimensional consideration of the heat flow to the fluid shows that,

$$\frac{C_i - \bar{C}}{C_o - C_i} = \frac{2 K_w}{K_f Nu} \frac{1}{\ln \left(\frac{R_o}{R_i} \right)} \quad (5.1)$$

where K_w , K_f and Nu are the thermal conductivity of the wall material, that of the fluid and the Nusselt number (assumed constant) of the flow situation respectively. Here $\bar{C}$ is the bulk temperature and suffixes i and o stand for inner and outer surfaces respectively. Equation (5.1) suggests that for a given fluid flowing inside a thin tube at a given Reynolds number the temperature drop across the tube material is inversely proportional to $K_w \frac{R}{t}$. Thus, the thermal conductivity of the wall material should be as high as possible.

The first requirement rules out commonly used stainless steel tubing. Commonly available electrically insulating tube materials are glass, plastic and some synthetic compounds. The thermal conductivity of plastic and other synthetics depends of their composition; however, on average it is about one-fifth that of glass. Although it is possible to obtain rather thin synthetic tubing, consideration of the quantity $K_w \frac{R}{t}$ suggest that a glass tube of 1.92 cm diameter is more suitable than available plastic tubes of nominally similar size.

5.1.5 Choice of Fluid

The choice could be made between the laboratory supplies of air and water to suit the aims and limitations of the experiment. As one would like to minimise temperature drop across the tube wall, again, reference is made to equation (5.1) in deciding the fluid be used in this experiment. For a given Reynolds number, the heat transfer characteristics of a given fluid can be obtained empirically by using, for example the Petukhov-Pepov equation along with an expression for the friction factors (e.g. the Filinenko equation (see for example KARLEKAR and DESMOND [98] page 300)). At a Reynolds number of 20000, the equation (5.1) gives

for air,

$$\frac{C_w - \bar{C}}{C_o - C_i} = 11.75$$

and for water,

$$\frac{C_w - \bar{C}}{C_o - C_i} = 0.1695 \quad .$$

This shows that as far as the temperature drop across the tube wall is concerned air is seventy times better than water. Therefore in the present investigation air was selected as the working fluid.

5.2 Experimental Equipment

5.2.1 Design of the Tube

The glass tube used in the present investigation is a commonly available T6-type fluorescent tube with a nominal diameter of 3/4 in.. The inner and outer diameters of the tube are 1.715 cm and 1.920 cm respectively. In preparing the tube for mettalic spraying the steps taken are the following;

- (a) Carefully remove the aluminium caps and electrodes from an already used fluorescent tube. This was done in a suitably protected surrounding. Once one end is broken open, the tube is kept in a well ventilated place for a short period so that its gas can diffuse out.
- (b) The two ends of the tube are now cut off using a glass cutting machine. The tube is then washed well so as to remove the phosphorous dust. The micrometer measurements of inner and outer diameters were made next. Then half an inch thick plexi-glass flanges were fitted to the two ends of the tube using a self drying adhesive.
- (c) The spraying technique used here provides a satisfactorily uniform coating [97]. In the present werk, however, a method of obtaining two-segments of conducting strips has to be developed. After considering several methods, it was decided to stick two very thin (about 1 mm in width) strips of adhesive tape (sellotape) along the length of the tube spaced 180° apart (see Fig. (5.1)). In a tube of 1.92 cm outer diameter, each piece of tape covers roughly a 6° arc.
- (d) The electroconducting paint used in the present investigation (as in GIESBRECHT [97]) is the "Flexible silver No. 16" manufactured by Englehard of New Jersey. This paint cures at room temperatures and can be thinned for spraying. The spraying was done on a lathe

bed where a precision spray gun was mounted to get a transverse motion at a constant speed. The spray paint was then applied in very thin coats on the rotating glass tube. The rotation speed was several times larger than the transversing speed. Several passes were made until the desired coating resistance was achieved. A period of about two minutes between the passes was allocated for the spray to dry out. A rough check on the resistance along the length of the sprayed section was made using an ohmmeter, this was used as the guide in deciding the total film to be applied.

Safety requirements (with regard to the lathe), made it necessary to spray the tube in two sections each about 30 - 40 D. One section was masked while the other was being sprayed. Our original intention was to get the tube sprayed over its whole length and then to supply a suitably adjusted electrical inputs to the two sections so as to get the same heat flux in both sections. The resistance measurements, to be discussed later, ruled out this possibility and only a length of 26.5 D was chosen as the heating length of the present work.

- (e) Now, the two adhesive strips were carefully removed from the tube so as to get two segments of sprayed silver. The width of a segment can be considered as about 174° arc at the outer surface (see Fig. (5.2)).
- (f) The initial testing of the tube for uniformity of the coating in the longitudinal direction was done at this stage. (described in Subsection (5.3.1)). The circumferential uniformity within a segment was not measured as there is no conveniently simple method of doing so.

(g) Four copper strips each of width 5 mm were clamped to the silver coated glass tube, two at each end of selected length, so that each segment of the coating made contact at its end with a given pair of strips (see Fig. (5.3)). This allowed the heating of the two silver segments independently.

5.2.2 Thermocouple Installation

The thermocouple installation was made with the aim of obtaining as much information as possible of the circumferential and longitudinal development of the temperature distribution of asymmetrically heated situations. Thermocouples were installed at five axial locations: 5 , 10 , 15 , 20 and 25 (internal) diameters from the start of the copper strip.

The thermocouple used in this installation were of 3 mil (0.003 in diameter) teflon covered Chromel-Constantan wire which is the most sensitive commonly used type suitable for low temperature measurements. The conversion factor as given by the manufacturers of these thermocouples is $0.060 \text{ mV}/^{\circ}\text{K}$. The wires were drawn from the same pair of spools to minimise any difference in quality between thermocouples.

At each axial location six thermocouples were installed, as shown in Fig. (5.4) spaced 36° apart. Since the silver coating was rather fragile, extreme care was taken in installing these thermocouples. The method adopted, was the following. First the thermocouples were placed on the adhesive side of a sellotape so that their beads just stuck out of the strip and the distance between the beads was equal to $\frac{\pi}{12} D_o$. Then another strip was placed on top of the former so that non-adhesive sides were at the outer sides. This strip was then carefully positioned on the glass tube without damaging the silver coating.

The cold junction was installed in front of the heating region and thus the thermocouples could be used in a differential manner. The potentiometer used had an accuracy of 0.02 mV and the thermocouple readings were in the range 0 - 1.0 mV . The thermocouple circuit is shown in Fig. (5.5).

5.2.3 Power Measurement

As the two segments were to be heated independently, the measurement of their power inputs were likewise made separately. The resistances of the segments were of the order of 1 ohm and, for the highest Reynolds number flow investigated ($Re = 90000$), the total power requirement was about 20 watts to get a bulk temperature rise of $1.0 - 1.5^{\circ}K$. Thus the experiment could be conducted at very low voltages and currents. The electrical circuit simply consisted of a stepdown variac and an ammeter in series with each segment. This is schematically shown in Fig (5.6). The ammeter used could be read to the nearest 0.05 amp. The voltage drop across each segment was measured using a digital voltmeter with an accuracy of $\pm 0.5\%$. With this system it was possible to adjust the variacs so as to obtain a predetermined total power input to a given segment.

5.2.4 Flow Measurement

The air supply to the experiment was from the laboratory compressed air unit. The regulator valve could be adjusted in order to get the required manometric height which represent the difference between total and static heads as read by a Pitot tube. The Pitot tube was mounted at the end of the glass tube so that it was located on the tube axis. After passing through the regulator air enters a long stainless steel tube of nominally the same diameter as the glass tube. The length of the stainless steel tube is about 80 diameters. The glass tube is rigidly attached to this stainless steel tube and there is 35 diameters of glass tube length preceding the heated section. Thus it can be conveniently assumed that the air flow is fully developed by the time it reaches the heating section. For the range 0 - 8 cm (0 - 3 in) an inclined water manometer which could be read to the nearest $1/8$ cm (0.05 in) was used. At Reynolds numbers of 40000 and 90000 a vertical

manometer which could be read to the nearest $1/4$ cm (0.1 in) was used. In calculating the total flow rate it was assumed that the velocity on the axis was 1.20 times the average velocity.

5.3 Preliminary Measurements

5.3.1 Verification of Uniformity of the Silver Coating

The verification of the uniformity of the coating is a necessary step prior to any other measurement. This was done before installing the thermocouples. After segmenting the silver coating the tube was allowed to dry overnight and then the total resistances of the two segments were 5.8 ohm and 6.0 ohm . After considerable heat curing this resistances decreased to a steady level of about 1.5 ohm each.

In order to evaluate the uniformity of the coating the voltage drop along the tube was measured at 2 cm intervals. Over a length of 45 diameters, the root mean square deviation was 9.6% . This unsatisfactorily large value was due to a small section in the tube (between $l = 28 D$ and $32 D$) which had large irregularities. It was decided at this point that the glass tube be heated only in the first $26\frac{1}{2} D$ length where the root mean square deviation was less than 5% . The resistances of the segments for a length of $26\frac{1}{2} D$ were,

(a) for top half, Resistance = 0.99 - 1.00 ohm

(b) for bottom half, Resistance = 0.91 - 0.92 ohm .

The discrepancy between the resistances in top and bottom segments gives some indication of the level of non-uniformity in the circumferential direction. Even though the resistances were different, since the voltage supply to each segment could be adjusted so as to get the required volt-ampere ($V \times I$) rate, the total heat production in each segment could be controlled as desired.

5.3.2 Uncertainties in Measurements

The largest uncertainty in this experiment concerns uniformity of the coating. The silver spraying was done in order to get best uniformity in the longitudinal direction. Since the tube was rotated at a higher circumferential speed as compared to the transverse speed of the spray gun it could be assumed that the circumferential uniformity was satisfactory as well. Initial measurements of resistance variation along the tube suggest that there could be variations upto 5% in longitudinal direction. This was considered satisfactory as GIESBRECHT [97] obtained considerable reproducibility in his experiment with similar variation in resistance of his tube. The circumferential variation of resistance could not however be exactly quantified. Ideally, one would expect a heat flux variation as shown in Fig. (5.7). In the region of the groove (where sellotape strip was removed), however, it is possible that the adhesion of the silver coating to the surface was weakened. Even though extreme care was taken while removing these tapes, it was found that there was minute damage to the paint. This would of course increase the local resistance and consequently the heat flux profile may look like that in Fig. (5.8). By heating both segments and observing the resultant circumferential temperature profile one could hope to quantify the modification to the circumferential heat-flux profile before studying the fully asymmetric situation.

There are some other uncertainties which can be considered to have only minor effect. They are

- (a) Possible inequality in the size of the two segments: This can come about due to the difficulty in laying out the adhesive tape strips along the length of the pipe. Although it is easy to lay one strip along the length, it is not easy to position the other exactly 180° apart from the first. The error associated with this is about $\pm 2^\circ$.

(b) The voltage drop across the contacts to the silver coating; Since the silver coating was fragile it was not advisable to press the prong of the voltmeter on the coating. Thus the voltage drop across the length of the tube was measured as that between one copper strip and the other. The voltage drop across the copper strip is very small and hence neglected. The copper strip fits the shape of the tube and further it was hand painted with the flexible silver at the contacts. It is possible however that due to the stress in clamping, the contact is not uniform. This may cause a distorted voltage drop pattern. Its effect however is confined to areas very close to the contact points.

5.4 Experimental Results

Only the different conditions for which the tests were carried out are mentioned here. The wall temperature obtained in these tests are presented along with the numerical predictions of the same.

Heating Condition: Two heating conditions were investigated. In the first the voltage applied to each segment was adjusted to give equal volt-ampere inputs to the segments. If the gap between the segments was negligibly small, in a uniformly coated tube, this would be equivalent to a uniform heat flux boundary condition. All measurements were repeated several times over a period of about two hours until the readings showed complete steadiness. The other boundary condition used was that where only the top segment was heated. This condition creates a strongly three-dimensional temperature field.

Reynolds Number: Tests were carried out at three different Reynolds numbers: 20000 , 40000 and 90000 . The air supply valve was manually adjusted several times during a test so as to counter any fluctuations in the supply system.

Temperature Range: The total power supplied to the tube was predetermined so as to get a total bulk temperature rise of only 1.0 - 1.5 °K over a length of $26\frac{1}{2}$ diameters of heating. The maximum wall temperature rise was in the range of 12°K . For this temperature difference the percentage variation of thermal conductivity, specific heat and density of air are 3.52 , 0.085 and 3.60 respectively. Thus the heat transfer situation under study could be satisfactorily assumed as a passive scalar transfer.

CHAPTER 6

PREDICTION OF TWO-DIMENSIONAL SCALAR TRANSPORT

6.1 Introduction

Turbulence models described in Chapter (2) are examined here by applying them in flow geometries where consistent experimental measurements exist. The numerical schemes employed for this purpose have been described in Chapter (3). As the scalar transport processes are heavily dependent on the hydrodynamics, a considerable number of explorations were made of flow field predictions. When comparing the predictive performance of models, as far as possible, a single aspect or effect of the models were chosen, so that it was possible to draw definite conclusions. As for the basic hydrodynamic turbulence model, the following models as in LAUNDER et al. [15] was chosen.

- (a) Pressure-velocity gradient correlation by the complete Launder et al. model (equations (2.11) and (2.14)) - denoted by R_{s1} ,
- (b) Turbulent diffusion of stress by the tensor invariant form, equation (2.6) - denoted by D_{s1} ,
- and (c) Near-wall effects of (a) by Launder et al. model, equation (2.22) - denoted by R_{sw1} .

When comparing the scalar transport models, the above hydrodynamic model is employed along with the following basic scalar transport model.

- (a) Pressure-scalar gradient correlation by linear destruction of flux (equation (2.48)) and redistribution of generation of flux (equation (2.58)) model - denoted by R_{c1} ,
- (b) Turbulent diffusion of scalar fluxes by gradient diffusion model (equation (2.45), see Table (2.2)) - denoted by D_{c2} ,
- and (c) Near-wall effects of pressure-scalar gradient correlation by equation (2.70) - denoted by R_{cw1} .

6.2 Prediction of Free Shear Flows

The aim here is to compare the performance of the pressure-strain and pressure-scalar gradient models with experimental data. The basic pressure strain models, (described in the previous section) is compared with the redistribution of production model (equation (2.19)) denoted by R_{s2} . In both models, the turbulent part (ϕ_{ij1}) is represented by the linear-return-to-isotropy model (equation (2.11)) with different coefficients (see Table (2.1)). For scalar transport, the performance of the quasi-isotropic model (equation (2.61) and (2.57) denoted by R_{c2}) is compared with the basic model described in the previous section. Models D_{s1} and D_{c2} were employed to simulate the diffusion of stresses and scalar fluxes respectively.

6.2.1 The Plane Jet

The plane jet in stagnant surroundings is considered first. RODI [61] has concluded that the plane jet measurements of ROBINS [65] and BRADBURY [72] display the best internal consistency and it is these data that were employed for comparison with predictions. Figures (6.1) and (6.2) show the measured and predicted mean velocity and shear stress profiles across the jet cross section. The agreement is quite satisfactory in the bulk of the cross section, but tends to be poor as the free stream is approached. The spreading rates obtained by the two models are 0.116 and 0.107 for models R_{s1} and R_{s2} respectively. The mean experimental value for the spreading rate quoted by Rodi is 0.11. The difference between the predicted maximum shear stresses can be directly attributed to the above difference in spreading rates. The predicted turbulence intensity profiles are given against the data of Bradbury in Fig. (6.3). RODI [61] has pointed out that the rather implausible result of $\overline{v^2} > \overline{u^2}$

at the centre of the jet is unique to Bradbury's data. The turbulence energy production rate (all of which enters via the $\overline{u^2}$ equation) has its maximum around 0.8 of the half width of the jet; the mechanism which makes any turbulent component very much larger away from this region is not clear. Certainly no linear effect could produce such behaviour. Over the whole of the jet cross-section, the predicted levels of $\overline{u^2}$ are about 15% larger than data, whereas the corresponding difference between predicted and measured levels in $\overline{w^2}$ is slightly smaller. Although this discrepancy is large, being a free shear layer they may be within the uncertainty of the measurements. The difference between $\overline{v^2}$ and $\overline{w^2}$ profiles obtained from the simple pressure-strain model R_{s2} is purely due to diffusion coefficient for $\overline{v^2}$ being about three times as large as that for $\overline{w^2}$. With a simple gradient diffusion model for stresses, on the other hand, model R_{s2} would predict identical profiles for $\overline{v^2}$ and $\overline{w^2}$. The turbulent intensities closer to the free stream indicate that the use of the same coefficient C_s in the diffusion model for both ϕ_{ij} models is inappropriate. It seems that the simple pressure-strain model requires a lower value for C_s than the other model. This aspect, which has not been pursued further in the present investigation, indicates that one can not identify with certainty between effects due to diffusion or to pressure-strain effects unless one has directly available measurements of the magnitudes of the processes themselves.

The scalar transport predictions of plane jets are shown in Fig. (6.4) to (6.7). The predicted mean temperature profiles seem to agree quite well with data of JENKINS and GOLDSCHMIDT [68] and those of VAN DER HEGGE ZIJNEN [67]. Note here that the same hydrodynamic model is employed with both scalar transport models R_{c1} and R_{c2} , thus any difference between their performance is due purely to differences in the scalar transport models. Model R_{c1} produces a better mean temperature profile

than model R_{c2} . The spreading rates of the temperature field from models R_{c1} and R_{c2} are 0,145 and 0,134 respectively, which are 25% and 15% higher than the spreading rate of the velocity field; experiments suggest an increase of about 25% in agreement with model R_{c1} . As there are no measurements available on cross-stream heat flux profiles, the predictions are compared with $\overline{vc}$ profiles obtained by applying a mean enthalpy balance to the measured temperature with the assumption of self similar profiles. This is obtained with the help of the expressions given in Table (4.3). The agreement is quite satisfactory in this comparison. The Figures (6.6) and (6.7) show the predictions of the ratio of the heat fluxes (streamwise to cross-stream) and turbulent Prandtl number of the plane jet. Over the bulk of the flow the streamwise flux is about 1.2 - 1.3 times larger than the cross-stream flux. At the plane of symmetry, the cross-stream heat flux drops to zero but the streamwise flux stays up thus giving a large $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$. The Prandtl numbers as predicted by the two models show a considerable difference. The profile from model R_{c1} can be considered satisfactory as the average level predicted by that model is about 0.70. The non-linear model R_{c2} produces too high Prandtl numbers near the centre of the jet. Although this effect could have been reduced by adjusting the coefficients of model R_{c2} , with non-linear terms it will always produce higher Prandtl numbers near the centre than over the other parts of the flow. Thus any adjustments in the coefficients will change the levels of Pr and $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ over larger regions of flow. It can be seen that if the effects of the non-linear terms in the model R_{c2} are to be small near the symmetry axis (which is necessary to produce a more plausible variation in turbulent Prandtl number) then the normal stress field should be closer to isotropy than predicted by present hydrodynamic models. This possibility is, however, not supported by the experimental data shown in Fig. (6.3).

6.2.2 The Plane Wake

In Figures (6.8) to (6.10) the flow predictions of a far plane wake are compared with the measurements of TOWNSEND [62] and FABRIS [81]. The calculations were carried out until the velocity deficit was only about 5% of the main stream velocity, for which level self similarity is achieved with certainty. In the selected data positions of Townsend and Fabris, the velocity defects are 3.1% and 5.7% respectively. The agreement of predictions with models R_{s1} and R_{s2} with above data are not satisfactory; the level of maximum shear stress being 22% lower than the experimental value. This in turn is seen in the predicted spreading parameter S being 0.074 and 0.071 with the models R_{s1} and R_{s2} respectively, as compared to the average level of 0.098 reported by RODI [61]. The predicted spread of the half width of the layer is lower than in data. This is responsible for rather poor agreement of all components of turbulence kinetic energy in regions near the free stream. At the plane of symmetry, Townsends $\frac{\overline{u^2}}{U_0^2}$ is only 0.072, whereas that from prediction, by both models R_{s1} and R_{s2} , is about 0.095. It must be noted however that this predicted level of $\overline{u^2}$ agrees well with data of ALEXOPOULOS and KEFFER [99] and that of UBEROI and FREYMUTH [100]. The level of $\overline{w^2}$ predicted by model R_{s1} agrees well with data over the inner half of the layer, whereas in the outer half, along with other components this too falls far too rapidly to the free stream levels. As in Bradbury's plane jet data, Townsend's measurements of $\overline{v^2}$ show a maximum at the plane of symmetry; a feature not obvious from the stress equations.

Considering the large discrepancy between predicted and measured spreading rates of the flow field, it is unwise to expect to obtain correct behaviour in the predicted scalar fields; relative magnitudes can however be compared. The predicted temperature field given in Fig. (6.11) show considerable departure from data, especially for the linear model R_{c1} .

The measured cross-stream heat fluxes from Townsends experiment are consistent with his self similar mean profiles. The measured levels of $\overline{vc}$ of Fabris, however, are about 45% lower than what is implied by self similar analysis of his mean velocity and mean temperature profiles. Present predictions - with a rather low spreading parameter - agrees well with data of Fabris. The predicted ratio of half-widths of the temperature and velocity field are 1.17 and 1.09 for the linear (R_{c1}) and non-linear (R_{c2}) models respectively. Corresponding ratio from the experiments are in the range of 1.20 to 1.30 . The predicted levels of ratio of streamwise to cross-stream heat fluxes and of turbulent Prandtl number are quite similar to those obtained from the plane jet predictions. Again, the implausible Prandtl number levels near the central plane obtained from the non-linear model R_{c2} can be attributed to the anisotropy of stresses in that region. In Figures (6.15) and (6.16) the prediction of streamwise heat flux and the temperature fluctuation are compared with the experimental data of FABRIS [81]. Although in the view of discrepancy between measured C and $\overline{vc}$, even the streamwise heat flux is to be expected too low, the ratio $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ from the experiment is suitable for comparison. The predicted level of 1.30 to 1.40 in the bulk of the layer compares well with the range 1.40 to 1.50 obtained by measurements of Fabris.

6.2.3. The Plane Mixing Layer

First attention is given to the prediction of a mixing layer between two moving streams. Fig. (6.17) shows the predictions by models R_{s1} and R_{s2} compared with the data of WATT [73]. The ratio of the velocities at the two streams is 0.5 . The prediction of mean velocity profile by models R_{s1} and R_{s2} are indistinguishable and are in quite good agreement with the measured profile. The spreading rates of the mixing layer predicted by the models R_{s1} and R_{s2} are 0.0486 and 0.0462 respectively and they can

be considered satisfactorily close to Watt's reported spreading rate of 0.045 . The predicted level of shear stress is about 15% too high when compared with the measured level; however, the shear stress calculated from Watt's mean velocity profile is much closer to the present predicted levels, the maximum of $\frac{\overline{uv}}{U_0^2}$ being about 0.105 . Over the bulk of the layer, the predicted levels of turbulence intensity profiles, shown in Fig. (6.19), are in good agreement with measurements. At the centre of the layer, the relative levels of the turbulent components predicted by model R_{s1} are in excellent agreement with data, whereas, model R_{s2} predicted the $\overline{u^2}$ component (r.m.s. value) about 5% too high; moreover, the difference between $\overline{w^2}$ and $\overline{v^2}$ at the centre of the layer is reduced by half. (As remarked above, any difference between $\overline{w^2}$ and $\overline{v^2}$ in predictions by model R_{s2} is purely due to the non-isotropic diffusion model D_{s1} .) Near the free streams the agreement of the predictions with measurements deteriorates, the prediction being consistently lower than the measurement.

The mean temperature profiles predicted from models R_{c1} and R_{c2} are again identical and they compare satisfactorily with the measurements of Watt. The predicted spreading rates of the temperature layer are 0.0547 and 0.0554 for models R_{c1} and R_{c2} respectively and they compare well with the Watt's measured level of 0.051 . Certainly the ratios of spreading rates of temperature and velocity layers are in good agreement. Watt's measurements of cross-stream heat flux are in serious error by a factor of four. Thus the $\overline{vc}$ profiles as deduced from measured mean velocity and temperature fields under self similar conditions are employed for comparison with present predictions. Except near the faster moving edge the agreement is within 10%; a large fraction of this discrepancy is due to the disagreement in spreading rate of the velocity mixing layer. There is a considerable difference between the predicted and calculated heat flux profiles near the faster moving edge. This aspect is similar to the

behaviour noticed in predicting the plane wake, Figures (6.22) and (6.23) show the predicted $\frac{\overline{u^2}}{\overline{v^2}}$ and the turbulent Prandtl number variation across the layer. The two models show a similar overall variation even though the levels of $\frac{\overline{u^2}}{\overline{v^2}}$ are different in the two cases.

Considered next is a mixing layer formed in the initial region of a jet. RODI [61] recommended data of BRADSHAW et al. [75] as the most consistent with respect to compliance with self similar velocity - shear stress relation. The predicted variations of the mean velocity profile obtained with models, R_{s1} and R_{s2} are identical except at the faster moving edge. The predicted profiles are in good agreement with data except in that region. The predicted spreading rates are 0.158 and 0.152 respectively, for models R_{s1} and R_{s2} . As there is considerable scatter in the spreading rates among experimental data these predicted spreading rates can probably be considered satisfactory in comparison with Bradshaw's value of 0.165. The predicted shear stress profiles agree well with measurements of Bradshaw et al.. It should be noted however, that the discrepancy of about 10% between calculated and measured levels of shear stress (see [61]) in Bradshaw's data is hidden in the present predictions by a similar discrepancy in the rate of spread.

Shown in Fig. (6.26) is the predicted variation of mean temperature across the layer compared with the data of SUNYACH and MATHIEU [74]. The predictions from models R_{c1} and R_{c2} are not distinguishable. Again the largest discrepancy between predictions and measurements lies in the faster moving edge. The spreading rates of the temperature layer predicted by models R_{c1} and R_{c2} are 0.198 and 0.201 respectively. The spreading rate of the velocity field as measured by Sunyach and Mathieu is 0.18 which is the highest value reported in Rodi's review, thus this reported spreading rate of 0.249 for temperature field can likewise be considered too high. Predicted profiles of cross-stream heat flux are shown in Fig. (6.27). The maximum

level of $\frac{\overline{vc}}{U_o C_o}$ implied by Sunyach and Mathieu's mean data is about 60% higher than the predicted levels. The average level in the ratios of spreading rates between temperature and velocity mixing layers are 1.37 and 1.28 from measurements and predictions respectively. The $\frac{\overline{uc}}{\overline{vc}}$ and σ_t profiles predicted by models R_{c1} and R_{c2} are shown in Figures (6.28) and (6.29). They are quite similar to those obtained for the case of mixing between two moving streams.

6.2.4 Conclusions

The hydrodynamic predictions of the three free shear flows discussed above show on average satisfactory agreement with corresponding experimental data. Predictions with both pressure-strain models R_{s1} and R_{s2} show similar behaviour, model R_{s2} gives slightly smaller spreading rates than model R_{s1} . In predictions reported in LAUNDER et al [15], the simple pressure-strain model with $C_{s1} = 1.5$ was employed along with the gradient diffusion model. Present predictions by the simple model with $C_{s1} = 1.7$ along with the tensor invariant diffusion model D_{c1} , show on average, improvements over the above predictions of Launder et al.. As far as the measurements employed are concerned, the largest uncertainty lies in the normal stress levels at the planes of symmetry in the plane wake and the jet. Even though the data of Bradbury and Townsend show considerably larger values for the $\overline{v^2}$ component than other components, measurements by PATEL [101] and by CHEVRAY and KOVASZNAY [102] do not show such effect. Thus no attempt had been made to improve the predictions in this regard. As far as the numerical predictions are concerned, the largest discrepancy was seen near the fast moving boundaries in plane wake and in mixing layers. Consistently the predictions show more abrupt approach to free stream conditions than do the measurements. The numerical predictions were thoroughly checked to make sure that this behaviour is not a numerical shortcoming.

The linear and non-linear models (R_{c1} and R_{c2}) for the pressure-scalar gradient correlation show similar mean temperature predictions. The prediction of large turbulent Prandtl numbers near the symmetry plane by the non-linear model R_{c2} however, is quite unacceptable. As seen before, model R_{c2} can be expected to give a more acceptable Pr_t profile only if applied with a hydrodynamic model which predicts near isotropy in regions closer to the planes of symmetry. For this reason this model is not considered for further investigation. The scalar field predictions to be reported in the remainder of the Thesis will thus be made only with model R_{c1} .

6.3 Flat Plate Boundary Layer

The flat plate boundary layer in a zero pressure gradient with no mass transfer through the wall provides excellent conditions for the verification of the models for near-wall effect terms of the pressure-velocity gradient correlation. Similarly the models for the pressure-scalar gradient correlation can be verified with flat plate boundary layer heat and mass transfer data. Here the near-wall models discussed in Chapter (2) are employed with corresponding ϕ_{ij} models as follows:

- (a) The LAUNDER et al. [15] near-wall model given in equation (2.22) is employed with the complete pressure-strain model given in equation (2.14) and is denoted by R_{sw1} ,
- (b) The GIBSON-LAUDER [31] near-wall model given in equations (2.26) - (2.27) is employed along with the simpler version of ϕ_{ij} (equation (2.19)) and is denoted by R_{sw2} ,
- (c) The isotropic near-wall model for ϕ_{ic} given in equation (2.70) is employed along with the linear model R_{c1} (equations (2.48) and (2.58)) and is denoted by R_{cw1} ,
- (d) The Gibson-Lauder model for near-wall effects of ϕ_{ic} (equations (2.71) and (2.72)) is employed along with model R_{c1} and is denoted by R_{cw2} .

Model R_{cw1} is employed in conjunction with model R_{sw1} while model R_{cw2} is used along with R_{sw2} .

6.3.1 Hydrodynamic Predictions

As data of KLEBANOFF [32] relate to turbulence measurements in zero-pressure gradient, smooth flat plate boundary layer, they are very suitable for the verification of

- (a) different models for wall effects on the pressure-strain correlation
- and (b) different decay functions (controlling how fast wall effects disappear at distances away from the wall).

The predictions with near-wall effect models R_{sw1} and R_{sw2} are compared with Klebanoff's data in Figures (6.30) to (6.32). For this test, the near-wall effect function of $f \propto \frac{k^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$ and the tensor invariant form (equation (2.6)) of the stress diffusion model were employed. The distance from the wall to the point where $U = 0.995U_E$, where U_E is the free stream velocity, was taken as the boundary layer thickness δ . The mean velocity profiles predicted by models R_{sw1} and R_{sw2} are in moderately good agreement with data. The predicted friction coefficients by models R_{sw1} and R_{sw2} are larger by 6.0% and 2.7% respectively than the value implied by the power law formula given by HINZE [26], p.638. The predicted shear stress profiles are however indistinguishable from each other with these two models. Fig. (6.32) show the predicted normal stress profiles against data of Klebanoff. Model R_{sw1} shows considerably better agreement with data than model R_{sw2} . Model R_{sw1} correctly predicts the increasing trends in magnitudes of $\overline{u^2}$ and $\overline{w^2}$ components, as the wall is approached. The difference between the models in predicting the $\overline{u^2}$ component is appreciable where that of $\overline{w^2}$ components is purely due to different boundary conditions applied in order to be consistent with the extents of redistribution expected by near-wall-effect models.

The next test to be reported here is the effect of the near-wall-effect function on the predictions of turbulence intensities. Two functions

were tested, $f \propto \frac{k^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$ and $f \propto \frac{|\overline{uv}|^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$. The proportionality constants were chosen so that, with boundary values of near-wall stress levels, f takes a value of unity. The models R_{sw1} and D_{s1} were employed along with above functions and predicted behaviour was compared. The mean velocity profile and the shear stress profile were identical in the two cases; the normal-stress profile shown in Fig. (6.33), however, were considerably affected. As the shear stress is practically constant in the near-wall region, with the dissipation rate being inversely proportional to the distance from the wall, function $f \propto \frac{|\overline{uv}|^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$ is rather flat over a considerable distance away from the wall. On the other hand the turbulent kinetic energy is roughly proportional to y^{-n} where n is about 0.20 - 0.25 and therefore $f \propto \frac{k^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$ decreases considerably with distance from wall. Comparison between turbulence intensities predicted by these two functions with Klebanoff's data indicate that $f \propto \frac{k^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$ represents the correct decay in effects of ϕ_{ijw} terms whereas $f \propto \frac{|\overline{uv}|^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$ provides excessive levels of $\overline{u^2}$ due to near-wall actions.

Fig. (6.34) shows the effects of turbulent diffusion models D_{s1} , the tensor invariant form and D_{s2} , the gradient diffusion model. The coefficient C_s in these two models was given values 0.11 and 0.20 respectively. Model R_{sw2} was used here as the model for ϕ_{ij} . The mean velocity and shear stress profiles are again identical for the two models. The gradient diffusion model produces excessive diffusion in stress components $\overline{u^2}$ and $\overline{w^2}$ and has negligible effect on the $\overline{v^2}$ component. Fig. (6.35) shows a rather interesting effect that was seen in the shear correlation coefficient. In Klebanoff's reported data, the correlation coefficient is constant at 0.5 upto 80% of the boundary layer thickness and then drops linearly to zero at 1.2δ . The predicted shear correlation coefficient with model D_{s2} shows a similar behaviour but with sudden drop to zero at 1.1δ , whereas model D_{s1} produces an implausible increase. This however can not be considered a serious defect as the shear stress in this region is anyway rather small.

6.3.2 Scalar Transport Predictions

The investigation of a developing thermal boundary layer within a thick velocity boundary layer provides an interesting problem for prediction methods. ANTONIA et al. [90] have reported detailed temperature field measurements of such a flow (the velocity field measurements were not reported in detail). The momentum thickness Reynolds number at the upstream edge of the heated section was about 3070. The velocity and thermal boundary layer thickness δ and δ_c were defined as the distances to the wall from positions $U = 0.995U_E$ and $(C - C_\infty) = 0.01 (C_w - C_\infty)$ respectively. Two major discrepancies were reported in their measurements: the skin friction coefficients obtained from the growth rate of the momentum thickness were about 25% larger than those obtained from measured velocity profiles (using a "Clauser" chart), and the wall heat flux implied by the mean enthalpy integral equation is about 20% higher than the measured levels. These discrepancies suggest a slight convergence of their streamlines, possibly due to the growth of boundary layers on the side walls.

The predictions by models R_{cw1} and R_{cw2} of this flow are shown in Figures (6.36) to (6.40). The agreement of the predictions with the mean temperature data as shown in Fig. (6.36) is rather poor. The discrepancies can be explained by looking more closely at the numerical treatment of the near wall region. Boundary conditions applied to the mean temperature and cross-stream heat flux equations are that of a given wall flux which is exactly known. There are no other relations feeding the numerical scheme[†]. Thus the discrepancy seen in Fig. (6.36) is due to

- (a) the logarithmic law of the wall for temperature used in evaluating wall temperature,

---

[†] For the case of known temperature wall boundary however, some auxiliary relation (generally the logarithmic law for temperature) will have to be used for the estimation of wall flux.

and (b) the turbulence model coefficients which expect a near-wall Prandtl number of about 0.9 .

The logarithmic law of the wall used in evaluation the wall temperature is

$$C^+ = \frac{1}{\kappa_c} \ln y^+ E_c \quad (6.1)$$

where κ_c and E_c were taken as 0.46 and 4.5 respectively, which were obtained from a consensus of near-wall data (see KARDAR and YAGLOM [8]). The value of 0.46 for κ_c is consistent with a Prandtl number of 0.9 , whereas the coefficient E_c which represent the resistance by viscous sublayer to heat transfer, was given a value which is consistent with values quoted by JAYATILLEKE [103] in his extensive review of near-wall data (a slightly different nomenclature was used in [103]).

The discrepancy between predicted and measured levels of Prandtl number can be isolated by looking at the temperature profiles in defect coordinates. This is done in Fig. (6.37). The near-wall Prandtl numbers implied by data at all experimental stations are in the range 1.0 - 1.3 , whereas predictions show a value of about 0.85 . The reason for rather high levels of Prandtl number obtained by Antonia et al. is not clear. The values of σ_t obtained by other workers who examined the problem of developing thermal layer however fall much closer to present predictions. For example, the constant-wall-temperature experiments of FULACHIER [104] and that of BLOM [86] and constant wall flux experiments of BRADSHAW and FERRISS [105] all indicate values of $\sigma_t = 0.90 - 0.92$ in the near-wall regions.

The data on Fig. (6.36) indicate that the additive constant E_c should in fact be a function of the streamwise distance, whose asymptotic value seems to have reached by $\frac{X}{\delta_o}$ of 11.4 . The review paper by JAYATILLEKE [103] however does not document such an effect. As there are no such correlations, in the present predictions, E_c was kept at a constant value which is consistent with reviews by [8] and [103].

The variation of Prandtl number across the thermal layer as calculated by ANTONIA et al. [90] has a large scatter and does not seem to approach a regular pattern at downstream locations. Self preserving analysis however suggests an asymptotic behaviour for all variations. This data is another piece of evidence on the unreliability of measurements of Prandtl number. The predicted Prandtl numbers, shown in Fig. (6.38) against data of Antonia et al., indicate a near-wall value of about 0.9 decreasing smoothly away from the wall. The agreement of predicted Prandtl number variation with the data of FULACHIER [104] and BLOM [86] in the inner 40% of the thermal boundary layer is satisfactory. In the outer regions of the layer, where estimation of mean gradients in data are less reliable, the variations in σ_t in data of

- ANTONIA et al. [90] do not show a clear pattern,
- FULACHIER [104] show an increase,
- BLOM [86], by turbulence measurements, show a decrease,
- BLOM [86], by mean profiles, show an increase[†],
- JOHNSON [89] show a decrease.

The present predictions show a decrease.

Antonia et al. report that the thermal layer thickness at the last measuring station (i.e. at $\frac{X}{\delta_0} = 42.9$) was 66% of the velocity boundary layer thickness at the same point. The corresponding predicted spreads of the thermal layers are 81% and 82% from models R_{cw1} and R_{cw2} respectively. This high rate of spread indicated by the predictions is consistent with difference between measured and predicted levels of Prandtl numbers.

[†] The Prandtl number variation across the boundary layer given by Blom in his Thesis [10] does not agree with his earlier reported version [86]. In [10], the Prandtl number profile across the layer calculated by turbulent variables as well as by mean profiles show a decrease away from a maximum of about 0.90 at $y^+ \approx 50$.

Predicted turbulent heat flux and temperature fluctuation profiles are compared with data in Figures (6.39) to (6.41). The cross-stream heat flux profiles show satisfactory agreement with measurements at all but first two measuring stations. Predicted streamwise heat flux profiles shown against data in Fig. (6.40) indicate that the boundary value of $\overline{uc}$ in the prediction is too low. The near-wall effect model R_{cw1} does not seem to give sufficient level of $\overline{uc}$. Model R_{cw2} , except very near to the wall, shows the correct decrease in $\overline{uc}$ away from the wall. The temperature fluctuation predictions shown in Fig. (6.41) suggest insufficient diffusion of c^2 in the outer parts of the layer. A value of 0.13 used for the gradient diffusion coefficient C_g is however not an optimised value. Predictions of the far plane wake also indicated an insufficient diffusion indicating that a higher level of C_g , to about 0.18 - 0.20, would probably produce an overall improvement.

6.4 Pipe Flow

6.4.1 Hydrodynamic Predictions

The mean and turbulence measurements by LAUFER [34] in smooth-walled pipes are a complete set of data suitable for comparison, Laufer made measurements at two Reynolds numbers $Re = 50000$ and $Re = 500000$, and found considerable Reynolds number dependence in mean and turbulence profiles. More recently LAWN [19] made measurements of turbulence quantities essentially for the same flow with more advanced electronics. He concluded that for the range of Reynolds numbers $36000 - 250000$, the turbulence intensities suitably non-dimensionalised with the friction velocity are independent of Reynolds number. Shown in Fig. (6.42) are the fully developed velocity profiles obtained from predictions with models R_{sw1} and R_{sw2} . They agree reasonably well with data of Laufer. The shear stress variation across the pipe radius as shown in Fig. (6.43) is mainly a check on the numerical procedure and on the fully developed character of the predictions. As shown here, the viscous effects are significant only very close to the wall at this high Reynolds number and for all other positions the shear stress profile is essentially linear.

In Fig. (6.44) the turbulence intensity profiles predicted from models R_{sw1} and R_{sw2} are compared with data of Laufer. The agreement of the predictions with data are not very satisfactory; it is noted however that the streamwise component of stress measured by Lawn is in good agreement with predictions. The other components of normal stress obtained by Lawn lie rather close to Laufer's data for $Re = 500000$. While, as remarked above Laufer's data indicate turbulence intensities which are highly dependent on Reynolds number influence. In the near-wall region, even though the predicted $\overline{u^2}$ and $\overline{w^2}$ are within the scatter, the $\overline{v^2}$ component seems to be too low. As a boundary condition the level of $\overline{v^2}$ at the grid point closest to the wall is indirectly imposed as equal in magnitude to the local shear stress. Laufer's data for $Re = 500000$ however imply a 20% larger level for $\overline{v^2}$ in

this region, a behaviour inconsistent with most other near-wall data (e.g. KLEBANOFF [32]).

Near the axis of the pipe the components $\overline{v^2}$ and $\overline{w^2}$ are predicted too low. Higher levels for these two components can be obtained by increasing the diffusion coefficient C_s , which however will increase the near axis levels of $\overline{u^2}$ as well, thus worsening the agreement of this component with experiment. The turbulent diffusion models D_{s1} and D_{s2} are compared in Fig. (6.45). Model D_{s2} , with a coefficient of $C'_s = 0.20$, seems to have rather too high diffusion rate. When C'_s was reduced to 0.15 model D_{s2} provides more acceptable stress levels near the axis; however no overall improvement over model D_{s1} was seen.

6.4.2 Scalar Transport Predictions

The predictions in the models R_{cw1} and R_{cw2} for the case of fully-developed temperature fields in pipes are shown in Figures (6.46) to (6.49). The predicted behaviour is compared with data of BREMHORST and BULLOCK [92] for a Reynolds number of 34200. Model R_{cw1} predicts a flatter mean temperature profile than R_{cw2} ; the agreement with data is satisfactory. The radial heat flux profiles given by the two models are identical. The streamwise heat flux profile shown in Fig. (6.48) is in excellent agreement with data of [92]. Considering the slight scatter in the experimental values it is not possible to choose which one of the near-wall models is more acceptable. The turbulent Prandtl number profile shown in Fig. (6.49) is that obtained for fully developed pipe flow.

Shown in Fig. (6.50) is the prediction of concentration profiles downstream of a small mass transfer region in the pipe wall, a configuration studied experimentally by QUARMBY and ANAND [94]. The first set of experimental data is given for the position where the porous region ends. There the agreement of the predicted profiles with data is quite satisfactory.

Under adiabatic wall conditions, the concentration profile will develop towards the asymptotic state of constant concentration across the cross-section. The prediction of this development is only in moderately satisfactory agreement with data.

At this point it is useful to look back at the modelling ideas and assumptions employed in the scalar flux model. In modelling the pressure-scalar gradient term in the scalar flux equation it was assumed that the time scales of hydrodynamic and thermal turbulence fields, i.e. $\frac{k}{\epsilon}$ and $\frac{c^2}{2\epsilon_c}$ respectively, are proportional. This assumption is likely to be satisfactory when

- (i) mean velocity and mean scalar equations are nearly similar
i.e. having similar boundary conditions etc.,
- (ii) the different contributing turbulence processes to the maintenance of the turbulent kinetic energy and the scalar fluctuations have the same relative magnitude, i.e. at any given region of flow,

$$\frac{P}{\epsilon} \approx \frac{P_c}{\epsilon_c} .$$

In situations where these conditions are not satisfied, the time scales $\frac{k}{\epsilon}$ and $\frac{c^2}{2\epsilon_c}$ can not be expected to be proportional; then the use of one scale will not be sufficient to describe a process where both time scales are influential. One of the limitations of the present model is that it assumes proportionality of velocity and scalar time scales and we may there expect anomalies to show up if the above conditions are not satisfied. The QUARMBY and ANAND [94] experiment is one situation where the boundary conditions for mean velocity and mean scalar are quite dissimilar. The mean velocity field is characterised by large gradients near the wall (i.e. non-zero wall friction) while the mean concentration profile downstream of the porous region has zero gradient at the (impermeable) wall. Thus while the

hydrodynamic turbulence field is in local equilibrium, (i.e. $\frac{P}{\epsilon} \rightarrow 1.0$), in the near-wall regions, the concentration fluctuation field is one of decaying strength; the production of $\overline{c^2}$ being nearly zero in regions close to the wall, i.e. $\frac{P_c}{\epsilon_c} \rightarrow 0$. With less production, in the near-wall region, $\overline{c^2}$ is likely to decrease faster than ϵ_c . Thus the effect of the time scale $\frac{\overline{c^2}}{2\epsilon_c}$ on the characteristic time scale (previously expressed as proportional to $\frac{k}{\epsilon}$) is to decrease its magnitude. If this process was to be accounted for, in an ad-hoc manner, within the framework of the present model, one would need to increase the coefficient C_{c1} near the wall, thus decreasing the effective thermal conductivity and raising the Prandtl number. This is certainly the direction of change needed to procure agreement with the measurements. In fact in the theoretical work of QUARMBY and ANAND [94] it was assumed that the turbulent Schmidt number was unity, compared with values much less than unity obtained in present predictions (see Fig. (6.51)) throughout the flow, and satisfactorily predicted the development of the concentration field. Due to above mentioned dissimilarity between velocity and scalar fields some assumptions made in modelling turbulent diffusion of scalar fluxes too become less relevant. Their implications however are not very clear (see Appendix (B)).

6.4.3 Conclusions

The prediction of flat plate boundary layer data of KLEBANOFF [32] suggests that model R_{sw1} is superior to model R_{sw2} and that the near-wall effect function $f \propto \frac{k^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$ is more suitable than the function $f \propto \frac{\overline{uv}^{3/2}}{\epsilon y}$. The models for near-wall effect of pressure-scalar gradient correlation do not show any large differences in their predictions. Therefore model R_{cw1} which parallel the near-wall model R_{sw1} is chosen for further work. The

tensor invariant diffusion model D_{s1} shows superiority over the model D_{s2} in pipe flow predictions. Therefore it is the model D_{s1} that is employed in further applications. Models D_{c1} and D_{c2} could not be distinguished when predicting Quarmby and Anand's flow. The model D_{c2} is thus chosen for further applications.

CHAPTER 7PREDICTION OF THREE-DIMENSIONALSCALAR TRANSPORT7.1 Introduction

Prediction of three-dimensional scalar transport provides a searching test for the turbulence model chosen in the previous chapter. For the first time all components of scalar fluxes become influential in the predictions here. The main feature that is under test here is the relative magnitude of the tangential scalar diffusivity with respect to the radial one. Ad-hoc assumptions, made by previous workers, on the ratio of tangential to radial scalar diffusivity, $\Gamma_{\theta}^C / \Gamma_r^C$, are briefly,

- (a) REYNOLDS' [106] assumption of unity throughout the flow,
- (b) SPARROW and LIN's [107] assumption of a diffusivity ratio varying with radial position (for flow in pipes),
- (c) QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] assumption of an isotropic diffusivity in predicting concentration profiles behind a short mass transfer section in a pipe,
- and (d) Consideration made by BERGELES et al. [108] where diffusivity ratio was taken as equal to the ratio of transverse to cross-stream normal stress levels.

Out of these assumptions it is the last one (Bergeles et al.), that is closer to generality. This relation is the form to which the present model reduces when convective and diffusive transport effects and near-wall effects are neglected. In the present investigation, where transport equations for the turbulent fluxes are being solved, the diffusivities are an outcome of the calculation rather than an input. It will be seen later, that the ratio of diffusivities in the tangential to radial directions is not a well-behaved two-dimensional function as assumed by previous workers,

but a complex three-dimensional function strongly dependent on the boundary conditions.

Section (7.2) reports preliminary testing of the three-dimensional calculation procedure. The aim here was to ensure that,

- (a) there were no asymmetries induced by the three-dimensional procedure, (caused by the chosen sweep direction, etc.)
- (b) the mean scalar was conserved,
- and (c) the solutions were independent of the finite difference grid chosen.

In Section (7.3) predicted results of three-dimensional scalar transport situations are compared with experimental data.

They are the simulations of,

- (a) QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] experiment, where the three-dimensionality is rather weak,
- (b) BLACK and SPARROW's [13] experiment, where the three-dimensionality is moderate and persisting,
- and (c) Present experimental situation (see Chapter (5)), where the three-dimensionality is strong and persisting.

Section (7.4) concludes the chapter by summarising the inferences made on the three-dimensional calculations.

7.2 Verification of the Three-Dimensional Solution Procedure

The $(\theta-r-z)$ numerical procedure described in Chapter (3) was utilised previously in Chapter (6) in predicting two-dimensional scalar transport situation. There the calculations were confined to a single $(\theta-z)$ plane. All three-dimensional scalar transport situations considered in this Thesis had two-dimensional fully developed flow fields. Thus the flow field calculations were performed on two-dimensional basis and the results were transferred to the three-dimensional procedure and then made to spread over all $(\theta-z)$ planes. The three-dimensional scalar field was then calculated with a frozen hydrodynamic field. The numerical solutions were checked to ensure that they correctly represented the solutions of the finite difference transport equations.

7.2.1 Check for Numerically Induced Asymmetry in Scalar Field

As the hydrodynamic field was obtained for a single θ -line in the cross-section of flow and then all other θ -lines were assigned, the flow field can be considered exactly symmetric. In the finite difference solution of the scalar transport equations however, even under symmetric boundary conditions, asymmetry can enter the calculations via

- (i) the method of imposing boundary conditions, which may make the finite difference equation of a variable Φ at any control volume remote from a boundary different from one adjacent to a boundary,
- and (ii) incorrect interpolation practices.

In order to check that the computer code is free from these deficiencies, a pseudo-three-dimensional calculation of heat transfer in a circumferentially uniformly heated pipe was made. The mean temperature field showed no asymmetry in the result. Also the diffusivity of scalar in the radial direction,

$$\Gamma_r^C = - \frac{\overline{u_r c}}{\frac{\partial C}{\partial r}} \quad (7.1)$$

showed prefect symmetry; the tangential diffusivity,

$$\Gamma_\theta^C = - \frac{\overline{u_\theta c}}{\frac{\partial C}{r \partial \theta}} \quad (7.2)$$

however, showed asymmetry, less than 3% at any point. It should be noted here that both $\overline{u_\theta c}$ and $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \theta}$ should be zero under these boundary conditions and thus above accuracy is remarkably good. This makes it possible to proceed in the knowledge that the asymmetries predicted with three-dimensional boundary conditions are in fact real.

7.2.2 Check for the Conservation of Mean Scalar

In making calculations of scalar transport inside tubes (without considering the conduction through the tube material), the wall scalar fluxes are given as the boundary condition to the fluid medium. Conservation of enthalpy or concentration is thus always achieved. The solution of problems where tube-wall conduction is present, however, presents an additional requirement. Since the axial conduction is to be neglected, here one must make sure that under steady state conditions, the heat generated (or supplied through the outer surface of the tube) in a given length of pipe wall is exactly equal to the net gain in heat by the fluid passing along the same length. Thus, for example, if the heat input per unit length is constant along the pipe, the bulk temperature rise should be exactly linear. As the general form of the finite difference equations for control volumes within the pipe wall (no turbulent transport) is strikingly different from those for control volumes in the fluid, these equations are not expected to converge to the solution at the same rate. In calculations where the grid was confined to the fluid inside the pipe it was found that at a given cross

section it was sufficient to make two sweeps each, in the radial and tangential directions, of the line-by-line solution of the finite difference equations. In cases where tube conduction was considered, however, a large number of sweeps was necessary to make sure that the fluid had absorbed all the heat that was supplied under steady conditions. During the first few steps of the calculation i.e. in the region close to start of the heating, the mean temperature equation was swept eight times, whereas, as the calculation proceeded downstream the number of sweeps were gradually reduced to four. This practice made sure that the total deficit in the bulk temperature was less than 0.1% of the exact value at all positions along the tube. As all turbulent variables were confined to the fluid, as before two sweeps were sufficient for their convergence.

7.2.3 Check for Grid Independence of the solution

It is necessary to make sure that the final solution of the equations was, for practical purposes, independent of the finite difference grid employed. Apart from limitations in grid placement in near-wall regions, as discussed in Section (3.6), one can generally expect to achieve higher accuracy by increasing the number of grid nodes across the region of interest, however, with added cost in computing. In two-dimensional calculations 22 grid nodes were used in the radial direction. Number of grid nodes necessary in the transverse direction were checked in three-dimensional calculations and 8 grid nodes were found to be sufficient to give mean field results with 1% of what is obtained with 14 grid nodes. As the computational time nearly doubled in the latter case it was felt that the accuracy with (8×22) grid was sufficient for the present investigation.

7.3 Comparison of Predicted Results with Experimental Data

Three sets of experiments in three-dimensional scalar transport (weak, moderate and strong in three-dimensionality) are compared here with the predicted behaviour.

The first situation considered is QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] measurements of concentration profiles downstream of a short mass transfer section. This work followed their two-dimensional explorations [93] made with the same apparatus and all details of the measurement technique and measuring stations etc. were given then. The presentation of the results in [59] however is rather misleading. The location $x^+ = 0$ in the first (axisymmetric) paper was at the downstream end of the mass transfer patch on the wall. In the second paper no statement as to the whereabouts of the origin was made. It was evident, however that it could not refer to a position in the porous patch since the reported near-wall radial gradients of concentration were low (indicating an impermeable wall). The experimenter reported that the stations were the same as for the axisymmetric tests however. It was eventually discovered that by interpreting $x^+ = 0$ as corresponding to the next position downstream the values of x^+ reported in the two studies were indeed the same (see Table (7.1)).

Present Notation $x^+ = \frac{x}{D}$	Notation in QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] Two-Dimensional Experiment, $x^+ = \frac{x}{R}$	Notation in QUARMBY and ANAND's [93] Three-Dimensional Experiment, $x^+ = \frac{x}{R}$
0	(Start of Porous Region)	
1.493	0	(End of Porous Region)
3.558	4.13	0
8.208	13.43	-
12.858	22.73	18.60
19.058	35.13	31.00
29.388	55.79	51.66

Table 7.1 Measuring Stations for Quarmby and Anand's Experiments

Now the predicted concentration profiles are compared with data of [59]. Shown in Fig. (7.1) is the variation of concentration at position (a) and (b) (which are the maximum and minimum of concentrations close to the wall). The agreement between the predicted variation and experimental data is poor. Some useful inferences can however be drawn.

- (i) Data at $\frac{X}{D} = 3.558$ indicate that the circumferential diffusion of matter is much larger than what is implied in the predictions (otherwise the concentration at (b) would not be so high).
- (ii) Data at locations further downstream indicate that circumferential diffusion is considerably smaller than that implied in the predictions (otherwise difference between the concentrations at (a) and (b) should decrease faster).
- (iii) The variation of the near-wall concentration (denoted as C_{2D}) profile in QUARMBY and ANAND's [93] two-dimensional investigation for the same Reynolds number ($Re = 20800$) is given in Fig. (7.1). Their three-dimensional mass source was obtained by blocking 50% of the porous ring used in two-dimensional investigation. Therefore, for the purpose of comparison, the intensity of mass source in three-dimensional case; q_{3D} , can be considered double as that for two-dimensional case; q_{2D} , i.e.

$$q_{3D} = 2 q_{2D}$$

In regions where diffusive effects are not predominant, concentration is likely to be proportional to the local mass flux. Therefore in regions close to the porous ring C_a should be roughly $2C_{2D}$. Quarmby and Anand's three-dimensional measurements, however, does not support this, indicating a clear discrepancy between their measurements. It is most likely that their three-dimensional measurements at $X^+ = 3.558$ are grossly in error.

The above discussion indicates that QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] data are neither consistent nor reliable. The fact remains however that the circumferential diffusion of matter as indicated by their data is substantially smaller than that implied in the present predictions. This fact in the light of other experimental data is discussed later.

It is worth mentioning here that QUARMBY and ANAND [59] came out with a set of assumptions which made it possible for them to predict their flow satisfactorily. They assumed that the diffusivities of mass and momentum are equal and that diffusivities of mass in radial and circumferential directions are equal. They assumed profiles for mean velocity and effective viscosity and then solved the concentration equation with the use of above assumptions. As initial conditions they took the experimental results at $\frac{X}{D} = 3.558$. Their predicted profiles at downstream locations were in excellent agreement with the experiment. It was seen earlier that data at $\frac{X}{D} = 3.558$ however are inconsistent with above assumptions. Thus with these assumptions, if their calculation started at $\frac{X}{D} = 0$, it would not have been possible for them to satisfactorily predict their data.

The next three-dimensional scalar transport situation to be considered is the investigation of BLACK and SPARROW [13] (see also BLACK [95]). Here the fluid is subjected to a circumferentially varying heat flux boundary condition obtained by resistance heating of a stainless steel tube of varying thickness. This boundary condition is applied to a length of 60 diameters of tube and temperature measurements were reported at the position $\frac{X}{D} = 52$. The ratio of maximum to minimum heat flux as implied by the variation in thickness is 2.92:1.00; however, due to circumferential conduction in the pipe wall this ratio of heat fluxes at the surface was reduced to a mere 1.31:1.00 at a Reynolds number of 7500. Thus their situation can be considered only moderately three-dimensional. Results were published for several Reynolds numbers in the range 7500 - 58000. For the present

investigation two Reynolds numbers were chosen, 40500 and 16800, for which complete sets of wall and flow measurements are available. (Wall data for $Re = 17200$ are taken as that would prevail for $Re = 16800$). The temperature and heat flux distribution at the inner wall (calculated by BLACK [95] by solving[†] the tube conduction problem) and the implied local Nusselt number variation were reported at $\frac{X}{D} = 52.0$. The predicted behaviour of

(a) the wall heat flux through the inner surface of the wall

(b) the wall temperature at the inner surface of wall

and (c) the implied local nusselt number calculated as

$$Nu \left(\omega, \frac{X}{D} \right) = \frac{q_i \left(\omega, \frac{X}{D} \right) \cdot \frac{D_i}{2}}{C_i \left(\omega, \frac{X}{D} \right) - C_b \left(\frac{X}{D} \right) K_w} \quad (7.3)$$

at the two Reynolds numbers, are compared with calculated profiles of BLACK and SPARROW [13] in Fig. (7.2) and (7.3). There are discrepancies of 4% and 2.6% between the predicted and measured circumferential heat flux variations at $Re = 40500$ and 16800 respectively. The predicted variation in the inner surface temperature however agree well with data. It should be noted that as Black did not apply an inner wall boundary condition in his calculations, but relied on two boundary conditions at the outer surface, the results of his calculation are liable to be rather sensitive to any errors in those boundary conditions. The maximum discrepancies in $Nu \left(\omega, \frac{X}{D} \right)$ are 6% and 2.8% for $Re = 40500$ and 16800 respectively. It is thus clear that a major portion of the difference between the calculated (by BLACK [95]) and predicted Nusselt numbers is due to difference in q -profiles which in their case is probably in error.

---

† The boundary conditions used in solving the conduction problem are,
 (i) Symmetry at $\omega = 0^\circ$ and $\omega = 180^\circ$
 (ii) Known temperature at the outer surface (measured values)
 and (iii) Assumed adiabatic outer surface, (heat generation rate calculated from measured enthalpy rise in air).

The non dimensional temperature contours drawn from the data of [95] and present predictions are compared in Figures (7.4) and (7.5). The agreement of the calculated and measured behaviour is very satisfactory. The radial diffusivity of heat implied in the predictions seems to be slightly too low whereas the circumferential diffusivity seems just correct shown in Fig. (7.6(a) and (b)). The measured temperature profiles and predictions at $\frac{X}{D} = 52$. The dashed lines indicate calculations made by Black using SPARROW and LIN's [107] analysis which assumed unity Prandtl number and isotropic diffusivity for heat. Since the agreement of the present predictions with measured levels is far better than with the isotropic assumption, it is possible to conclude that the notion of isotropy is not in accord with experiment.

The development of the local Nusselt number in the streamwise direction is shown in Figures (7.8) and (7.9). Five angular locations 45° apart in the tube were chosen for representation. The following inferences can be drawn

- (a) The thermal flow has not become fully developed even at $\frac{X}{D} = 60$,
- (b) The Nusselt numbers in the hotter areas seem to be close to fully developed levels than do the others.

The final three-dimensional scalar transport situation to be considered is that of the experiment described in Chapter (5). Here the three-dimensionality is obtained by heating only the top half of a glass tube. Due to conduction through glass, however, a small fraction of heat found its way through the non heated half. As the heat flux variation around the circumference was not measured one had to make an assumption as to how it varied in that direction. Preliminary calculation with a square-wave heat flux distribution in the θ -direction showed that the measured temperature variations were by no means compatible with this distribution. To find a more probable q -profile around the circumference measurements

were made with both sides heated. Figures (7.9) to (7.12) show the results of these explorations. The aim here was to obtain a $q_o + \omega$ profile which would give best agreement with wall temperature measurements made for the Reynolds numbers 20000 , 40000 and 90000 . The profile of $q_o + \omega$ chosen after considerable exploration is given in Fig. (7.9). The $q_i + \omega$ profiles refer to the heat flux variation entering the fluid. As expected the wall conduction effects are more dominant at lower Reynolds numbers.

It should be noted here that the temperature profiles shown in Figures (7.10) to (7.12) are obtained without modifications to the turbulence model. It was hoped that any shortcomings in the turbulence model would still be evident with the adjusted q_o profiles. On average predicted temperature profiles indicate slightly lower values than that obtained from measurements. This may be inferred as an effect of slightly high radial diffusivity in near wall regions.

Shown in Fig. (7.13) is the streamwise development of local Nusselt number (non dimensionalised with respect to the fully developed value for the axi-symmetric case) at three different angular positions. The wall fluxes corresponding to this case are those at Fig. (7.9(a)). The Nusselt number profile at $\omega = 45^\circ$ for which point $\frac{q_i}{q_o}$ is very nearly unity falls along with that obtained in the axi-symmetric calculation described in Subsection (7.2.1). The data of entrance region Nusselt number by MILLS [109] for the case of uniformly heated tube (long calming section entrance) are shown here for comparison. Considering the scatter in data the predicted variation for the axi-symmetric case can be considered satisfactory. The non dimensional temperature contours at axial locations $\frac{X}{D} = 5 , 10 , 15 , 20 , 25$ for the case of $Re \approx 40000$ are shown in Fig. (7.14). The slight asymmetry created by the weakly three-dimensional wall boundary condition is evident here.

The simulation of the situation where only one half of the tube was heated will be discussed next. The outer wall heat flux distribution $\frac{q_o}{q_o}$ profile is that given in Fig. (7.15(a)). Again measurements and predictions were made for three Reynolds numbers 20000 , 40000 and 90000 . The results of these tests are given in Figures (7.15) to (7.20), two figures for each Reynolds number. The first of these show the given q_o ϕ ω ψ profile along with predicted q_i ϕ ω ψ profile (q_i ϕ ω ψ varies in the axial direction as well, however this variation is quite small). Again, larger influence of conduction at lower Reynolds number is evident. The ratio of maximum to minimum heat fluxes (predicted, inner surface of tube) was 51.5 , 131 , 405 respectively for Reynolds numbers 20000 , 40000 and 90000 . (cf. Black and Sparrow experiment where this ratio was 1.67 for $Re = 40500$) The predicted temperature profiles around the circumference suitably non-dimensionalised with respect to the local bulk temperature show satisfactory agreement with measurements .The discrepancy at $\frac{X}{D} = 5$ could arise from two possibilities; one, as mentioned before, a high radial diffusivity in the prediction and the other a possibly low heat flux in the initial region of the experimented tube. The Nusselt number profiles shown here indicates negative values over most of the half where the heat flux is very low. (The local Nusselt number becomes negative when the wall temperature is smaller than the bulk temperature at that axial location.) Non-dimensional temperature contours at five axial locations for $Re = 40000$ are given in Fig. (7.21). The rather strong three-dimensionality obtained with present boundary conditions is clear. The temperature measurements in the fluid, had they been available, would have provided an invaluable test for the detailed turbulence modelling.

The ratio of diffusivities in tangential to radial direction for two representative cases are shown in Figures (7.22) and (7.23). The first refers to the Black and Sparrow's experimental situation at $Re = 40500$. Here the three-dimensionality of the scalar field being only moderate, the transport effects in the scalar flux equations are never dominant. This can be seen in these contours which indicate values for ratio of diffusivities in two directions quite close to ratio in respective normal stresses. Fig. (6.23) which relate to the case of $Re = 40000$ in the present experiment indicate that for strongly three-dimensional scalar situations the ratio of tangential to radial diffusivities of heat is indeed clearly three-dimensional.

7.4 Conclusions

It was shown that the measurements of concentrations behind a short mass transfer section in a pipe made by QUARMBY and ANAND [11] are not reliable. Their data however indicate that the near-wall diffusivities are predicted too high. As noted before, similar impression was given by predictions of their data for the two-dimensional problem as well. Other two situations which the predictions were attempting to simulate were for the cases where there were non-zero heat fluxes at all cross-sections of the flow. The three-dimensionality of the scalar field in these cases were much stronger and the predictions were in very good agreement with data certainly far superior to the calculations with the assumption of unity for the ratio between diffusivities in tangential and radial directions. It was shown at the end that this ratio is in fact a three-dimensional function very much dependent on boundary conditions and is far from well-behaved ad-hoc assumptions found in the literature.

CHAPTER 8CONCLUDING REMARKS8.1 Achievements and Limitations of Present Work

The main theoretical contribution of this Thesis has been in the area of extension and application of existing second-order closure models. The Reynolds stress closure models employed have previously being tested by others e.g. LAUNDER et al [15], in the same or similar experimental situations. In the present work, the main concern was to apply the scalar transport models in situations where reliable experimental data exist.

Models for two terms, the pressure-scalar gradient term and the turbulent diffusion term, that appear in the scalar flux equation were tested.

Attention was given to the modelling of influence of a rigid wall on the pressure-scalar gradient term, and a new model based on ideas exactly parallel to the modelling of near-wall effects of pressure-strain term is presented.

Two existing numerical schemes, Patankar-Spalding ($x-\Psi$) procedure and ($\theta-r-z$) procedure developed by Gosman and his colleagues, were extensively modified so as to facilitate the study of hydrodynamic and scalar transport problems with second-order closure models. New set of nodes, staggered with respect to those at which the mean flow variables were stored, were introduced for the calculation of turbulence variables. In the ($x-\Psi$) procedure, for two-dimensional boundary layer flows, turbulent variables were calculated in positions shifted half a grid node in the Ψ -direction. In ($\theta-r-z$) procedure the displacements of the turbulent grid were chosen with due regard to the appearance of these variables in the mean equations. This technique clearly stabilized the numerical calculations by keeping the correct degree of tightness between mean and turbulent equations. Within the framework of the above numerical schemes, this idea

of staggered grid for turbulent variables provided a much improved arrangement for the solution of conservation equations in the second-order closure models.

The final version of the (θ - r - z) computer code contains a facility that permit the solution of the mean temperature equation both within the flow and in the wall of the containing pipe. This enables one to take a correct account of the effects of conduction in the tube wall under circumferentially non-symmetric boundary conditions.

The present work has provided measurements in strongly three-dimensional heat transfer situations in a pipe. The technique of obtaining uniform heat flux boundaries in long pipes using metallic spray deposition has been extended to obtain segments of uniform heat flux regions. Experiments which were performed for three Reynolds numbers (20000 , 40000 and 90000) provide a useful set of data for the verification of turbulence model.

Several free as well as wall-affected two-dimensional flow and scalar transport situations were numerically predicted using the second-order turbulence models. The level of agreement obtained in the hydrodynamic predictions is similar to that obtained by previous workers. Even though the predictions of the plane jet and of the mixing layer between two moving streams is quite satisfactory, the plane wake and the mixing layer with $\frac{U_I}{U_E} \approx 0$ show too low spreading rates. The weak point there seems to lie in the modelling of the dissipation rate of turbulent kinetic energy. The level of agreement obtained in scalar transport predictions is satisfactory, however, it is always limited by the corresponding success in the hydrodynamic predictions. The present pressure-scalar gradient model predicts about the correct level of turbulent Prandtl numbers in free shear flows. The effects of considerably different production to dissipation rates on the level of turbulent Prandtl number, while in the correct direction, however seem to be underpredicted.

One of the major limitations of the present scalar transport model is that it assumes proportionality between the turbulent velocity and scalar time scales. When the boundary conditions for velocity and mean scalar are nearly similar this assumption is found to be satisfactory. The computations of mass diffusion downstream from a wall source has shown however that the supposition is inadequate when the boundary conditions are dissimilar.

The major physical phenomenon under study was the anisotropy of diffusivities in three-dimensional scalar transport situations. The present numerical predictions clearly confirm that the distribution of the diffusivities in the circumferential and radial direction is in fact quite complex and three-dimensional and certainly far from isotropy. When the three-dimensionality is only moderate the transport effects never being dominant, the ratio of tangential to radial diffusivity seems to be close to the ratio of corresponding normal stress levels. Under conditions of strong three-dimensionality, there are considerably larger regions where transport effects are dominant and hence the ratio of the diffusivities of scalar is a strongly three-dimensional function.

8.2 Suggestions for Future Work

- (a) The experimental technique employed in the present investigation can be improved in a number of ways. As the first step towards perfecting methods of achieving a more square-wave-like heat flux variation around the tube, the present tests should be repeated with larger diameter tube. (A commonly available T12 fluorescence tube of nominal diameter 1.5 in., if employed, should reduce the conduction effects by a factor of three and the damage in peeling the strip of silver off from the tube would be confined to a much smaller angular region). Over a slightly longer time scale, attempts should be made to make mean temperature and temperature fluctuation measurements in the flow. It is only such detailed measurements that can provide the depth of information needed for improving the turbulence models.
- (b) A complete rethinking in modelling of turbulent kinetic energy dissipation rate equation is necessary. It is rather sad to note that even though the stress and flux modelling have progressed considerably during last decade, the modelling of dissipation rate equation has not changed very much. In this regard, more recent ideas of multiple length scale models which take into account the transfer of energy between adjacent wave number regions should be pursued.
- (c) As discussed in Sub section (6.4.2) the present assumption of proportional time scales for the velocity and scalar fields needs to be replaced. The way forward would be to provide a model for the dissipation rate of scalar fluctuations, ϵ_ϕ .

As the measurement of terms in the ϵ_c equation is relatively easy (compared with terms in the ϵ equation), the model of ϵ_c may end up being a better representation of scalar dissipation than does the model for ϵ .

REFERENCES

1. REYNOLDS, W.C. and CEBECI, T. : Calculation of turbulent flows, in: Turbulence - Topics in Applied Physics; Vol. 12 (editor- P. Bradshaw). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (1976)
2. LAUNDER, B.E. and SPALDING, D.B. : Mathematical models of turbulence. Academic Press, London and New York (1972)
3. CHOU, P.Y. : On velocity correlations and the solutions of the equations of turbulent fluctuation. Quart. Appl. Math. 3, 38 (1945)
4. ROTTA, J.C. : Statistische theorie nichthomogener turbulenz. Z. Phys. 129, 547 and 131, 51 (1951)
(Translation to english by W. Rodi, Rep. Nos. TWF/TN/38 and TWF/TN/39, Dept. Mech. Eng., Imperial College, London. (1968)
5. CEBECI, T. and SMITH, A.M.O. : Analysis of turbulent boundary layers. Academic Press, New York (1974)
6. RODI, W. and SPALDING, D.B. : A two-parameter model of turbulence and its application to free jets. Rep. No. HTS/69/20, Dept. Mech. Eng., Imperial College, London (1969)
7. LAUNDER, B.E., MORSE, A., RODI, W. and SPALDING, D.B. : Prediction of free shear flows - A comparison of the performance of six turbulence models. NASA - SP321, Free Turbulent Shear Flows Vol. I, 361 (1972)
8. KADER, B.A. and YAGLOM, A.M. : Heat and mass transfer laws for fully turbulent wall flows. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 15, 2329 (1972)
9. PATANKAR, S.V. and SPALDING, D.B. : Heat and mass transfer in boundary layers (2nd edition). Intertext Books, London. (1970)
10. BLOM, J. : An experimental determination of the turbulent Prandtl number in a developing temperature boundary layer. PhD Thesis, The Technological University, Eindhoven, Holland. (1970)
11. QUARMBY, A. and QUIRK, R. : Measurements of the radial and tangential eddy diffusivities of heat and mass in turbulent flow in a plain tube. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 15, 2309 (1972)
12. FULACHIER, L., BEGUIER, C. and KEFFER, J.F. : Interpretation of negative production of temperature fluctuations by spectral analysis. Symposium on Turbulent Shear Flows (The Pennsylvania State University), 15 (1977)
13. BLACK, A.W. and SPARROW, E.M. : Experiments on turbulent heat transfer in a tube with circumferentially varying boundary conditions. J. Heat Mass Transf., Trans ASME 89, 258 (1967)

14. HANJALIĆ, K. and LAUNDER, B.E. : A Reynolds stress model of turbulence and its application to thin shear flows. J. Fluid Mech. 52(4), 609 (1972)
15. LAUNDER, B.E., REECE, G.J. and RODI, W. : Progress in the development of a Reynolds-stress turbulence closure. J. Fluid Mech. 68(3), 537 (1975)
16. SYED, S.A. : Experimental and theoretical investigation of a horizontal free turbulent diffusion flame. PhD Thesis, University of London. (1977)
17. BRYANT, D. : PhD Thesis (to be published), University of London. (1978)
18. LAUNDER, B.E. : On the effects of a gravitational field on the turbulent transport of heat and momentum. J. Fluid Mech. 67(3), 569 (1975)
19. LAWN, C.J. : The determination of the rate of dissipation in turbulent pipe flow. J. Fluid Mech. 48(3), 477 (1971)
20. HANJALIĆ, K. and LAUNDER, B.E. : Fully developed asymmetric flow in a plane channel. J. Fluid Mech. 51(2), 301 (1972)
21. LUMLEY, J.L. : Pressure-strain correlation. Phys. Fluids 18(6), 750 (1975)
22. KOLOVANDIN, B.A. and VATUTIN, I.A. : Statistical transfer theory in non-homogeneous turbulence. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 15, 2371 (1972)
23. MILLIONSHTCHIKOV, M.D. : On the theory of homogeneous isotropic turbulence. C.R. Acad. Sci. S.S.S.R. 32, 615 (1941)
24. DALY, B.J. and HARLOW, F.H. : Transport Equations in turbulence. Phys. Fluids 13(11), 2634 (1970)
25. REECE, G.J. : Development and application of a generalized Reynolds-stress model of turbulence. PhD Thesis, University of London (1977)
26. HINZE, J.O. : Turbulence (2nd edition). McGraw-hill, New York. (1975)
27. CROW, S.C. : Viscoelastic properties of fine grained incompressible turbulence. J. Fluid Mech. 33(1), 1 (1968)
28. NAOT, D., SHAVIT, A. and WOLFSHTEIN, M. : Two-point correlation model and the redistribution of Reynolds stress. Phys. Fluids 16(6), 738 (1973)

29. CHAMPAGNE, F.H., HARRIS, V.G. and CORRSIN, S. : Experiments on nearly homogeneous turbulent shear flow, J. Fluid Mech. 41(1), 81 (1970)
30. SHIR, C.C. : A preliminary numerical study of atmospheric turbulent flows in the idealized planetary boundary layer. J. Atmos. Sci. 30, 1327 (1972)
31. GIBSON, M.M. and LAUNDER, B.E. : Ground effects on pressure fluctuations in the atmospheric boundary layer. J. Fluid Mech. (to be published) (1978)
32. KLEBANOFF, P.S. : Characteristics of turbulence in a boundary layer with zero pressure gradient. NACA TN 3178, (1954)
33. COMTE-BELLOT, G. : Ecoulement turbulent entre deux parois parallèles. Publ. Sci. Tech. Ministère de l'Air, No. 419 (1965)
34. LAUFER, J. : The structure of turbulence in fully developed pipe flow. NACA Rep. 1174, (1954)
35. HARLOW, F.H. and NAKAYAMA, P.I. : Turbulent transport equations. Phys. Fluids 10(11), 2323 (1967)
36. LUMLEY, J.L. and KHAJEH-NOURI, B. : Computational modelling of turbulent transport. Adv. Geophysics 18A, 169 (1974)
37. COMTE-BELLOT, G. and CORRSIN, S. : The use of a contraction to improve the isotropy of grid-generated turbulence. J. Fluid Mech. 25(4), 657 (1966)
38. REYNOLDS, W.C. : Computation of turbulent flows. Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech. 8, 183 (1976)
39. OWEN, R.G. : An analytical turbulent transport model applied to non-isothermal fully-developed duct flows. PhD Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University. (1973)
40. RUBESIN, M.W. and ROSE, W.C. : The turbulent mean flow, Reynolds stress and heat flux equations in mass averaged dependent variables. NASA TM-X-62248, (1973)
41. TENNEKES, H. and LUMLEY, J.L. : A first course in turbulence. MIT Press, Cambridge. (1972)
42. LAUNDER, B.E. : Scalar property transport by turbulence. Rep. No. HTS/73/26 Dept. Mech. Eng., Imperial College, London. (1973)
43. WYNGAARD, J.C. and COTE, O.R. : The evolution of a convective planetary boundary layer - A higher order closure model study. Boundary-Layer Meteorology 7, 289 (1974)
44. DONALDSON, C du P., SULLIVAN, R.D. and ROSENBAUM, H. : A theoretical study of the generation of Atmospheric-clear air turbulence. AIAA J. 10(2), 162 (1972)

45. LUMLEY, J.L. : Modelling turbulent flux of passive scalar quantity in inhomogeneous flows. Phys. Fluids 18(6), 619 (1975)
46. MONIN, A.S. : On the symmetry properties of turbulence in the surface layer of air. Izvestiya, Atmos. Oceanic Phys. 1, 45 (1965)
47. LUMLEY, J.L. : Lecture series No. 76, von Kármán Institute, Belgium. (1975)
48. WEBSTER, C.A.G. : An experimental study of turbulence in a density - stratified shear flow. J. Fluid Mech. 19(2), 221 (1964)
49. SPALDING, D.B. : Concentration fluctuations in a round turbulent free jet. Chem. Eng. Sci. 26, 95 (1971)
50. GOSMAN, A.D. and PUN, W.M. : Lecture notes for course entitled "Calculation of recirculating flows". Rep. No. HTS/74/2, Dept. Mech. Eng., Imperial College, London. (1974)
51. HARLOW, F.H. and WELCH, J.E. : Numerical calculation of time-dependent viscous incompressible flow of fluid with free surface. Phys. Fluids 8(12), 2182 (1965)
52. CARETTO, L.S., GOSMAN, A.D. PATANKAR, S.V. and SPALDING, D.B. : Two calculation procedures for steady, three-dimensional flows with recirculation. Proc. 3rd Intern. conference on numerical methods in Fluid Dynamics, Springer-Verlag. (1972)
53. MORSE, A. : PhD Thesis. (to be published), University of London (1978)
54. POPE, S.B. and WHITELAW, J.H. : The calculation of near-wake flows. J. Fluid Mech. 73(1), 9 (1976)
55. ANDRÉ, J.C., DE MOOR, G., LACARRÈRE, P. and DU VACHAT, R. : Turbulence approximation for inhomogeneous flows. Part I: The clipping approximation. Part II: The numerical simulation of a penetrative convection experiment. J. Atmos. Sci. 33, 482 (1976)
56. CHORIN, A.J. : Numerical solution of the Navier-Stokes equations. Maths. Comput. 22, 745 (1968)
57. PATANKAR, S.V. and SPALDING, D.B. : A calculation procedure for heat, mass and momentum transfer in three-dimensional parabolic flows. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 15, 1787 (1972)
58. BERGELES, G. : Three-dimensional discrete-hole cooling processes. An experimental and theoretical study. PhD Thesis, University of London. (1976)
59. QUARMBY, A. and ANAND, R.K. : Non-axisymmetric turbulent mass transfer in a circular tube. J. Fluid Mech. 38(3), 457 (1969)

60. CHAN, A.L., BAUGHN, J.W. and HOFFMAN, M.A. : Non uniform circumferential heat flux experiments in a circular tube. ASME 75-WA/HT-52 (1976)
61. RODI, W. : A review of experimental data of uniform density free turbulent boundary layers, in: Studies in Convection - Theory, measurements and applications; Vol. 1 (editor-B.E. Launder) Academic Press, London, New York (1975)
62. TOWNSEND, A.A. : The structure of turbulent shear flow. Cambridge University Press (1956)
63. RODI, W. : The prediction of free turbulent boundary layers by use of a two-equation model of turbulence. PhD. Thesis, University of London. (1972)
64. NEWMAN, B.G. : Turbulent jets and wakes in a pressure gradient, in: Proc. Symposium on Fluid Mechanics of Internal Flow, (editor-G. Sovran). (1967)
65. ROBINS, A. : The structure and development of a plane turbulent free jet. PhD Thesis, University of London. (1971)
66. DAVIES, A.E., KEFFER, J.F. and BAINES, W.D. : Spread of a heated plane turbulent jet. Phys. Fluids 18(7), 770 (1975)
67. VAN DER HEGGE ZIJNEN, B.G. : Measurements of turbulence in a plane jet of air by the diffusion method and by the hot-wire method. Appl. Sci. Res. 7A, 293 (1958)
68. JENKINS, P.E. and GOLDSCHMIDT, V.W. : Mean temperature and velocity in a plane turbulent jet. J. Fluids Eng., Trans ASME 95, 581 (1973)
69. REICHARDT, H. : Gesetzmässigkeiten der freien turbulenz. VDI - Forschungsheft, 414 (1942)
70. SINGH, P.I. and UBEROI, M.S. : Instantaneous measurements of turbulent-nonturbulent interface and temperature in a two-dimensional jet. American Phys. Soc., Fluid Dynamics Div., Boulder, Colorado. (1972)
71. LAUNDER, B.E. : Heat and mass transport, in; Turbulence - Topics in Applied Physics; Vol. 12 (editor-P. Bradshaw) Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (1976)
72. BRADBURY, L.J.S. : The structure of a self-preserving turbulent plane jet. J. Fluid Mech. 23(1), (1965)
73. WATT, W.E. : The velocity-temperature mixing layer. Rep. No. TP 6705, Dept. Mech. Eng., University of Toronto. (1967)
74. SUNYACH, M. and MATHIEU, J. : Zone de melange D'un jet plan fluctuations induites dans le cone a potentiel-intermittence. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 12, 1679 (1969)

75. BRADSHAW, P., FERRISS, D.H. and JOHNSON, R.F. : Turbulence in the noise producing region of a circular jet, J. Fluid Mech. 19, 591 (1964)
76. FIEDLER, H.E. : Transport of heat across a plane turbulent mixing layer. Adv. Geophysics 18A, 93 (1974)
77. BROWN, G.L. and ROSHKO, A. : On density effects and large structure in turbulent mixing layers. J. Fluid Mech. 64(4), 775 (1974)
78. WYGNANSKI, I. and FIEDLER, H.E. : The two-dimensional mixing region. J. Fluid Mech. 41(2), 327 (1970)
79. TOWNSEND, A.A. : The fully developed turbulent wake of a circular cylinder. Australian Inst. Sci. Res. 2A, 451 (1949)
80. FREYMUTH, P. and UBEROI, M.S. : Structure of temperature fluctuations in the turbulent wake behind a heated cylinder. Phys. Fluids 14(12), 2574 (1971)
81. FABRIS, G. : Turbulent temperature and thermal flux characteristics in the wake of a cylinder. Symposium on Turbulent Shear Flows (The Pennsylvania State University), 15.11 (1977)
82. LARUE, J.C. and LIBBY, P.A. : Temperature fluctuations in the plane turbulent wake. Phys. Fluids 17(11), 1956 (1974)
83. KOVASZNAY, L.S.G. and ALI, S.F. : Structure of the turbulence in the wake of a heated flat plate, Paper FC 3.2. Proc. 5th Intern. Heat Transf. Conf. (Vol. 4) Tokyo, (1975)
84. KESTIN, J. and RICHARDSON, P.D. : Heat transfer across turbulent, incompressible boundary layers. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 6, 147 (1963)
85. REYNOLDS, W.C., KAYS, W.M. and KLINE, S.J. : Heat transfer in the turbulent incompressible boundary layer
  - (i) Constant wall temperature
  - (ii) Step wall-temperature distribution
  - (iii) Arbitrary wall temperature and heat flux
 and (iv) Effects of location of transition and prediction of heat transfer in a known transition region.
 NASA Memo 12-1-58W to 12-4-58W, (1958)
86. BLOM, J. : Experimental determination of the turbulent Prandtl number in a developing temperature boundary layer, Paper FC 2.2. 4th Intern. Heat Transf. Conf.. Paris. (1970)
87. FULACHIER, L., VEROLLET, E. and DEKEYSER, I. : Resultats experimentaux concernant une couche limite turbulente avec aspiration et chauffage a la paroi. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 20, 731 (1977)
88. JOHNSON, D.S. : Velocity and temperature fluctuation measurements in a turbulent boundary layer downstream of a stepwise discontinuity in wall temperature. J. Appl. Mech., Trans ASME 81, 325 (1959)

89. JOHNSON, D.S. : Velocity, temperature and heat-transfer measurements in a turbulent boundary layer downstream of a stepwise discontinuity in wall temperature. J. Appl. Mech., Trans ASME 79, 2 (1958)
90. ANTONIA, R.A., DANH, H.Q. and PRABHU, A. : Response of a turbulent boundary layer to a step change in surface heat flux. J. Fluid Mech. 80(1), 153 (1977)
91. PIMENTA, M.M., MOFFAT, R.J. and KAYS, W.M. : The turbulent boundary layer: an experimental study of the transport of momentum and heat with the effect of roughness. Rep. No. HMT-21, Mech. Eng. Dept., Stanford University, (1975)
92. BREMHORST, K. and BULLOCK, K.J. : Spectral measurements of temperature and longitudinal velocity fluctuations in fully developed pipe flow. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 13, 1313 (1970)
93. BOURKE, P.J. and PULLING, D.J. : A turbulent heat flux meter and some measurements of turbulence in air flow through a heated pipe. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 13, 1331 (1970)
94. QUARMBY, A. and ANAND, R.K. : Axisymmetric turbulent mass transfer in a circular tube. J. Fluid Mech. 38(3), 433 (1969)
95. BLACK, A.W. : The effect of circumferentially-varying boundary conditions on turbulent heat transfer in a tube. PhD Thesis, University of Minnesota. (1966)
96. QUARMBY, A. and QUIRK, R. : Axisymmetric and non-axisymmetric turbulent diffusion in a plain circular tube at high Schmidt number. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 17, 143 (1974)
97. GIESBRECHT, A.J. : Heat transfer from a yawed cylinder to air with a constant heat flux thermal boundary condition. M.S. Thesis, University of California, Davis. (1978)
98. KARLEKAR, B.V. and DESMOND, R.M. : Engineering heat transfer. West Publishing Company, New York. (1977)
99. ALEXOPOLOUS, C.C. and KEFFER, J.F. : Turbulent wake in a passively stratified fluid. Phys. Fluids 14(2), 216 (1971)
100. UBEROI, M.S. and FREYMUTH, P. : Spectra of turbulence in wakes behind circular cylinders. Phys. Fluids 12(7), 1359 (1969)
101. PATEL, R.P. : A study of two-dimensional symmetric and asymmetric turbulent shear flows. PhD Thesis, McGill University. (1970)
102. CHEVRAY, R. and KOVASZNY, L.S.G. : Turbulent measurements in the wake of thin flat plate. AIAA J. 7, 1641 (1969)
103. JAYATILLEKE, C.L.V. : The influence of Prandtl number and surface roughness on the resistance of the laminar sub-layer to momentum and heat transfer. Prog. Heat Mass Transf. 1, 193 (1959)

104. FULACHIER, L. : Contribution à l'étude des analogies des champs dynamique et thermique dans une couche limite turbulente. Effect de l'aspiration. Thèse Docteur ès Sciences, Université de Provence. (1972)
105. BRADSHAW P. and FERRISS, D.H. : Calculation of boundary layer development using the turbulent energy equation. (IV) Heat transfer with small temperature difference. N.P.L. Aero. Rep. 1271, (1968)
106. REYNOLDS. W.C. : Turbulent heat transfer in a circular tube with variable circumferential heat flux. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 6, 445 (1963)
107. SPARROW, E.M. and LIN, S.H. : Turbulent heat transfer in a tube with circumferentially varying temperature or heat flux. Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 6, 866 (1963)
108. BERGELES, G., GOSMAN, A.D. and LAUNDER, B.E. : The turbulent jet in a cross-stream at finite injection rates: A three-dimensional numerical treatment. (to be published)
109. MILLS, A.F. : Experimental investigation of turbulent heat transfer in the entrance region of a circular conduit. J. Mech Eng. Sci. 4(1), 63 (1962)
110. BIERNES DE HANN : Nouvelles tables d'intégrales définies. Hafner Publishing Company, New York. (1957)
111. ARIS, R. : Vectors, tensors and the basic equations of fluid mechanics. Prentice-Hall, N.J.. (1962)
112. LIN, S.C. and LIN, S.C. : Study of strong temperature mixing in subsonic grid turbulence. Phys. Fluids 16(10), 1587 (1973)

Fig. 3.1 Control Volumes in Patankar-Spalding Method

Fig. 3.2 Conventional Grid Arrangement

Fig. 3.3 Grid Layout in the Cross-Stream

Fig. 3.4 Cell Mass Balance

Fig. 3.5 Three orthogonal views of control volume with ideal orientation of stresses and fluxes. (A Cartesian, non expanding grid is shown here for clarity)

Note: All scalar variables and z components of all first-order vectors are located at (I, J)

Fig. 3.6 Idealised Grid System for Three-Dimensional Boundary Layer Flows

Fig. 3.7 Modified Grid System for the Present Problem

Fig. 3.10 Treatment of a Conducting Thick Wall

(a) Plane Jet

(b) Plane Mixing Layer

Fig. 4.1 (a) and (b)

(c) Plane Wake

Fig. 4.1 Notation for Velocity and Scalar Field Configurations

Fig. 5.1 Adhesive Tape Strips

Fig. 5.2 Silver Coating on the Tube

Fig. 5.3 Electrical Connections to the Silver Coating

Fig. 5.4 Thermocouple Arrangement Around the Tube

Fig. 5.5 Thermocouple Circuit

Fig. 5.6 Electrical Power Circuit

(a) Heat Flux Variation if Both Segments were Heated

(b) Heat Flux Variation if Only Top Segment Heated

Fig. 5.7 Heat Flux Variation (Ideal)

(a) Heat Flux Variation if Both Segments were Heated

(b) Heat Flux Variation if Only Top Segment Heated

Fig. 5.8 A More Plausible Heat Flux Variation

Fig. 6.1 The Plane Jet in Stagnant Surroundings :
Mean Velocity Profiles

Fig. 6.2 The Plane Jet in Stagnant Surroundings :
Shear Stress Profiles

Fig. 6.3 The Plane Jet in Stagnant Surroundings :
Turbulence Intensity Profiles

Fig. 6.4 The Plane Jet in Stagnant Surroundings :
 Mean Temperature Profiles

Fig. 6.5 The Plane Jet in Stagnant Surroundings :
 Cross-stream Heat Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.6 The Plane Jet in Stagnant Surroundings :
The Ratio of Streamwise to Cross-stream Scalar Flux
Profiles

Fig. 6.7 The Plane Jet in Stagnant Surroundings ;
Turbulent Prandtl Number Profiles

Fig. 6.8 The Plane Wake : Mean Velocity Profiles

Fig. 6.9 The Plane Wake : Shear Stress Profiles

Fig. 6.10 The Plane Wake : Turbulence Intensity Profiles

Fig. 6.11 The Plane Wake : Mean Temperature Profiles

Fig. 6.12 The Plane Wake : Cross-stream Heat Flux Profiles,
 ——— Calculated profiles from Townsend's mean data,
 - - - - - Calculated profiles from Fabris' mean data

Fig. 6.13 The Plane Wake : Ratio of Streamwise to Cross-stream Scalar Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.14 The Plane Wake : Turbulent Prandtl Number Profiles

Fig. 6.15 The Plane Wake : Streamwise Heat Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.16 The Plane Wake : Temperature Fluctuations Profiles

Fig. 6.17 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$:
Mean Velocity Profiles

Fig. 6.18 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$:
Shear Stress Profiles

Fig. 6.19 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$;
Turbulence Intensity Profiles

Fig. 6.20 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$:
Mean Temperature Profiles

Fig. 6.21 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$:
Cross-stream Scalar Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.22 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$:
Ratio of Streamwise to Cross-stream Scalar Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.23 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} = 0.5$:
Turbulent Prandtl Number Profiles

Fig. 6.24 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: Mean Velocity Profiles

Fig. 6.25 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$: Shear Stress Profiles

Fig. 6.26 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$:

Mean Temperature Profiles

Fig. 6.27 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$:

Cross-stream Heat Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.28 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$:
Ratio of Streamwise to Cross-stream Scalar Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.29 The Plane Mixing Layer with $\frac{U_1}{U_2} \approx 0$:
Turbulent Prandtl Number Profiles

Fig. 6.30 Flat Plate Boundary Layer : Mean Velocity Profiles

Fig 6.31 Flat Plate Boundary Layer : Shear Stress Profiles

Fig. 6.32 Flat Plate Boundary Layer : Turbulence Intensity Profiles - Comparison of Two Near-wall Effect Models

Fig. 6.33 Flat Plate Boundary Layer : Turbulence Intensity Profiles - Comparison of Two Near-wall Effect Functions

Fig. 6.34 Flat Plate Boundary Layer : Turbulence Intensity Profiles - Comparison of Two Diffusion Models

Fig. 6.35 Flat Plate Boundary Layer : Shear Correlation Coefficient - Comparison of Two Diffusion Models

Fig. 6.36 Flat Plate Boundary Layer - Step in Wall Heat Flux : Mean Temperature Profiles

Fig. 6.37 Flat Plate Boundary Layer - Step in Wall Heat Flux :
Temperature Defect Profiles;
Symbols as in Fig. (6.36)

Fig. 6.38 Flat Plate Boundary Layer - Step in Wall Heat Flux :
Turbulent Prandtl Number Profiles;
Symbols as in Fig. (6.36),
x Data of BLOM [86] , — Data of FULACHIER [104]

Fig. 6.39 Flat Plate Boundary Layer - Step in Wall Heat Flux : Cross-streams Heat Flux Profiles
 Symbols as in Fig. (6.36)

Fig. 6.40 Flat Plate Boundary Layer - Step in Wall Heat Flux : Streamwise Heat Flux Profiles
Symbols as in Fig. (6.36)

Fig. 6.41 Flat Plate Boundary Layer - Step in Wall Heat Flux : Temperature Fluctuations Profiles
Symbols as in Fig. (6.36)

Fig. 6.42 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Mean Velocity Profiles

Fig. 6.43 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Shear Stress Profiles

Fig. 6.44 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Turbulence Intensity Profiles - Comparison of Two Near-wall Effect Models

Fig. 6.45 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Turbulence Intensity Profiles - Comparison of Two Diffusion Models

Fig. 6.46 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Mean Temperature Profiles

Fig. 6.47 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Cross-stream Heat Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.48 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Streamwise Heat Flux Profiles

Fig. 6.49 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Turbulent Prandtl Number Profiles

Fig. 6.50 Fully Developed Pipe Flow : Concentration Profiles Downstream of a Short Mass Transfer Region

Fig. 6.51 Turbulent Schmidt Number Profiles Downstream of a Short Mass Transfer Section in the Wall-Pipe Flow

Fig. 7.1 Comparison of Streamwise Development of Near-wall Concentration Levels in QUARMBY and ANAND's [59] Experiment

Fig. 7.2 The Angular Variation of (a) Wall Heat Flux, (b) Wall Temperature and (c) Nusselt Number $Nu(\omega, X/D)$, BLACK and SPARROW's [13] Experiment, $Re = 40500$.

Fig. 7.3 The Angular Variation of (a) Wall Heat Flux, (b) Wall Temperature and (c) Nusselt Number $Nu(\omega, X/D)$, BLACK and SPARROW's [13] Experiment. $Re = 16800$

Note the variation in thickness of the tube wall through which heat is supplied.

Fig. 7.4 Non Dimensional Temperature $\frac{C - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}}$ contours :
 Black and Sparrow's
 Experiment, $Re = 40500$.

Note the variation in thickness of the tube wall through which heat is supplied.

Fig. 7.5 Non Dimensional Temperature $\frac{C - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}}$ contours :
 Black and Sparrow's
 Experiment, $Re = 16800$.

Fig. 7.6 Non-Dimensional Temperature Profiles in BLACK and SPARROW's [13] Experiment, $X/D = 52$;
 $\circ$ Data of [13], — Present Predictions,
 --- Calculated Profiles Assuming Isotropic Diffusivity [13]

Fig. 7.7 Streamwise Development of Nusselt Numbers at Several Angular Locations - BLACK and SPARROW's [13]
Experiment , $Re = 40500$.

Fig. 7.8 Streamwise Development of Nusselt Numbers at Several Angular Locations - BLACK and SPARROW's [13]
Experiment , $Re = 16800$.

Fig. 7.9 Heat flux Through the Outer and Inner Surface of the Tube, (a) $Re \approx 20000$, (b) $Re \approx 40000$, (c) $Re \approx 90000$.

Fig. 7.10 Temperature Profiles at the Outer Surface of the Tube Wall : Present Experimental Situation; Both Halves Heating, $Re \approx 20000$.

Fig. 7.11 Temperature Profiles at the Outer Surface of the Tube Wall : Present Experimental Situation; Both Halves Heating, $Re \approx 40000$.

Fig. 7.12 Temperature Profiles at the Outer Surface of the Tube Wall : Present Experimental Situation; Both Halves Heating, $Re \approx 90000$.

Fig. 7.13 Streamwise Variation of Nusselt Number : Present Experimental Investigation,
Both Halves Heating, $Re \approx 20000$.

(a)

(b)

Fig. 7.14 (a) and (b)

Fig. 7.14 (c) and (d)

Fig. 7.14 Predicted Non-Dimensional Temperature $\frac{C - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}}$ contours :
Present Experimental Situation;
Both Halves Heating, $Re \approx 40000$.

- (a) $\frac{X}{D} = 5.0$, (b) $\frac{X}{D} = 10.0$, (c) $\frac{X}{D} = 15.0$,
(d) $\frac{X}{D} = 20.0$, (e) $\frac{X}{D} = 25.0$

Fig. 7.15 Variation of (a) Heat Fluxes and (b) Local Nusselt Number, Around the Tube Wall .
 $Re \approx 20000$

Fig. 7.16 Temperature Profiles at the Outer Surface of the Tube Wall : Present Experimental Situation (Heat Flux Profiles as in Fig. (7.15(a))) $Re \approx 20000$

Fig. 7.17 Variation of (a) Heat Fluxes and (b) Local Nusselt Number, Around the Tube Wall .
 $Re \approx 40000$

Fig. 7.18 Temperature Profiles at the Outer Surface of the Tube Wall : Present Experimental Situation (Heat Flux Profiles as in Fig. (7.17(a)))
 $Re \approx 40000$

Fig. 7.19 Variation of (a) Heat Fluxes and (b) Local Nusselt Number, Around the Tube Wall .
 $Re \approx 90000$

Fig. 7.20 Temperature Profiles at the Outer Surface of the Tube Wall : Present Experimental Situation (Heat Flux Profiles as in Fig. (7.10(a)))
Re $\approx$ 90000

Fig. 7.21 (a) and (b)

Fig. 7.21 (c) and (d)

Fig. 7.21 Predicted Non-Dimensional Temperature $\frac{C - C_{min}}{C_{max} - C_{min}}$ contours :
Present Experimental Situation;
Only Right Half Heating, $Re \approx 40000$.

- (a) $\frac{X}{D} = 5.0$, (b) $\frac{X}{D} = 10.0$, (c) $\frac{X}{D} = 15.0$
(d) $\frac{X}{D} = 20.0$, (e) $\frac{X}{D} = 25.0$

Fig. 7.22 Ratio of Diffusivity of Heat in Tangential to Radial Direction : Prediction of Black and Sparrow's Flow, $Re = 40500$.

Fig. 7.23 Ratio of Diffusivity of Heat in Tangential to Radial Direction : Prediction of Present Experiment , $Re \approx 40000$ (Only Right Half Heated).

APPENDIX (A)

A Form for the Near-Wall Effect Function in Cylindrical Geometry

A form for the near-wall function can be obtained by considering the respective geometric configurations. The Fig. (A.1) considers the following situations

- (a) flow affected by a single plane wall,
- (b) flow affected by two parallel plane walls,
- and (c) flow inside a circular tube.

If the near-wall function,

$$f = f + \frac{l_E}{y_0} \quad (A.1)$$

is to depict the effective influence of the wall, then for a point at a given distance, a , from the wall,

$$f_{(a)} < f_{(b)} < f_{(c)} \quad (A.2)$$

Out of several plausible forms the following is chosen to represent the effective distance to the wall.

$$\frac{1}{y_0} \propto \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\cos \alpha}{l^2} dx \right| \quad (A.3)$$

Thus for case (a),

$$\frac{1}{y_0} = \left| 2 \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{a \cos \theta \sec^2 \theta}{a^2 \sec^2 \theta} d\theta \right| = \frac{2}{a} \quad (A.4)$$

i.e.

$$y_0 = K_0 a \quad (A.5)$$

The constant of proportionality in (A.3) is thus equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. For the case of two plane walls (A.3) can be applied to both walls to obtain,

$$y_o = K_o \left[\frac{1}{\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{h-a}\right)} \right] \quad (A.6)$$

For the case of a cylindrical geometry, case (c),

$$\frac{1}{y_o} \propto \left| 2 \int \frac{R \cos (\theta - \beta)}{R^2 (1 + b^2 - 2 b \cos \beta)} d\beta \right| \quad (A.7)$$

where $b = \frac{R-a}{R}$

i.e.

$$y_o = K_o \left[\frac{R}{\int_0^\pi \frac{(1 - b \cos \theta) d\theta}{(1 + b^2 - 2 b \cos \theta)^{3/2}}} \right] \quad (A.8)$$

Though the exact solution of the definite integral in (A.8) can be obtained (see Table 67, BERNES DE HANN [110]) its inclusion in a calculation may be rather expensive. A fourth order polynomial equivalent of the integral can however be easily obtained as

$$y_o = k_o R g$$

where,

$$g = q - 1.4955 q^2 + 1.2673 q^3 - 0.4535 q^4 \quad (A.9)$$

and,

$$q = 1 - b$$

APPENDIX (B)

Simulation of the Diffusive Transport of $\overline{u_i c}$ and $\overline{c^2}$

The transport equation for the triple correlation $\overline{u_i u_k c}$ for high Reynolds and Peclet numbers can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{u_i u_k c}_{,t} + U_l \overline{u_i u_k c}_{,l} &= - (\overline{u_i u_l c} U_{k,l} + \overline{u_i u_k u_l} c_{,l} + \overline{u_l u_k c} U_{i,l}) \\ &\quad (a) \\ &\quad - \overline{u_i u_k u_l c}_{,l} - (\overline{u_i c p_{,k}} + \overline{u_k c p_{,i}}) \\ &\quad (b) \quad (c) \\ &\quad + (\overline{u_i c \cdot u_k u_l}_{,l} + \overline{u_i u_k \cdot u_l c}_{,l} + \overline{u_k c \cdot u_i u_l}_{,l}) . \\ &\quad (d) \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

The quadruple correlation $\overline{u_i u_k u_l c}$ can be simplified with reference to MILLIONSHTCHIKOV's [23] hypothesis,

$$\overline{u_i u_k u_l c} = \overline{u_i u_k} \overline{u_l c} + \overline{u_i u_l} \overline{u_k c} + \overline{u_i c} \overline{u_k u_l} \tag{B.2}$$

which is strictly valid only in random fields with Gaussian probability density distributions but approximately satisfied even in non-homogeneous turbulence fields [22]. Therefore

$$(b) + (d) = - (\overline{u_k u_l \cdot u_i c}_{,l} + \overline{u_l c \cdot u_i u_k}_{,l} + \overline{u_i u_l \cdot u_k c}_{,l}) . \tag{B.3}$$

The exact expression for the pressure-scalar flux correlation can be obtained as,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{u_i c p_{,k}} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(U'_{m,n} \overline{u'_n u_i c}_{,m} \right)_{,k} dVol \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(\overline{u'_m u'_n u_i c}_{,mmk} \right) dVol + S \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

This expression clearly has two distinct types, one expressing the influence of the mean-rate-of-strain and the other involving only turbulent quantities. The first process can be modelled, following the pattern of pressure-strain modelling, by terms of the form $\overline{u_p u_q^c} U_{m,n}$. The second term can be modelled following the approximation of ϕ_{ij1} as $-\frac{\varepsilon}{k} (\overline{u_i u_k^c})$.

The parts of term (a) with mean velocity gradients are now neglected following a similar action by HANJALIĆ and LAUNDER [14] in deriving the algebraic model of $\overline{u_i u_j u_k}$. Consistent with that step the mean strain terms in the pressure-scalar flux correlation can be neglected too.

Finally, on neglect of the convective transport term in (B.1) and on substitution of the above formulations an algebraic expression for $\overline{u_i u_k^c}$ emerges. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{u_i u_k^c} = & -C_c \frac{k}{\varepsilon} (\overline{u_k u_l} \overline{u_i^c}, l + \overline{u_l^c} \overline{u_i u_k}, l + \overline{u_i u_l} \overline{u_k^c}, l \\ & + \overline{u_i u_k u_l} C_{,l}) \end{aligned} \quad (B.5)$$

In order to derive the corresponding algebraic expression for $\overline{u_k^c^2}$, which appears in the diffusion term of $\overline{c^2}$, again reference is made to its transport equation. As given for example in KOLOVANDIN and VATUTIN [22], for high Reynolds and Peclet numbers,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{u_k^c^2}, t + U_l \overline{u_k^c^2}, l = & - (\overline{u_l^c^2} U_{k,l} + 2 \overline{u_k u_l^c} C_{,l}) - \overline{u_k u_l^c^2}, l \\ & (a) \quad (b) \\ & - \frac{1}{\rho} \overline{c^2 p}, k + (\overline{c^2} \overline{u_k u_l}, l + 2 \overline{u_k^c} \overline{u_l^c}, l) \quad (c) \quad (d) \\ & (B.6) \end{aligned}$$

Now following arguments and assumptions similar to those made in deriving the algebraic form for $\overline{u_i u_k^c}$ one obtains,

$$\overline{u_k^c^2} = -C_g \frac{k}{\varepsilon} (\overline{u_k u_l} \overline{c^2}, l + 2 \overline{u_l^c} \overline{u_k^c}, l + 2 \overline{u_k u_l^c} C_{,l}) \quad (B.7)$$

Inherent in the above formulations for $\overline{u_i u_k c}$ and $\overline{u_k c^2}$ is the assumption that the velocity and scalar time scales are proportional. Under circumstances of dissimilar hydrodynamic and scalar fields however, (for example QUARMBY and ANAND's [94] experiment where the velocity field has large gradients in near-wall region (due to wall friction) and scalar field has zero gradients (impermeable wall)), the time scales are not likely to be proportional. The second term in (B.4) was expressed as proportional to $\frac{\overline{u_i u_k c}}{\tau}$ where τ was taken as equal to $\frac{k}{\epsilon}$. More accurately τ should be a mixture of $\frac{k}{\epsilon}$ and $\frac{c^2}{\epsilon}$.

Moreover, in modelling the $\overline{u_i u_k c}$ term, the effects of the production term due to mean strain

$$- (\overline{u_i u_l c} U_{k,l} + \overline{u_i u_k c} U_{i,l})$$

as well as mean strain contributions to $\frac{1}{\rho} \overline{u_i c} p_{,k}$ were neglected. It was hoped that the effect of these terms would be small and conveniently be absorbed in the coefficient C_c . Eventhough it is likely that this is possible in situations where the scalar and hydrodynamic fields nearly similar, under circumstances where $\frac{\partial U}{\partial y}$ is large and $\frac{\partial C}{\partial y}$ is small, the above terms may even be the dominant.

These shortcomings may show up in predicting scalar transport situations where strong dissimilarities between velocity and scalar fields exist.

APPENDIX (C)

Derivation of the Exact Equation for Pressure-Scalar Gradient Correlation

In order to obtain correlations of the type pressure-scalar gradient $\overline{\frac{p}{\rho} c_{,i}}$, pressure gradient-scalar flux $\overline{\frac{u_i c}{\rho} p_{,k}}$ one should first derive the Poisson equation for p . Consider the equation for fluctuating component of velocity u_i obtained by subtracting the mean velocity equation from the instantaneous velocity equation. It is

$$u_{i,t} + U_k u_{i,k} + u_k U_{i,k} + u_k u_{i,k} = -\frac{1}{\rho} p_{,i} + \nu u_{i,kk} + (\overline{u_i u_k})_{,k} \quad (C.1)$$

Taking the divergence with respect to x_i , and considering continuity,

$$u_{i,i} = 0 \quad (C.2)$$

one obtains,

$$U_{k,i} u_{i,k} + u_{k,i} U_{i,k} + u_{i,k} u_{k,i} = -\frac{1}{\rho} p_{,ii} + (\overline{u_i u_k})_{,ik} \quad (C.3)$$

Now

$$(\overline{u_i u_k})_{,ik} = (\overline{u_i u_{k,i}})_{,k} = \overline{u_{i,k} u_{k,i}} \quad .$$

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{\rho} p_{,ii} = -2 \overline{u_{i,k} U_{k,i}} - (\overline{u_i u_k})_{,ik} + (\overline{u_i u_k})_{,ik} \quad (C.4)$$

or taking the derivative with respect to x_k

$$\frac{1}{\rho} (\overline{p_{,k}})_{,ii} = -2 (\overline{u_{n,m} U_{m,n}})_{,k} - (\overline{u_n u_m})_{,nmk} + (\overline{u_n u_m})_{,nmk} \quad (C.5)$$

The Green's theorem applied to a variable a is,

$$a = - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \frac{\nabla^2 a}{r} dV + \text{Surface integrals} . \quad (\text{C.6})$$

So that Green's theorem on fluctuating pressure p is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p}{\rho} = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} u'_{n,m} U'_{m,n} dV' + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(\frac{u'_n u'_m}{r} \right)_{,mn} dV' \\ & - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(\overline{\frac{u'_n u'_m}{r}} \right)_{,nm} dV' + S . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Here p is a function at (X_o, Y_o, Z_o) the point under consideration and the right hand side of (C.7) is evaluated at (X', Y', Z') points over the control volume V of surface s . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho} p_{,k} = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(u'_{n,m} U'_{m,n} \right)_{,k} dV' + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(\frac{u'_n u'_m}{r} \right)_{,mnk} dV' \\ & - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(\overline{\frac{u'_n u'_m}{r}} \right)_{,mnk} dV' + S . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

The equations (C.7) and (C.8) can be used in obtaining various correlations that appear as pressure related terms in turbulence equations.

In order to obtain the pressure-scalar gradient $\overline{\frac{p}{\rho} c_{,i}}$ correlation, (C.7) is multiplied by $c_{,i}$ and time averaged, thus

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\frac{p}{\rho} c_{,i}} = & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} U'_{m,n} \overline{u'_{n,m} c_{,i}} dV' \\ & + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_V \frac{1}{r'} \left(\overline{\frac{u'_n u'_m}{r}} \right)_{,mn} c_{,i} dV' + S_i . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

This is same as the equation (2.47) used in Section (2.4.2). Similarly scalar flux-pressure gradient correlation is obtained by multiplying (C.8) by $\overline{u_i^c}$ and time averaging the product,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\frac{u_i^c}{\rho} p_{,k}} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{V'} \frac{1}{r'} \left(u'_{m,n} \overline{u'_n u_i^c}_{,m} \right)_{,k} dV' \\ &+ \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{V'} \frac{1}{r'} \left(\overline{u'_n u'_m u_i^c}_{,mnk} \right) dV' + S_{ik} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (C.10)$$

This equation is utilised in Appendix (B) in obtaining the algebraic expression for $\overline{u_i u_k^c}$.

APPENDIX (D)

Modelled Reynolds Stress and Scalar Flux Equations
in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates

Reynolds stress and scalar flux equations presented in Chapter (2) are in Cartesian tensor form. In order to transform them into any curvilinear coordinate system, the contravariant and covariant character of the tensors involved should be recognised. The covariant differentials appearing in exact and modelled terms of present set of equations can be reexpressed in partial differential forms using expressions involving Christoffel symbols of the second kind. A complete account of such tensorial manipulations, with particular reference to fluid mechanics, is given in ARIS [111]. In Table (D.1), the modelled forms of Reynolds stress equations as employed in the present study are displayed. They are valid for

- two-dimensional, non swirling i.e. $U_\theta = 0$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} = 0$
- steady i.e. $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = 0$
- boundary layer, with negligible streamwise gradients i.e. $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = 0$
(except for convection terms).

flow situations only.

These equations have previously being obtained by others, for e.g. MORSE [53].

Presented in Table (D.2) are the scalar flux equations in the forms utilized in the numerical prediction of situations covered by this Thesis. These equations are relevant only for the flow situations mentioned above. In addition the lateral velocity U_r is neglected too. The scalar field is

- three-dimensional
- boundary layer type i.e. $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = 0$ except in convection terms.

Term; Model	Stress Component			
	$\overline{u_z^2}$	$\overline{u_r^2}$	$\overline{u_\theta^2}$	$\overline{u_r u_z}$
$\frac{D}{Dt}(\overline{u_i u_j})$	$U_z \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^2}}{\partial z} + U_r \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^2}}{\partial r}$	$U_z \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^2}}{\partial z} + U_r \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^2}}{\partial r}$	$U_z \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^2}}{\partial z} + U_r \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^2}}{\partial r}$	$U_z \frac{\partial \overline{u_r u_z}}{\partial z} + U_r \frac{\partial \overline{u_r u_z}}{\partial r}$
P_{ij}	$-2\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r}$	0	$-2\frac{U_r}{r} \overline{u_\theta^2}$	$-\frac{\overline{u_z^2}}{r} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r}$
$-\epsilon_{ij}$	$-\frac{2\epsilon}{3}$	$-\frac{2\epsilon}{3}$	$-\frac{2\epsilon}{3}$	0
ϕ_{ij1}	$-C_{s1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_z^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right)$	$-C_{s1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_r^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right)$	$-C_{s1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_\theta^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right)$	$-C_{s1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \overline{u_r u_z}$

Table D.1 Modelled Reynolds Stress Equations in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates

(contd.)

Term; Model	Stress Component			
	$\overline{u_z^2}$	$\overline{u_r^2}$	$\overline{u_\theta^2}$	$\overline{u_r u_z}$
$\phi_{ij2};$ $\bullet R_{s1}$	$-\left[-\frac{4\alpha}{3} \left(\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r} \right) \right.$ $- \beta 2k \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial z}$ $\left. + \frac{2\gamma}{3} \left(\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r} \right) \right]$	$-\left[\frac{2\alpha}{3} \left(\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r} \right) \right.$ $- \beta 2k \frac{\partial U_r}{\partial r}$ $\left. - \frac{4\gamma}{3} \left(\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r} \right) \right]$	$-\left[\frac{2\alpha}{3} \left(\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r} \right) \right.$ $- \beta 2k \frac{U_r}{r}$ $\left. + \frac{2\gamma}{3} \left(\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r} \right) \right]$	$-\left[-\alpha \left(\overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} \right) \right.$ $- \beta k \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r}$ $\left. - \gamma \left(\overline{u_z^2} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} \right) \right]$
$\bullet R_{s2}$	same as R_{s1} with $\alpha = C_{s2}$, $\beta = \gamma = 0$			
$\phi_{ijlw};$ $\bullet R_{sw1}$	$C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \left(\overline{u_z^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right) f$	$C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \left(\overline{u_r^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right) f$	$C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \left(\overline{u_\theta^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right) f$	$C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \overline{u_r u_z} f$
$\bullet R_{sw2}$	$C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \overline{u_r^2} f$	$-2C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \overline{u_r^2} f$	$C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \overline{u_r^2} f$	$-\frac{3}{2} C_{slw_k} \overline{\epsilon} \overline{u_r u_z} f$

Table D.1 Modelled Reynolds Stress Equations in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates

(contd.)

Term; Model	Stress Component			
	$\overline{u_z^2}$	$\overline{u_r^2}$	$\overline{u_\theta^2}$	$\overline{u_r u_z}$
$\phi_{ij2w};$ • R_{sw1}	$-2C_{s2w} \left[\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_z^2}}{r} \right] f$	$2C_{s2w} \left[\overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} + \frac{U_r \overline{u_z^2}}{r} \right] f$	0	$C_{s2w} \left[(\overline{u_z^2} - \overline{u_r^2}) \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} \right] f$
• R_{sw2}	$C_{s2w} \phi_{rr2} f$	$-2C_{s2w} \phi_{rr2} f$	$C_{s2w} \phi_{rr2} f$	$-\frac{3}{2} C_{s2w} \phi_{rz2}$
$D(\overline{u_i u_j});$ • D_{s1}	$\frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[r \Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^2}}{\partial r} \right]$	$\frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[r \Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^2}}{\partial r} \right]$ $-2 \frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_\theta^2} (\overline{u_r^2} - \overline{u_\theta^2})}{r^2}$	$\frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[r \Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^2}}{\partial r} \right]$ $+2 \frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_\theta^2} (\overline{u_r^2} - \overline{u_\theta^2})}{r^2}$	$\frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[r \Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r u_z}}{\partial r} \right]$ $-\frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r^2} \overline{u_r u_z}$
• D_{s2}	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[2r \Omega_s \overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r u_z}}{\partial r} \right]$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[2r \Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^2}}{\partial r} \right]$ $-2 \frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_\theta^2} (\overline{u_r^2} - \overline{u_\theta^2})}{r^2}$ $-2 \frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \partial \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r \partial r}$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[2 \Omega_s \overline{u_\theta^2} (\overline{u_r^2} - \overline{u_\theta^2}) \right]$ $+2 \frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_\theta^2} (\overline{u_r^2} - \overline{u_\theta^2})}{r^2}$ $+2 \frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \partial \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r \partial r}$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[r \Omega_s \overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r u_z}}{\partial r} \right]$ $-\frac{\Omega_s \overline{u_\theta^2}}{r^2} \overline{u_r u_z}$ $+ \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left[r \Omega_s \overline{u_r u_z} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^2}}{\partial r} \right]$

Table D.1 Modelled Reynolds Stress Equations in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates

Term; Model	Flux Component		
	$\overline{u_z^c}$	$\overline{u_r^c}$	$\overline{u_\theta^c}$
$\frac{D}{Dt}(\overline{u_i^c})$	$U_z \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^c}}{\partial z}$	$U_z \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial z}$	$U_z \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{\partial z}$
P_{ic}	$-\overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r} - \overline{u_r^c} \overline{u_z} \frac{\partial C}{\partial r}$	$-\overline{u_r^2} \frac{\partial C}{\partial r}$	$-\overline{u_\theta^2} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \theta}$
$\phi_{ic1};$ • R_{c1}	$-C_{c1} \frac{\epsilon \overline{u_z^c}}{k}$	$-C_{c1} \frac{\epsilon \overline{u_r^c}}{k}$	$-C_{c1} \frac{\epsilon \overline{u_\theta^c}}{k}$
• R_{c2}	$\dots -C'_{c1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_z^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right) \overline{u_z^c} + \overline{u_r^c} \overline{u_z} \cdot \overline{u_r^c}$	$\dots -C'_{c1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_r^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right) \overline{u_r^c} + \overline{u_r^c} \overline{u_z} \cdot \overline{u_z^c}$	$\dots -C'_{c1} \frac{\epsilon}{k} \left(\overline{u_\theta^2} - \frac{2k}{3} \right) \overline{u_\theta^c}$
$\phi_{ic2};$ • R_{c1}	$C_{c2} \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r}$	0	0
• R_{c2}	$0.8 \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r}$	$-0.2 \overline{u_z^c} \frac{\partial U_z}{\partial r}$	0

Table D.2 Modelled Scalar Flux Equations in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates

(contd.)

Term; Model	Flux Components		
	$\overline{u_z^c}$	$\overline{u_r^c}$	$\overline{u_\theta^c}$
$\phi_{ic1w};$ • R_{cw1}	$-C_{clw} \frac{\epsilon \overline{u_z^c} f}{k}$	$-C_{clw} \frac{\epsilon \overline{u_r^c} f}{k}$	$-C_{clw} \frac{\epsilon \overline{u_\theta^c} f}{k}$
• R_{cw2}	0	$-C_{clw} \frac{\epsilon \overline{u_r^c} f}{k}$	0
$\phi_{ic2w};$ • R_{cw1}	$-4\beta_c' \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^c}}{\partial r}$	$\beta_c' \overline{u_z^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^c}}{\partial r}$	0
• R_{cw2}	0	0	0
$D(\overline{u_z^c});$ • D_{c1}	$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^c}}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_z^c}}{\partial \theta} \right)$	$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial r} \right) - \frac{\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c}}{r} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\overline{u_r^c}}{r} \right)$ $+ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial \theta} - \frac{\overline{u_\theta^c}}{r} \right) \right)$	$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{\Omega_c \overline{u_r^c}}{r} \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{\partial r}$ $+ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\overline{u_r^c}}{r} \right) \right)$

Table D.2 Modelled Scalar Flux Equations in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates

(contd.)

Term; Model	Flux Component		
	$\overline{u_z^c}$	$\overline{u_r^c}$	$\overline{u_\theta^c}$
$D(\overline{u_z^c});$ $\bullet D_{c2}$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial r} \right)$ $+ \frac{\partial}{r \partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{\partial r} \right)$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial r} \right)$ $+ \frac{\partial}{r \partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{\partial r} \right)$ $- \frac{\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c}}{r} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{r \partial \theta} + \frac{\overline{u_r^c}}{r} \right)$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{r \partial \theta} - \frac{\overline{u_\theta^c}}{r} \right) \right)$ $+ \frac{\partial}{r \partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{r \partial \theta} + \frac{\overline{u_r^c}}{r} \right) \right)$ $+ \frac{\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c}}{r} \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{r \partial \theta} - \frac{\overline{u_\theta^c}}{r} \right)$
$\bullet D_{c3}$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial r} \right)$ $+ \frac{\partial}{r \partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c} \frac{\overline{u_r^c}}{r} \right)$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left(r \Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_r^c}}{\partial r} \right)$ $+ \frac{\partial}{r \partial \theta} \left(\frac{\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c}}{r} (\overline{u_r^c}^2 - \overline{u_\theta^c}^2) \right)$ $- \frac{\Omega_c \overline{u_r^c}}{r} \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}^2}{\partial r}$	$\dots + \frac{\partial}{r \partial r} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_\theta^c} (\overline{u_r^c}^2 - \overline{u_\theta^c}^2) \right)$ $+ \frac{\partial}{r \partial \theta} \left(\Omega_c \overline{u_r^c} \frac{\partial \overline{u_\theta^c}}{\partial r} \right)$ $+ \Omega_c \frac{\overline{u_\theta^c}}{r^2} (\overline{u_r^c}^2 - \overline{u_\theta^c}^2)$

Table D.2 Modelled Scalar Flux Equations in Cylindrical Polar Coordinates

APPENDIX (E)Derivation of Finite Difference Equation for VariablesStored in Staggered ($x-\Psi$) Grid

The finite difference equation to be solved in a staggered grid (see Fig.(E.1)) is same as in conventional grid. It is

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} + (a + b\omega) \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \omega} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} (c \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \omega}) + d \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} a &= - \frac{1}{\Psi_E - \Psi_I} \frac{d\Psi_I}{dx} \\ b &= - \frac{1}{\Psi_E - \Psi_I} \frac{d}{dx} (\Psi_E - \Psi_I) \\ c &= \frac{r^2 \rho U \Gamma_{eff}}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)^2} \\ d &= \frac{1}{\rho U} S^\Phi \end{aligned}$$

Here the notation is same as that in Chapter (3). The suffices I and E denote the interior and exterior boundaries of the layer, whereas (I) denotes the grid point. Here Φ is the variable to be stored in the staggered location. Note that the mean velocity is stored at regular grid points i.e. at (I) , $(I-1)$ etc.

Consider a control cell shifted half a grid node from (I) in the (minus) ω -direction, and denote the variable to be calculated at this point by $\Phi_{(I)}$.

Notation: Except for the variable Φ , suffix (I) stands for that quantity at (I) the regular node. $\Phi_{(I)}$ stands for the variable Φ stored at the shifted grid node and $\bar{\Phi}_{(I)}$ denotes the interpolated value of Φ at the regular grid point (I) . The suffixes d and u

stand for quantities evaluated at downstream and upstream locations respectively.

Now assume that the variation of Φ between the shifted nodes is linear. (The variation of mean velocity U between its nodes too is assumed to be linear.) In order to obtain the finite difference equation for $\Phi_{(I)}$ multiply (E.1) by $d\omega$ and integrate between the limits $(I-1)$ and (I) .

$$(a) \quad \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x} d\omega = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \left[\Phi_{(I,d)} - \Phi_{(I,u)} \right] d\omega \quad (E.2)$$

$$(b) \quad \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \left[a + b\omega \right] \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \omega} d\omega = -b \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \Phi_{(I,m)} d\omega + \left[(a + b\omega) \Phi \right]_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \quad (b1) \quad (b2) \quad (E.3)$$

$$(c) \quad \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} c \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \omega} \right] d\omega = \left[c \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \omega} \right]_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \quad (E.4)$$

$$(d) \quad \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \frac{1}{\rho U} S^\Phi d\omega = \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} d_m d\omega \quad (E.5)$$

In order to evaluate the right hand sides of (E.2) to (E.5) values of Φ at some intermediate locations should be known. To facilitate that, define weighting factors $\Omega_{(I)}^+$ and $\Omega_{(I)}^-$ by

$$\Omega_{(I)}^+ = 0.5 \frac{(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)})}{(\omega_{(I+1)} - \omega_{(I-1)})} \quad (E.6)$$

and

$$\Omega_{(I)}^- = 0.5 \frac{(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)})}{(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-2)})} \quad (E.7)$$

so that (see Fig. (E.1)),

$$\Phi_a = \Omega_{(I)}^+ \Phi_{(I+1)} + (1 - \Omega_{(I)}^+) \Phi_{(I)} \quad (\text{E.8})$$

and

$$\bar{\Phi}_{(I)} = 2 \Omega_{(I)}^+ \Phi_{(I+1)} + (1 - 2 \Omega_{(I)}^+) \Phi_{(I)} \quad (\text{E.9})$$

Further, in obtaining partial derivatives with respect to ω , the values of Φ at $x = x_d$ are chosen. This is same as the practice of [9] and is both unconditionally stable and convenient. i.e.

$$\Phi_m = \Phi_d \quad (\text{E.10})$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{a}) + (\text{b1}) &= \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \Phi_{(I,d)} d\omega - \frac{1}{\Delta x} \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \Phi_{(I,u)} d\omega \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)} \frac{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_d - (\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u}{\Delta x} \int_{(I-1)}^{(I)} \Phi_{(I,d)} d\omega \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.11})$$

Substituting

$$\frac{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u}{\Delta x} = P$$

and

$$\frac{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_d - (\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u}{\Delta x} = G$$

and with (E.8) substituted on two halves of the shifted cell at (I),

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a) + (b1) &= \frac{1}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u} \frac{\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}}{2} \\
 &\times \left[(P + G) \left\{ \Phi_{(I+1,d)} \Omega_{(I)}^+ + \Phi_{(I,d)} (2 - \Omega_{(I)}^+ - \Omega_{(I)}^-) \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. + \Phi_{(I-1,d)} \Omega_{(I)}^- \right\} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - P \left\{ \Phi_{(I+1,u)} \Omega_{(I)}^+ + \Phi_{(I,u)} (2 - \Omega_{(I)}^+ - \Omega_{(I)}^-) \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. + \Phi_{(I-1,u)} \Omega_{(I)}^- \right\} \right] . \tag{E.12}
 \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a) + (b1) &= \frac{(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)})}{8 (\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u} \\
 &\times \left[4 (2 - \Omega_{(I)}^+ - \Omega_{(I)}^-) \left\{ (P + G) \Phi_{(I,d)} - P \Phi_{(I,u)} \right\} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + 4 (\Omega_{(I)}^+) \left\{ (P + G) \Phi_{(I+1,d)} - P \Phi_{(I+1,u)} \right\} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + 4 (\Omega_{(I)}^-) \left\{ (P + G) \Phi_{(I-1,d)} - P \Phi_{(I-1,u)} \right\} \right] . \tag{E.13}
 \end{aligned}$$

The balance of the term (b) is,

$$(b2) = (a + b\omega)_{(I)} \bar{\Phi}_{(I)} - (a + b\omega)_{(I-1)} \bar{\Phi}_{(I-1)} \tag{E.14}$$

but,

$$(a + b\omega) = - \frac{1}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u} \left[\frac{d\Psi_I}{dx} + \omega \left(\frac{d\Psi_E}{dx} - \frac{d\Psi_I}{dx} \right) \right] .$$

Denoting

$$L_{(I)}^+ = - \left[(1 - \omega_{(I)}) \frac{d\Psi_I}{dx} + \omega_{(I)} \frac{d\Psi_E}{dx} \right] \tag{E.15}$$

and

$$L_{(I)}^- = - \left[(1 - \omega_{(I-1)}) \frac{d\Psi_I}{dx} + \omega_{(I-1)} \frac{d\Psi_E}{dx} \right] \tag{E.16}$$

equation (E.14) reduces to

$$(b2) = \frac{1}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u} \left[L_{(I)}^+ \bar{\Phi}_{(I,d)} - L_{(I)}^- \bar{\Phi}_{(I-1,d)} \right] .$$

Substituting $\bar{\Phi}_{(I,d)}$ etc. from (E.9), obtain

$$(b2) = \frac{1}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u} \left[\Phi_{(I,d)} \left[L_{(I)}^+ (1 - 2\Omega_{(I)}^+) - L_{(I)}^- (1 - 2\Omega_{(I)}^-) \right] + \Phi_{(I+1,d)} L_{(I)}^+ 2\Omega_{(I)}^+ - \Phi_{(I-1,d)} L_{(I)}^- 2\Omega_{(I)}^- \right] . \quad (E.17)$$

Note here that $L_{(I)}^+$ and $L_{(I)}^-$ are different from L^+ and L^- of [9] .

$$(c) = \left[c \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \omega} \right]_{(I)} - \left[c \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \omega} \right]_{(I-1)} . \quad (E.18)$$

The ω -differences across the regular grid can be written as

$$\omega_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} - \omega_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} \approx r \rho U_{(I)} (y_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} - y_{(I-\frac{1}{2})}) / (\Psi_E - \Psi_I)$$

and

$$\omega_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} - \omega_{(I-1\frac{1}{2})} \approx r \rho U_{(I-1)} (y_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} - y_{(I-1\frac{1}{2})}) / (\Psi_E - \Psi_I) . \quad (E.19)$$

The transport coefficients at the edges of the cell are

$$T_{(I)}^+ = (r \Gamma_{eff})_{(I)} / (y_{(I+\frac{1}{2})} - y_{(I-\frac{1}{2})})$$

$$T_{(I)}^- = (r \Gamma_{eff})_{(I-1)} / (y_{(I-\frac{1}{2})} - y_{(I-1\frac{1}{2})}) . \quad (E.20)$$

Therefore (E.18) can be reexpressed as

$$(c) = \frac{1}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u} \left[-\Phi_{(I,d)} (T_{(I)}^+ + T_{(I)}^-) + \Phi_{(I+1,d)} T_{(I)}^+ + \Phi_{(I-1,d)} T_{(I)}^- \right] . \quad (E.21)$$

Lastly, the source term can be integrated so as to read

$$(d) = \frac{1}{(\Psi_E - \Psi_I)_u} \left[S_u + S_d \Phi_{(I,d)} \right] \quad (E.22)$$

Now summing up the terms in (E.13), (E.17), (E.21) and (E.22) and rearranging,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \Phi_{(I,d)} \left[(P + G) (\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) (2 - \Omega_{(I)}^+ - \Omega_{(I)}^-) \right. \\ & + 2 L_{(I)}^+ (1 - 2 \Omega_{(I)}^+) - 2 L_{(I)}^- (1 - 2 \Omega_{(I)}^-) \\ & \left. + 2 T_{(I)}^+ + 2 T_{(I)}^- - 2 S_d \right] \\ & + \Phi_{(I+1,d)} \left[(P + G) (\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) \Omega_{(I)}^+ + 4 L_{(I)}^+ \Omega_{(I)}^- - 2 T_{(I)}^+ \right] \\ & + \Phi_{(I-1,d)} \left[(P + G) (\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) \Omega_{(I)}^- + 4 L_{(I)}^- \Omega_{(I)}^- - 2 T_{(I)}^- \right] \\ & - \left[P \left[\Phi_{(I,u)} (\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) (2 - \Omega_{(I)}^+ - \Omega_{(I)}^-) \right. \right. \\ & + \Phi_{(I+1,u)} (\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) \Omega_{(I)}^+ \\ & \left. \left. + \Phi_{(I-1,u)} (\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) \Omega_{(I)}^- \right] + 2 S_u \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (E.23)$$

This is the finite difference equation for the variable Φ at (I) . As in [9], implausible effects of this equation due to the linearity assumption of the $\Phi \sim \omega$ relation in high lateral flux situations can be removed by modifying the transport terms as

$$T^* = \frac{1}{2} (T + |2 L \Omega| + |T - |2 L \Omega||) \quad (E.24)$$

Consequences of this modification and the implausibility of the uncorrected form is discussed in [9].

Thus (E.23) can be rearranged to the form,

$$D_{(I)} \Phi_{(I)} = A_{(I)} \Phi_{(I+1)} + B_{(I)} \Phi_{(I-1)} + C_{(I)} \quad (\text{E.25})$$

where,

$$A_{(I)} = 2 T_{(I)}^{*+} - 4 L_{(I)}^+ \Omega_{(I)}^+ - (P + G)(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) \Omega_{(I)}^+$$

$$B_{(I)} = 2 T_{(I)}^{*-} + 4 L_{(I)}^- \Omega_{(I)}^- - (P + G)(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) \Omega_{(I)}^-$$

$$C_{(I)} = P(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) \left[\Phi_{(I,u)} (2 - \Omega_{(I)}^+ - \Omega_{(I)}^-) + \Phi_{(I+1,u)} \Omega_{(I)}^+ + \Phi_{(I-1,u)} \Omega_{(I)}^- \right] + 2 S_u$$

and

$$D_{(I)} = A_{(I)} + B_{(I)} + 2 P(\omega_{(I)} - \omega_{(I-1)}) - 2 S_d$$

Simultaneous solution of equations of the type (E.25) can now be done in a marching fashion with known initial and boundary conditions.

APPENDIX (F)

Computer Program for the Solution of Two-and Three-Dimensional

Scalar Transport Problem

F.1 Introduction

The computer code to be described is an outgrowth of the TEACHL program outlined in GOSMAN and PUN [50]. It incorporates the staggered grid arrangement as described in Section (3.5). The program is arranged to solve the flow and scalar transport equations described in Section(2.7). The flow considered is of two-dimensional boundary layer type, whereas the scalar transport problem can either be two-or three-dimensional in character. The three-dimensional situations were considered with frozen hydrodynamic field obtained from two-dimensional calculations made before hand. Simultaneous solution of all equations can however be easily arranged.

This computer code was developed in CDC 7600 and CDC 6600 computers in the "update" mode, however, it can easily be adopted for other machines. The program is written in FORTRAN IV language.

In the Subroutine SOURCE which evaluates the source terms of all equations of the second-order (stress and scalar-flux) closure model, it was attempted, to retain the tensorial character of the terms. This may enhance the clarity and facilitate understanding of the evaluation of the source terms.

The coordinate system in which the equations are written is the cylindrical polar (θ - r - z) and can be converted to Cartesian coordinates (x - y - z) by changing an index. The notation followed is, for directions,

$$x_{\theta} \equiv x_1 \quad ; \quad x_r \equiv x_2 \quad ; \quad x_z \equiv x_3 \quad ,$$

and for velocities, stress and flux components

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{\theta} &\equiv U, & U_r &\equiv V, & U_z &\equiv W \\
 \overline{u_{\theta}^2} &\equiv \overline{u^2}, & \overline{u_r^2} &\equiv \overline{v^2}, & \overline{u_z^2} &\equiv \overline{w^2} \text{ etc.} \\
 \overline{u_{\theta} c} &\equiv \overline{uc}, & \overline{u_r c} &\equiv \overline{vc}, & \overline{u_z c} &\equiv \overline{wc},
 \end{aligned}$$

F.1.1 Base Case

The program is set for the solution of mean and turbulent equations in a cylindrical geometry. As described in Section (3.3), for this case the partial differential equations for U_{θ} , U_r and P' are redundant. Thus these equations have been excluded from consideration here. These equations can however be incorporated easily as in TEACHT program. (Relevant turbulent stresses in U_{θ} and U_r equations can be inserted in a manner parallel to that of $U_z \equiv W$ equation described here.)

The boundary condition for the scalar transport situation considered is that discussed in Section (3.7). Note here that all other cases under investigation can be generated from this base case.

F.1.2 The Grid System

Main calculation domain is a segment of a circular area of radius $R_{(NJ)}$. See Fig. (F.1). The enclosed angle of Θ can be chosen as desired. NI is the number of grid lines in the angular direction, whereas NJ is the number of lines covering the radius. This enables one to have $(NI-2) \times (NJ-2)$ grid nodes for solution of the equations. The region between NJ and NJ0 represent the thick wall where only the partial differential equation for mean temperature is solved.

Fig. (F.2) shows the control volumes around the point P . The control volume for $U_z \equiv W$ equation is centered at P whereas those for $U_r \equiv W$ and $U_\theta \equiv U$ are shifted in $-r$ and $-\theta$ direction respectively. All hydrodynamic turbulent variables, in the present base case are solved at the shifted grid point V . The scalar fluxes $\overline{u_r^C}$ and $\overline{u_\theta^C}$ are solved at V and U respectively. The dimensions of the main and shifted control volumes are shown in Fig. (F.2).

F.2 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

Given below is the list of all the important FORTRAN symbols that are used in the program. Symbols that only have a local meaning in the subroutines are not listed here. Whenever possible the variables are grouped together to avoid an unnecessary long index.

FORTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
AD, AE, AN, AP, AS, AU, AW	Coefficients of the general finite difference equation	IT×JT
AREA	$\iint r \, dr \, d\theta$	
BVE, BVS, BVW, BWS	Weighting factors near boundaries	
C	Mean scalar variable	IT×JT×2
CAPPA	κ ; the von Kármán constant	
CAPPAC	κ_c ; Coefficient in log law for C	
CBULK	$\bar{C}$; Bulk temperature	
CC, CC1, CC2, CC1W, CC2W	$C_c, C_{c1}, C_{c2}, C_{c1w}, C_{c2w}$; Coefficients in scalar flux model	
CEPS, CEPS1, CEPS2	$C_\epsilon, C_{\epsilon1}, C_{\epsilon2}$; Coefficients in modelled ϵ -equation	
CG, CG2	C_g, C_{g2} ; Coefficients in $\overline{c^2}$ equation	
CMU	C_μ ; Coefficient in two-equation model of turbulence	
CRS, CR1, CR2, CR1W, CR2W	$C_s, C_{s1}, C_{s2}, C_{s1w}, C_{s2w}$; Coefficients in stress model	
CT	C_τ : Friction scalar	IT
D	D_{ij} ; see equation (2.16)	3×3
DCDXJ	$\frac{\partial C}{\partial x_j}$; e.g. DCDXJ(2) $\equiv \frac{\partial C}{\partial r}$	3

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
DCDZB	$\left(\frac{\Delta C}{\Delta z}\right)$ in the near-wall cell	IJ
DEL	δ_{ij} : Kronecker delta	3×3
DEN	ρ ; Density of fluid	IT×JT×2
DENSIT	ρ ; Density of fluid	
DET, DETU, ET, ETU	Geometrical parameters denoting tube wall control volumes	IT
DIF	Γ^Φ ; Diffusion coefficient of Φ	IT×JT×2
DIS	ϵ_{ij} ; Component of dissipation tensor	3×3
DISCSQ	ϵ_c ; Scalar dissipation rate	
DPDZ	$\frac{dP}{dz}$; Streamwise pressure gradient	
DUIDXJ	$\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j}$; e.g. DUIDXJ(3,2) $\equiv \frac{\partial W}{\partial r}$	3×3
DXEP, DXPW, DXEPU, DXPWU	Geometrical variables, see Fig. (F.2)	IT
DYNP, DYPS, DYNPV, DYPSV	Geometrical variables, see Fig. (F.2)	JT
DYW	Geometrical parameter in thick wall control volumes	
DZ	dz ; Step size in streamwise direction	
DIC	$-\overline{u_k^c} \frac{\partial U_k}{\partial x_j}$	3
EC	ϵ_c ; Scalar dissipation rate	IT×JT
ECCEN	Eccentricity of the tube wall	
ED	ϵ ; Isotropic dissipation rate	IT×JT
ELOG	E ; Coefficient in log-law for velocity	
ELOGC	E_c ; Coefficient in log-law for scalar	
ENUSS	Nu ; Nusselt number	
ES	Power input per unit volume of tube wall	

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
EXCHAT	K_f ; Thermal conductivity of fluid	IT×JT
EXCHAW	K_w ; Thermal conductivity of wall material	
FF	$(\overline{u_\theta^2} - \overline{u_r^2})$;	
FLOWIN	$\iint \rho U_z r dr d\theta$;	
FRA	Step size controlling factor	IT×JT
FU, FV	$\overline{u_\theta u_z}$, $\overline{u_r u_z}$ or $\overline{u_\theta^c}$, $\overline{u_r^c}$; Fluxes in θ and r directions	
FWL	f ; Near wall effect function	
FWM1	f in near wall cell	
F1, F2, F3	Coefficients in ϕ_{ij2} model	IT×JT×2
GAM	Γ^C ; Molecular diffusivity of C	
GINLET	Total mass flux at the inlet	
GREAT	A large numerical value	
GSTAR	Total mass flux in the new step	4
G1, G2	Coefficients in ϕ_{ic2} model	
HEDU → HEDVIS	Variable titles	
ICON	= 0 ; Starting run = 1 ; Continuation run	
IDIF	= 1 ; Gradient diffusion model = 2 ; Tensor invariant model of diffusion	
IEND	Number of steps required for the calculation	
IHT	= 0 ; Scalar transfer problem not solved = 1 ; Two-dimensional scalar transport = 2 ; Three-dimensional scalar transport	

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
IJ	Array dimension in x ($\equiv \theta$) direction	
IJET	= 1 ; for jet flow (this should be set to zero)	
IJT	IJ×JT	
INCALU → INCALR	Logical variables denoting the equations to be solved	
INDCOS	= 1 ; Plane flow = 2 ; Round flow	
INDEX	= 0 ; At the starting step in calculation = 1 ; After the first step	
INDIFF	= FALSE ; Turbulent stresses or fluxes to be treated in source form = TRUE ; Same to be treated in diffusion form	
INDPRI	Limited print-out control	
INPRO	= FALSE ; Constant transport coefficients = TRUE ; Variable transport coefficients	
INTURB	= FALSE ; Laminar flow = TRUE ; Turbulent flow	
INUM	Number of points for which the initial conditions are given	
IPRO	Argument for ZDPRO	
IQUE	= 0 ; Prescribed wall scalar value boundary condition = 1 ; Prescribed wall flux	
IRUN	= 1 ; First run = 2 ; Two-dimensional scalar calculation = 3 ; Second and subsequent runs in three-dimensional scalar calculation	
ISTEP	Step number	

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
ISC	= 0 ; Mean scalar equation = 1 ; Mean velocity equation	
IT	Array dimension in θ -direction	
ITESC, ITESU	= 1; When the source balance of respective equations are needed in the output	
ITEST	An index used when details of finite difference coefficients are required	
IU	= 0 ; Hydrodynamic field not solved = 1 ; Two-dimensional flow field = 2 ; Three-dimensional flow field	
IVAR	= IU or IHT ; Depending on whether flow or scalar variables are under consideration	
IWALL	= 0 ; Wall control volumes ignored in calculations = 1 ; Wall control volumes considered	
JUJ → JEC	Indices denoting turbulent variables	
JT	Array dimension in r -direction	
K	= 1 ; Upstream plane = 2 ; Downstream plane	
KT	= 2 ; In boundary layers	
MCW	= 1 ; Model R_{cw1} = 2 ; Model R_{cw2}	
MODEC	= 1 ; Model R_{c1} = 2 ; Model R_{c2}	
MODEL	= 1 ; Model R_{s1} = 2 ; Model R_{s2}	
MRW	= 1 ; Model R_{sw1} = 2 ; Model R_{sw2}	

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
NI	Number of grid nodes in x (or θ -direction) $NIM1 = NI-1$, $NIM2 = NI-2$	
NJ	Number of grid nodes in r -direction	
NJO	Number of grid nodes in r -direction (including wall) $NJOM1 = NJO-1$	
NJP	Same as NJ , $NJP1 = NJP+1$, $NJPM1 = NJP-1$	
NK	Number of grid nodes in z -direction $= 2$; in boundary layers	
NSWPU $\rightarrow$ NSWPR	Number of times a certain equation be solved at a given streamwise plane	
NUMPRI	Full printout controlling index	
OLDU $\rightarrow$ ODPDZ	Variables transferred from two-dimensional calculations	
P	P_{ij} ; Stress production tensor (see equation (2.15))	3×3
PC	P_c ; Flux production tensor (see equation (2.41))	3
PCSQ	Generation rate of scalar fluctuations	
PE	P : Pressure	$IT \times JT \times 2$
PI	π	
PHI	Φ ; General dependent variable	$IT \times JT \times 2$
PHI1, PHI2, PHIW1, PHIW2	ϕ_{ij1} , ϕ_{ij2} , ϕ_{ijw1} , ϕ_{ijw2} ; Pressure strain model	3×3
PP	P' ; Pressure correction	$IT \times JT$
PRANDT	Pr ; Prandtl number	
PSI1, PSI2, PSIW1, PSIW2	ϕ_{ic1} , ϕ_{ic2} , ϕ_{icw1} , ϕ_{icw2} ; Terms in model of pressure-scalar gradient correlation	3

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
PT	Production of turbulent kinetic energy	
PIC	$P_{1c} ; - \overline{u_k^c} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}$	
QLENTH	Heating length	
QUE	Heating flux entering the fluid	IT
QUO	Heating flux at the outer wall of the tube	IT
R, RV, RCV	Radial positions of the grids (see Fig. (F.2))	JT
RINNER	R_i ; Inner radius	
ROUTER	R_o ; Outer radius	
RS	Dummy turbulent variable	IT×JT
RSWALL	Boundary condition of turbulent variables	14
SAVE	Array for saving contents of the common block COMALL	Depends on IT and JT
SEW , SEWU	Geometric variables, see Fig. (F.2)	IT
SNS, SNSV	Geometric variables, see Fig. (F.2)	JT
SDEX	Extra sources due to diffusion term	14
SEX	Extra sources due to polar grid	14
SMALL	Numerically small near-zero number	
SP, SU	Parts of linearised source term	IT×JT
SPS, SUS	Parts of linearised source term	IJT
SPHEAT	c_p ; Specific heat of fluid	
SPH	= 1.0 ; In momentum equation = SPHEAT ; In C-equation	
STAN	= St ; Stanton number	
S1, S2	Parts of source terms of turbulent variables	14×IJT

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
TE	$= k$; Turbulent kinetic energy	IT×JT
U	U_{θ} ; Transverse velocity	IT×JT×2
UC	$\overline{u_{\theta} c}$; Transverse scalar flux	IT×JT
UIUJ	$\overline{u_i u_j}$; e.g. UIUJ(2,3) = $\overline{u_r u_z}$	3×3
UT	U_{τ} ; Friction velocity	IT
UU, UV, UW	$\overline{u_{\theta}^2}$, $\overline{u_{\theta} u_r}$, $\overline{u_{\theta} u_z}$	IT×JT
UUMAX etc.	Maximum magnitudes of variables (input conditions)	
UU1 etc.	Array of dimensionless UU etc. (input conditions)	INUM
URFS	Under-relaxation factor for source terms near axis	
V	U_r ; Cross-stream velocity	IT×JT×2
VC	$\overline{u_r c}$; Cross-stream scalar flux	IT×JT
VIS	μ ; Molecular viscosity of fluid	IT×JT×2
VISCOS	μ ; Molecular viscosity of fluid	
VISUU	$\frac{k}{\epsilon} \overline{u_{\theta}^2}$	IT×JT
VISVV	$\frac{k}{\epsilon} \overline{u_r^2}$	IT×JT
VMEAN	U_b ; Bulk mean velocity	
VV	$\overline{u_r^2}$; Cross-stream components of Reynolds stress	IT×JT
VW	$\overline{u_r u_z}$; Reynolds shear stress	IT×JT
W	U_z ; Streamwise component of mean velocity	IT×JT×2
WC	$\overline{u_z c}$; Streamwise turbulent scalar flux	IT×JT
WCORR	Correction to the W velocity	

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

(contd.)

FORTRAN Symbol	Description	Dimension
WFE, WFW	Weighting factors	IT
WFN, WFS	Weighting factors	JT
WW	$\overline{u_z^2}$; Streamwise component of Reynolds stress	IT×JT
X, XU	Transverse coordinates of grid (see Fig. (F.2))	IT
XTOT	Maximum value of X, i.e. total angle covered by the domain	
Y, YV	Cross-stream coordinate of grid (see Fig.(F.2))	JT
YTOT	Maximum value of Y, i.e. radius of tube	
YTOTO	Outer radius of tube	
YPLUS	$y^+ = \frac{yU_\tau}{\nu}$	
Y2	Dimensionless Y locations for which initial profiles are given	INUM
Z, ZW	Streamwise coordinate of grid	2
ZDPRO	Streamwise locations for which output is required, ZDPRO is in number of diameters	18

Table F.1 Listing of FORTRAN Symbols

E.3 Description of the Subroutines and Common Blocks

As the program listing given in the next Section is produced by "update" mode each line in it is identified by a name and a sequence number. If that name is same as that of the particular subroutine then it identifies a line that is common to both two-and three-dimensional versions. If the identifier is DIM3, then it corresponds to a line which should be present only in the three-dimensional version. The sequence numbers on these identifiers clearly indicate whether any statements were deleted during this modification. All such deletions are explained after the following subroutine descriptions.

Comdeck COMALL

This common block contains all the variables that are needed to be transferred between subroutines. In the present form it allows a maximum of 15 grid points in the transverse direction and 30 grid points in the radial direction.

The array SAVE is equivalent to the bulk of the common block and it is used in saving contents (via TAPE 4) from one run so that it can be used as input (via TAPE 3) in the next. This is a convenient and economical facility specially during the program development stages. It ensures fast turnaround from the computer too. Similarly, the array TRANS transfers relevant information of the two-dimensional hydrodynamic variables obtained in a previous run. This facilitates one to carry out variety to three-dimensional scalar transport explorations (for example, grid dependency tests, various model testing) with an established hydrodynamic field.

Broadly the contents of the main common block can be described as follows.

Line No.	Contents
1	Location of main grid nodes
2	Description of main control volumes
3	Description of staggered control volumes
4	The radial location and weighting factors
5	Mean flow variables and mean scalar
6 - 8	Turbulent variables
9	Density, kinematic and turbulent transport coefficients
10 - 11	Coefficients of finite difference equation
12	Useful wall parameters
13	Fluid properties
14 - 15	Coefficients of the turbulent model and wall laws
16	Identifying integers for turbulent variables
17	Limits of the calculation domain and that of arrays
18	Headings for the output
19	Logical variables
20	Number of sweeps in the solution for tri-diagonal matrix algorithm
21	Choice of model and choice of output
22 - 23	Dimensionality and other details of the particular run
24	Flow conditions, boundary conditions for turbulent variables
25	Output manipulation parameter and some near boundary weighting factors

Table F.2 Contents of Comdeck COMALL

The next two lines carry the variables that are relevant to the thick wall calculations. The main common block ends here. The next common block contains the variables that need be transferred from previous two-dimensional flow calculation.

The comdeck COMALL appears in all subroutines except LISOLV and PRINT.

Subroutine MAIN

This is the main section of the program which does the management of the calculation scheme. Briefly its major actions are the following.

- Call the subroutine INDATA(1) for initial conditions of the problem.
- Supply the main grid to cover the domain of interest.
- Call INTIG to get the geometric variables ready.
- Call INIT0 to set variables to zero.
- Call INDATA(2) in order to get the dependent variable profiles.
- Print out the problem heading and fluid properties.
- Call OUTPUT in order to get a full output of the initial conditions.
- Then enter the calculation loop which is to be traversed as many times as the number of steps taken in z -direction.
- Calculate the forward step by calling STEP.
- Call PROPS to calculate the fluid properties and kinematic and turbulent transport coefficients at all nodes.
- Calculate the source terms for all turbulence equations by entering the SOURCE subroutine at CALSOR.
- Call CALCRS in order to calculate finite difference coefficients and then to solve the turbulence equations. This step is taken for all turbulence variables.
- Call CALCM in order to solve the W -momentum equation.
- Call CALCM in order to solve the mean scalar C equation.
- If any intermediate output is required, call OUTPUT.

- Check for conditions for termination of the calculation. If more calculations are to be performed return to the beginning of the calculation loop.
- If to be terminated, then produce an output just before stopping.

In addition to these, one thing worth a mention is that when solving turbulence equations, it is the shear stress $\overline{u_r u_z} \equiv VW$ and the lateral scalar flux $\overline{u_r c} \equiv VC$ equation that are solved first. This was done because description of near-wall boundary condition of all other turbulence variables are specified in terms of these two.

Subroutine INDATA

This subroutine supplies the external input data to the program. It has two entry points.

At the first level,

- Identifying integers for turbulence equations are prescribed.
- If necessary, data is read from a previous run (via SAVE or TRANS).
- Supply choice of model, turbulence constants, necessary numerical constants and controlling indicies.
- Supply the wall properties.

At the second level,

- Dimensionless profiles and their multiplying factors for all dependent variables are read from data.
- The mean profiles are interpolated to obtain values corresponding to the regular grid.
- The turbulence profiles are interpolated to obtain values corresponding to the respective shifted grid.

Subroutine SOURCE

This subroutine calculate the source terms for all turbulent variables. It has three entry points SORCEI, CALSOR and SORCE. SORCEI is entered only once in a given run. Here some arrays are initialised and some coefficients relevant to the turbulence model are calculated. The section CALSOR is entered once in every calculation step. In this section the tensorial character of the source terms of the turbulence equation is attempted to be maintained. Since most of the turbulence variables are to be evaluated at the grid shifted half spacing in direction $-x$, here the node refers to that at V (see Fig. (F.2)). In the Section CALSOR, for every shifted control volume the following calculations were made.

- Perform necessary initialisations.
- Assign the Reynolds stress tensor at the node (i.e. at V).
- Obtain gradients of Reynolds stress that are required in evaluations to follow.
- Similarly assign the scalar fluxes and evaluate any necessary gradients.
- Calculate mean velocity gradients.
- Calculate mean scalar gradients.

With these preliminaries now one is in a position to evaluate the source terms, and they are done in the following order.

(a) Evaluate sources for Reynolds stress equations

- Calculate Production terms.
- Calculate modelled terms of pressure-strain and dissipation terms.
- Evaluate the near-wall-effect terms of pressure-strain relation.
- Evaluate sources due to tensor invariant diffusion model, and those additional terms due to cylindrical polar grid.
- Assemble the source terms.

(b) Evaluate source terms for turbulent kinetic energy equation (in a two-equation model of turbulence),

- Calculate the production and assign the dissipation term in source form.

(c) Evaluate source terms for the dissipation rate equation

(d) Evaluate sources in turbulent scalar flux equations

- Calculate production terms
- Calculate the pressure-scalar gradient correlation terms.
- Evaluate the near-wall effects of the same.
- Evaluate additional sources from the diffusion model.
- Assemble the source terms.

(e) Evaluate sources in $\frac{\overline{c^2}}{2}$ equation.

Now one has the option of taking an output of source balance in component stress equations and turbulent scalar equations.

For a given step the third section SORCE is entered as many times as there are dependent turbulence variables. Here the source terms calculated in CALSOR are picked up by each variable, in the linearised source form.

Subroutine INIT

This subroutine provides the initialisation of variable fields and calculation of geometric parameters. It has three entry points, namely, INITG, INITO and STEP. The INITG is for the evaluation of the geometric variables. If it is the first run this section is entered once and on continuation runs this is not entered at all. This section calculates the locations and relevant weighting factors, distances for regular as well staggered grid systems. For three-dimensional heat transfer problems, the wall geometry is calculated here.

In the Section INIT0, the variables are set to zero and a call is made to SORCEI where some arrays are initialised.

In two-dimensional problems calculation is made only for one radial plane. In STEP all such planes were filled with those calculated values. This is done merely for cosmetic reasons and obviously is skipped in three-dimensional situations. The forward step calculation is also made here.

Subroutine PROPS

This subroutine prescribes the material properties and turbulent diffusion transport coefficients for the problem. If the hydrodynamic field is kept frozen then PROPS is called only once in a run.

Subroutine CALCM

Calculation of the mean variables (W and C) are done in this subroutine. When calling for solution of W -momentum equation, specify $ISC = 1$, and for C -equation specify $ISC = 0$. Other arguments of the call statements can be easily recognised (see call statements in MAIN).

The first section of the subroutine calculate the finite difference coefficients. Note here that the turbulent stresses or fluxes can be expressed either as diffusion terms or (as will be seen next) as source terms. A call to the relevant section of PROMOD (i.e. MODW or MODC) is made now to obtain boundary conditions and other problem modifications. Next the coefficients are assembled and solved in LISOLV. Next the pressure gradient is calculated and corresponding velocity corrections are made. The lateral velocity field is obtained next by considering the mass continuity in individual cells. Lastly the variable W or C at the boundaries are calculated.

Subroutine CALCRS

This subroutine calculate the turbulent variables, such as, Reynolds Stresses, scalar flux etc.. It is done in the relevant shifted grid described previously. First section of CALCRS calculates the finite difference coefficients, the second section will perform the problem modification and assembly of coefficients. The equations are solved in subroutine LISOLV next and then the boundary values are calculated.

Subroutine PROMOD

This subroutine supplies the relevant problem modifications to all dependent variable equations. MODW supplies the modifications for *W*-momentum equation. Here

- the logarithmic law of the wall is applied,
- the source term due to turbulent stresses are calculated,
- other boundary conditions for momentum equation supplied.

In the Section MODC, the modifications to the *C*-equation are made. For the sake of clarity the modifications for the case of a thick conducting wall is given separately. Here

- the logarithmic law of the wall for *C*-equation is applied,
- the source term due to turbulent scalar fluxes are calculated,
- boundary conditions of *C*-equation supplied.

For the thick wall case in addition to these,

- finite difference coefficients for the wall control volumes are calculated,
- sources of heat (say, due to electrical heating) are integrated,
- sources of heat externally applied to the tube (as in the present experimental arrangement) are integrated,
- and other boundary conditions supplied.

The Section MODRS supplies necessary boundary information to all turbulent equations. The near-wall boundary conditions of shear stress VW and scalar flux VC are obtained with respect to their corresponding mean equations. The near-wall boundary condition for other turbulent variables are expressed in terms of the boundary values of VW and VC.

Subroutine OUTPUT

This subroutine supplies the main output of the calculations. The first section supplies the characteristic single variable outputs, e.g. skin friction coefficient, Nusselt numbers etc.. Outputs of mean and turbulent hydrodynamic variables and any necessary details of these are obtained next. Similarly outputs of mean and turbulent scalar fields are obtained next. For three-dimensional problems these variables are printed in block form by calling subroutine PRINT.

Subroutine LISOLV

A line by line solving procedure is utilised in solving the finite difference equations generated in CALCM and CALCRS. Here, the tri-diagonal matrix algorithm is employed in each line to be solved. In three-dimensional problems the domain is swept in both transverse (west-east) and radial (north-south) directions.

Subroutine PRINT

This subroutine printout two-dimensional arrays in block form.

A note on deleted lines (as can be seen by missing sequence numbers)

- The comdeck COMALL has replaced a line (e.g. MAIN,3) in each subroutine.
- DIM3.92 can well be same as INIT,123 .
- DIM3.94 has replaced "DO 710 J = 1,NJ" (as NJ0 is not defined in the two-dimensional case).
- DIM3.153 has replaced "DO 670 J = 2,NJ" for the same reason.
- DIM3.165 has replaced "I = 3" (in two-dimensional flows only one I-plane is solved.
- DIM3.226 has replaced "LISOLV.4 and 5" which had a smaller three-dimensional array.

F.4 Listing of the Computer Program

A listing of the computer program used in the present study in solving two-and three-dimensional scalar transport problems is given in the next few pages. This listing was obtained by running the program in update mode. The meanings of the identifiers were explained before in Section (F.3).

```

MAIN
**PROGRAM MAIN(INPUT,OUTPUT,TAPE3,TAPE4,TAPE5=INPUT,TAPE6=OUTPUT)
1. 0000008 PROGRAM MAIN(INPUT,OUTPUT,TAPE3,TAPE4,TAPE5=INPUT,TAPE6=OUTPUT)
C*****
C COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0022058 DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0022058 DIMENSION TRANS(1512)
4. 0022058 COMMON
1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
10XEP(15),DXPW(15),SEW(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
1R(30),RV(30),RCV(30),WFN(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
1U(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
1JU(15,30),UV(15,30),UH(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
1ED(15,30),TE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
1CZ(15,30),EZ(15,30),RS(15,30),
1DEY(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),AH(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
1AP(15,30),SJ(15,30),SP(15,30),
1JT(15),CT(15),QUE(15),DCDZB(15),QUO(15),
1DENSIT,VISCOS,PRANDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
1CMJ,CR1,CR2,CRS,CR1W,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELOG,
1CC1,CC2,CC3,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELJGC,
1JUU,JUV,JUH,JVV,JVW,JWJ,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JC2,JEC,
1NI,NIM,NIM2,NJ,NJM1,NJM2,NK,NK1,IT,JF,KT,IJT,
1AEDU(4),HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
1INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
1NSWPV,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
1MODEL,MJDEC,MHW,MCH,IQUE,IDIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
1IRUN,IJ,IH,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
1C,DZ,ISTEP,ISTP1,NRS,INDEX,UPDZ,
1FLDWIN,VMEAN,QLENTN,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,RSWALL(14),
1ZDPRJ(18),IPRO,IEND,INDPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
COMMON
1ET(15),ETJ(15),DET(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJP1,NJPM1,IWALL,
1ROUTER,RYNER,ECCEN,ES,NJO,YTDTU,EXCHAW,NJOM1
6. 0022058 COMMON OLDJ(30),OLDV(30),OLDW(30),OLDP(30),
1 OLDU(30),OLDUV(30),OLDUW(30),OLDVV(30),OLDVW(30),
1 OLDW(30),OLDTE(30),OLDED(30),OLDFF(30),
1 OLDEN(30),OLDVIS(30),OLDISUU(30),OLDISVV(30),
1 OLDUTA,CDPOZ
7. 0022058 LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
1 INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0022058 EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0022058 EQUIVALENCE (OLDU(1),TRANS(1))
C*****
C RUN SPECIFICATIONS
C*****
10. 0022058 CALL INDATA(1)
11. 0022078 INDEX=0
12. 0022078 IF(IRUN.EQ.3) GO TO 10
13. 0022118 ISTEP=0
14. 0022128 ICON=0
15. 0022128 IPRG=1
16. 0022138 Z(1)=0.0
17. 0022148 10 CONTINUE
18. 0022158 IF(IRUN.NE.1) CALL INITO
19. 0022218 IF(IRUN.EQ.3) CALL OUTPUT

```

MAIN.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM2.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.33
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM2.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
MAIN.4
MAIN.5
MAIN.6
MAIN.7
MAIN.8
MAIN.9
MAIN.10
MAIN.11
MAIN.12
MAIN.13
MAIN.14
MAIN.15
MAIN.16

000000-339-48

MAIN

PROGRAM MAIN(INPUT,OUTPUT,TAPE3,TAPE4,TAPE5=INPUT,TAPE6=OUTPUT)

PAGE 2

```

20. 0022258      IF(IRUN.NE.1) GO TO 200
      C*****
      C                      GRID DIMENSIONS
      C*****
21. 0022268      PI=3.14159
22. 0022278      IF(INDCJS.EQ.2) XTOT=XTOT*PI
      C-----GRID SPACING
23. 0022348      DO 100 I=1,NI
24. 0022368      100 X(I)=X(I)*XTOT
25. 0022408      DO 110 J=1,NJ
26. 0022438      110 Y(J)=Y(J)*YTOT
27. 0022458      Z(1)=Z.0
28. 0022468      Z(2)=Z(1)
29. 0022468      DZ=Z.0
30. 0022478      K=2
      C*****
      C                      INITIAL OPERATIONS
      C*****
      C-----CALCULATE GEOMETRICAL QUANTITIES AND SET VARIABLES TO ZERO
31. 0022508      CALL INIT3
32. 0022538      CALL INIT0
      C-----INITIALISE VARIABLE FIELDS
33. 0022558      200 IF(IRUN.EQ.3) GO TO 400
      C-----READ IN INITIAL PROFILES . (ZERO DEFAULT VALUES SET IN INIT0)
34. 0022568      CALL INJATA(2)
      C-----INFLOW CALCULATION
35. 0022618      FLOWIN=0.0
36. 0022618      AREA=0.
37. 0022618      DO 205 J=2,NJM1
38. 0022648      DO 205 I=1U1,IU2
39. 0022678      AREA=AREA+RCV(J)*SNS(J)*SEW(I)
40. 0022738      205 FLOWIN=FLOWIN+DEN(I,J,2)*RCV(J)*SNS(J)*SEW(I)*W(I,J,2)
41. 0023048      VMEAN=FLOWIN/AREA/DENSIT
42. 0023058      RE=VMEAN*DENSIT*2.0*Y(NJ)/VISCOS
      C-----PROBLEM HEADING AND INFORMATION
43. 0023108      WRITE(6,210)
44. 0023158      WRITE(6,220)
45. 0023208      WRITE(6,230) RE
46. 0023248      WRITE(6,240) VMEAN
47. 0023308      WRITE(6,250) PRANTJ
48. 0023348      WRITE(6,260) SPHEAT
49. 0023408      WRITE(6,270) VISCOS
50. 0023448      WRITE(6,280) DENSIT
51. 0023508      WRITE(6,210)
      C-----INITIAL OUTPUT
52. 0023538      K=2
53. 0023538      CALL OUTPUT
      C*****
      C                      ITERATION LOOP
      C*****
54. 0023568      300 ISTEP=ISTEP+1
55. 0023578      ISTEP1=ISTEP+1
56. 0023578      IF(ISTEP.LT.IEND) GO TO 400
57. 0023628      WRITE(4) SAVE
58. 0023728      GO TO 600
59. 0023728      400 CONTINUE
      C-----STEP FORWARD NOW.
60. 0023738      CALL STEP

```

```

MAIN.17
MAIN.18
MAIN.19
MAIN.20
MAIN.21
MAIN.22
MAIN.23
MAIN.24
MAIN.25
MAIN.26
MAIN.27
MAIN.28
MAIN.29
MAIN.30
MAIN.31
MAIN.32
MAIN.33
MAIN.34
MAIN.35
MAIN.36
MAIN.37
MAIN.38
MAIN.39
MAIN.40
MAIN.41
MAIN.42
MAIN.43
MAIN.44
MAIN.45
MAIN.46
MAIN.47
MAIN.48
MAIN.49
MAIN.50
MAIN.51
MAIN.52
MAIN.53
MAIN.54
MAIN.55
MAIN.56
MAIN.57
MAIN.58
MAIN.59
MAIN.60
MAIN.61
MAIN.62
MAIN.63
MAIN.64
MAIN.65
MAIN.66
MAIN.67
MAIN.68
MAIN.69
MAIN.70
MAIN.71
MAIN.72
MAIN.73
MAIN.74

```

```

MAIN      **PROGRAM MAIN(INPUT,OUTPUT,TAPE3,TAPE4,TAPE5=INPUT,TAPE6=OUTPUT)**

61. 0023758      IF(INPR) CALL PROPS
C*****
C-----CALCULATE SOURCE TERMS FOR ALL TURBULENT EQUATIONS.
62. 0024008      IF(INTUR) CALL CALSDR(MS,NRS,SU,SP,IJT,IL,I2)
C*****
C-----UPDATE MEAN VARIABLES.
63. 0024038      DO 410 I=1,NI
64. 0024058      DO 410 J=1,NJ
65. 0024108      M(I,J,1)=M(I,J,2)
66. 0024138      C(I,J,1)=C(I,J,2)
C-----CALCULATE VARIABLES AT THE NEW STEP.
67. 0024208      IF(INCALR(JVW)) CALL CALCRS(VW,JVW,CRS ,IT,JT,IU ,IU1,IU2)
68. 0024238      IF(INCALR(JUU)) CALL CALCRS(UU,JUU,CRS ,IT,JT,IU ,IU1,IU2)
69. 0024268      IF(INCALR(JVV)) CALL CALCRS(VV,JVV,CRS ,IT,JT,IU ,IU1,IU2)
70. 0024318      IF(INCALR(JWH)) CALL CALCRS(WH,JWH,CRS ,IT,JT,IU ,IU1,IU2)
71. 0024348      IF(INCALR(JTE)) CALL CALCRS(TE,JTE,CRS ,IT,JT,IU ,IU1,IU2)
72. 0024378      IF(INCALR(JED)) CALL CALCRS(ED,JED,CEPS,IT,JT,IU ,IU1,IU2)
73. 0024428      IF(INCALR(JVC)) CALL CALCRS(VC,JVC,CC ,IT,JT,IHT,IC1,IC2)
74. 0024458      IF(INCALR(JUC)) CALL CALCRS(UC,JUC,CC ,IT,JT,IHT,IC1,IC2)
75. 0024508      IF(INCALR(JWC)) CALL CALCRS(WC,JWC,CC ,IT,JT,IHT,IC1,IC2)
76. 0024538      IF(INCALR(JC2)) CALL CALCRS(C2,JC2,CC ,IT,JT,IHT,IC1,IC2)
77. 0024568      IF(INCALW) CALL CALCM(W,VIS,OW,VW,1.0 ,IT,JT,IU ,I,
1          IU1,IU2,VSWPW)
78. 0024618      IF(INCALC) CALL CALCM(C,GAM,UC,VC,SPHEAT,IT,JT,IHT,O,
1          IC1,IC2,NSWPC)
79. 0024648      IF(IWALL.EQ.O) GO TO 445
80. 0024658      DO 440 I=1,NI
81. 0024678      QUE(I)=EXCHAW*(C(I,NJPI,K)-C(I,NJ,K))/DET(I)*2.0
82. 0024678      440 CONTINUE
83. 0025048      445 CONTINUE
C*****
C-----INTERMEDIATE OUTPUT
84. 0025048      K=2
85. 0025048      IF(MOD(ISTEP,INDPPI).EQ.O) CALL OUTPUT
86. 0025138      ZD=Z(2)/YTOT/2.0
87. 0025148      IF(ZD.GT.ZDPRO(I*PRO+1)) IPRO=IPRO+1
88. 0025218      IF(ZD.LT.ZDPRO(IPRO)) GO TO 450
89. 0025238      NUMP=NUMPRI
90. 0025248      NUMPRI=ISTEP
91. 0025258      CALL OUTPUT
92. 0025308      IPRO=IPRO+1
93. 0025318      NUMPRI=NUMP
94. 0025328      450 CONTINUE
C-----TERMINATION TESTS
95. 0025338      IF(ISTEP.GT.IEND) GO TO 600
96. 0025358      INDEX=1
97. 0025368      GO TO 300
C*****
600 CONTINUE
C-----FINAL OUTPUT.
99. 0025378      CALL OUTPUT
100. 0025418      STOP
C*****
C          FOPMAT STATEMENTS
C*****
101. 0025428      210 FOPMAT(///1H0,120(1H*)///)
102. 0025428      220 FOPMAT(1H3,40X,*          TURBULENT PIPE FLOW *///)
103. 0025428      230 FOPMAT(1H0,15X,*REYNOLDS NUMBER*,T60,1H=,3X,1PE11.3)

```

MAIN.75
 MAIN.76
 MAIN.77
 MAIN.78
 MAIN.79
 MAIN.80
 MAIN.81
 MAIN.82
 MAIN.83
 MAIN.84
 MAIN.85
 MAIN.86
 MAIN.87
 MAIN.88
 MAIN.89
 MAIN.90
 MAIN.91
 MAIN.92
 MAIN.93
 MAIN.94
 MAIN.95
 MAIN.96
 MAIN.97
 MAIN.98
 MAIN.99
 DIM3.24
 DIM3.25
 DIM3.26
 DIM3.27
 DIM3.28
 MAIN.100
 MAIN.101
 MAIN.102
 MAIN.103
 MAIN.104
 MAIN.105
 MAIN.106
 MAIN.107
 MAIN.108
 MAIN.109
 MAIN.110
 MAIN.111
 MAIN.112
 MAIN.113
 MAIN.114
 MAIN.115
 MAIN.116
 MAIN.117
 MAIN.118
 MAIN.119
 MAIN.120
 MAIN.121
 MAIN.122
 MAIN.123
 MAIN.124
 MAIN.125
 MAIN.126
 MAIN.127

0010490341.149

MAIN

PROGRAM MAIN(INPUT,OUTPUT,TAPE3,TAPE4,TAPE5=INPUT,TAPE6=OUTPUT)

PAGE 4

```
104. 0025428 240 FORMAT(///1H0,15X,*MEAN INITIAL VELOCITY*,T60,1H=,3X,1PE11.3)
105. 0025428 250 FORMAT(1H0,15X,*PRANDTL NUMBER*,T60,1H=,3X,1PE11.3)
106. 0025428 260 FORMAT(1H0,15X,*FLUID SPECIFIC HEAT*,T60,1H=,3X,1PE11.3)
107. 0025428 270 FORMAT(1H0,15X,*FLUID VISCOSITY*,T60,1H=,3X,1PE11.3)
108. 0025428 280 FORMAT(1H0,15X,*FLUID DENSITY*,T60,1H=,3X,1PE11.3///)
109. 0025428      END
```

```
MAIN.128
MAIN.129
MAIN.130
MAIN.131
MAIN.132
MAIN.133
```

INDATA

SUBROUTINE INDATA(LEVEL)

PAGE 1

```

1. 0000008 SUBROUTINE INDATA(LEVEL)
C*****
C          COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008 DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008 DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008 COMMON
   1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
   1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
   1DXEPU(15),DXPWU(15),SEWU(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
   1R(30),RV(30),RCV(30),WFN(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
   1J(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
   1UU(15,30),UV(15,30),UW(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
   1ED(15,30),TE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
   1C2(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
   1DEN(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
   1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),AN(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
   1AP(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
   1JT(15),CT(15),QUE(15),DCDZB(15),QUD(15),
   1DENSIT,VISCOS,PRANDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
   1CMU,CR1,CR2,CRS,CR1W,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELDG,
   1CCI,CL2,CC,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELJGC,
   1JUU,JUV,JUW,JVV,JVW,JWH,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JCZ,JEC,
   1VI,NIM1,NIM2,NJ,NJ41,NJM2,NK,NK41,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
   1HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
   1INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
   1NSWPJ,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
   1MODEL,MJDEC,MRW,MGW,IJUE,IOIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICDN,
   1IRUN,IU,IHT,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
   1K,DZ,ISTEP,ISTPL,NRS,INDEX,OPDZ,
   1FLJWIN,VMEAY,OLENTH,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,PSWALL(14),
   1ZDPRO(14),IPRO,IEND,INDPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
COMMON
   1ET(15),ETU(15),DET(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJPI,NJPM1,IWALL,
   1RUTER,RIVNER,ECCEN,ES,NJO,YTJTO,EXCHAW,NJDM1
6. 0000008 COMMON LLDU(30),OLDV(30),OLDW(30),OLDP(30),
   1 O_OJU(30),OLDUV(30),OLDUW(30),OLDVV(30),OLDVW(30),
   1 OLD_W(30),OLDTE(30),OLDED(30),LOFF(30),
   1 OLDJEN(30),OLDVIS(30),OVISUU(30),OVISVV(30),
   1 OLDUTA,OPDZ
7. 0000008 LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
   1 INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (OLDU(1),TRANS(1))
C*****
10. 0000008 DIMENSION Y2(21),W1(21),UJ1(21),VVI(21),WW1(21),VW1(21),UW1(21),
   1 ED1(21),C1(21),UC1(21),VC1(21),WC1(21),C21(21),E1(21)
C*****
C          MISCELLANEOUS DATA
C*****
11. 0000008 GO TO (100,200),LEVEL
12. 0004468 100 CONTINUE
13. 0004508 GREAT=1.0E+30
14. 0004508 SMALL=1.0E-40
15. 0004528 JUJ=1
16. 0004538 JUV=2
17. 0004548 JUW=3

```

```

INDATA.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
INDATA.4
INDATA.5
INDATA.6
INDATA.7
INDATA.8
INDATA.9
INDATA.10
INDATA.11
INDATA.12
INDATA.13
INDATA.14
INDATA.15
INDATA.16

```

0000490343150

```

INDATA      **SUBROUTINE INDATA(LEVEL)**

18. 0004558 JVV=4
19. 0004568 JVV=5
20. 0004578 JVV=6
21. 0004608 JED=7
22. 0004618 JTE=8
23. 0004628 JFF=9
24. 0004638 JUC=10
25. 0004648 JVC=11
26. 0004658 JWC=12
27. 0004668 JC2=13
28. 0004678 JEC=14
29. 0004708 READ(5,010) HEDU,HEDV,HEDW,HEDP,HEDC
30. 0005068 READ(5,010) HEDR,HEDD,HEDVIS
31. 0005178 DO 120 L=1,14
32. 0005208 120 INCALR(L)=.FALSE.
33. 0005228 READ(5,020) IRUN,IEND
34. 0005278 IENDNE=IEND
35. 0005278 IRUNEW=IRUN
36. 0005318 READ(5,020) NI,NJ,NK,IT,JT,KT
37. 0005438 IJT=IT*JT
38. 0005448 NIM1=NI-1
39. 0005458 NIM2=NJ-2
40. 0005478 NJM1=NJ-1
41. 0005508 NJM2=NJ-2
42. 0005528 NK1=NK-1
43. 0005538 READ(5,035) (X(I),I=1,NI)
44. 0005658 READ(5,035) (Y(J),J=1,NJ)
C-----FULLJING CARD IS INACTIVE IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL PROBLEMS.
45. 0005758 IF(IRUN.EQ.1) READ(3) TRANS
46. 0006068 IF(IRUN.EQ.1) GO TO 130
47. 0006078 READ(3) SAVE
48. 0006178 130 CONTINUE
49. 0006178 IEVD=IENDNE
50. 0006178 IRUN=IRUNEW
51. 0006218 READ(5,015) INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC
52. 0006328 READ(5,015) INTURB,INCALR(JTE),INCALR(JED),INPRD,INDIFF
53. 0006448 READ(5,015) INCALR(JUU),INCALR(JVV),INCALR(JWW),INCALR(JVW)
54. 0006618 1 INCALR(JUC),INCALR(JVC),INCALR(JWC),INCALR(JC2),
1 INCALR(JEC)
55. 0006768 READ(5,020) MODEL,MODEC,MRW,MCH,IOIF
56. 0007068 READ(5,020) IJET,INDCOS,IU,IHT,IQUE
C-----DIMENSIONAL LIMITS.
57. 0007168 IU1=3
58. 0007168 IU2=3
59. 0007178 IC1=3
60. 0007178 IC2=3
61. 0007208 IF(IU.EQ.2) IU1=2
62. 0007248 IF(IU.EQ.2) IU2=NIM1
63. 0007278 IF(IHT.EQ.2) IC1=2
64. 0007328 IF(IHT.EQ.2) IC2=NIM1
65. 0007358 I1=MIN(IU1,IC1)
66. 0007378 I2=MAX(IU2,IC2)
67. 0007428 READ(5,020) NSWPU,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPR,NSWPC
68. 0007548 READ(5,020) ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,INDPRI,VUMPRI
69. 0007648 READ(5,025) FRA
70. 0007708 READ(5,025) CMU,CEPS1,PS2,CEPS
71. 0007778 READ(5,025) CR1,CR2,C RIW,CR2W

```

```

INDATA.17
INDATA.18
INDATA.19
INDATA.20
INDATA.21
INDATA.22
INDATA.23
INDATA.24
INDATA.25
INDATA.26
INDATA.27
INDATA.28
INDATA.29
INDATA.30
INDATA.31
INDATA.32
INDATA.33
INDATA.34
INDATA.35
INDATA.36
INDATA.37
INDATA.38
INDATA.39
INDATA.40
INDATA.41
INDATA.42
INDATA.43
INDATA.44
DIM3.29
INDATA.46
INDATA.47
INDATA.48
INDATA.49
INDATA.50
INDATA.51
INDATA.52
INDATA.53
INDATA.54
INDATA.55
INDATA.56
INDATA.57
INDATA.58
INDATA.59
INDATA.60
INDATA.61
INDATA.62
INDATA.63
INDATA.64
INDATA.65
INDATA.66
INDATA.67
INDATA.68
INDATA.69
INDATA.70
INDATA.71
INDATA.72
INDATA.7
INDATA.7

```

```

INDATA      **SUBROUTINE INDATA(LEVEL)**

72. 0010078 READ(5,025) CC1,CC2,CC,CC1W,CC2W
73. 0010178 READ(5,025) CG2,CG
74. 0010248 READ(5,025) CAPP,ELUG
75. 0010318 READ(5,025) CAPPAC,ELUGC
76. 0010368 READ(5,030) VISCOS,DENSIT,PRANDT,SPHEAT
77. 0010458 READ(5,030) XTOT,YTOT,QLENTH
78. 0010538 QLENTH=QLENTH*YTOT*2.0
79. 0010548 READ(5,030) RSWALL(1),RSWALL(3),RSWALL(4),RSWALL(5)
80. 0010648 READ(5,030) RSWALL(6),RSWALL(8)
81. 0010718 READ(5,030) RSWALL(10),RSWALL(11),RSWALL(12),RSWALL(13)
82. 0011008 READ(5,035) (ZOPRO(I),I=1,18)
83. 0011078 WRITE(5,050) INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALR(JTE),INCALR(JED),
1 INCALR(JUU),INCALR(JVV),INCALR(JWW),INCALR(JVW),
1 INCALR(JJW),INDIFF,INCALC,INCALR(JUC),INCALR(JVC),
1 INCALR(JWC),INCALR(JC2),INCALR(JEC)

84. 0011508 WRITE(6,055) IRUN,ICJN,INDCOS,IU,IHT,IQUE,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2
85. 0011678 WRITE(6,060) MODEL,MODEC,MHW,MCH,IDIF
86. 0011778 WRITE(6,065) CMU,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CR1,CR2,CRS,CRIW,CR2W,
1 CAPP,ELUG,
1 CC1,CC2,CC,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELUGC,
1 DENSIT,VISCOS,PRANDT,SPHEAT

C *****CAUTION...ONLY UNIFORM Y-SPACING INSIDE TUBE WALL PROVIDED.
C IF WE NEED M GRID NODES INSIDE TUBE WALL, SUPPLY NJ0=NJ+M+1
C-----IF I WALL=J, SUPPLY NJ0=NJ, ROUTER=RINNER, ECCEN=0, EXCHAW=0
87. 0012328 READ(5,040) IWALL,NJ0,YTOTQ,EXCHAW
88. 0012418 WRITE(6,066) IWALL,NJ0,YTOTQ,EXCHAW
89. 0012508 READ(5,045) ROUTER,RINNER,ECCEN,ES
90. 0012578 WRITE(6,067) ROUTER,RINNER,ECCEN,ES
91. 0012668 RETURN

C*****INITIAL PROFILES*****
C
C*****INITIAL CONDITIONS IN DIMENSIONLESS FORM*****
92. 0012708 200 CONTINUE
93. 0012708 IF(IHT.EQ.2) GO TO 205
94. 0012718 READ(5,030) WMAX,UWMAX,VWMAX,WMAX
95. 0013018 READ(5,030) VWMAX,UWMAX,EDMAX
96. 0013078 205 READ(5,030) CMAX,UCMAX,VCMAX,WCMAX
97. 0013168 READ(5,030) C2MAX,ECMAX

C-----INITIAL CONDITIONS IN DIMENSIONLESS FORM
98. 0013238 INUM=21
99. 0013238 READ(5,070) (Y2(J),J=1,INUM)
100. 0013348 IF(IHT.EQ.2) GO TO 206
101. 0013358 READ(5,070) (W1(J),J=1,INUM)
102. 0013468 READ(5,070) (UU1(J),J=1,INUM)
103. 0013568 READ(5,070) (VV1(J),J=1,INUM)
104. 0013668 READ(5,070) (WW1(J),J=1,INUM)
105. 0013768 READ(5,070) (VW1(J),J=1,INUM)
106. 0014068 READ(5,070) (UW1(J),J=1,INUM)
107. 0014168 READ(5,070) (ED1(J),J=1,INUM)
108. 0014268 206 READ(5,070) (C1(J),J=1,INUM)
109. 0014368 READ(5,070) (UC1(J),J=1,INUM)
110. 0014468 READ(5,070) (VC1(J),J=1,INUM)
111. 0014568 READ(5,070) (WC1(J),J=1,INUM)
112. 0014668 READ(5,070) (C21(J),J=1,INUM)
113. 0014768 READ(5,070) (EC1(J),J=1,INUM)
114. 0015068 READ(5,070) (CT(I),I=1,NI)
115. 0015168 READ(5,070) (QUE(I),I=1,NI)
116. 0015268 IF(IHT.EQ.2) GO TO 210

```

```

INDATA.75
INDATA.76
INDATA.77
INDATA.78
INDATA.79
INDATA.80
INDATA.81
INDATA.82
INDATA.83
INDATA.84
INDATA.85
INDATA.86
INDATA.87
INDATA.88
INDATA.89
INDATA.90
INDATA.91
INDATA.92
INDATA.93
INDATA.94
INDATA.95
DIM3.30
DIM3.31
DIM3.32
DIM3.33
DIM3.34
DIM3.35
DIM3.36
INDATA.96
INDATA.97
INDATA.98
INDATA.99
INDATA.100
INDATA.101
INDATA.102
INDATA.103
INDATA.104
INDATA.105
INDATA.106
INDATA.107
INDATA.108
INDATA.109
INDATA.110
INDATA.111
INDATA.112
INDATA.113
INDATA.114
INDATA.115
INDATA.116
INDATA.117
INDATA.118
INDATA.119
INDATA.120
INDATA.121
INDATA.122
INDATA.123
INDATA.124
INDATA.125

```

00004902151
- 345 -


```

INDATA      **SUBROUTINE INDATA(LEVEL)**

117. 0015278 IF(IRUN.EQ.1) GO TO 210
118. 0015318 READ(5,370) OPDZ
119. 0015368 READ(5,070) (UT(I),I=1,NI)
120. 0015468 210 CONTINUE
121. 0015468 IF(IMALL.EQ.0) GO TO 212
122. 0015478 DO 211 I=1,NI
123. 0015518 QUD(I)=QUD(I)
124. 0015518 QUD(I)=0.0
125. 0015528 211 CONTINUE
126. 0015548 212 CONTINUE
C*****
127. 0015548 IF(IMP.EQ.2) GO TO 215
128. 0015558 WRITE(6,0075) (J,Y2(J),W1(J),U01(J),VW1(J),HW1(J),VW1(J),UW1(J),
1 ED1(J),J=1,INUM)
129. 0016078 215 WRITE(6,0080) (J,Y2(J),C1(J),UC1(J),VC1(J),WC1(J),
1 C21(J),EC1(J),J=1,INUM)
C*****
130. 0016368 INUM1=INUM-1
131. 0016378 NJ1=NJ+1
C-----INTERPOLATION OF MEAN PROFILES.
132. 0016408 J=1
133. 0016418 DO 220 JJ=2,INUM
134. 0016438 220 Y2(JJ)=Y2(JJ)*YTOT
135. 0016458 DO 250 JJ=1,INUM1
136. 0016508 IF(Y(J).LT.Y2(JJ)) GO TO 250
137. 0016538 230 IF(Y(J).GT.Y2(JJ+1)) GO TO 250
138. 0016578 RATIO=(Y(J)-Y2(JJ))/(Y2(JJ+1)-Y2(JJ))
139. 0016638 IF(IMP.EQ.2) GO TO 240
140. 0016658 IF(IRUN.EQ.1) GO TO 240
141. 0016678 W(NI,J,2)=W1(JJ)+RATIO*(W1(JJ+1)-W1(JJ))
142. 0016768 240 C(NI,J,2)=C1(JJ)+RATIO*(C1(JJ+1)-C1(JJ))
143. 0017058 J=J+1
144. 0017068 IF(J.EQ.NJ1) GO TO 250
145. 0017108 GO TO 230
146. 0017108 250 CONTINUE
147. 0017138 IF(IRUN.EQ.1) W(NI,NJ,2)=0.0
C*****
C-----INTERPOLATION OF TURBULENT PROFILES.
148. 0017218 J=2
149. 0017218 DO 260 JJ=1,INUM1
150. 0017238 IF(YV(J).LT.Y2(JJ)) GO TO 280
151. 0017268 260 IF(YV(J).GT.Y2(JJ+1)) GO TO 280
152. 0017328 RATIO=(YV(J)-Y2(JJ))/(Y2(JJ+1)-Y2(JJ))
153. 0017368 IF(IMP.EQ.2) GO TO 270
154. 0017408 IF(IRUN.EQ.1) GO TO 270
155. 0017428 U0(NI,J)=U01(JJ)+RATIO*(U01(JJ+1)-U01(JJ))
156. 0017518 VV(NI,J)=VV1(JJ)+RATIO*(VV1(JJ+1)-VV1(JJ))
157. 0017578 WW(NI,J)=WW1(JJ)+RATIO*(WW1(JJ+1)-WW1(JJ))
158. 0017658 VV(NI,J)=VV1(JJ)+RATIO*(VV1(JJ+1)-VV1(JJ))
159. 0017748 UW(NI,J)=UW1(JJ)+RATIO*(UW1(JJ+1)-UW1(JJ))
160. 0020028 ED(NI,J)=ED1(JJ)+RATIO*(ED1(JJ+1)-ED1(JJ))
161. 0020118 270 UC(NI,J)=UC1(JJ)+RATIO*(UC1(JJ+1)-UC1(JJ))
162. 0020208 VC(NI,J)=VC1(JJ)+RATIO*(VC1(JJ+1)-VC1(JJ))
163. 0020268 WC(NI,J)=WC1(JJ)+RATIO*(WC1(JJ+1)-WC1(JJ))
164. 0020348 C2(NI,J)=C21(JJ)+RATIO*(C21(JJ+1)-C21(JJ))
165. 0020438 EC(NI,J)=EC1(JJ)+RATIO*(EC1(JJ+1)-EC1(JJ))
166. 0020518 J=J+1
167. 0020538 IF(J.EQ.NJ1) GO TO 280

```

```

INDATA.126
INDATA.127
INDATA.128
INDATA.129
DIM3.37
DIM3.38
DIM3.39
DIM3.40
DIM3.41
DIM3.42
INDATA.130
INDATA.131
INDATA.132
INDATA.133
INDATA.134
INDATA.135
INDATA.136
INDATA.137
INDATA.138
INDATA.139
INDATA.140
INDATA.141
INDATA.142
INDATA.143
INDATA.144
INDATA.145
INDATA.146
INDATA.147
INDATA.148
INDATA.149
INDATA.150
INDATA.151
INDATA.152
INDATA.153
INDATA.154
INDATA.155
INDATA.156
INDATA.157
INDATA.158
INDATA.159
INDATA.160
INDATA.161
INDATA.162
INDATA.163
INDATA.164
INDATA.165
INDATA.166
INDATA.167
INDATA.168
INDATA.169
INDATA.170
INDATA.171
INDATA.172
INDATA.173
INDATA.174
INDATA.175
INDATA.176
INDATA.1

```

```

INDATA          **SUBROUTINE INDATA(LEVEL)**

168. 0020548      GO TO 260
169. 0020548      280 CONTINUE
C*****
C-----CALCULATE ACTUAL MAGNITUDES OF ALL VARIABLES.
170. 0020608      DO 320 I=1,N1
171. 0020628      DO 310 J=1,NJ
172. 0020658      IF(IROY.NE.1) GO TO 300
173. 0020678      IF(IHF.NE.2) GO TO 305
174. 0020718      U(I,J,1)=OLDU(J)
175. 0020768      U(I,J,2)=OLDU(J)
176. 0021018      V(I,J,1)=OLDV(J)
177. 0021048      V(I,J,2)=OLDV(J)
178. 0021078      W(I,J,1)=OLDW(J)
179. 0021128      W(I,J,2)=OLDW(J)
180. 0021158      PE(I,J,1)=OLDP(J)
181. 0021208      PE(I,J,2)=OLDP(J)
182. 0021238      JU(I,J)=JLDUU(J)
183. 0021268      UV(I,J)=JLDV(J)
184. 0021328      UW(I,J)=JLDUW(J)
185. 0021368      VV(I,J)=JLDVV(J)
186. 0021428      VW(I,J)=JLDVW(J)
187. 0021468      WW(I,J)=JLDWW(J)
188. 0021528      TE(I,J)=JLDEI(J)
189. 0021568      ED(I,J)=JLDED(J)
190. 0021628      FF(I,J)=JLDFE(J)
191. 0021668      DEN(I,J,1)=CLDDEN(J)
192. 0021728      DEN(I,J,2)=CLDDEN(J)
193. 0021768      VIS(I,J,1)=JLDVIS(J)
194. 0022028      VIS(I,J,2)=JLDVIS(J)
195. 0022068      VISUU(I,J)=QVISUU(J)
196. 0022128      VISVV(I,J)=QVISVV(J)
197. 0022168      UT(I)=JLDUTA
198. 0022178      DPDUZ=DDPDZ
199. 0022218      GO TO 300
200. 0022218      305 CONTINUE
201. 0022238      W(I,J,1)=W(NI,J,2)*WMAX
202. 0022318      W(I,J,2)=W(NI,J,2)*WMAX
203. 0022378      UU(I,J)=UJ(NI,J)*UUMAX
204. 0022458      VV(I,J)=VV(NI,J)*VVMAX
205. 0022538      WW(I,J)=WW(NI,J)*WWMAX
206. 0022618      VW(I,J)=VW(NI,J)*VVMAX
207. 0022678      UW(I,J)=UW(NI,J)*UWMAX
208. 0022758      ED(I,J)=ED(NI,J)*EDMAX
209. 0023038      TE(I,J)=(JU(I,J)+VV(I,J)+WW(I,J))*0.5
210. 0023118      FF(I,J)=UU(I,J)-VV(I,J)
211. 0023168      300 C(I,J,2)=C(NI,J,2)*CMAX
212. 0023248      C(I,J,1)=C(NI,J,2)*CMAX
213. 0023328      JC(I,J)=UC(NI,J)*UCMAX
214. 0023408      VC(I,J)=VC(NI,J)*VCMAX
215. 0023468      WC(I,J)=WC(NI,J)*WCMAX
216. 0023548      C2(I,J)=C2(NI,J)*C2MAX
217. 0023628      EC(I,J)=EC(NI,J)*ECMAX
218. 0023708      310 CONTINUE
219. 0023738      320 CONTINUE
220. 0023768      I=3
221. 0023778      WRITE(6,3085) (J,UU(I,J),VV(I,J),WW(I,J),VW(I,J),UW(I,J),
1      ,FF(I,J),TE(I,J),ED(I,J),J=1,NJ)
222. 0024618      WRITE(6,3090) (J,C(I,J,2),UC(I,J),VC(I,J),WC(I,J),C2(I,J),

```

```

INDATA.178
INDATA.179
INDATA.180
INDATA.181
INDATA.182
INDATA.183
INDATA.184
INDATA.185
DIM3.43
DIM3.44
DIM3.45
DIM3.46
DIM3.47
DIM3.48
DIM3.49
DIM3.50
DIM3.51
DIM3.52
DIM3.53
DIM3.54
DIM3.55
DIM3.56
DIM3.57
DIM3.58
DIM3.59
DIM3.60
DIM3.61
DIM3.62
DIM3.63
DIM3.64
DIM3.65
DIM3.66
DIM3.67
INDATA.186
INDATA.187
INDATA.188
INDATA.189
INDATA.190
INDATA.191
INDATA.192
INDATA.193
INDATA.194
INDATA.195
INDATA.196
INDATA.197
INDATA.198
INDATA.199
INDATA.200
INDATA.201
INDATA.202
INDATA.203
INDATA.204
INDATA.205
INDATA.206
INDATA.207
INDATA.208
INDATA.209
INDATA.210

```

00004902152
-347-

INDATA

SUBROUTINE INDATA(LEVEL)

```

1          EC(I,J),J=1,NJ)
C*****
C          FORMAT STATEMENTS
C*****
223. 0025308 10 FORMAT(4A10)
224. 0025308 15 FORMAT(5(4X,L1))
225. 0025308 20 FORMAT(7(7X,I4))
226. 0025308 25 FORMAT(5(6X,F6.3))
227. 0025308 30 FORMAT(4(7X,1PE10.3))
228. 0025308 35 FORMAT(4X,1P6E11.3)
229. 0025308 040 FORMAT(7X,I4,7X,I4,2(7X,1PE11.3))
230. 0025308 045 FORMAT(4X,4(4X,1PE11.3))
231. 0025308 50 FORMAT(1H1///,5X,*SELECTION OF VARIABLES*,/
1          10X,* U=*,L1,* V=*,L1,* W=*,L1,* P=*,L1,/
1          10X,* TE=*,L1,* ED=*,L1,* UU=*,L1,* VV=*,L1,* WW=*,L1,
1          * Vn=*,L1,* UW=*,L1,* DIF=*,L1,/
1          10X,* C=*,L1,* UC=*,L1,* VC=*,L1,* WC=*,L1,* C2=*,L1,
1          * EC=*,L1)
232. 0025308 55 FORMAT(1H ,5X,*RUN SPECIFICATIONS*,/
1          10X,*IRUN=*,I2,*ICON=*,I2,*INOCOS=*,I2,*IU=*,I2,*IHT=*,I2,
1          *IQUE=*,I2,*IU1=*,I2,*IU2=*,I2,*IC1=*,I2,*IC2=*,I2,
1          *I1=*,I2,*I2=*,I2)
233. 0025308 60 FORMAT(1H ,5X,*TURBULENCE MODEL*,/
1          10X,*MODEL=*,I2,*MODEC=*,I2,*MHW=*,I2,*MCH=*,I2,*IDIF=*,I2)
234. 0025308 65 FORMAT(1H ,5X,*TURBULENCE CONSTANTS ETC.*,/
1          10X,* CMU=*,F6.3,*CEPS1=*,F6.3,*CEPS2=*,F6.3,*CEPS=*,F6.3/
1          10X,* CR1=*,F6.3,* CR2=*,F6.3,* CRS=*,F6.3,
1          * CF1W=*,F6.3,* CR2W=*,F6.3/
1          10X,*CAPPA=*,F6.3,*ELQG=*,F6.3/
1          10X,* CC1=*,F6.3,* CC2=*,F6.3,* CC=*,F6.3,
1          * CC1W=*,F6.3,* CC2W=*,F6.3/
1          10X,* CG2=*,F6.3,* CG=*,F6.3/
1          10X,*CAPAC=*,F6.3,*ELQGC=*,F6.3/
1          10X,*DENSITY=*,1PE11.3,*VISCOSITY=*,1PE11.3/
1          10X,*PRANDTL=*,1PE11.3,*SP. HEAT=*,1PE11.3)
235. 0025308 066 FORMAT(///40H*** UNIFORM Y-SPACING INSIDE WALL ****//,
1          10X,6H1WALL=,I3,5X,4HNJO=,I3,5X,6HYTOFO=,1PE11.3,7HEXC4HW=,
1          21PE11.3)
236. 0025308 67 FORMAT(///24HSPARROW AND BLACK S DATA,7HROUTER=,1PE11.3,
1          7HINNER=,1PE11.3,7HECCEN =,1PE11.3,11HPOWER RATE=,1PE11.3)
237. 0025308 70 FORMAT(4X,1P6E11.3)
238. 0025308 75 FORMAT(5X,I3,1P8E11.3)
239. 0025308 80 FORMAT(5X,I3,1P7E11.3)
240. 0025308 85 FORMAT(5X,I3,1P8E11.3)
241. 0025308 90 FORMAT(5X,I3,1P6E11.3)
242. 0025308 RETURN
243. 0025328 END

```

```

INDATA.211
INDATA.212
INDATA.213
INDATA.214
INDATA.215
INDATA.216
INDATA.217
INDATA.218
INDATA.219
INDATA.220
DIM3.68
DIM3.69
INDATA.221
INDATA.222
INDATA.223
INDATA.224
INDATA.225
INDATA.226
INDATA.227
INDATA.228
INDATA.229
INDATA.230
INDATA.231
INDATA.232
INDATA.233
INDATA.234
INDATA.235
INDATA.236
INDATA.237
INDATA.238
INDATA.239
INDATA.240
INDATA.241
INDATA.242
INDATA.243
DIM3.70
DIM3.71
DIM3.72
DIM3.73
DIM3.74
INDATA.244
INDATA.245
INDATA.246
INDATA.247
INDATA.248
INDATA.249
INDATA.250

```

SOURCE.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
SOURCE.4
SOURCE.5
SOURCE.6
SOURCE.7
SOURCE.8
DIM3.75
SOURCE.10
SOURCE.11
SOURCE.12
SOURCE.13
SOURCE.14
SOURCE.15
SOURCE.16

```

SOURCE      **SUBROUTINE SOURCE(PHI,IRS,SUS,SPS,IJMAX,IM1,IM2)**

13. 0307358      URFS=0.1
14. 0307378      C-----SET INTERVAL VARIABLES TO ZERO INITIALLY.
15. 0307418      DO 10 IRS=1,14
16. 0307448      DO 10 IJ=1,IJF
17. 0307468      S1(IRS,IJ)=0.0
18. 0307538      10 S2(IRS,IJ)=0.0
19. 0307548      DO 20 I=1,3
20. 0307568      DO 20 J=1,3
21. 0307608      DEL(I,J)=0.0
22. 0307658      IF(I.EQ.J) DEL(I,J)=1.0
23. 0307718      20 CONTINUE
24. 0307728      C*****
25. 0307738      C-----CALCULATE RELEVANT CONSTANTS.
26. 0307738      C-----REDISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION MODEL
27. 0307768      F1=-CS2
28. 0310018      F2=0.0
29. 0310058      F3=0.0
30. 0310108      IF(MODEL.EQ.2)GO TO 30
31. 0310138      C-----LAJYDER-REECE-RODI MODEL
32. 0310148      F1=-(CS2+8.0)/11.0
33. 0310148      F2=-(30.0*CS2-2.0)/55.0
34. 0310178      F3=-(6.0*CS2-2.0)/11.0
35. 0310208      30 IF(IHT.EQ.0) GO TO 40
36. 0310218      C-----REDISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCTION (BY MEAN STRAIN) MODEL
37. 0310238      G1=-CS2
38. 0310258      G2= 0.0
39. 0310338      IF(MODEC.EQ.1) GO TO 40
40. 0310338      C-----QUASI-ISOTROPIC MODEL
41. 0310358      G1=-0.8
42. 0310368      G2= 0.2
43. 0310408      40 CONTINUE
44. 0310628      RETURN
45. 0310658      ENTRY CALSDR
46. 0310708      C*****
47. 0310728      C-----PRELIMINARIES
48. 0310758      C*****
49. 0310758      CS1=CR1
50. 0310758      CS=CRS
51. 0310758      CE1=CEPS1
52. 0311008      CE2=CEPS2
53. 0311028      C-----DECAY FUNCTION AT THE NEAR WALL POINT.
54. 0311058      FWM1=ABS(VW(3,NJM1))*SQRT(ABS(VW(3,NJM1)))/(ED(3,NJM1)+SMALL)/
55. 0311108      1 (Y(NJ)*Y(NJ)-YV(NJM1)*YV(NJM1))*2.0*Y(NJ)
56. 0311108      DO 1000 J=2,NJM1
57. 0311108      DO 1000 I=IM1,IM2
58. 0311108      IJ=I+IT*(J-1)
59. 0311108      DO 110 IRS=1,14
60. 0311108      SULD(IRS)=0.0
61. 0311108      SEX(IRS)=0.0
62. 0311108      SOEA(IRS)=0.0
63. 0311108      110 CONTINUE
64. 0311108      IF(I.GT.IM1) GO TO 140
65. 0311108      C*****
66. 0311108      C*****REYNOLDS STRESS TENSOR AND NECESSARY GRADIENTS.
67. 0311108      C-----AT THE NODE.
68. 0311108      UIUJ(1,1)=UU(I,J)
69. 0311108      JIUJ(1,2)=UV(I,J)
70. 0311108      UIUJ(2,1)=UV(I,J)

```

SOURCE.17
 SOURCE.18
 SOURCE.19
 SOURCE.20
 SOURCE.21
 SOURCE.22
 SOURCE.23
 SOURCE.24
 SOURCE.25
 SOURCE.26
 SOURCE.27
 SOURCE.28
 SOURCE.29
 SOURCE.30
 SOURCE.31
 SOURCE.32
 SOURCE.33
 SOURCE.34
 SOURCE.35
 SOURCE.36
 SOURCE.37
 SOURCE.38
 SOURCE.39
 SOURCE.40
 SOURCE.41
 SOURCE.42
 SOURCE.43
 SOURCE.44
 SOURCE.45
 SOURCE.46
 SOURCE.47
 SOURCE.48
 SOURCE.49
 SOURCE.50
 SOURCE.51
 SOURCE.52
 SOURCE.53
 SOURCE.54
 SOURCE.55
 SOURCE.56
 SOURCE.57
 SOURCE.58
 SOURCE.59
 SOURCE.60
 SOURCE.61
 SOURCE.62
 SOURCE.63
 SOURCE.64
 SOURCE.65
 SOURCE.66
 SOURCE.67
 SOURCE.68
 SOURCE.69
 SOURCE.70
 SOURCE.71
 SOURCE.72
 SOURCE.73
 SOURCE.74

SOURCE **SUBROUTINE SOURCE(PHI,IRS,SUS,SPS,IJMAX,IM1,IM2)**

```

56. 0311138 UIUJ(1,3)=UW(I,J)
57. 0311168 UIUJ(3,1)=UW(I,J)
58. 0311218 UIUJ(2,2)=VV(I,J)
59. 0311248 UIUJ(2,3)=VW(I,J)
60. 0311278 UIUJ(3,2)=VW(I,J)
61. 0311328 UIUJ(3,3)=WW(I,J)
62. 0311358 T=TE(I,J)+SMALL
63. 0311418 E=ED(I,J)+SMALL
C-----AT THE NORTH SIDE.
64. 0311468 UUN=UJ(I,J)*WFN(J)+UU(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J))
65. 0311558 VVN=VJ(I,J)*WFN(J)+VV(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J))
66. 0311648 VWV=VW(I,J)*WFN(J)+VW(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J))
67. 0311728 TEN=TE(I,J)*WFN(J)+TE(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J))
68. 0312018 EUN=EU(I,J)*WFN(J)+EU(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J))
69. 0312078 DVVN=(VV(I,J+1)-VV(I,J))/(YV(J+1)-YV(J))
70. 0312178 DVWN=(VW(I,J+1)-VW(I,J))/(YV(J+1)-YV(J))
C-----AT THE SOUTH SIDE.
71. 0312258 UUS=UJ(I,J)*(1.0-WFN(J-1))+UU(I,J-1)*WFN(J-1)
72. 0312348 VVS=VJ(I,J)*(1.0-WFN(J-1))+VV(I,J-1)*WFN(J-1)
73. 0312428 VWS=VW(I,J)*(1.0-WFN(J-1))+VW(I,J-1)*WFN(J-1)
74. 0312508 TES=TE(I,J)*(1.0-WFN(J-1))+TE(I,J-1)*WFN(J-1)
75. 0312568 EOS=EU(I,J)*(1.0-WFN(J-1))+EU(I,J-1)*WFN(J-1)
76. 0312648 DVVS=(VV(I,J)-VV(I,J-1))/(YV(J)-YV(J-1))
77. 0312728 DVWS=(VW(I,J)-VW(I,J-1))/(YV(J)-YV(J-1))
78. 0313008 140 IF(IHT.EQ.0) GO TO 150
C*****SCALAR FLUX TENSOR AND NECESSARY GRADIENTS
C-----AT THE NODE
79. 0313028 UJC(1)=JC(I,J)
80. 0313058 UJC(2)=VC(I,J)
81. 0313108 UJC(3)=WC(I,J)
82. 0313138 CSQ=C2(I,J)
C-----AT THE NORTH SIDE
83. 0313168 JVCN=(VC(I,J+1)-VC(I,J))/(YV(J+1)-YV(J))
C-----AT THE SOUTH SIDE
84. 0313258 DVCS=(VC(I,J)-VC(I,J-1))/(YV(J)-YV(J-1))
85. 0313338 150 CONTINUE
86. 0313348 IF(IHT.NE.2) GO TO 160
87. 0313358 UCN=0.5*(JC(I,J)+UC(I,J-1))
88. 0313428 UCE=0.5*(UC(I+1,J)+UC(I+1,J-1))
89. 0313478 VCN=VC(I,J)*WFN(J)+VC(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J))
90. 0313578 EUTPL=EU(I,J+1)/(TE(I,J+1)+SMALL)
91. 0313638 UUI=UU(I,J+1)
92. 0313668 JVCN=(VC(I,J+1)-VC(I-1,J+1))/(X(I)-X(I-1))
93. 0313758 DVCS=(VC(I,J)-VC(I-1,J))/(X(I)-X(I-1))
94. 0314038 DUCE=(UC(I+1,J)-UC(I,J))/(XU(I+1)-XU(I))
95. 0314128 DULW=(UC(I,J)-UC(I-1,J))/(XU(I)-XU(I-1)+SMALL)
96. 0314218 UCN=0.5*(UC(I,J+1)+UC(I,J))
97. 0314268 UCS=0.5*(UC(I,J)+UC(I,J-1))
98. 0314338 VCN1=VC(I-1,J)*WFN(J)+VC(I-1,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J))
99. 0314438 DUCSE=(UC(I+1,J)-UC(I+1,J-1))/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
100. 0314528 DUCS=(UC(I,J)-UC(I,J-1))/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
101. 0314628 160 CONTINUE
102. 0314638 EDT=E/T
103. 0314648 FNL=ABS(UIUJ(2,3)*SQRT(ABS(UIUJ(2,3))))/(E+SMALL)/
      1 (Y(NJ)*Y(NJ)-YV(J)*YV(J))*2.0*Y(NJ)/(FWM1+SMALL)
C*****MEAN GRADIENTS
104. 0315068 IF(1.GT.141) GO TO 190

```

SOURCE.75
 SOURCE.76
 SOURCE.77
 SOURCE.78
 SOURCE.79
 SOURCE.80
 SOURCE.81
 SOURCE.82
 SOURCE.83
 SOURCE.84
 SOURCE.85
 SOURCE.86
 SOURCE.87
 SOURCE.88
 SOURCE.89
 SOURCE.90
 SOURCE.91
 SOURCE.92
 SOURCE.93
 SOURCE.94
 SOURCE.95
 SOURCE.96
 SOURCE.97
 SOURCE.98
 SOURCE.99
 SOURCE.100
 SOURCE.101
 SOURCE.102
 SOURCE.103
 SOURCE.104
 SOURCE.105
 SOURCE.106
 SOURCE.107
 SOURCE.108
 SOURCE.109
 SOURCE.110
 SOURCE.111
 SOURCE.112
 SOURCE.113
 SOURCE.114
 SOURCE.115
 SOURCE.116
 SOURCE.117
 SOURCE.118
 SOURCE.119
 SOURCE.120
 SOURCE.121
 SOURCE.122
 SOURCE.123
 SOURCE.124
 SOURCE.125
 SOURCE.126
 SOURCE.127
 SOURCE.128
 SOURCE.129
 SOURCE.130
 SOURCE.131
 SOURCE.132

0000490351154

SOURCE

C-----VELOCITY GRADIENTS.

```

105. 0315103      WP=W(I,J,K)
106. 0315158      WPP=W(I,J,1)
107. 0315208      JP=.0
108. 0315218      VP=W(I,J,K)
109. 0315268      WS=W(I,J-1,K)
110. 0315328      WSP=W(I,J-1,1)
111. 0315358      DUIDXJ(1,1)=0.0
112. 0315358      DUIDXJ(1,2)=0.0
113. 0315368      DUIDXJ(1,3)=0.0
114. 0315378      DUIDXJ(2,1)=0.0
115. 0315378      DUIDXJ(2,2)=0.0
116. 0315408      DUIDXJ(2,3)=0.0
117. 0315408      DUIDXJ(3,1)=0.0
118. 0315418      DUIDXJ(3,2)=(WP-WS)/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
119. 0315468      DUIDXJ(3,3)=(WP+WS-WPP-WSP)*0.5/(Z(2)-Z(1))
120. 0315558
190 CONTINUE

```

193 CONTINUE

C-----SCALAR GRADIENTS.

```

121. 0315568 CP=C(I,J,K)
122. 0315628 CPP=C(I,J,1)
123. 0315658 CWE=C(I-1,J,K)
124. 0315728 CSS=C(I,J-1,K)
125. 0315768 CSP=C(I,J-1,1)
126. 0316018 DCUXJ(1)=(CP-CWE)/(R(J)*(X(I)-X(I-1)))
127. 0316068 DCUXJ(2)=(CP-CSS)/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
128. 0316138 UCUXJ(1)=(CPP-CSS-CPP-CSP)*0.5/(Z(2)-Z(1))
129. 0316228 IFIMODEL.EQ.3IGOTO 300
130. 0316258 IF(IU.EJ.0) GOTO 500
131. 0316268 IF(IJ.EJ.2) GOTO 500

```

SOURCES FOR REYNOLDS STRESS EQUATIONS

*****

C*****PRODUCTION TERMS

```

132. 0316308      DD 200 II=1,3
133. 0316328      DD 200 JJ=1,II
134. 0316348      P(II,JJ)=J.0
135. 0316358      D(II,JJ)=0.0
136. 0316358      DD 200 <<=1,3
137. 0316418      P(II,JJ)=P(II,JJ)-(UIUJ(JJ,KK)*DUIDXJ(II,KK)+
1      UIUJ(II,KK)*DUIDXJ(JJ,KK))
138. 0316528      D(II,JJ)=D(II,JJ)-(UIUJ(II,KK)*DUIDXJ(KK,JJ)+
1      UIUJ(JJ,KK)*DUIDXJ(KK,II))

```

200 CONTINUE

C-----EXTRA TERMS FOR CYLINDRICAL GRID.

```

140. 0316678 IF(INDCJS.EQ.1)GO TO 210
141. 0316718 UPR=UP/YV(J)
142. 0316738 VPR=VP/YV(J)
143. 0316748 P(1,1)=P(1,1)-2.0*VPR*UIUJ(1,1)
144. 0317008 P(2,1)=P(2,1)+UPR*UIUJ(1,1)-VPR*UIUJ(1,2)
145. 0317038 P(2,2)=P(2,2)+2.0*UPR*UIUJ(1,2)
146. 0317068 P(3,1)=P(3,1)-VPR*UIUJ(1,3)
147. 0317118 P(3,2)=P(3,2)+UPR*UIUJ(1,3)

```

C

```

148. 0317138 D(1,1)=D(1,1)+2.0*UPR*UIUJ(1,2)-VPR*UIUJ(1,1)
149. 0317208 D(2,1)=D(2,1)-VPR*UIUJ(1,2)+UPR*UIUJ(2,2)
150. 0317248 D(3,1)=D(3,1)-VPR*UIUJ(1,3)+UPR*UIUJ(2,3)

```

C-----CALCULATE PRODUCTION OF TURBULENT ENERGY.

SOURCE.133
SOURCE.134
SOURCE.135
SOURCE.136
SOURCE.137
SOURCE.138
SOURCE.139
SOURCE.140
SOURCE.141
SOURCE.142
SOURCE.143
SOURCE.144
SOURCE.145
SOURCE.146
SOURCE.147
SOURCE.148
SOURCE.149
SOURCE.150
SOURCE.151
SOURCE.152
SOURCE.153
SOURCE.154
SOURCE.155
SOURCE.156
SOURCE.157
SOURCE.158
SOURCE.159
SOURCE.160
SOURCE.161
SOURCE.162
SOURCE.163
SOURCE.164
SOURCE.165
SOURCE.166
SOURCE.167
SOURCE.168
SOURCE.169
SOURCE.170
SOURCE.171
SOURCE.172
SOURCE.173
SOURCE.174
SOURCE.175
SOURCE.176
SOURCE.177
SOURCE.178
SOURCE.179
SOURCE.180
SOURCE.181
SOURCE.182
SOURCE.183
SOURCE.184
SOURCE.185
SOURCE.186
SOURCE.187
SOURCE.188
SOURCE.189
SOURCE.

```

SOURCE          **SUBROUTINE SOURCE (PHI,IRS,SUS,SPS,IJMAX,IM1,IM2)**
151. 0317318    210 PT=(P(1,1)+P(2,2)+P(3,3))/2.
C*****
C*****PRESSURE STRAIN AND DISSIPATION TERMS
152. 0317358    DO 220 II=1,3
153. 0317378    DO 220 JJ=1,II
154. 0317418    PHI1(II,JJ)=CS1*EDT*(UIUJ(II,JJ)-2.*DEL(II,JJ)*T/3.)
155. 0317508    PHI2(II,JJ)=F1*(P(II,JJ)-2.*DEL(II,JJ)*PT/3.)
1          +F2*T*(DUIDXJ(II,JJ)+DUIDXJ(JJ,II))
1          +F3*(D(II,JJ)-2.*DEL(II,JJ)*PT/3.)
156. 0317708    DIS(II,JJ)=-2.*DEL(II,JJ)*E/3.
157. 0317748    220 CONTINUE
C
C-----EXTRA TERMS FOR CYLINDRICAL POLAR COORDINATES.
158. 0320008    IF(INDCJS.EQ.1)GO TO 230
159. 0320018    PHI2(2,1)=PHI2(2,1)-F2*UPR*T
160. 0320058    PHI2(1,1)=PHI2(1,1)-F2*2.0*VPR*T
161. 0320078    230 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****YEAR 4ALL EFFECT TERMS ON PRESSURE STRAIN
162. 0320108    PHI2(2,3)=PHI2(3,2)
163. 0320108    FWL=ABS(UIUJ(2,3)*SQRT(ABS(UIUJ(2,3))))/(E+SMALL)/
1          (Y(NJ)*Y(NJ)-YV(J)*YV(J))*2.0*Y(NJ)/(FWL1+SMALL)
164. 0320338    DO 250 II=1,3
165. 0320358    DO 250 JJ=1,II
166. 0320378    IF(MRW.EQ.2) GO TO 240
C-----LAUNDER-REECE-RODI MODEL
167. 0320418    PHI1(II,JJ)=CR1W*EDT*(UIUJ(II,JJ)-2.*DEL(II,JJ)*T/3.)*FWL
168. 0320538    PHI2(II,JJ)=CR2W*(P(II,JJ)-D(II,JJ))*FWL
169. 0320618    GO TO 250
C-----GIBSON-LAUNDER MODEL
170. 0320628    240 PHI1(II,JJ)=CR1W*EDT*(UIUJ(2,2)*DEL(II,JJ)
1          -1.5*UIUJ(2,II)*DEL(2,JJ)-1.5*UIUJ(2,JJ)*DEL(2,II))*FWL
171. 0321008    PHI2(II,JJ)=CR2W*(PHI2(2,2)*DEL(II,JJ)-1.5*PHI2(2,II)*DEL(2,JJ)
1          -1.5*PHI2(2,JJ)*DEL(2,II))*FWL
172. 0321168    250 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****ADDITIONAL SOURCES DUE TO DIFFUSION MODEL
C-----SOURCES FROM TENSOR INVARIANT DIFFUSION MODEL
173. 0321238    IF(INDIF.EQ.1) GO TO 260
174. 0321258    SDEX(1)=0.0
175. 0321258    SDEX(4)=2.*CS/YV(J)*(Y(J)*TEN/EDN*VVN*DVVN-
1          Y(J-1)*TES/EDS*VVS*DVVS)/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
176. 0321448    SDEX(5)=CS/YV(J)*(Y(J)*TEN/EDN*(VVN*DVVN+VWN*DVVN)-
1          Y(J-1)*TES/EDS*(VVS*DVVS+VWS*DVWS))/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
177. 0321668    SDEX(6)=2.*CS/YV(J)*(Y(J)*TEN/EDN*VWN*DVWN-
1          Y(J-1)*TES/EDS*VWS*DVWS)/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
C-----EXTRA SOURCES DUE TO CYLINDRICAL POLAR COORDINATES
178. 0322038    260 IF(INDCJS.EQ.1) GO TO 270
179. 0322058    SEX(1)=CS/EDT*2./YV(J)/YV(J)*(UIUJ(2,2)-UIUJ(1,1))*UIUJ(1,1)
180. 0322138    IF(IJ.EQ.3) SEX(1)=URFS*SEX(1)+(1.0-URFS)*SCID(1)
181. 0322238    IF(IJ.EQ.3) SOLD(1)=SEX(1)
182. 0322278    SEX(4)=-SEX(1)
183. 0322308    SEX(5)=-CS/EDT*UIJ(1,1)*UIUJ(2,3)/YV(J)/YV(J)
184. 0322338    IF(INDIF.EQ.1) GO TO 270
185. 0322368    SEX(1)=2.*SEX(1)
186. 0322378    SEX(4)=2.*SEX(4)
187. 0322408    SEX(5)=2.*SEX(5)
188. 0322418    SDEX(1)=SDEX(1)+2.*CS/YV(J)*(TEN*UUN/EDN*(VVN-UUN)-

```

SOURCE.191
 SOURCE.192
 SOURCE.193
 SOURCE.194
 SOURCE.195
 SOURCE.196
 SOURCE.197
 SOURCE.198
 SOURCE.199
 SOURCE.200
 SOURCE.201
 SOURCE.202
 SOURCE.203
 SOURCE.204
 SOURCE.205
 SOURCE.206
 SOURCE.207
 SOURCE.208
 SOURCE.209
 SOURCE.210
 SOURCE.211
 SOURCE.212
 SOURCE.213
 SOURCE.214
 SOURCE.215
 SOURCE.216
 SOURCE.217
 SOURCE.218
 SOURCE.219
 SOURCE.220
 SOURCE.221
 SOURCE.222
 SOURCE.223
 SOURCE.224
 SOURCE.225
 SOURCE.226
 SOURCE.227
 SOURCE.228
 SOURCE.229
 SOURCE.230
 SOURCE.231
 SOURCE.232
 SOURCE.233
 SOURCE.234
 SOURCE.235
 SOURCE.236
 SOURCE.237
 SOURCE.238
 SOURCE.239
 SOURCE.240
 SOURCE.241
 SOURCE.242
 SOURCE.243
 SOURCE.244
 SOURCE.245
 SOURCE.246
 SOURCE.247
 SOURCE.248


```

SOURCE          **SUBROUTINE SOURCE(PHI,IRS,SUS,SPS,IJMAX,IM1,IM2)**
1              TES=UUS/EDS*(VVS-UUS)/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
1              +2.*CS/EDT/YV(J)*UIUJ(2,2)*(UUN-UUS)/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
189. 0322718    SDEX(4)=SDEX(4)-2.*CS/EDT/YV(J)*UIUJ(2,2)*(UUN-UUS)/
1              (Y(J)-Y(J-1))
190. 0323038    SDEX(5)=SDEX(5)-CS/EDT/YV(J)*UIUJ(2,3)*(UUN-UUS)/
1              (Y(J)-Y(J-1))
191. 0323158    270 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****ASSEMBLY OF SOURCE TERMS
192. 0323168    DO 280 II=1,3
193. 0323178    DO 290 JJ=1,II
194. 0323218    IRS=II+JJ
195. 0323218    IF(IJJ.EQ.1)IRS=IRS-1
196. 0323268    S1(IRS,IJ)=P(II,JJ)+PHI1(II,JJ)+PHI2(II,JJ)
1              +PHIWI(II,JJ)+PHIW2(II,JJ)+SEX(IRS)+SDEX(IRS)
197. 0323418    S2(IRS,IJ)=DIS(II,JJ)
198. 0323468    280 CONTINUE
199. 0323538    GO TO 400
C*****
C              TWO-EQUATION MODEL OF TURBULENCE
C*****
C*****TURBULENT KINETIC ENERGY EQUATION
200. 0323538    300 CONTINUE
201. 0323548    S1(1,IJ)=0.0
202. 0323568    S1(4,IJ)=0.0
203. 0323608    S1(6,IJ)=0.0
204. 0323628    S2(1,IJ)=0.0
205. 0323648    S2(4,IJ)=0.0
206. 0323668    S2(6,IJ)=0.0
207. 0323708    PT=0.
208. 0323708    DO 310 II=1,3
209. 0323728    DO 310 JJ=1,3
210. 0323748    310 PT=PT+(DUIOXJ(II,JJ)+DUIDXJ(JJ,II))*DUIDXJ(II,JJ)
C-----EXTRA TERMS FOR CYLINDRICAL GRID.
211. 0324068    IF(INUCJS.EQ.1) GO TO 320
212. 0324108    TERM1=VP**2/R(IJ)**2
213. 0324138    TERM2=2.0*VP*DUIDXJ(1,1)/R(IJ)
214. 0324158    TERM3=-UP*(DUIDXJ(1,2)+DUIDXJ(2,1))/R(IJ)
215. 0324208    TERM4=UP**2/R(IJ)**2
216. 0324218    PT=PT+2.0*(TERM1+TERM2+TERM3)+TERM4
C
217. 0324278    320 PT=CMU*T/(EDT+SMALL)*PT
C-----NOTE SOURCE TIMES TWO TO ALLOW FOR LATER DIVISION BY TWO.
218. 0324348    S1(1,IJ)=2.*PT
219. 0324378    S2(1,IJ)=-2.*E
C*****
C              SOURCES IN ISOTROPIC DISSIPATION RATE EQUATION
C*****
220. 0324428    400 CONTINUE
221. 0324438    S1(7,IJ)=CE1*EDT*PT
222. 0324478    S2(7,IJ)=-CE2*EDT*E
223. 0324538    500 IF(IHT.EQ.0) GO TO 700
C*****
C              SOURCES IN TURBULENT SCALAR FLUX EQUATION
C*****
C*****PRODUCTION TERMS
224. 0324558    PCSQ=0.0

```

SOURCE.249
SOURCE.250
SOURCE.251
SOURCE.252
SOURCE.253
SOURCE.254
SOURCE.255
SOURCE.256
SOURCE.257
SOURCE.258
SOURCE.259
SOURCE.260
SOURCE.261
SOURCE.262
SOURCE.263
SOURCE.264
SOURCE.265
SOURCE.266
SOURCE.267
SOURCE.268
SOURCE.269
SOURCE.270
SOURCE.271
SOURCE.272
SOURCE.273
SOURCE.274
SOURCE.275
SOURCE.276
SOURCE.277
SOURCE.278
SOURCE.279
SOURCE.280
SOURCE.281
SOURCE.282
SOURCE.283
SOURCE.284
SOURCE.285
SOURCE.286
SOURCE.287
SOURCE.288
SOURCE.289
SOURCE.290
SOURCE.291
SOURCE.292
SOURCE.293
SOURCE.294
SOURCE.295
SOURCE.296
SOURCE.297
SOURCE.298
SOURCE.299
SOURCE.300
SOURCE.301
SOURCE.302
SOURCE.303
SOURCE.304
SOURCE.305
SOURCE.306

```

SOURCE      **SUBROUTINE SOURCE (PHI,IRS,SUS,SPS,IJMAX,IM1,IM2)**

225. 0324558 DO 520 JJ=1,3
226. 0324578 PC(JJ)=J.J
227. 0324578 PIC(JJ)=J.O
228. 0324578 DIC(JJ)=J.O
229. 0324608 DO 520 KK=1,3
230. 0324638 PC(JJ)=PC(JJ)-UJC(KK)*DUIDXJ(JJ,KK)-UIUJ(JJ,KK)*DCDXJ(KK)
231. 0324718 UJC(JJ)=DIC(JJ)-UJC(KK)*DUIDXJ(KK,JJ)
232. 0324758 PIC(JJ)=PIC(JJ)-UJC(KK)*DUIDXJ(JJ,KK)
233. 0325008 IF (JJ-1) 520,510,520
234. 0325038 510 PCSQ=PCSQ-2.0*UJC(KK)*DCDXJ(KK)
235. 0325078 520 CONTINUE
236. 0325148 PC(1)=-JJN*DCDXJ(1)
237. 0325168 IF (J.EQ.2) GO TO 530
238. 0325208 IF (INDCIS.EQ.1) GO TO 530
C-----EXTRA TERMS FOR CYLINDRICAL GRID
239. 0325228 UPR=UP/YV(J)
240. 0325248 VPR=VP/YV(J)
241. 0325268 STJRE=-UPR*UJC(1)
242. 0325308 PIC(1)=PIC(1)+STORE
243. 0325328 PC(1)=PC(1)+STORE
244. 0325338 STJRE=VPR*UJC(1)
245. 0325358 PIC(2)=PIC(2)+STORE
246. 0325378 PC(2)=PC(2)+STORE
247. 0325408 DIC(2)=DIC(2)-UPR*UJC(2)+VPR*UJC(1)
248. 0325458 530 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****PRESSURE-SCALAR CORRELATION
249. 0325468 DO 540 JJ=1,3
250. 0325478 PSI1(JJ)=-CC1*EDT*UJC(JJ)
251. 0325518 PSI2(JJ)= G1*PIC(JJ)
1      +G2*DIC(JJ)
252. 0325558 540 CONTINUE
253. 0325578 DISCSJ=-CG2*EDT*CSQ
254. 0325618 PSI1(1)=-CC1*EDN/TEN*UJC(1)
C*****
C*****YEAR WALL EFFECTS ON PRESSURE-SCALAR CORRELATION
255. 0325658 DO 560 JJ=1,3
256. 0325678 IF (MCW.EQ.2) GO TO 550
257. 0325718 PSI1(JJ)=-CC1W*EDT*UJC(JJ)*FWL
258. 0325768 PSI2(JJ)=-CC2W*(DIC(JJ)*DEL(JJ,2)-4.3*PIC(JJ)*DEL(JJ,3))*FWL
259. 0326058 GO TO 560
260. 0326068 550 PSI1(JJ)=-CC1W*EDT*UJC(JJ)*DEL(JJ,2)*FWL
261. 0326148 PSI2(JJ)=CC2W*PSI2(JJ)*DEL(JJ,2)*FWL
262. 0326168 560 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****ADDITIONAL SOURCES FROM DIFFUSION MODEL
263. 0326228 IF (J.EQ.2) GO TO 580
264. 0326248 IF (IDIF.EQ.1) GO TO 570
C-----SOURCES FROM TENSOR INVARIANT DIFFUSION MODEL
265. 0326268 SDEX(11)=CC/YV(J)*(Y(J)*TEN/EDN*VVV*DVCN-Y(J-1)*TES/EDS*VVS*DVCN)/
1      (Y(J)-Y(J-1))
266. 0326448 SDEX(12)=CC/YV(J)*(Y(J)*TEN/EDN*VVV*DVCN-Y(J-1)*TES/EDS*VVS*DVCN)/
1      (Y(J)-Y(J-1))
267. 0326608 IF (IHT.NE.2) GO TO 570
268. 0326638 SDEX(10)=CC/Y(J)*(UUI/EDTPI*DVCN-UIUJ(1,1)/EDT*DVCN)/
1      (YV(J+1)-YV(J))
1      +CC/Y(J)/Y(J)*TEN/EDN*UUN*(DUCE-DUCH)/
1      (X(I)-X(I-1))

```

SOURCE.307
SOURCE.308
SOURCE.309
SOURCE.310
SOURCE.311
SOURCE.312
SOURCE.313
SOURCE.314
SOURCE.315
SOURCE.316
SOURCE.317
SOURCE.318
SOURCE.319
SOURCE.320
SOURCE.321
SOURCE.322
SOURCE.323
SOURCE.324
SOURCE.325
SOURCE.326
SOURCE.327
SOURCE.328
SOURCE.329
SOURCE.330
SOURCE.331
SOURCE.332
SOURCE.333
SOURCE.334
SOURCE.335
SOURCE.336
SOURCE.337
SOURCE.338
SOURCE.339
SOURCE.340
SOURCE.341
SOURCE.342
SOURCE.343
SOURCE.344
SOURCE.345
SOURCE.346
SOURCE.347
SOURCE.348
SOURCE.349
SOURCE.350
SOURCE.351
SOURCE.352
SOURCE.353
SOURCE.354
SOURCE.355
SOURCE.356
SOURCE.357
SOURCE.358
SOURCE.359
SOURCE.360
SOURCE.361
SOURCE.362
SOURCE.363
SOURCE.364

00004902156
-355-

```

SOURCE      **SUBROUTINE SOURCE(PHI,IRS,SUS,SPS,IJMAX,IM1,IM2)**
269. 0327118 SDEX(11)=SDEX(11)+CC/YV(J)/EDT*UIUJ(2,2)*(DUCSE-DUCSW)/
1          (XJ(I+1)-XU(I))
270. 0327238 SDEX(12)=SDEX(12)+CC/YV(J)/EDT*UIUJ(2,3)*(DUCSE-DUCSW)/
1          (XU(I+1)-XU(I))
C-----EXTRA SOURCES DUE TO CYLINDRICAL POLAR COORDINATES
271. 0327358 570 IF(INDCJS.EQ.1) GO TO 580
272. 0327378 SEX(11)=-CC/EDT*UIUJ(1,1)*UJC(2)/YV(J)/YV(J)
273. 0327458 IF(IHF.NE.2) GO TO 575
274. 0327478 SDEX(10)=SDEX(10)+CC/Y(J)*TEN/EDN*UUN/Y(J)*(VCN-VCN1)/
1          (X(I)-X(I-1))
1          +CC/Y(J)*TEN/EDN*VVN*(UCN-UCS)/
1          (YV(J+1)-YV(J))
275. 0327758 SDEX(11)=SDEX(11)-CC/EDT*UIUJ(1,1)/YV(J)/YV(J)*(UCE-UCW)/
1          (XU(I+1)-XU(I))
1          -CC/EDT*UIUJ(1,1)/YV(J)/YV(J)*(UCE-UCW)/
1          (XU(I+1)-XU(I))
276. 0330158 575 IF(IDIF.EQ.1) GO TO 580
277. 0330178 SEX(11)=2.0*SEX(11)
278. 0330208 IF(IHF.NE.2) GO TO 580
279. 0330238 SDEX(10)=SDEX(10)-CC/Y(J)*(UUI/EDTP1+UCN-UIUJ(1,1)/EDT*UCS)/
1          (YV(J+1)-YV(J))
1          +CC/Y(J)*TEN/EDN*UUN/Y(J)*(VCN-VCN1)/
1          (X(I)-X(I-1))
1          +CC/Y(J)/Y(J)*TEN/EDN*UUN*((VCN-VCN1)/
1          (X(I)-X(I-1))-UJC(1))
280. 0330608 SDEX(11)=SDEX(11)-CC/EDT*UIUJ(1,1)/YV(J)/YV(J)*(UCE-UCW)/
1          (XU(I+1)-XU(I))
281. 0330738 580 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****ASSEMBLY OF SOURCE TERMS
282. 0330748 DO 590 JJ=1,3
283. 0330758 IHF=9+JJ
284. 0330768 S1(IHF,IJ)=PC(IJJ)+PSI1(IJJ)+PSI2(IJJ)+PSI11(IJJ)+PSI12(IJJ)
1          +SEX(IHF)+SDEX(IHF)
285. 0331078 590 S2(IHF,IJ)=0.0
C*****
C***** SOURCES IN SCALAR FLUCTUATION EQUATION
C*****
286. 0331138 S1(13,IJ)=PCSQ+DISCSQ
287. 0331178 S2(13,IJ)=0.0
C*****
C***** OPTIONAL OUTPUT
C*****
288. 0331228 700 CONTINUE
C-----SOURCE BALANCE OF STRESS TENSOR COMPONENTS.
289. 0331228 IF(IU.EQ.0) GO TO 750
290. 0331238 IF(ITESU.EQ.0) GO TO 750
291. 0331248 IF(MDO(ISTEP,NUMPRI).NE.0) GO TO 750
292. 0331278 WRITE(6,720) I,J,P(1,1),DIS(1,1),P(2,2),DIS(2,2),P(3,3),DIS(3,3)
1          ,P(3,2),DIS(3,2),P(3,1),DIS(3,1)
293. 0331478 WRITE(6,730) PHI1(1,1),PHI1(2,2),PHI1(3,3),PHI1(3,2),PHI1(3,1)
294. 0331578 WRITE(6,730) PHI2(1,1),PHI2(2,2),PHI2(3,3),PHI2(3,2),PHI2(3,1)
295. 0331678 WRITE(6,730) PHIW1(1,1),PHIW1(2,2),PHIW1(3,3),PHIW1(3,2)
1          ,PHIW1(3,1)
296. 0331778 WRITE(6,730) PHIW2(1,1),PHIW2(2,2),PHIW2(3,3),PHIW2(3,2)
1          ,PHIW2(3,1)
297. 0332078 WRITE(6,730) SEX(1),SEX(4),SEX(5),SEX(3)
298. 0332178 WRITE(6,730) SDEX(1),SDEX(4),SDEX(5),SDEX(3)

```

SOURCE.365
SOURCE.366
SOURCE.367
SOURCE.368
SOURCE.369
SOURCE.370
SOURCE.371
SOURCE.372
SOURCE.373
SOURCE.374
SOURCE.375
SOURCE.376
SOURCE.377
SOURCE.378
SOURCE.379
SOURCE.380
SOURCE.381
SOURCE.382
SOURCE.383
SOURCE.384
SOURCE.385
SOURCE.386
SOURCE.387
SOURCE.388
SOURCE.389
SOURCE.390
SOURCE.391
SOURCE.392
SOURCE.393
SOURCE.394
SOURCE.395
SOURCE.396
SOURCE.397
SOURCE.398
SOURCE.399
SOURCE.400
SOURCE.401
SOURCE.402
SOURCE.403
SOURCE.404
SOURCE.405
SOURCE.406
SOURCE.407
SOURCE.408
SOURCE.409
SOURCE.410
SOURCE.411
SOURCE.412
SOURCE.413
SOURCE.414
SOURCE.415
SOURCE.416
SOURCE.417
SOURCE.418
SOURCE.419
SOURCE.420
SOURCE.421
SOURCE.422

```

SOURCE          **SUBROUTINE SOURCE(PHI,IRS,SUS,SPS,IJMAX,IM1,IM2)**
299. 0332278      WRITE(6,740) S1(1,IJ),S2(1,IJ),S1(4,IJ),S2(4,IJ),S1(6,IJ)
1              ,S2(6,IJ),S1(5,IJ),S2(5,IJ),S1(3,IJ),S2(3,IJ)
1              ,S1(7,IJ),S2(7,IJ)
300. 0333128      720 FORMAT(/2X,2I3,5(1P2E9.2,2X))
301. 0333128      730 FORMAT(8X,5(1PE9.2,11X))
302. 0333128      740 FORMAT(1X,7HSOURCE=,6(1P2E9.2,2X)/)
303. 0333128      750 CONTINUE
C
C
C-----SOURCE BALANCE OF SCALAR FLUX TENSOR COMPONENTS.
304. 0333128      IF(IHT.EQ.0) GO TO 800
305. 0333138      IF(ITESC.EQ.0) GO TO 800
306. 0333148      IF(IMDUI(1STEP,NUMPRI).NE.0) GO TO 800
307. 0333178      WRITE(5,760) I,J,PC(1),PC(2),PC(3),PC(5)
308. 0333318      WRITE(5,770) PSI1(1),PSI1(2),PSI1(3),DISCSQ
309. 0333408      WRITE(6,780) PSI2(1),PSI2(2),PSI2(3)
310. 0333468      WRITE(6,780) PSIW1(1),PSIW1(2),PSIW1(3)
311. 0333548      WRITE(6,780) PSIW2(1),PSIW2(2),PSIW2(3)
312. 0333628      WRITE(6,780) SEX(10),SEX(11),SEX(12)
313. 0333708      WRITE(5,780) SDEX(10),SDEX(11),SDEX(12)
314. 0333768      WRITE(6,790) S1(10,IJ),S1(11,IJ),S1(12,IJ),S1(13,IJ)
315. 0334218      760 FORMAT(/2X,2I3,1P4E13.2)
316. 0334218      770 FORMAT(8X,1P4E13.2)
317. 0334218      780 FORMAT(6X,1P3E13.2)
318. 0334218      790 FORMAT(1X,7HSOURCE=,1P4E13.2)
319. 0334218      800 CONTINUE
C
320. 0334218      1000 CONTINUE
321. 0334268      RETURN
C
C*****
C          SOURCE TERMS PICK-UP LEVEL
C*****
322. 0334308      ENTRY SOURCE
323. 0334368      IF(IRS.EQ.8) GO TO 1120
324. 0334378      DO 1110 I=IM1,IM2
325. 0334428      DO 1110 J=2,NUM1
326. 0334458      IJ=I+IT*(J-1)
327. 0334478      SUS(IJ)=S1(IRS,IJ)
328. 0334538      1110 SPS(IJ)=S2(IRS,IJ)/(PHI(IJ)+SMALL)
329. 0334648      RETURN
C
C-----SOURCES FOR KINETIC ENERGY.
330. 0334668      1120 CONTINUE
331. 0334668      DO 1130 I=IM1,IM2
332. 0334708      DO 1130 J=2,NUM1
333. 0334738      IJ=I+IT*(J-1)
334. 0334758      SUS(IJ)=(S1(1,IJ)+S1(4,IJ)+S1(6,IJ))/2.
335. 0335038      1130 SPS(IJ)=(S2(1,IJ)+S2(4,IJ)+S2(6,IJ))/2./(PHI(IJ)+SMALL)
336. 0335178      RETURN
C
337. 0335218      END

```

PAGE 9

SOURCE.423
SOURCE.424
SOURCE.425
SOURCE.426
SOURCE.427
SOURCE.428
SOURCE.429
SOURCE.430
SOURCE.431
SOURCE.432
SOURCE.433
SOURCE.434
SOURCE.435
SOURCE.436
SOURCE.437
SOURCE.438
SOURCE.439
SOURCE.440
SOURCE.441
SOURCE.442
SOURCE.443
SOURCE.444
SOURCE.445
SOURCE.446
SOURCE.447
SOURCE.448
SOURCE.449
SOURCE.450
SOURCE.451
SOURCE.452
SOURCE.453
SOURCE.454
SOURCE.455
SOURCE.456
SOURCE.457
SOURCE.458
SOURCE.459
SOURCE.460
SOURCE.461
SOURCE.462
SOURCE.463
SOURCE.464
SOURCE.465
SOURCE.466
SOURCE.467
SOURCE.468
SOURCE.469
SOURCE.470
SOURCE.471
SOURCE.472
SOURCE.473
SOURCE.474

0000490-357157

INIT **SUBROUTINE INIT**

```

1. 0000008 SUBROUTINE INIT
C*****
C COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008 DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008 DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008 COMMON
1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
1DXEPU(15),DXPU(15),SEWU(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
1R(50),RV(30),RCV(30),WFN(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
1U(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
1UU(15,30),UV(15,30),UW(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
1ED(15,30),FE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
1C2(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
1DEN(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),AH(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
1API(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
1UT(15),CT(15),QUE(15),DCOZB(15),QUO(15),
1DENSIT,VISCOS,PRANDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
1CHU,CRI,CR2,CRS,CRIW,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELGG,
1CC1,CC2,CC,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELJGC,
1JUU,JUV,JUW,JVV,JVW,JWW,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JC2,JEC,
1NI,NIM1,NIM2,NJ,NJM1,NJM2,NK,NKM1,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
1HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
1INCALJ,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
1NSWPU,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
1MCDL,MJUEC,MRW,MCH,IJUE,IDIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
1IRUN,IU,IHT,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
1K,CZ,ISTEP,ISTP1,NRS,INDEX,OPDZ,
1FLUWIV,V4EAV,QLENTH,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,RSWALL(14),
1ZUPRO(18),IPRO,IEND,INOPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
COMMON
1ET(15),ETU(15),DET(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJP1,NJPM1,IWALL,
1ROUTER,XINNER,ECCEN,ES,PJO,YTOTO,EXCHAW,NJCM1
COMMON
1OLDU(30),OLDV(30),OLDW(30),OLDP(30),
1OLDUU(30),OLDUV(30),OLDUW(30),OLDVV(30),OLDVW(30),
1OLDWW(30),OLDTE(30),CLDED(30),CLOFF(30),
1OLDEN(30),OLDVIS(30),OVISUU(30),OVISVV(30),
1OLDUTA,OPDZ
7. 0000008 LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
1 INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (OLDU(1),TRANS(1))
10. 0000008 REAL MAXC,MINC
C*****
C GEOMETRICAL VARIABLES
C*****
11. 0000008 ENTRY INIG
C*****
C*****CALCULATION OF LOCATION AND DISTANCES FOR P-CELLS
12. 0000108 DXPW(1)=0.0
13. 0000108 DXEP(1)=0.0
14. 0000108 DO 100 I=1,NIM1
15. 0000148 DXEP(I)=X(I+1)-X(I)
16. 0000158 100 DXPW(I+1)=DXEP(I)
17. 0000178 DYPS(1)=0.0

```

```

INIT.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
INIT.4
INIT.5
INIT.6
INIT.7
INIT.8
INIT.9
INIT.10
INIT.11
INIT.12
INIT.13
INIT.14
INIT.15
INIT.16

```

```

INIT          **SUBROUTINE INIT**

18. 0000178      DYNP(NJ)=0.0
19. 0000208      DO 110 J=1,NJM1
20. 0000238      DYNP(J)=Y(J+1)-Y(J)
21. 0000248      110 DYP(S(J+1)=DYNP(J)
C-----P-CELL DIMENSIONS
22. 0000268      SEW(1)=0.0
23. 0000268      SEW(2)=DXPW(2)+0.5*DXEP(2)
24. 0000328      SEW(NIM1)=0.5*DXPW(NIM1)+DXEP(NIM1)
25. 0000358      SEW(N1)=0.0
26. 0000368      N142=N141-1
27. 0000408      DO 200 I=3,NIM2
28. 0000428      200 SEW(I)=0.5*(DXEP(I)+DXPW(I))
29. 0000468      SNS(1)=0.0
30. 0000468      SNS(2)=DYP(S(2)+0.5*DYNP(2)
31. 0000518      SNS(NJ+1)=DYNP(NJM1)+0.5*DYP(S(NJM1)
32. 0000558      SNS(NJ)=0.0
33. 0000568      NJ42=NJM1-1
34. 0000578      DO 210 J=3,NJM2
35. 0000628      210 SNS(J)=0.5*(DYNP(J)+DYP(S(J))
C*****
C*****CALCULATION OF LOCATION AND DISTANCES FOR U-CELLS
36. 0000668      XU(1)=X(1)
37. 0000678      XU(2)=X(1)
38. 0000708      XU(N1)=X(N1)
39. 0000718      DO 300 I=3,NIM1
40. 0000748      300 XU(I)=0.5*(X(I)+X(I-1))
41. 0001008      DXPU(1)=0.0
42. 0001008      DXPU(2)=0.0
43. 0001018      DXPU(1)=0.0
44. 0001028      DXPU(N1)=0.0
45. 0001028      DO 310 I=1,NIM1
46. 0001048      DXPU(I)=XU(I+1)-XU(I)
47. 0001058      310 DXPU(I+1)=DXPU(I)
C-----U-CELL DIMENSIONS
48. 0001078      SEWU(1)=0.0
49. 0001078      DO 320 I=2,N1
50. 0001128      320 SEWU(I)=X(I)-X(I-1)
C-----WEIGHTING FACTORS IN X-DIRECTION
51. 0001158      DO 330 I=3,NIM1
52. 0001208      WFW(I)=SEWU(I-1)/(SEWU(I-1)+SEWU(I))
53. 0001218      WFE(I)=SEWU(I+1)/(SEWU(I+1)+SEWU(I))
54. 0001238      330 CONTINUE
55. 0001258      WFE(2)=SEWU(3)/(SEWU(3)+2.0*SEWU(2))
56. 0001278      WFW(3)=SEWU(2)/(SEWU(2)+0.5*SEWU(3))
57. 0001318      WFE(NIM1)=SEWU(N1)/(SEWU(N1)+0.5*SEWU(NIM1))
C*****
C*****CALCULATION OF LOCATION AND DISTANCES FOR V-CELLS
58. 0001348      YV(1)=Y(1)-SMALL
59. 0001378      YV(2)=Y(1)
60. 0001378      YV(NJ)=Y(NJ)
61. 0001418      DO 400 J=3,NJM1
62. 0001448      400 YV(J)=0.5*(Y(J)+Y(J-1))
63. 0001508      DYP(SV(1)=0.0
64. 0001508      DYP(SV(2)=0.0
65. 0001518      DYNP(V(1)=0.0
66. 0001528      DYNP(V(NJ)=0.0
67. 0001528      DO 410 J=1,NJM1
68. 0001548      DYNP(V(J)=YV(J+1)-YV(J)
INIT.17
INIT.18
INIT.19
INIT.20
INIT.21
INIT.22
INIT.23
INIT.24
INIT.25
INIT.26
INIT.27
INIT.28
INIT.29
INIT.30
INIT.31
INIT.32
INIT.33
INIT.34
INIT.35
INIT.36
INIT.37
INIT.38
INIT.39
INIT.40
INIT.41
INIT.42
INIT.43
INIT.44
INIT.45
INIT.46
INIT.47
INIT.48
INIT.49
INIT.50
INIT.51
INIT.52
INIT.53
INIT.54
INIT.55
INIT.56
INIT.57
INIT.58
INIT.59
INIT.60
INIT.61
INIT.62
INIT.63
INIT.64
INIT.65
INIT.66
INIT.67
INIT.68
INIT.69
INIT.70
INIT.71
INIT.72
INIT.73
INIT.74

```

0000490359158

```

INIT
**SUBROUTINE INIT**
69. 0001558 410 DYPSV(J+1)=DYNPV(J)
C-----V-CELL DIMENSIONS
70. 0001578 SNSV(1)=0.0
71. 0001578 DO 420 J=2,NJ
72. 0001628 420 SNSV(J)=Y(J)-Y(J-1)
C-----WEIGHTING FACTORS IN Y-DIRECTION
73. 0001658 DO 430 J=3,NJM1
74. 0001708 WFS(J)=SNSV(J-1)/(SNSV(J-1)+SNSV(J))
75. 0001718 WFN(J)=SNSV(J+1)/(SNSV(J+1)+SNSV(J))
76. 0001738 430 CONTINUE
77. 0001758 WFN(1)=0.0
78. 0001758 WFN(2)=SNSV(3)/(SNSV(3)+2.0*SNSV(2))
79. 0002008 WFS(3)=SNSV(2)/(SNSV(2)+0.5*SNSV(3))
80. 0002028 WFN(NJ+1)=SNSV(NJ)/(SNSV(NJ)+0.5*SNSV(NJM1))
C*****
C*****EXTRA WEIGHTING FACTORS FOR APPROXIMATING BOUNDARY VALUES.
81. 0002058 STORE=(UXEP(1)+DXEP(2))**2
82. 0002108 BVM=STORE/(STORE-DXEP(1))**2
83. 0002128 STORE=(UXPW(NI)+DXPW(NIM1))**2
84. 0002158 BVE=STORE/(STORE-DXPW(NI))**2
85. 0002178 STORE=(SNS(2)+SNS(3))**2
86. 0002218 BVS=STORE/(STORE-SNS(2))**2
87. 0002238 STORE=(SNSV(3)+SNSV(2))**2
88. 0002248 BWS=STORE/(STORE-SNSV(2))**2
C*****
C*****EXTRA VARIABLES DEFINED FOR CYLINDRICAL COORDINATES
89. 0002268 DO 600 J=1,NJ
90. 0002318 R(J)=Y(J)
91. 0002318 600 IF(INUCOS.EQ.1) R(J)=1.0
92. 0002378 RV(1)=R(1)
93. 0002378 RV(2)=R(1)
94. 0002408 RV(NJ)=R(NJ)
95. 0002428 DO 610 J=3,NJM1
96. 0002458 610 RV(J)=0.5*(R(J)+R(J-1))
97. 0002518 RCV(1)=R(1)
98. 0002528 RCV(NJ)=R(NJ)
99. 0002548 DO 620 J=2,NJM1
100. 0002568 620 RCV(J)=0.5*(RV(J+1)+RV(J))
C-----THICKNESS OF THE TUBE AS A FUNCTION OF THE ANGLE X
101. 0002628 JNC=NJO-NJ-1
102. 0002648 NJO+1=NJO-1
103. 0002658 NJP=NJ
104. 0002658 NJP1=NJ+1
105. 0002668 NJP+1=NJ-1
106. 0002678 DO 665 I=1,NI
107. 0002728 ET(I)=SQRT(ROUTER*ROUTER-ECCEN*ECCEN*SIN(X(I))*SIN(X(I)))
1 -RINNER-ECCEN*COS(X(I))
108. 0003118 ETU(I)=SQRT(ROUTER*ROUTER-ECCEN*ECCEN*SIN(XU(I))*SIN(XJ(I)))
1 -RINNER-ECCEN*COS(XU(I))
109. 0003318 DET(I)=ET(I)/FLOAT(JNC)
110. 0003353 DETU(I)=ETU(I)/FLOAT(JNC)
111. 0003378 WRITE(6,670) I,ET(I),ETU(I),DET(I),DETU(I)
112. 0003548 665 CONTINUE
113. 0003568 670 FORMAT(17X,I3,1P4E13.3)
114. 0003568 RETURN
C*****
C INITIALISATION DEPENDENT VARIABLE FIELDS
C*****
INIT.75
INIT.76
INIT.77
INIT.78
INIT.79
INIT.80
INIT.81
INIT.82
INIT.83
INIT.84
INIT.85
INIT.86
INIT.87
INIT.88
INIT.89
INIT.90
INIT.91
INIT.92
INIT.93
INIT.94
INIT.95
INIT.96
INIT.97
INIT.98
INIT.99
INIT.100
INIT.101
INIT.102
INIT.103
INIT.104
INIT.105
INIT.106
INIT.107
INIT.108
INIT.109
INIT.110
INIT.111
INIT.112
DIM3.76
DIM3.77
DIM3.78
DIM3.79
DIM3.80
DIM3.81
DIM3.82
DIM3.83
DIM3.84
DIM3.85
DIM3.86
DIM3.87
DIM3.88
DIM3.89
DIM3.90
DIM3.91
INIT.113
INIT.114
INIT.115
INIT.116

```

```

INIT          **SUBROUTINE INIT**

115. 0003608 ENTRY INITO
116. 0003668 IF(IRJY.NE.1) GO TO 720
117. 0003678 IF(ISTEP.GT.0) GO TO 720
C-----SET VARIABLES TO ZERO
118. 0003718 EXCHAT=VISCOS*SPHEAT/PRANDT
119. 0003738 DO 700 K=1,2
120. 0003768 DO 700 J=1,JT
121. 0004018 DO 700 I=1,NI
122. 0004048 U(I,J,K)=0.0
123. 0004078 V(I,J,K)=0.0
124. 0004108 W(I,J,K)=0.0
125. 0004118 PE(I,J,K)=0.0
126. 0004118 UU(I,J)=0.
127. 0004138 UV(I,J)=0.
128. 0004148 UW(I,J)=0.
129. 0004158 VV(I,J)=0.
130. 0004158 VW(I,J)=0.
131. 0004168 WW(I,J)=0.
132. 0004168 ED(I,J)=0.
133. 0004178 FE(I,J)=0.
134. 0004178 FF(I,J)=0.
135. 0004208 C(I,J,K)=0.0
136. 0004208 JC(I,J)=0.0
137. 0004218 VC(I,J)=0.0
138. 0004218 WC(I,J)=0.0
139. 0004228 C2(I,J)=0.0
140. 0004228 EC(I,J)=0.0
141. 0004238 VISUU(I,J)=0.
142. 0004238 VISVV(I,J)=0.0
143. 0004248 DEN(I,J,K)=DENSIT
144. 0004258 VIS(I,J,K)=VISCOS
145. 0004268 GAM(I,J,K)=EXCHAT
146. 0004308 IF(J.O.T.NJ) GAM(I,J,K)=EXCHAW
147. 0004378 700 CONTINUE
148. 0004468 DO 710 J=1,NJD
149. 0004508 DO 710 I=1,NI
150. 0004538 PP(I,J)=0.0
151. 0004558 AE(I,J)=0.0
152. 0004553 AN(I,J)=0.0
153. 0004568 AN(I,J)=0.0
154. 0004568 AS(I,J)=0.0
155. 0004578 AU(I,J)=0.0
156. 0004578 AP(I,J)=0.0
157. 0004603 AG(I,J)=0.0
158. 0004608 SU(I,J)=0.0
159. 0004618 SP(I,J)=0.0
160. 0004618 710 CONTINUE
161. 0004658 720 CONTINUE
162. 0004668 DO 730 I=1,NI
163. 0004708 DCDZB(I)=0.0
164. 0004708 730 CONTINUE
C
C*****
C*****CALL INITIALISING SECTION OF SOURCE SUBROUTINE
165. 0004738 CALL SRCDEI(RS,NRS,SU,SP,IJT,I1,I2)
166. 0004758 RETURN
C*****
C

```

FORWARD STEP

```

INIT.117
INIT.118
INIT.119
INIT.120
INIT.121
INIT.122
DIM3.92
INIT.124
INIT.125
INIT.126
INIT.127
INIT.128
INIT.129
INIT.130
INIT.131
INIT.132
INIT.133
INIT.134
INIT.135
INIT.136
INIT.137
INIT.138
INIT.139
INIT.140
INIT.141
INIT.142
INIT.143
INIT.144
INIT.145
INIT.146
INIT.147
INIT.148
DIM3.93
INIT.149
DIM3.94
INIT.151
INIT.152
INIT.153
INIT.154
INIT.155
INIT.156
INIT.157
INIT.158
INIT.159
INIT.160
INIT.161
INIT.162
INIT.163
INIT.164
INIT.165
INIT.166
INIT.167
INIT.168
INIT.169
INIT.170
INIT.171
INIT.172
INIT.173

```

00004902159-361-


```

INIT          **SUBROUTINE INIT**
C*****
167. 0004778      ENTRY STEP
168. 0005058      IF(ISTEP.EQ.1) GO TO 900
169. 0005068      Z(1)=Z(2)
C*****
C*****SYMMETRY OF HYDRODYNAMIC FIELD
170. 0005078      IF(IU.EQ.0.AND.IHT.EQ.2) GO TO 900
171. 0005148      DO 800 I=1,NI
172. 0005168      DO 800 J=1,NJ
173. 0005218      II=3
174. 0005218      IF(IU.EQ.2) II=1
175. 0005268      U(1,J,1)=U(II,J,2)
176. 0005338      U(1,J,2)=U(II,J,2)
177. 0005408      V(1,J,1)=V(II,J,2)
178. 0005458      V(1,J,2)=V(II,J,2)
179. 0005528      W(1,J,2)=W(II,J,2)
180. 0005578      PE(1,J,1)=PE(II,J,2)
181. 0005648      PE(1,J,2)=PE(II,J,2)
182. 0005718      PP(1,J)=PP(II,J)
183. 0005768      VW(1,J)=VW(II,J)
184. 0006038      UW(1,J)=UW(II,J)
185. 0006108      UV(1,J)=UV(II,J)
186. 0006158      FF(1,J)=FF(II,J)
187. 0006228      UU(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,UU(II,J))
188. 0006308      VV(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,VV(II,J))
189. 0006378      WW(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,WW(II,J))
190. 0006458      ED(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,ED(II,J))
191. 0006548      TE(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,TE(II,J))
192. 0006628      DEN(1,J,1)=DEN(II,J,2)
193. 0006708      DEN(1,J,2)=DEN(II,J,2)
194. 0006758      VIS(1,J,1)=VIS(II,J,2)
195. 0007038      VIS(1,J,2)=VIS(II,J,2)
196. 0007108      VISUU(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,VISUU(II,J))
197. 0007178      VISVV(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,VISVV(II,J))
198. 0007258      IF(IHT.NE.1) GO TO 800
199. 0007278      C(1,J,2)=C(II,J,2)
200. 0007368      VC(1,J)=VC(II,J)
201. 0007438      WC(1,J)=WC(II,J)
202. 0007508      UC(1,J)=UC(II,J)
203. 0007558      C2(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,C2(II,J))
204. 0007638      EC(1,J)=AMAX1(SMALL,EC(II,J))
205. 0007728      800 CONTINUE
206. 0010008      900 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****FORWARD STEP SIZE
207. 0010008      DZ=FRATYTOT
208. 0010018      Z(2)=Z(1)+DZ
209. 0010038      IF(IHT.EQ.0) RETURN
210. 0010068      MAXC=0.0
211. 0010068      MINC=GREAT
212. 0010078      DO 910 I=IC1,IC2
213. 0010128      DO 910 J=2,NJ
214. 0010158      MAXC=AMAX1(C(1,J,2),MAXC)
215. 0010218      910 MINC=AMIN1(C(1,J,2),MINC)
216. 0010278      DZ=FRATJ.05*YTOT
217. 0010318      Z(2)=Z(1)+DZ
218. 0010338      IF(Z(2).LT.QLENTN) GO 120
219. 0010358      IF(Z(1).GE.QLENTN) GO 120

```

```

INIT.174
INIT.175
INIT.176
INIT.177
INIT.178
INIT.179
INIT.180
INIT.181
INIT.182
INIT.183
INIT.184
INIT.185
INIT.186
INIT.187
INIT.188
INIT.189
INIT.190
INIT.191
INIT.192
INIT.193
INIT.194
INIT.195
INIT.196
INIT.197
INIT.198
INIT.199
INIT.200
INIT.201
INIT.202
INIT.203
INIT.204
INIT.205
INIT.206
INIT.207
INIT.208
INIT.209
INIT.210
INIT.211
INIT.212
INIT.213
INIT.214
INIT.215
INIT.216
INIT.217
INIT.218
INIT.219
INIT.220
INIT.221
INIT.222
INIT.223
INIT.224
INIT.225
INIT.226
INIT.227
INIT.228
INIT.229
INIT.230
INIT.231

```

INIT

SUBROUTINE INIT

PAGE 6

```
220. 0010378 Z(2)=QLENTN
221. 0010408 DZ=Z(2)-Z(1)
222. 0010428 920 CONTINUE
223. 0010438 IF(Z(1).EQ.QLENTN) CALL OUTPUT
224. 0010478 DO 930 I=1,NI
225. 0010518 IF(Z(1).GE.QLENTN) CT(I)=0.0
226. 0010558 930 IF(Z(1).GE.QLENTN) QUE(I)=0.0
227. 0010638 RETURN
228. 0010658 END
```

```
INIT.232
INIT.233
INIT.234
INIT.235
INIT.236
INIT.237
INIT.238
INIT.239
INIT.240
```

000049036160

```

PROPS      **SUBROUTINE PROPS**
1. 0000008  SUBROUTINE PROPS
C*****
C          COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008  DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008  DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008  COMMON
   1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZH(02),
   1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
   1DXEPU(15),DXPWU(15),SEWU(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
   1R(30),RV(30),RCV(30),WFN(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
   1U(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
   1JU(15,30),UV(15,30),UH(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
   1ED(15,30),TE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
   1C2(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
   1DEV(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
   1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),AN(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
   1AP(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
   1UT(15),CF(15),QUE(15),DCDZB(15),QUO(15),
   1DENSIT,VISCOS,PRANDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
   1CMU,CRI,CR2,CRS,CRIW,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELJG,
   1CC1,CC2,CC,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELJGC,
   1JUU,JUV,JJW,JVW,JVH,JWW,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JC2,JEC,
   1NI,NIM1,NIM2,NJ,NJM1,NJM2,NK,NKM1,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
   1HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
   1INCALJ,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRC,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
   1NSWPU,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
   1MODEL,MDOEC,MRW,MCW,IQUE,IDIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
   1IRUN,IU,IHF,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
   1K,DZ,ISTEP,ISTP1,NRS,INDEX,DPUZ,
   1FLOWIN,VMEAN,QLENTH,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,RSWALL(14),
   1ZDPRO(14),IPRO,IEND,INDPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
   COMMON
5. 0000008  1ET(15),ETU(15),DET(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJP1,NJPM1,IWALL,
   1ROUTER,RIWNER,ECCEN,ES,NJO,YTOTO,EXCHAW,NJOM1
6. 0000008  COMMON  1LDU(30),1LDV(30),1LDW(30),1LDP(30),
   1  1OLDJU(30),1OLDUV(30),1OLDUW(30),1OLDVV(30),1OLDVW(30),
   1  1OLDWH(30),1OLDTE(30),1LOED(30),1LODF(30),
   1  1LODEN(30),1LOVIS(30),1OVISUU(30),1OVISVV(30),
   1  1OLDUTA,ODPOZ
7. 0000008  LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
   1  1INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0000008  EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008  EQUIVALENCE (OLDU(1),TRANS(1))
C
C*****
C          DENSITY,VISCOSITY AND THERMAL EXCHANGE COEFFICIENT
C*****
C-----PROPERTIES ARE UNIFORM FOR THIS PROBLEM
10. 0000008  EXCHAT=VISCOS/PRANDT*SPHEAT
11. 0000028  DO 500 I=1,12
12. 0000048  DO 500 J=2,NJ
13. 0000078  DO 500 K=1,2
14. 0000118  IF(INDEX.VE.0) GO TO 200
15. 0000138  DEN(I,J,K)=DENSIT
16. 0000208  VIS(I,J,K)=VISCOS
17. 0000248  GAM(I,J,K)=EXCHAT

```

```

PROPS.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
PROPS.4
PROPS.5
PROPS.6
PROPS.7
PROPS.8
PROPS.9
PROPS.10
PROPS.11
PROPS.12
PROPS.13
PROPS.14
PROPS.15
PROPS.16

```

PROPS

SUBROUTINE PROPS

PAGE 2

```

18. 0000309 IF(K.EQ.2) GO TO 500
19. 0000328 200 IF(.NOT.INTURB) GO TO 500
C-----EXTRA TERMS REQUIRED IN CALCULATION PROCEDURE
20. 0000348 IF(MODEL.EQ.3)GO TO 400
21. 0000368 IF(.NOT.INCALR(JTE))TE(I,J)=(UU(I,J)+VV(I,J)+WW(I,J))/2.0
C
C*****
C DIFFUSIVE TRANSPORT COEFFICIENTS FOR REYNOLDS STRESSES.
C*****
22. 0000478 TDE=TE(I,J)/ED(I,J)*DEN(I,J,2)
23. 0000558 VISUU(I,J)=TDE*UU(I,J)
24. 0000618 VISVV(I,J)=TDE*VV(I,J)
25. 0000658 VISUU(I,J)=AMAX1(VISUU(I,J),VISCOS)
26. 0000728 VISVV(I,J)=AMAX1(VISVV(I,J),VISCOS)
27. 0000778 GO TO 500
C*****
C TWO EQUATION MODEL VISCOSITIES.
C*****
28. 0000778 400 CONTINUE
29. 0001008 IF(ED(I,J).EQ.0.)GO TO 410
30. 0001058 VISUU(I,J)=DEN(I,J,K)*TE(I,J)**2*CMU/ED(I,J)
31. 0001178 410 VISUU(I,J)=VISCOS
32. 0001238 500 CONTINUE
33. 0001338 DO 510 I=1,N1
34. 0001358 VISVV(I,2)=VISVV(I,3)*BVS+VISVV(I,4)*(1.0-BVS)
35. 0001358 510 CONTINUE
36. 0001448 IF(IU.EQ.0) INPRO=.FALSE.
37. 0001468 RETURN
38. 0001508 END

```

```

PROPS.17
PROPS.18
PROPS.19
PROPS.20
PROPS.21
PROPS.22
PROPS.23
PROPS.24
PROPS.25
PROPS.26
PROPS.27
PROPS.28
PROPS.29
PROPS.30
PROPS.31
PROPS.32
PROPS.33
PROPS.34
PROPS.35
PROPS.36
PROPS.37
PROPS.38
PROPS.39
PROPS.40
PROPS.41
PROPS.42
PROPS.43
PROPS.44
PROPS.45

```

0000490365161

```

CALCM
1. 0000008 SUBROUTINE CALCM(PHI,DIF,FU,FV,SPH,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,ISC,**
1 SUBROUTINE CALCM(PHI,DIF,FU,FV,SPH,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,ISC,
IM1,IM2,NSWPHI)
C*****
C COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008 DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008 DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008 COMMON
1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),SEW(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
1R(30),RV(30),RCV(30),AFH(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
1U(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
1JU(15,30),UV(15,30),UH(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
1ED(15,30),TE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
1C2(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
1JEN(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),AY(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
1AP(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
1JT(15),CT(15),QUE(15),DCDZB(15),QUO(15),
1DEVSIT,VISCOS,PRAVDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
1CMU,CR1,CR2,CRS,CR1W,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CAPP,ELDG,
1CC1,CC2,CC,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELDGC,
1JUJ,JUV,JJW,JVJ,JVW,JWW,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JC2,JEC,
1NI,NIM1,NIM2,NJ,NJM1,NJM2,NK,NKM1,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
1HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
1INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
1NSWPU,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
1MODEL,MODEC,MRW,MCW,IQUE,IOIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
1IRUN,IU,INT,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
1K,DZ,ISTEP,ISTP1,NRS,INDEX,DPOZ,
1FLOXIN,VMEAN,QLENTN,SMALL,GREAT,XTDT,YTDT,RSWALL(14),
1ZUPR(18),IPRO,IEND,INOPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
5. 0000008 COMMON
1ET(15),ETU(15),DET(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJP1,NJPM1,INALL,
1ROJTER,RIYNER,ECCEN,ES,NJO,YTOTO,EXCHAW,NJOM1
6. 0000008 COMMON OLDU(30),OLDV(30),OLDW(30),OLDV(30),OLDV(30),
1 OLDUU(30),OLDUV(30),OLDUW(30),OLDVV(30),OLDVW(30),
1 OLDWW(30),OLDTE(30),OLDED(30),OLDOFF(30),
1 OLDDEM(30),OLDVIS(30),OVISUU(30),OVISVV(30),
1 OLDUTA,ODPDZ
7. 0000008 LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
1 INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (OLDU(1),TRANS(1))
10. 0000008 DIMENSION PHI(IMAX,JMAX,2),DIF(IMAX,JMAX,2),FU(IMAX,JMAX),
1 FV(IMAX,JMAX)
C*****
C ASSEMBLY OF COEFFICIENTS
C*****
11. 0000008 IF(ISTEP.LT.5) URF=0.05
12. 0000048 II=0
13. 0000048 1400 CONTINUE
C
14. 0000058 K=1
15. 0000058 DO 100 I=IM1,IM2
16. 0000108 DO 100 J=2,NJM1

```

PAGE 1

CALCM.2
 CALCM.3
 COMALL.2
 COMALL.3
 COMALL.4
 DIM3.1
 DIM3.2
 COMALL.6
 DIM3.3
 DIM3.4
 DIM3.5
 DIM3.6
 DIM3.7
 DIM3.8
 DIM3.9
 DIM3.10
 DIM3.11
 DIM3.12
 DIM3.13
 DIM3.14
 COMALL.19
 COMALL.20
 COMALL.21
 COMALL.22
 COMALL.23
 COMALL.24
 COMALL.25
 COMALL.26
 COMALL.27
 COMALL.28
 COMALL.29
 COMALL.30
 COMALL.31
 DIM3.15
 DIM3.16
 DIM3.17
 DIM3.18
 DIM3.19
 DIM3.20
 DIM3.21
 DIM3.22
 COMALL.32
 COMALL.33
 COMALL.34
 DIM3.23
 CALCM.5
 CALCM.6
 CALCM.7
 CALCM.8
 CALCM.9
 CALCM.10
 CALCM.11
 CALCM.12
 CALCM.13
 CALCM.14
 CALCM.15
 CALCM.16

CALCM

SUBROUTINE CALCM(PHI,OIF,FU,FV,SPH,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,ISC,

PAGE 2

```

C-----COMPUTE AREAS AND VOLUME
17. 0000138 AREA=SEW(I)*OZ*RV(J+1)
18. 0000158 AREA=OZ*SNS(J)
19. 0000178 AREAU=SEW(I)*RCV(J)*SNS(J)
20. 0000218 VOL=RCV(J)*OZ*SNS(J)*SEW(I)
C-----CALCULATE CONVECTION COEFFICIENTS
21. 0000228 CU=DEV(I,J,K)*W(I,J,K)*AREAU*SPH
22. 0000318 CN=0.5*(DEV(I,J,K)+DEV(I,J+1,K))*V(I,J+1,K)*AREAN*SPH
23. 0000428 CE=0.5*(DEV(I,J,K)+DEV(I+1,J,K))*U(I+1,J,K)*AREAEW*SPH
C-----CALCULATE DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS
24. 0000528 DIFE=0.5*(DIF(I,J,K)+DIF(I+1,J,K))
25. 0000618 DIFN=0.5*(DIF(I,J,K)+DIF(I,J+1,K))
26. 0000748 IF(IJDEL.EQ.3.OR..NOT.INDIFF) GO TO 120
27. 0001018 FVN=FV(I,J+1)
28. 0001048 FUE=FU(I+1,J)
29. 0001078 OIFN=DIFN-FVN/(PHI(I,J+1,K)-PHI(I,J,K)-SMALL)*DEN(I,J,K)*SPH*
1 SNSV(J+1)
30. 0001338 DIFE=DIFE-FUE/(PHI(I+1,J,K)-PHI(I,J,K)-SMALL)*DEN(I,J,K)*SPH*
1 RCV(J)*SEW(I+1)
31. 0001548 120 CONTINUE
32. 0001558 DIN=OIFN*AREAN/DYNP(J)
33. 0001578 DIE=DIFE*AREAEW/(DXEP(I)*RCV(J))
C-----ASSEMBLE MAIN COEFFICIENTS
34. 0001658 AU(I,J)=CJ
35. 0001718 AD(I,J)=0.0
36. 0001748 AN(I,J)=AMAX1(ABS(0.5*CN),DIN)-0.5*CN
37. 0002058 AS(I,J)=AN(I,J-1)
38. 0002118 AE(I,J)=AMAX1(ABS(0.5*CE),DIE)-0.5*CE
39. 0002228 A(I,J)=AE(I-1,J)
40. 0002268 SU(I,J)=DPDZ*FLOAT(ISC)*VCL
41. 0002348 SP(I,J)=0.0
42. 0002378 100 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****PROBLEM MODIFICATIONS
43. 0002448 IF(ISC.EQ.0) CALL MODC(RS,NRS,IT,JT,IC1,IC2)
44. 0002478 IF(ISC.EQ.1) CALL MODH(RS,NRS,IT,JT,IU1,IU2)
C*****FINAL COEFFICIENT ASSEMBLY
45. 0002538 IF(ISC.EQ.1) GO TO 210
46. 0002548 IF(IWALL.EQ.0) GO TO 210
47. 0002568 NJM1=NJUM1
48. 0002568 NJ=NJJ
49. 0002608 210 CONTINUE
50. 0002618 DO 300 I=IM1,IM2
51. 0002638 DO 300 J=2,NJM1
52. 0002668 AP(I,J)=AD(I,J)+AU(I,J)+AN(I,J)+AS(I,J)
1+AE(I,J)+A(I,J)-SP(I,J)
53. 0002668 300 CONTINUE
C*****
C SOLUTION OF DIFFERENCE EQUATION
C*****
54. 0003058 K=2
55. 0003068 DO 400 N=1,NSWPHI
56. 0003108 400 CALL LISOLV(2,2,PHI,N,2,IVAR,IM1,IM2)
57. 0003218 IF(ISC.EQ.1) GO TO 450
58. 0003238 IF(IWALL.EQ.0) GO TO 450
59. 0003248 NJ=NJP
60. 0003258 NJM1=NJPM1
61. 0003268 450 CONTINUE

```

CALCM.17
 CALCM.18
 CALCM.19
 CALCM.20
 CALCM.21
 CALCM.22
 CALCM.23
 CALCM.24
 CALCM.25
 CALCM.26
 CALCM.27
 CALCM.28
 CALCM.29
 CALCM.30
 CALCM.31
 CALCM.32
 CALCM.33
 CALCM.34
 CALCM.35
 CALCM.36
 CALCM.37
 CALCM.38
 CALCM.39
 CALCM.40
 CALCM.41
 CALCM.42
 CALCM.43
 CALCM.44
 CALCM.45
 CALCM.46
 CALCM.47
 CALCM.48
 CALCM.49
 CALCM.50
 CALCM.51
 CALCM.52
 CALCM.53
 DIM3.95
 DIM3.96
 DIM3.97
 DIM3.98
 DIM3.99
 CALCM.54
 CALCM.55
 CALCM.56
 CALCM.57
 CALCM.58
 CALCM.59
 CALCM.60
 CALCM.61
 CALCM.62
 CALCM.63
 CALCM.64
 DIM3.100
 DIM3.101
 DIM3.102
 DIM3.103
 DIM3.104

0000490367162

```

CALCM      **SUBROUTINE CALCM(PHI,DIF,FU,FV,SPH,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,ISC,**
62. 0003308 IF(ISC.EQ.1) GO TO 910
63. 0003318 NJP42=NJ41
64. 0003328 DO 905 I=1,N1
65. 0003358 UCZB(I)=(C(I,NJP42,2)-C(I,NJP42,1))/(DZ+SMALL)
66. 0003358 905 CONTINUE
67. 0003468 DO TJ 1250
68. 0003468 910 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****CALCULATION OF PRESSURE GRADIENT
69. 0003478 GINLET=FLJWIN
70. 0003478 GSTAR=0.0
71. 0003508 DSUM=0.0
72. 0003518 DO 1100 I=IM1,IM2
73. 0003548 DO 1100 J=2,NJM1
74. 0003578 AREAD=SEW(I)*SNS(I)*RCV(J)
75. 0003618 DSUM1=AREAD*AREAD*DZ*DEN(I,J,2)/AP(I,J)
76. 0003708 DSUM=DSUM+DSUM1
77. 0003728 GSTAR1=AREAD*W(I,J,K)*DEN(I,J,2)
78. 0004008 1100 GSTAR=GSTAR+GSTAR1
79. 0004058 DPOZ1=(GINLET-GSTAR)/DSUM
80. 0004078 JPLZ=DPOZ+DPOZ1*URF
81. 0004128 IF(DPOZ.LE.0) STOP
82. 0004158 DPCENT=ABS(DPOZ1/(DPOZ+SMALL))
83. 0004178 I1=I+1
84. 0004218 IF(DPCENT.GT.0.01) GO TO 1400
85. 0004248 URF=AMAX1(URF,1.0/FLOAT(I1))
86. 0004278 DO 1200 I=IM1,IM2
87. 0004328 DO 1200 J=2,NJM1
88. 0004358 AREAD=SEW(I)*SNS(J)*RCV(J)
89. 0004378 W CORR=DPOZ1*AREAD*DZ/AP(I,J)
90. 0004448 1200 W(I,J,K)=W(I,J,K)+W CORR
C*****
C*****ESTIMATION OF V-VELOCITY
C-----THIS SIMPLIFICATION IS APPLICABLE IN AXISYMMETRIC INTERNAL
C FLOWS ONLY
91. 0004568 NJM2=NJ-2
92. 0004578 DO 410 I=IM1,IM2
93. 0004618 DO 410 J=2,NJM2
94. 0004648 V(I,J+1,K)=(1.0/(DZ*RV(J+1)*SEW(I)))*
1 (+W(I,J,1)*RCV(J)*SEW(I)*SNS(J)
1 -W(I,J,2)*RCV(J)*SEW(I)*SNS(J)
1 +V(I,J,K)*DZ*RV(J)*SEW(I))
95. 0004648 410 CONTINUE
96. 0005148 1250 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****SET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS FOR USE IN GRADIENT CALCULATIONS.
C (ASSUME PARABOLIC PROFILES NEAR SYMMETRY AXES)
97. 0005158 DO 401 I=1,12
98. 0005178 401 PHI(I,1,K)=BWS*PHI(I,2,K)+(1.0-BWS)*PHI(I,3,K)
99. 0005368 NIM2=NIM1-1
100. 0005378 DO 402 J=1,NJO
101. 0005428 PHI(1,J,K)=BVM*PHI(2,J,K)+(1.0-BVM)*PHI(3,J,K)
102. 0005528 402 PHI(NI,J,K)=BVE*PHI(NIM1,J,K)+(1.0-BVE)*PHI(NIM2,J,K)
103. 0005748 RETURN
104. 0005768 END

```

CALCM.65
 CALCM.66
 CALCM.67
 CALCM.68
 CALCM.69
 CALCM.70
 CALCM.71
 CALCM.72
 CALCM.73
 CALCM.74
 CALCM.75
 CALCM.76
 CALCM.77
 CALCM.78
 CALCM.79
 CALCM.80
 CALCM.81
 CALCM.82
 CALCM.83
 CALCM.84
 CALCM.85
 CALCM.86
 CALCM.87
 CALCM.88
 CALCM.89
 CALCM.90
 CALCM.91
 CALCM.92
 CALCM.93
 CALCM.94
 CALCM.95
 CALCM.96
 CALCM.97
 CALCM.98
 CALCM.99
 CALCM.100
 CALCM.101
 CALCM.102
 CALCM.103
 CALCM.104
 CALCM.105
 CALCM.106
 CALCM.107
 CALCM.108
 CALCM.109
 CALCM.110
 CALCM.111
 CALCM.112
 CALCM.113
 CALCM.114
 OIM3.105
 CALCM.116
 CALCM.117
 CALCM.118
 CALCM.119

CALCM

SUBROUTINE CALCM(PHI,DIF,FU,FV,SPH,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,ISC,

PAGE 3

```

62. 0003308 IF(ISC.EQ.1) GO TO 910
63. 0003318 NJPM2=NJM1
64. 0003328 DO 905 I=1,NI
65. 0003358 DCDZ8(I)=(C(I,NJPM2,2)-C(I,NJPM2,1))/(DZ+SMALL)
66. 0003358 905 CONTINUE
67. 0003468 GO TO 1250
68. 0003468 910 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****CALCULATION OF PRESSURE GRADIENT
69. 0003478 GINLET=FLJWIN
70. 0003478 GSTAR=0.0
71. 0003508 DSUM=0.0
72. 0003518 DO 1100 I=IM1,IM2
73. 0003548 DO 1100 J=2,NJM1
74. 0003578 AREAD=SEW(I)*SNS(J)*RCV(J)
75. 0003618 DSUM1=AREAD*AREAD*DZ*DEN(I,J,2)/AP(I,J)
76. 0003708 DSUM=DSUM+DSUM1
77. 0003728 GSTAR1=AREAD*W(I,J,K)*DEN(I,J,2)
78. 0004008 1100 GSTAR=GSTAR+GSTAR1
79. 0004058 DPOZ1=(GINLET-GSTAR)/DSUM
80. 0004078 DPLZ=DPOZ+DPOZ1*URF
81. 0004128 IF(DPOZ.LE.0) STOP
82. 0004158 DPCENT=ABS(DPOZ1/(DPOZ+SMALL))
83. 0004178 II=II+1
84. 0004218 IF(DPCENT.GT.0.01) GO TO 1400
85. 0004248 URF=AMAX1(URF,1.0/FLOAT(II))
86. 0004278 DO 1200 I=IM1,IM2
87. 0004328 DO 1200 J=2,NJM1
88. 0004358 AREAD=SEW(I)*SNS(J)*RCV(J)
89. 0004378 WCORR=DPOZ1*AREAD*DZ/AP(I,J)
90. 0004448 1200 W(I,J,K)=W(I,J,K)+WCORR
C*****
C*****ESTIMATION OF V-VELOCITY
C-----THIS SIMPLIFICATION IS APPLICABLE IN AXISYMMETRIC INTERNAL
C FLOWS ONLY
91. 0004568 NJM2=NJ-2
92. 0004578 DO 410 I=IM1,IM2
93. 0004618 DO 410 J=2,NJM2
94. 0004648 V(I,J+1,K)=(1.0/(DZ*RV(J+1)*SEW(I)))*
1 (+W(I,J,1)*RCV(J)*SEW(I)*SNS(J)
1 -W(I,J,2)*RCV(J)*SEW(I)*SNS(J)
1 +V(I,J,K)*DZ*RV(J)*SEW(I))
95. 0004648 410 CONTINUE
96. 0005148 1250 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****SET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS FOR USE IN GRADIENT CALCULATIONS.
C (ASSUME PARABOLIC PROFILES NEAR SYMMETRY AXES)
97. 0005158 DO 401 I=1,12
98. 0005178 401 PHI(I,1,K)=BWS*PHI(I,2,K)+(1.0-BWS)*PHI(I,3,K)
99. 0005368 NIM2=NIM1-1
100. 0005378 DO 402 J=1,NJO
101. 0005428 PHI(I,J,K)=BVM*PHI(2,J,K)+(1.0-BVM)*PHI(3,J,K)
102. 0005528 402 PHI(NI,J,K)=BVE*PHI(NIM1,J,K)+(1.0-BVE)*PHI(NIM2,J,K)
103. 0005748 RETURN
104. 0005768 END

```

CALCM.65
 CALCM.66
 CALCM.67
 CALCM.68
 CALCM.69
 CALCM.70
 CALCM.71
 CALCM.72
 CALCM.73
 CALCM.74
 CALCM.75
 CALCM.76
 CALCM.77
 CALCM.78
 CALCM.79
 CALCM.80
 CALCM.81
 CALCM.82
 CALCM.83
 CALCM.84
 CALCM.85
 CALCM.86
 CALCM.87
 CALCM.88
 CALCM.89
 CALCM.90
 CALCM.91
 CALCM.92
 CALCM.93
 CALCM.94
 CALCM.95
 CALCM.96
 CALCM.97
 CALCM.98
 CALCM.99
 CALCM.100
 CALCM.101
 CALCM.102
 CALCM.103
 CALCM.104
 CALCM.105
 CALCM.106
 CALCM.107
 CALCM.108
 CALCM.109
 CALCM.110
 CALCM.111
 CALCM.112
 CALCM.113
 CALCM.114
 DIM3.105
 CALCM.116
 CALCM.117
 CALCM.118
 CALCM.119

0000490-3691-63


```

CALCRS      **SUBROUTINE CALCRS(PHI,IRS,CO,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,IM1,IM2)**
1. 0000008  SUBROUTINE CALCRS(PHI,IRS,CO,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,IM1,IM2)
C*****
C          COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008  DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008  DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008  COMMON
1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
1DXEPV(15),DXPWV(15),SEWV(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
1R(30),RV(30),RCV(30),WFM(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
1J(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
1UU(15,30),UV(15,30),UW(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
1ED(15,30),FE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
1C2(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
1UEN(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
1A(15,30),AE(15,30),AN(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
1AP(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
1JF(15),CT(15),QUE(15),OCDZB(15),QUO(15),
1DENSIT,VISCDS,PRANDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
1CMJ,CRI,CR2,CRS,CRIW,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELDG,
1CCI,CC2,CC,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELJCG,
1JUU,JUV,JUH,JVV,JVW,JWH,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JC2,JEC,
1VI,VIM1,VIM2,NJ,NJM1,NJM2,NK,NKM1,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
1HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
1INCALJ,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
1NSWPU,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
1MODEL,MDEEC,MRW,MCW,IQUE,IDIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
1IRUN,IU,IHT,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
1K,DZ,ISTEP,ISTP1,NRS,INDEX,DPDZ,
1FLJWIN,VMEAN,QLENT1,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,RSWALL(14),
1ZDPXU(18),IPRO,LEND,INDPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
COMMON
1ET(15),EFU(15),DEF(15),DETU(15),OYW,NJP,NJPI,NJPM1,IWALL,
1ROUTER,RINNER,ECCEN,ES,NJO,YTOTO,EXCHAW,NJOM1
COMMON OLDJ(30),OLDV(30),OLDW(30),OLDP(30),
1 OLDJU(30),OLDUV(30),OLDUW(30),OLDVV(30),OLDVW(30),
1 OLDWW(30),OLDTE(30),OLDED(30),OLDFF(30),
1 OLDDEN(30),OLDVIS(30),OVISUU(30),OVISVV(30),
1 OLDUTA,ODPDZ
7. 0000008  LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
1 INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0000008  EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008  EQUIVALENCE (OLDU(1),TRANS(1))
10. 0000008  DIMENSION PHI(IMAX,JMAX)
C*****
C          ASSEMBLY OF COEFFICIENTS
C*****
11. 0000008  VRS=IRS
12. 0000008  CALL SOURCE(PHI,IRS,SU,SP,IJT,IM1,IM2)
13. 0000078  K=1
14. 0000078  IS1=IM1
15. 0000108  JS1=3
16. 0000128  IF(IRS.EQ.JUC) IS1=3
17. 0000168  IF(IRS.EQ.JUC) JS1=2
18. 0000208  DO 100 I=IM1,IM2
19. 0000218  DO 100 J=JS1,NJM1

```

```

CALCRS.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
CALCRS.4
CALCRS.5
CALCRS.6
CALCRS.7
CALCRS.8
CALCRS.9
CALCRS.10
CALCRS.11
CALCRS.12
CALCRS.13
CALCRS.14
CALCRS.15
CALCRS.1

```

CALCRS

SUBROUTINE CALCRS(PHI,IRS,CO,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,IM1,IM2)

PAGE 2

```

20. 0000248 IF(IRS.EQ.JUC) GO TO 110
C-----COMPUTE AREAS AND VOLUME
21. 0000268 AREAN=SEW(I)*DZ*R(J)
22. 0000328 AKEAEW=DZ*SNSV(J)
23. 0000338 AREAU=SEW(I)*RV(J)*SNSV(J)
24. 0000358 VOL=RV(J)*DZ*SNSV(J)*SEW(I)
C-----CALCULATE CONVECTION COEFFICIENTS
25. 0000378 CU=0.5*(DEN(I,J,K)*W(I,J,K)+DEN(I,J-1,K)*W(I,J-1,K))*AREAU
26. 0000508 CN=DEV(I,J,K)*(V(I,J+1,K)*(1.0-WFN(J))+V(I,J,K)*WFN(J))*AREAN
27. 0000628 CE=0.5*(0.5*(DEN(I,J,K)+DEN(I+1,J,K))*U(I+1,J,K)+
1 0.5*(DEN(I,J-1,K)+DEN(I+1,J-1,K))*U(I+1,J-1,K))*AREAEW
C-----CALCULATE DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS
28. 0001008 GAME=0.5*(VISUU(I,J)+VISUU(I+1,J))*CD
29. 0001068 GAMN=(VISVV(I,J)*WFN(J)+VISVV(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J)))*CD
30. 0001178 IF(J.EJ.NJMI) GAMN=VISVV(I,J)*CD*(Y(NJ)-Y(NJMI))/SNS(NJMI)
31. 0001328 DIN=GAMN*AREAN/DYNPV(J)
32. 0001348 DIE=GAME*AREAEW/IDXPV(I)*RV(J)
33. 0001428 GO TO 120
34. 0001428 110 CONTINUE
35. 0001438 CU=DEV(I,J,K)*W(I,J,K)*SEW(I)*RCV(J)*SNS(J)
36. 0001538 CN=CE*0.0
37. 0001548 DIN=VISVV(I,J+1)*CD*SEW(I)*RV(J+1)*DZ/DYNPV(J)
38. 0001638 DIE=(VISUU(I,J)*WFN(J)+VISUU(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J)))*CD*SNS(J)*DZ/
1 IDXPV(I)*RCV(J)
39. 0001778 VOL=RCV(J)*SEW(I)*SNS(J)*DZ
40. 0002028 120 CONTINUE
C-----ASSEMBLE MAIN COEFFICIENTS
41. 0002048 AU(I,J)=CU
42. 0002078 AUI(I,J)=0.0
43. 0002128 AN(I,J)=AMAX1(ABS(0.5*CN),DIN)-0.5*CN
44. 0002238 AS(I,J)=AN(I,J-1)
45. 0002278 AE(I,J)=AMAX1(ABS(0.5*CE),DIE)-0.5*CE
46. 0002408 AW(I,J)=AE(I-1,J)
47. 0002448 SUI(I,J)=SU(I,J)*VOL
48. 0002508 SPI(I,J)=SP(I,J)*VOL
49. 0002548 100 CONTINUE
C*****
C*****PROBLEM MODIFICATIONS
50. 0002618 CALL MODRS (PHI,IRS,IMAX,JMAX,IM1,IM2)
51. 0002718 IF(IRS.EQ.JUC) GO TO 200
52. 0002728 DO 150 I=IM1,IM2
53. 0002758 J=2
54. 0002758 CN=DEV(I,J,K)*(V(I,J+1,K)*(1.0-WFN(J))+V(I,J,K)*WFN(J))*
1 SEW(I)*DZ*R(J)
55. 0003108 DIN=(VISVV(I,J)*WFN(J)+VISVV(I,J+1)*(1.0-WFN(J)))*CD*SEW(I)*
1 DZ*R(J)/DYNPV(J)
56. 0003228 AS(I,3)=AMAX1(ABS(0.5*CN),DIN)-0.5*CN
57. 0003278 150 CONTINUE
58. 0003318 200 CONTINUE
C*****FINAL COEFFICIENT ASSEMBLY
59. 0003328 DO 300 I=IS1,IM2
60. 0003348 DO 300 J=JS1,NJMI
61. 0003378 AP(I,J)=AU(I,J)+AU(I,J)+AN(I,J)+AS(I,J)
1+AE(I,J)+AW(I,J)-SP(I,J)
62. 0003378 300 CONTINUE
C*****
C SOLUTION OF DIFFERENCE EQUATION
C*****

```

CALCRS.17
 CALCRS.18
 CALCRS.19
 CALCRS.20
 CALCRS.21
 CALCRS.22
 CALCRS.23
 CALCRS.24
 CALCRS.25
 CALCRS.26
 CALCRS.27
 CALCRS.28
 CALCRS.29
 CALCRS.30
 CALCRS.31
 CALCRS.32
 CALCRS.33
 CALCRS.34
 CALCRS.35
 CALCRS.36
 CALCRS.37
 CALCRS.38
 CALCRS.39
 CALCRS.40
 CALCRS.41
 CALCRS.42
 CALCRS.43
 CALCRS.44
 CALCRS.45
 CALCRS.46
 CALCRS.47
 CALCRS.48
 CALCRS.49
 CALCRS.50
 CALCRS.51
 CALCRS.52
 CALCRS.53
 CALCRS.54
 CALCRS.55
 CALCRS.56
 CALCRS.57
 CALCRS.58
 CALCRS.59
 CALCRS.60
 CALCRS.61
 CALCRS.62
 CALCRS.63
 CALCRS.64
 CALCRS.65
 CALCRS.66
 CALCRS.67
 CALCRS.68
 CALCRS.69
 CALCRS.70
 CALCRS.71
 CALCRS.72
 CALCRS.73
 CALCRS.74

0000490-37164

CALCRS

SUBROUTINE CALCRS(PHI,IRS,CO,IMAX,JMAX,IVAR,IM1,IM2)

PAGE 3

```

63. 0003568      K=2
64. 0003573      DO 400 N=1,NSWPR
65. 0003618      400 CALL LISOLV(IS1,JS1,PHI,N,1,IVAR,IS1,IM2)
66. 0003718      IF(IRS.EQ.JJW.OR.IRS.EQ.JJC) RETURN
67. 0003778      IF(IRS.EQ.JVW.OR.IRS.EQ.JVC) GO TO 410
68. 0004028      DO 401 I=IM1,IM2
69. 0004048      PHI(I,2)=BVS*PHI(I,3)+(1.0-BVS)*PHI(I,4)
70. 0004048      401 CONTINUE
71. 0004178      410 CONTINUE
72. 0004178      IF(IVAR.EQ.1) GO TO 405
73. 0004209      DO 402 J=2,NJM1
74. 0004238      PHI(1,J)=BVW*PHI(2,J)+(1.0-BVW)*PHI(3,J)
75. 0004308      402 PHI(NI,J)=BVE*PHI(NIM1,J)+(1.0-BVE)*PHI(NIM2,J)
76. 0004468      405 CONTINUE
77. 0004468      RETURN
78. 0004508      END

```

```

CALCRS.75
CALCRS.76
CALCRS.77
CALCRS.78
CALCRS.79
CALCRS.80
CALCRS.81
CALCRS.82
CALCRS.83
CALCRS.84
CALCRS.85
CALCRS.86
CALCRS.87
CALCRS.88
CALCRS.89
CALCRS.90

```

PRJMD

SUBROUTINE PROMOD(PHI,IRS,IMAX,JMAX,IM1,IM2)

PAGE 1

```

1. 0000008 SUBROUTINE PROMOD(PHI,IRS,IMAX,JMAX,IM1,IM2)
C*****
C COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008 DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008 DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008 COMMON
1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
1DXEPU(15),DXPU(15),SEWU(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
1R(30),RV(30),RCV(30),WFN(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
1U(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
1UU(15,30),UV(15,30),UH(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WH(15,30),
1EC(15,30),TE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
1CZ(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
1DEN(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),AN(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
1AP(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
1UT(15),CT(15),QUE(15),DCOZB(15),QUO(15),
1DENSIT,VISCOS,PRANJT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
1CMJ,CRI,CR2,CRS,CRLW,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELOG,
1CC1,CC2,CC,CCIW,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELGC,
1JUU,JUV,JUW,JVV,JVW,JWW,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JC2,JEC,
1NI,NIM1,NIM2,NJ,NJM1,NJM2,NK,NKM1,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
1HEJU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDVIS(4),
1INCALJ,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
1NSWP,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
1NQUEL,NQUEC,MRW,MCH,IQUE,IDIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
1IRJN,IU,IHT,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
1K,QZ,ISTEP,ISTP1,NRS,INDEX,DPDZ,
1FLJW,IN,VMEAN,QLENTH,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,RSWALL(14),
1ZDPD(13),IPRO,IEND,INOPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
5. 0000008 COMMON
1ET(15),ETU(15),DET(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJP1,NJPM1,IWALL,
1ROUTER,XINNER,ECCEN,ES,NJO,YTOTO,EXCHAW,NJOM1
6. 0000008 COMMON OLDJ(20),OLDV(30),OLDW(30),OLDP(30),
1 OLDUU(30),OLDVV(30),OLDUW(30),OLDVV(30),OLDVW(30),
1 OLDWW(30),OLDTE(30),OLDED(30),OLDFF(30),
1 OLDDEN(30),OLDVIS(30),OVISUU(30),OVISVV(30),
1 OLDDTA,CDPDZ
7. 0000008 LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
1 INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (OLDU(1),TRANS(1))
10. 0000008 DIMENSION WNEAR(15,14),
1 PHI(IMAX,JMAX)
C*****
C W MOMENTUM
C*****
11. 0000008 ENTRY MUOW
C AN OUTER WALL
12. 0003308 IF(.NOT.INTURB) GOTO 220
13. 0003318 DO 200 I=IM1,IM2
14. 0003338 YREF=YV(NJ)-Y(NJM1)
15. 0003358 VISREF=VISCOS
16. 0003368 DENREF=DEN(I,NJM1,1)
17. 0003418 UVEC=W(I,NJM1,1)

```

```

PROMOD.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
DIM3.106
PROMOD.5
PROMOD.6
PROMOD.7
PROMOD.8
PROMOD.9
PROMOD.10
PROMOD.11
PROMOD.12
PROMOD.13
PROMOD.14
PROMOD.15
PROMOD.16

```

0000490-373165

```

PROMOD      **SUBROUTINE PROMOD(PHI,IRS,IMAX,JMAX,IM1,IM2)**
18. 0003448  YPLUS=UT(I)*DENREF*YREF/VISREF
19. 0003478  UT(I)=UVEC*CAPPAC/ALOG(ELOG*YPLUS)
20. 0003578  VW(I,NJ)=UT(I)*UT(I)
21. 0003628  IF(.NOT.INDIFF) GO TO 200
22. 0003648  SP(I,NJM1)=SP(I,NJM1)-UT(I)*SEW(I)*R(NJ)*DZ/
      1      *I(NJM1,1)*DEN(I,NJM1,1)
23. 0004008  AN(I,NJM1)=0.0
24. 0004038  200 CONTINUE
25. 0004068  IF(INDIFF) GO TO 220
26. 0004078  DO 210 I=IM1,IM2
27. 0004118  AN(I,NJM1)=0.0
28. 0004138  DO 210 J=2,NJM1
29. 0004168  210 SU(I,J)=SU(I,J)-(VW(I,J+1)*RV(J+1)-VW(I,J)*RV(J))*DEN(I,J,1)
      1      *SEW(I)*DZ
30. 0004368  220 CONTINUE
31. 0004368  DO 230 J=2,NJ
32. 0004408  AW(IM1,J)=0.0
33. 0004438  AE(IM2,J)=0.0
34. 0004458  230 CONTINUE
35. 0004478  DO 240 I=IM1,IM2
36. 0004508  240 AS(I,2)=0.0
37. 0004528  RETURN
C*****
C      MEAN SCALAR
C*****
38. 0004548  C      ENTRY MODC
      C      AN OUTER WALL
39. 0004628  IF(.NOT.INTJRB) GO TO 660
40. 0004638  IF(IWALL.EQ.1) GO TO 660
41. 0004658  DO 630 I=IM1,IM2
42. 0004678  YREF=YV(NJ)-Y(NJM1)
43. 0004718  VISREF=VISCUS
44. 0004728  DENREF=DEN(I,NJM1,K)
45. 0004778  YPLUS=UT(I)*DENREF*YREF/VISREF
46. 0005028  IF(IQUE.EQ.0) GO TO 610
47. 0005058  CT(I)=QUE(I)/(DEN(I,NJ,2)*UT(I)*SPHEAT)
48. 0005128  COIF=CT(I)/CAPPAC*ALOG(YPLUS*ELOGC)
49. 0005218  C(I,NJ,2)=C(I,NJM1,1)+COIF
50. 0005308  GO TO 620
51. 0005308  610 COIF=ABS(C(I,NJ,K)-C(I,NJM1,K))
52. 0005418  CT(I)=COIF*CAPPAC/ALOG(ELOGC*YPLUS)
53. 0005508  620 VC(I,NJ)=-CT(I)*UT(I)
54. 0005558  IF(.NOT.IYDIFF) GO TO 630
55. 0005578  SU(I,NJM1)=SU(I,NJM1)-VC(I,NJ)*DEN(I,NJM1,1)*SEW(I)*R(NJ)*DZ*
      1      SPHEAT
56. 0005758  AN(I,NJM1)=0.0
57. 0006008  630 CONTINUE
58. 0006038  IF(IYDIFF) GO TO 660
59. 0006048  DO 650 I=IM1,IM2
60. 0006068  AN(I,NJM1)=0.0
61. 0006108  DO 650 J=2,NJM1
62. 0006138  650 SU(I,J)=SU(I,J)-SPHEAT*DEN(I,J,1)*(SEW(I)*DZ*(VC(I,J+1)*RV(J+1)-
      1      VC(I,J)*RV(J))+SNS(J)*DZ*(UC(I+1,J)-UC(I,J)))
63. 0006418  660 CONTINUE
64. 0006428  IF(IWALL.EQ.0) GO TO 669
65. 0006438  DO 661 I=IM1,IM2
66. 0006458  YREF=YV(NJP)-Y(NJPM1)
67. 0006478  VISREF=VIS(I,NJPM1,K)

```

```

PROMOD.17
PROMOD.18
PROMOD.19
PROMOD.20
PROMOD.21
PROMOD.22
PROMOD.23
PROMOD.24
PROMOD.25
PROMOD.26
PROMOD.27
PROMOD.28
PROMOD.29
PROMOD.30
PROMOD.31
PROMOD.32
PROMOD.33
PROMOD.34
PROMOD.35
PROMOD.36
PROMOD.37
PROMOD.38
PROMOD.39
PROMOD.40
PROMOD.41
PROMOD.42
PROMOD.43
PROMOD.44
DIM3.107
PROMOD.45
PROMOD.46
PROMOD.47
PROMOD.48
PROMOD.49
PROMOD.50
PROMOD.51
PROMOD.52
PROMOD.53
PROMOD.54
PROMOD.55
PROMOD.56
PROMOD.57
PROMOD.58
PROMOD.59
PROMOD.60
PROMOD.61
PROMOD.62
PROMOD.63
PROMOD.64
PROMOD.65
PROMOD.66
PROMOD.67
PROMOD.68
PROMOD.69
DIM3.108
DIM3.109
DIM3.110
DIM3.111

```

```

PROMOD      **SUBROUTINE PROMOD(PHI,IRS,IMAX,JMAX,IM1,IM2)**
68. 0006548 DENREF=DEV(I,NJPM1,K)
69. 0006608 YPLUS=UT(I)*DENREF*YREF/VISREF
70. 0006628 ARWALL=R(NJP)*SEW(I)*DZ
71. 0006668 AN(I,NJP)=GAM(I,NJP1,K)/DET(I)*2.0*ARWALL
72. 0006758 AS(I,NJP1)=AN(I,NJP)
73. 0007028 AS(I,NJP)=CAPPAC*UT(I)*DEN(I,NJP,K)*ARWALL/
      1 ALGO(ELOGC*YPLUS)*SPHEAT
74. 0007228 AN(I,NJPM1)=AS(I,NJP)
75. 0007308 VC(I,NJP)=0.0
76. 0007338 CT(I)=CAPPAC*(C(I,NJP,K)-C(I,NJPM1,K))/ALGO(ELOGC*YPLUS)
77. 0007508 661 CONTINUE
      C----- ECCENTRIC CONDUCTING ANNULUS OF SPARROW AND BLACK S FLJW.
78. 0007548 MMAX=VJU-NJP-1
79. 0007558 DO 662 I=IM1,IM2
80. 0007578 DO 662 M=1,MMAX
81. 0007628 J=NJP+M
82. 0007638 EM=FLOAT(M)
83. 0007648 RAD=R(NJP)*DET(I)*(EM-0.5)
84. 0007708 RAD1=R(NJP)+DET(I)*EM
85. 0007718 RADU1=R(NJP)+DETU(I+1)*(EM-0.5)
86. 0007748 AW(I,J)=AE(I-1,J)
87. 0010008 AE(I,J)=GAM(I,J,2)/RADU1/SEWU(I+1)*DETU(I+1)*DZ
88. 0010118 AS(I,J)=AN(I,J-1)
89. 0010158 AN(I,J)=GAM(I,J,2)/DET(I)*RAD1*SEW(I)*DZ
90. 0010268 SU(I,J)=ES*RAD*SEW(I)*DET(I)*DZ
91. 0010348 IF(ISTEP.EQ.1) WRITE(6,663) I,J,AE(I,J),AW(I,J),AN(I,J),AS(I,J),
      1 SU(I,J)
92. 0010768 663 FORMAT(10X,2I3,1P5E11.3)
93. 0010768 662 CONTINUE
94. 0011038 IF(INDIFF) GO TO 664
95. 0011048 DO 666 I=IM1,IM2
96. 0011068 DO 666 J=2,NJPM1
97. 0011118 666 SU(I,J)=SU(I,J)-SPHEAT*DEN(I,J,1)*(SEW(I)*DZ*(VC(I,J+1)*RV(J+1)-
      1 VC(I,J)*RV(J)+SNS(J)*DZ*(UC(I+1,J)-UC(I,J)))
98. 0011378 664 CONTINUE
99. 0011408 DO 665 I=IM1,IM2
100. 0011428 SU(I,NJPM1)=SU(I,NJPM1)+QUO(I)*(R(NJP)+ET(I))*SEW(I)*DZ
101. 0011528 AN(I,NJPM1)=0.0
102. 0011548 VC(I,NJP)=-CT(I)*UT(I)
103. 0011608 665 CONTINUE
104. 0011628 669 CONTINUE
105. 0011628 DO 673 J=2,NJO
106. 0011648 A=(IM1,J)=0.0
107. 0011678 670 AE(IM2,J)=0.0
108. 0011738 DO 683 I=IM1,IM2
109. 0011748 680 AS(I,2)=0.0
110. 0011768 RETURN
      C*****
      C ALL TURBULENT VARIABLES
      C*****
111. 0012008 ENTRY 4DORS
112. 0012068 DO 800 I=IM1,IM2
113. 0012108 GO TO (710,710,710,710,700,710,720,740,740,760,750,760,770)IRS
114. 0012248 700 RS=ALL(JVW)=Y(NJPM1)/Y(NJ)-VISCOS/DENSIT/UT(I)/CAPPAC/DYNP(NJPM1)
115. 0012338 WNEAR(I,JVW)=UT(I)*UT(I)*RSWALL(JVW)
116. 0012378 GO TO 790
117. 0012408 710 WNEAR(I,IRS)=WNEAR(I,JVW)*RSWALL(IRS)
118. 0012468 GO TO 790

```

DIM3.112
 DIM3.113
 DIM3.114
 DIM3.115
 DIM3.116
 DIM3.117
 DIM3.118
 DIM3.119
 DIM3.120
 DIM3.121
 DIM3.122
 DIM3.123
 DIM3.124
 DIM3.125
 DIM3.126
 DIM3.127
 DIM3.128
 DIM3.129
 DIM3.130
 DIM3.131
 DIM3.132
 DIM3.133
 DIM3.134
 DIM3.135
 DIM3.136
 DIM3.137
 DIM3.138
 DIM3.139
 DIM3.140
 DIM3.141
 DIM3.142
 DIM3.143
 DIM3.144
 DIM3.145
 DIM3.146
 DIM3.147
 DIM3.148
 DIM3.149
 DIM3.150
 DIM3.151
 DIM3.152
 DIM3.153
 PROMOD.71
 PROMOD.72
 PROMOD.73
 PROMOD.74
 PROMOD.75
 PROMOD.76
 PROMOD.77
 PROMOD.78
 PROMOD.79
 PROMOD.80
 PROMOD.81
 PROMOD.82
 PROMOD.83
 PROMOD.84
 PROMOD.85
 PROMOD.86

0000490-379-66

PROMOD

SUBROUTINE PROMOD(PHI,IRS,IMAX,JMAX,IM1,IM2)

PAGE 4

119. 0012478
120. 0012578
121. 0012608
122. 0012638
123. 0012638
124. 0012648
125. 0012658
126. 0012718
127. 0012768

128. 0013168

129. 0013348
130. 0013428
131. 0013508
132. 0013578
133. 0013668
134. 0013718
135. 0013748

136. 0014048
137. 0014148
138. 0014228
139. 0014268
140. 0014278
141. 0014358
142. 0014368
143. 0014428

144. 0014618
145. 0014648
146. 0014678
147. 0014728
148. 0014758
149. 0015018
150. 0015018
151. 0015058
152. 0015078
153. 0015118
154. 0015128
155. 0015148

720 WNEAR(I,JED)=WNEAR(I,JVW)*UT(I)/CAPPA/DYNP(NJM1)
GO TO 790
740 WNEAR(I,IRS)=0.0
GO TO 790
750 CONTINUE
NJM2=NJM1-1
RDR=(R(NJ)*R(NJ)-R(NJM1)*R(NJM1))*0.5
QWF=QUE(I)*R(NJ)/DEN(I,NJ,2)/SPHEAT
IF(QUE(I).NE.0.0) DCDYB=(C(I,NJM1,2)-C(I,NJM2,2))/SNSV(NJM1)*
1 SNS(NJM1)/(Y(NJ)-Y(NJM1))
IF(QUE(I).EQ.0.0) DCDYB=(C(I,NJM1,2)-C(I,NJM2,2))/SNSV(NJM1)*
1 (Y(NJ)-Y(NJM1))/SNS(NJM1)
QVIS=R(NJM1)*GAM(I,NJM1,2)*DCDYB/DEN(I,NJM1,2)/SPHEAT
JAX=DCJZ3(I)*W(I,NJM1,2)*RDR*0.8
CDXIP=(C(I+1,NJM1,2)-C(I,NJM1,2))/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I+1))
CDXIM=(C(I,NJM1,2)-C(I-1,NJM1,2))/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I))
IF(I.EQ.IM1) CDXIM=0.0
IF(I.EQ.IM2) CDXIP=0.0
QVISX=(CDXIP-CDXIM)/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I))*GAM(I,NJM1,2)*RDR/
1 DEN(I,NJM1,2)/SPHEAT
QUC=(UC(I+1,NJM1)-UC(I,NJM1))/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I))*RDR
VCB=(-QWF+QVIS+QAX-QVISX+QUC)/RCV(NJM1)
WNEAR(I,JVC)=VCB
GO TO 790
760 WNEAR(I,IRS)=WNEAR(I,JVC)*RSWALL(IRS)
GO TO 790
770 WNEAR(I,JC2)=CT(I)*CT(I)*RSWALL(JC2)
790 PHI(I,NJ)=(WNEAR(I,IRS)*SNS(NJM1)-PHI(I,NJM1)*DYNP(NJM1))/
1 (Y(NJM1)-Y(NJM1))
800 CONTINUE
IF(NRS.EQ.JUW.OR.NRS.EQ.JUC) GO TO 910
DO 900 J=2,NJ
A=IM1,J)=0.0
900 AE(IM2,J)=0.0
910 CONTINUE
IF(NRS.NE.JUW.AND.NRS.NE.JUC) GO TO 930
DO 920 I=IM1,IM2
920 AS(I,2)=0.0
930 CONTINUE
RETURN
END

PROMOD.87
PROMOD.88
PROMOD.89
PROMOD.90
PROMOD.91
PROMOD.92
PROMOD.93
PROMOD.94
PROMOD.95
PROMOD.96
PROMOD.97
PROMOD.98
PROMOD.99
PROMOD.100
DIM3.154
DIM3.155
DIM3.156
DIM3.157
DIM3.158
DIM3.159
DIM3.160
DIM3.161
PROMOD.102
PROMOD.103
PROMOD.104
PROMOD.105
PROMOD.106
PROMOD.107
PROMOD.108
PROMOD.109
PROMOD.110
PROMOD.111
PROMOD.112
PROMOD.113
PROMOD.114
PROMOD.115
PROMOD.116
PROMOD.117
PROMOD.118
PROMOD.119
PROMOD.120

PROMOD

SUBROUTINE PROMOD(PHI,IRS,IMAX,JMAX,IM1,IM2)

PAGE 4

```

119. 0012478 720 WNEAR(I,JED)=WNEAR(I,JVW)*UT(I)/CAPPA/DYNP(NJM1)
120. 0012578 GO TO 790
121. 0012608 740 WNEAR(I,IRS)=0.0
122. 0012638 GO TO 790
123. 0012638 750 CONTINUE
124. 0012648 NJM2=NJM1-1
125. 0012658 RDR=(R(NJ)*R(NJ)-R(NJM1)*R(NJM1))*0.5
126. 0012718 QWF=QUE(I)*R(NJ)/DEN(I,NJ,2)/SPHEAT
127. 0012768 IF(QUE(I).NE.0.0) DCDYB=(C(I,NJM1,2)-C(I,NJM2,2))/SNSV(NJM1)*
      1 SNS(NJM1)/(Y(NJ)-Y(NJM1))
      1 IF(QUE(I).EQ.0.0) DCDYB=(C(I,NJM1,2)-C(I,NJM2,2))/SNSV(NJM1)*
      1 (Y(NJ)-Y(NJM1))/SNS(NJM1)
129. 0013168 QVIS=R(NJM1)*GAM(I,NJM1,2)*DCDYB/DEN(I,NJM1,2)/SPHEAT
130. 0013428 JAX=UCJ23(I)*W(I,NJM1,2)*RDR*0.8
131. 0013508 COXIP=(C(I+1,NJM1,2)-C(I,NJM1,2))/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I+1))
132. 0013578 COXIM=(C(I,NJM1,2)-C(I-1,NJM1,2))/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I))
133. 0013668 IF(I.EQ.IM1) COXIM=0.0
134. 0013718 IF(I.EQ.IM2) COXIP=0.0
135. 0013748 QVISX=(COXIP-COXIM)/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I))*GAM(I,NJM1,2)*RDR/
      1 DEN(I,NJM1,2)/SPHEAT
      1 QUC=(UC(I+1,NJM1)-UC(I,NJM1))/(RCV(NJM1)*SEW(I))*RDR
      1 VCB=(-QWF+QVIS+QAX-QVISX+QUC)/RCV(NJM1)
136. 0014048 WNEAR(I,JVC)=VCB
137. 0014148 GO TO 790
138. 0014228 760 WNEAR(I,IRS)=WNEAR(I,JVC)*RSWALL(IRS)
139. 0014268 GO TO 790
140. 0014278 770 WNEAR(I,JC2)=CT(I)*CT(I)*RSWALL(JC2)
141. 0014358 790 PHI(I,NJ)=(WNEAR(I,IRS)*SNS(NJM1)-PHI(I,NJM1)*DYNP(NJM1))/
      1 (Y(NJM1)-Y(NJM1))
144. 0014618 800 CONTINUE
145. 0014648 IF(NRS.EQ.JUW.OR.NRS.EQ.JUC) GO TO 910
146. 0014678 DO 900 J=2,NJ
147. 0014728 A=(IM1,J)=0.0
148. 0014758 900 AE(IM2,J)=0.0
149. 0015018 910 CONTINUE
150. 0015018 IF(NRS.NE.JUW.AND.NRS.NE.JUC) GO TO 930
151. 0015058 DO 920 I=IM1,IM2
152. 0015078 920 AS(I,2)=0.0
153. 0015118 930 CONTINUE
154. 0015128 RETURN
155. 0015148 END

```

```

PROMOD.87
PROMOD.88
PROMOD.89
PROMOD.90
PROMOD.91
PROMOD.92
PROMOD.93
PROMOD.94
PROMOD.95
PROMOD.96
PROMOD.97
PROMOD.98
PROMOD.99
PROMOD.100
DIM3.154
DIM3.155
DIM3.156
DIM3.157
DIM3.158
DIM3.159
DIM3.160
DIM3.161
PROMOD.102
PROMOD.103
PROMOD.104
PROMOD.105
PROMOD.106
PROMOD.107
PROMOD.108
PROMOD.109
PROMOD.110
PROMOD.111
PROMOD.112
PROMOD.113
PROMOD.114
PROMOD.115
PROMOD.116
PROMOD.117
PROMOD.118
PROMOD.119
PROMOD.120

```

0000491374.67


```

OUTPUT          **SUBROUTINE OUTPUT**

1. 0000008      SUBROUTINE OUTPUT
C*****
C                      COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008      DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008      DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008      COMMON
1X(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
1DXEPU(15),DXPWU(15),SEWU(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
1R(30),KV(30),RCV(30),WFM(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
1J(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
1UU(15,30),UV(15,30),UW(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
1EDI(15,30),TE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
1C2(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
1JEN(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),AV(15,30),AS(15,30),AD(15,30),AU(15,30),
1AP(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
1UT(15),CT(15),QUE(15),DCOZ8(15),QUO(15),
1DEVSIT,VISCOS,PRANDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
1CMU,CRI,CR2,CRS,CRIW,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELJG,
1CC1,CC2,CC,CCLW,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELJGC,
1JUU,JUV,JUW,JVV,JVW,JWW,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JEC,
1NI,NIM1,NIM2,NJ,NJM1,NJM2,NK,NKM1,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
1HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDR(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
1INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRD,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
1NSWPV,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
1MUDEL,MODEC,MRW,MCH,IQUE,IDIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
1IRU4,IU,IHT,IU1,IC1,IC2,IL,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
1K,UZ,ISTEP,ISTP1,NRS,INDEX,DPOZ,
1FLUIN,VMEAN,QLENTH,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,RSWALL(14),
1ZOP3(14),IPRO,IEND,INDPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVM,BVS,BWS
COMMON
1ETI(15),ETU(15),DETI(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJP1,NJPM1,IWALL,
1ROUTER,RINVER,ECCV,ES,NJO,YTOT,EXCHAW,NJOM1
COMMON  OLOU(30),OLOV(30),OLDW(30),OLOP(30),
1      OLOJU(30),OLOUV(30),CLOUW(30),OLOVV(30),OLOVW(30),
1      OLDW(30),OLDTE(30),OLOED(30),OLOFF(30),
1      OLODEN(30),OLOVIS(30),OVISUU(30),OVISVV(30),
1      OLOUTA,DPOZ
7. 0000008      LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRD,
1      INCALR,INTURB,INDIFF
8. 0000008      EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008      EQUIVALENCE (OLOU(1),TRANS(1))
10. 0000008      DIMENSION AT(30),JU1(15,30),OU2(15,30),OU3(15,30),OU4(15,30),
1      OJ5(15,30)
11. 0000008      REAL MINC,MAXC
C*****
C                      SINGLE VARIABLES
C*****
12. 0000008      WRITE(6,U10)
13. 0043558      ZO=Z(2)/YTOT/2.
14. 0043563      WRITE(6,U20) ISTEP,ZO,OZ,DPOZ,UT(3)
15. 0043708      IF(IU.EQ.0.AND.INDEX.NE.0) GO TO 110
16. 0043728      DO 100 I=IU1,IU2
17. 0043748      TAU=UT(I)*UT(I)*DENSIT
18. 0043758      IF(.NOT.INTURB) TAU=VISCOS*(W(I,NJM1,2)-W(I,NJ,2))

```

```

OUTPUT.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
DIM3.162
DIM3.163
DIM3.164
OUTPUT.4
OUTPUT.5
OUTPUT.6
OUTPUT.7
OUTPUT.8
OUTPUT.9
OUTPUT.10
OUTPUT.11
OUTPUT.12
OUTPUT.12

```

```

**SUBROUTINE OUTPUT**

```

```

19. 0044138 1 CF=TAU/(J.5*DENSI*W(I,1,K)*W(I,1,K))
20. 0044208 DEL1=0.0
21. 0044218 DEL2=0.0
22. 0044228 DO 100 J=2,NJMI
23. 0044258 WR=W(I,J,2)/W(I,1,2)
24. 0044308 DEL1=DEL1+(1.0-WR)*SNS(J)
25. 0044348 100 DEL2=DEL2+WR*(1.0-WR)*SNS(J)
26. 0044438 EH=DEL1/(DEL2+1.E-30)
27. 0044458 WRITE(6,030) CF,DEL1,DEL2,EH
28. 0044558 110 IF(IHT.EQ.0) GO TO 140
29. 0044568 CFLUX=0.0
30. 0044568 DELC=0.0
31. 0044568 DO 120 I=IC1,IC2
32. 0044618 DO 120 J=2,NJ
33. 0044648 CFLUX=CFLUX+W(I,J,2)*C(I,J,2)*RCV(J)*SEW(I)*SNS(J)*DEN(I,J,2)
34. 0044768 1 *SPHEAT
35. 0045008 WR=W(I,J,2)/W(I,1,2)
36. 0045078 CR=(C(I,J,2)-C(I,1,2))/(C(I,NJ,2)-C(I,1,2)+SMALL)
37. 0045168 120 DELC=DELC+WR*CR*SNS(J)
38. 0045248 WRITE(6,040) DELC,CFLUX,CT(3)
39. 0045348 CBULK=CFLUX/(VMEAN*R(NJ)*R(NJ)*0.5*(XU(I2+1)-XU(I1)))/DENSI
40. 0045418 1 /SPHEAT
41. 0045438 WRITE(6,50)
42. 0045458 DO 130 I=1,NI
43. 0045538 THETA=X(I)/3.14159*180.
44. 0045638 COIFF=(C(I,NJ,2)-CBULK)/(CBULK+SMALL)
45. 0045708 STAY=QUE(I)/(C(I,NJ,2)-CBULK+SMALL)/(DENSI*VMEAN*SPHEAT)
46. 0045758 ENUS=STAY*PRANDT*DENSI*VMEAN*2.0*YTOT/VISCO
47. 0046148 IF(STAY.GE.1.E+20) STAN=6H
48. 0046168 WRITE(6,060) I,THETA,QUO(I),QUE(I),CT(I),COIFF,CBULK,STAN,ENUS
49. 0046178 130 CONTINUE
50. 0046228 140 CONTINUE
51. 0046348 WRITE(6,10)
52. 0046378 IF(MOD(ISTEP,INDPRI).EQ.0.AND.MOD(ISTEP,NUMPRI).NE.0) RETURN
53. 0046428 C*****
54. 0046448 C OUTPUT FROM HYDRODYNAMIC CALCULATIONS
55. 0046478 C*****
56. 0046508 C*****MEAN VELOCITY FIELD
57. 0046548 IF(IU.EQ.0.AND.INDEX.EQ.1) GO TO 500
58. 0046568 WRITE(6,240)
59. 0046608 DO 200 I=IU1,IU2
60. 0047128 DO 200 J=1,NJ
61. 0047178 OUT1=Y(J)/Y(NJ)
62. 0047208 OUT2=W(I,J,2)/UT(I)
63. 0047228 OUT3=(Y(NJ)-Y(J))*UT(I)/VISCO
64. 0047268 OUT4=W(I,J,2)/W(I,1,2)
65. 0047308 WRITE(6,250) J,Y(J),U(I,J,2),V(I,J,2),W(I,J,2),PE(I,J,2),PP(I,J)
66. 0047338 1 ,OUT1,OUT2,OUT3,OUT4
67. 0047368 200 CONTINUE
68. 0047398 IF(.NOT.INTURB) GO TO 500
69. 0047428 C*****
70. 0047458 C*****TWO-EQUATION MODEL
71. 0047488 IF(MODEL.NE.3) GO TO 390
72. 0047518 WRITE(6,340)
73. 0047548 DO 300 I=IU1,IU2
74. 0047578 DO 300 J=1,NJMI
75. 0047608 OUT1=Y(J)/Y(NJ)

```

OUTPUT.14
OUTPUT.15
OUTPUT.16
OUTPUT.17
OUTPUT.18
OUTPUT.19
OUTPUT.20
OUTPUT.21
OUTPUT.22
OUTPUT.23
OUTPUT.24
OUTPUT.25
OUTPUT.26
OUTPUT.27
OUTPUT.28
OUTPUT.29
OUTPUT.30
OUTPUT.31
OUTPUT.32
OUTPUT.33
OUTPUT.34
OUTPUT.35
OUTPUT.36
OUTPUT.37
DIM.165
OUTPUT.39
OUTPUT.41
OUTPUT.42
OUTPUT.43
OUTPUT.44
OUTPUT.45
OUTPUT.46
OUTPUT.47
OUTPUT.48
OUTPUT.49
OUTPUT.50
OUTPUT.51
OUTPUT.52
OUTPUT.53
OUTPUT.54
OUTPUT.55
OUTPUT.56
OUTPUT.57
OUTPUT.58
OUTPUT.59
OUTPUT.60
OUTPUT.61
OUTPUT.62
OUTPUT.63
OUTPUT.64
OUTPUT.65
OUTPUT.66
OUTPUT.67
OUTPUT.68
OUTPUT.69
OUTPUT.70
OUTPUT.71
OUTPUT.72

```

OUTPUT      **SUBROUTINE OUTPUT**

67. 0047348  OUT2=TE(I,J)/UT(I)/UT(I)
68. 0047418  OUT3=ED(I,J)*Y(NJ)/UT(I)**3
69. 0047448  OUT4=VIS(I,J,2)/UT(I)/Y(NJ)
70. 0047508  OUT5=-1/VIS(I,J,2)+VIS(I,J,2)*0.5*(W(I,J+1,2)-W(I,J,2))/
              1 (Y(J+1)-Y(J))/UT(I)/UT(I)
71. 0047618  WRITE(6,350) J,OUT1,TE(I,J),ED(I,J),OUT2,OUT3,OUT4,OUT5
72. 0050018  300 CONTINUE
73. 0050068  RETURN
74. 0050108  390 CONTINUE

C*****
C*****KEYVULDS STRESSES
75. 0050108  WRITE(6,440)
76. 0050138  DO 400 I=1U1,IU2
77. 0050158  DO 400 J=2,NJ
78. 0050208  OUT1=YV(J)/Y(NJ)
79. 0050218  OUT2=UU(I,J)/UT(I)/UT(I)
80. 0050258  OUT3=VV(I,J)/UT(I)/UT(I)
81. 0050278  OUT4=WW(I,J)/UT(I)/UT(I)
82. 0050318  OUT5=TE(I,J)/UT(I)/UT(I)
83. 0050338  OUT6=-VW(I,J)/(W(I,J,2)-W(I,J-1,2)-SMALL)*(Y(J)-Y(J-1))/
              1 R(NJ)/UT(I)
84. 0050468  WRITE(6,450) J,OUT1,UU(I,J),VV(I,J),WW(I,J),OUT2,OUT3,OUT4
              1 ,OUT5,OUT6
85. 0050728  400 CONTINUE
C-----SOME DETAILED INFORMATION
86. 0050778  WRITE(6,460)
87. 0051028  DO 470 I=1U1,IU2
88. 0051048  DO 470 J=2,NJ
89. 0051078  OUT1=YV(J)/Y(NJ)
90. 0051108  OUT2=VW(I,J)/UT(I)/UT(I)
91. 0051148  OUT3=-VW(I,J)*(W(I,J,2)-W(I,J-1,2))/(Y(J)-Y(J-1))/(ED(I,J)+SMALL)
92. 0051278  OUT4=ED(I,J)*Y(NJ)/UT(I)**3
93. 0051328  OUT5=VISUU(I,J)/UT(I)/Y(NJ)
94. 0051338  OUT6=VISVV(I,J)/UT(I)/Y(NJ)
95. 0051358  OUT7=VW(I,J)/(SORT(ABS(WW(I,J)*VV(I,J)))+SMALL)
96. 0051478  WRITE(6,480) J,OUT1,VW(I,J),UW(I,J),ED(I,J),OUT2,OUT3,OUT4
              1 ,OUT5,OUT6,OUT7
97. 0051718  470 CONTINUE
98. 0051768  500 CONTINUE

C*****
C*****
C*****OUTPUT FROM SCALAR TRANSPORT CALCULATIONS
C*****
C*****MEAN SCALAR FIELD
99. 0051768  IF(IHT.EQ.0) RETURN
100. 0052018  IF(IHT.EQ.2) GO TO 800
101. 0052028  WRITE(6,640)
102. 0052068  DO 600 I=1C1,IC2
103. 0052108  DO 600 J=2,NJ
104. 0052138  OUT1=Y(J)/Y(NJ)
105. 0052148  OUT2=(C(I,NJ,2)-C(I,J,2))/(CT(I)+SMALL)
106. 0052258  OUT3=(C(I,NJ,2)-C(I,J,2))/(C(I,NJ,2)-C(I,1,2))
107. 0052338  OUT4=(VW(I,J)*C(I,J,2)-C(I,J-1,2))/
              1 (VC(I,J)*(W(I,J,2)-W(I,J-1,2))+SMALL)
108. 0052458  WRITE(6,650) J,OUT1,C(I,J,2),OUT2,OUT3,OUT4
109. 0052638  600 CONTINUE
110. 0052708  IF(.NOT.INTURB) RETURN

C*****
C*****SCALAR FLUXES AND SCAL FLUCTUATIONS

```

```

OUTPUT.73
OUTPUT.74
OUTPUT.75
OUTPUT.76
OUTPUT.77
OUTPUT.78
OUTPUT.79
OUTPUT.80
OUTPUT.81
OUTPUT.82
OUTPUT.83
OUTPUT.84
OUTPUT.85
OUTPUT.86
OUTPUT.87
OUTPUT.88
OUTPUT.89
OUTPUT.90
OUTPUT.91
OUTPUT.92
OUTPUT.93
OUTPUT.94
OUTPUT.95
OUTPUT.96
OUTPUT.97
OUTPUT.98
OUTPUT.99
OUTPUT.100
OUTPUT.101
OUTPUT.102
OUTPUT.103
OUTPUT.104
OUTPUT.105
OUTPUT.106
OUTPUT.107
OUTPUT.108
OUTPUT.109
OUTPUT.110
OUTPUT.111
OUTPUT.112
OUTPUT.113
OUTPUT.114
OUTPUT.115
OUTPUT.116
OUTPUT.117
OUTPUT.118
OUTPUT.119
OUTPUT.120
OUTPUT.121
OUTPUT.122
OUTPUT.123
OUTPUT.124
OUTPUT.125
OUTPUT.126
OUTPUT.127
OUTPUT.128
OUTPUT.1
OUTPUT.1

```

OUTPUT

SUBROUTINE OUTPUT

PAGE

4

```

111. 0052738 WRITE(6,740)
112. 0052768 DO 700 I=IC1,IC2
113. 0053008 DO 700 J=2,NJ
114. 0053038 OUT1=YV(J)/Y(NJ)
115. 0053048 OUT2=UC(I,J)/(UT(I)*CT(I)+SMALL)
116. 0053128 OUT3=VC(I,J)/(UT(I)*CT(I)+SMALL)
117. 0053148 OUT4=WC(I,J)/(UT(I)*CT(I)+SMALL)
118. 0053178 OUT5=C2(I,J)/(CT(I)*CT(I)+SMALL)
119. 0053228 OUT6=-VC(I,J)/(C(I,J,2)-C(I,J-1,2)+SMALL)*(Y(J)-Y(J-1))
1      *DENSIT/VISCOS
120. 0053368 WRITE(6,750) J,OUT1,UC(I,J),VC(I,J),WC(I,J),C2(I,J),EC(I,J),
1      OUT2,OUT3,OUT4,OUT5,OUT6
121. 0053668 700 CONTINUE
C
122. 0053738 RETURN
123. 0053758 800 CONTINUE
124. 0053758 IF(INDEX.NE.0) GO TO 805
125. 0053768 DO 804 I=1,IT
126. 0054008 DO 804 J=1, JT
127. 0054038 OUT1(I,J)=0.0
128. 0054058 OUT2(I,J)=0.0
129. 0054068 OUT3(I,J)=0.0
130. 0054068 OUT4(I,J)=0.0
131. 0054078 OUT5(I,J)=0.0
132. 0054078 804 CONTINUE
133. 0054138 NT=NJ
134. 0054138 805 CONTINUE
135. 0054158 MAXC=-GREAT
136. 0054168 MINC=GREAT
137. 0054168 DO 810 J=1,NJ
138. 0054218 AT(J)=YV(J)/Y(NJ)
139. 0054228 DO 810 I=1,NI
140. 0054258 MINC=AMIN1(MINC,C(I,J,2))
141. 0054318 MAXC=AMAX1(MAXC,C(I,J,2))
142. 0054338 810 CONTINUE
143. 0054378 DO 820 J=1,NJO
144. 0054418 DO 820 I=1,NI
145. 0054448 OUT1(I,J)=C(I,J,K)/(CBULK+SMALL)
146. 0054538 OUT2(I,J)=(C(I,J,K)-MINC)/(MAXC-MINC+SMALL)
147. 0054638 820 CONTINUE
148. 0054678 IF(INCALC) CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NT,IT,JT,KT,X,Y,C,HEDC,2)
149. 0054728 IF(INCALC) CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NT,IT,JT,KT,X,Y,OUT1,HEDC,1)
150. 0054758 IF(INCALC) CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NT,IT,JT,KT,X,Y,OUT2,HEDC,1)
151. 0055008 IF(INCALR(JUC))CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,UC,
1      40H TANGENTIAL SCALAR FLUX ,1)
152. 0055038 IF(INCALR(JVC))CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,VC,
1      40H RADIAL SCALAR FLUX ,1)
153. 0055068 IF(INCALR(JWC))CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,WC,
1      40H AXIAL SCALAR FLUX ,1)
154. 0055118 IF(INCALR(JC2))CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,C2,
1      40H ( SCALAR FLUCTUATION )**2 ,1)
155. 0055148 IF(INCALR(JEC))CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,EC,
1      40H SCALAR DISSIPATION RATE ,1)
156. 0055178 DO 825 I=1,NI
157. 0055218 DO 825 J=1,NJ
158. 0055248 OUT1(I,J)=0.0
159. 0055268 OUT2(I,J)=0.0
160. 0055278 825 CONTINUE

```

```

OUTPUT.131
OUTPUT.132
OUTPUT.133
OUTPUT.134
OUTPUT.135
OUTPUT.136
OUTPUT.137
OUTPUT.138
OUTPUT.139
OUTPUT.140
OUTPUT.141
OUTPUT.142
OUTPUT.143
OUTPUT.144
OUTPUT.145
OUTPUT.146
DIM3.166
DIM3.167
DIM3.168
DIM3.169
DIM3.170
DIM3.171
DIM3.172
DIM3.173
DIM3.174
DIM3.175
DIM3.176
DIM3.177
DIM3.178
DIM3.179
DIM3.180
DIM3.181
DIM3.182
DIM3.183
DIM3.184
DIM3.185
DIM3.186
DIM3.187
DIM3.188
DIM3.189
DIM3.190
DIM3.191
DIM3.192
DIM3.193
DIM3.194
DIM3.195
DIM3.196
DIM3.197
DIM3.198
DIM3.199
DIM3.200
DIM3.201
DIM3.202
DIM3.203
DIM3.204
DIM3.205
DIM3.206
DIM3.207

```

000049031169

```

OUTPUT          **SUBROUTINE OUTPUT**

161. 0055328      DO 830 I=IC1,IC2
162. 0055348      DO 830 J=2,NJM1
163. 0055378      QU1(I,J)=-VW(I,J)*(Y(J)-Y(J-1))/(W(I,J,K)-W(I,J-1,K)-SMALL)
164. 0055528      QU2(I,J)=-VZ(I,J)*(Y(J)-Y(J-1))/(C(I,J,K)-C(I,J-1,K)-SMALL)
165. 0055658      QU3(I,J)=-JC(I,J)/(C(I,J,K)-C(I-1,J,K)+SMALL)*SEWU(I)*PCV(J)
166. 0056003      QU4(I,J)=QU1(I,J)/(QU2(I,J)+SMALL)
167. 0056028      QU5(I,J)=QU3(I,J)/(QU2(I,J)+SMALL)
168. 0056058      830 CONTINUE
169. 0056118      IF(ISTEP.LE.1) CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,QU1,
170. 0056158      1 40H      MOMENTUM DIFFUSIVITY -RADIAL-      ,1)
171. 0056178      CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ      ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,QU2,
172. 0056218      1 40H      SCALAR DIFFUSIVITY -RADIAL-      ,1)
173. 0056238      CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ      ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,QU3,
174. 0056258      1 40H      SCALAR DIFFUSIVITY -TANGENTIAL-      ,1)
175. 0056278      CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ      ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,QU4,
176. 0056298      1 40H      PRANDTL NUMBER -RADIAL-      ,1)
177. 0056318      CALL PRINT(1,1,NI,NJ      ,IT,JT,KT,X,AT,QU5,
178. 0056338      1 40H      PRANDTL NUMBER -TANGENTIAL-      ,1)
179. 0056358      RETURN
180. 0056378      C*****
181. 0056398      C      FORMAT STATEMENTS
182. 0056418      C*****
183. 0056438      10 FORMAT(///1H0,120(1H*///)
184. 0056458      20 FORMAT(14,20X,*STEP=,14,3X,* ZD=,1PE10.3,* DZ=,1PE10.3,
185. 0056478      1 * DPDZ=,1PE10.3,* UTAU=,1PE10.3)
186. 0056498      30 FORMAT(14,32X,* CF=,1PE10.3,*DEL1=,1PE10.3,* DEL2=,
187. 0056518      1 1PE10.3,* EH=,1PE10.3)
188. 0056538      40 FORMAT(1H,31X,*DELCL=,1PE10.3,*CFLUX=,1PE10.3)
189. 0056558      50 FORMAT(34X,*I THETA QO QI CTAU (CW-CB)/CB*
190. 0056578      1 *,* CBULK STAN NUSS*)
191. 0056598      60 FORMAT(33X,12,1P8E11.3)
192. 0056618      240 FORMAT(//2X,* J Y U V W*
193. 0056638      1 *,* P PP Y/R WPLUS*
194. 0056658      1 *,* YPLUS W/WMAX */)
195. 0056678      250 FORMAT(2X,12,1P10E11.3)
196. 0056698      340 FORMAT(//2X,* J Y/R K.E. ED K/UT2*
197. 0056718      1 *,* ER/UT3 VIS/UT/R SHEAR/UT2*/)
198. 0056738      350 FORMAT(2X,12,1P7E11.3)
199. 0056758      440 FORMAT(//2X,* J YV/R UU VV WW*
200. 0056778      1 *,* UU/UT2 VV/UT2 WW/UT2 TE/UT2*
201. 0056798      1 *,* W-DIFFUSIVITY*/)
202. 0056818      450 FORMAT(2X,12,1P9E11.3)
203. 0056838      460 FORMAT(//2X,* J YV/R VH UW ED*
204. 0056858      1 *,* VW/UT2 P/E ER/UT3 VIUU/UTR*
205. 0056878      1 *,* VIVV/UT1 VH/V/W*/)
206. 0056898      480 FORMAT(2X,12,1P10E11.3)
207. 0056918      640 FORMAT(//2X,* J Y/R C CPLUS CBAR*,
208. 0056938      1 *,* PR*/)
209. 0056958      650 FORMAT(2X,12,1P5E11.3)
210. 0056978      740 FORMAT(//2X,* J YV/R UC VC WC*,
211. 0056998      1 *,* C2 EC UC/UTCT VC/UTCT*,
212. 0057018      1 *,* WC/UTCT C2/CTCT VC/DCY*/)
213. 0057038      750 FORMAT(2X,12,1P11E11.3)
214. 0057058      END

```

```

DIM3.208
DIM3.209
DIM3.210
DIM3.211
DIM3.212
DIM3.213
DIM3.214
DIM3.215
DIM3.216
DIM3.217
DIM3.218
DIM3.219
DIM3.220
DIM3.221
DIM3.222
DIM3.223
DIM3.224
DIM3.225
OUTPUT.147
OUTPUT.148
OUTPUT.149
OUTPUT.150
OUTPUT.151
OUTPUT.152
OUTPUT.153
OUTPUT.154
OUTPUT.155
OUTPUT.156
OUTPUT.157
OUTPUT.158
OUTPUT.159
OUTPUT.160
OUTPUT.161
OUTPUT.162
OUTPUT.163
OUTPUT.164
OUTPUT.165
OUTPUT.166
OUTPUT.167
OUTPUT.168
OUTPUT.169
OUTPUT.170
OUTPUT.171
OUTPUT.172
OUTPUT.173
OUTPUT.174
OUTPUT.175
OUTPUT.176
OUTPUT.177
OUTPUT.178
OUTPUT.179
OUTPUT.180
OUTPUT.181
OUTPUT.182

```

LISOLV

SUBROUTINE LISOLV (ISTART,JSTART,PHI1,N,KP,NS,IM1,IM2)

PAGE 1

```

1. 0000008 SUBROUTINE LISOLV (ISTART,JSTART,PHI1,N,KP,NS,IM1,IM2)
C*****
C COMMON BLOCKS
C*****
2. 0000008 DIMENSION SAVE(20229)
3. 0000008 DIMENSION TRANS(512)
4. 0000008 COMMON
1A(15),Y(30),Z(02),XU(15),YV(30),ZW(02),
1DXEP(15),DXPW(15),DYNP(30),DYPS(30),SEW(15),SNS(30),
1DXEPU(15),DXPHU(15),SEWU(15),DYNPV(30),DYPSV(30),SNSV(30),
1R(30),RV(30),RCV(30),WFH(30),WFS(30),WFE(15),WFW(15),
1U(15,30,2),V(15,30,2),W(15,30,2),PE(15,30,2),C(15,30,2),PP(15,30),
1UU(15,30),UV(15,30),UW(15,30),VV(15,30),VW(15,30),WW(15,30),
1EG(15,30),FE(15,30),FF(15,30),UC(15,30),VC(15,30),WC(15,30),
1C2(15,30),EC(15,30),RS(15,30),
1DEN(15,30,2),VIS(15,30,2),GAM(15,30,2),VISUU(15,30),VISVV(15,30),
1AW(15,30),AE(15,30),ANI(15,30),AS(15,30),ADI(15,30),AU(15,30),
1API(15,30),SU(15,30),SP(15,30),
1UT(15),CY(15),QUE(15),DCOZB(15),QUO(15),
1JENSIT,VISCOS,PFANDT,SPHEAT,EXCHAT,
1CMJ,CR1,CR2,CRS,CR1W,CR2W,CEPS1,CEPS2,CEPS,CAPPA,ELOG,
1CC1,CC2,CC,CC1W,CC2W,CG2,CG,CAPPAC,ELJGC,
1JUU,JUV,JVW,JVV,JVW,JWW,JED,JTE,JFF,JUC,JVC,JWC,JC2,JEC,
1VI,NI41,NI42,NJ,NJ41,NJ42,NK,NK41,IT,JT,KT,IJT,
1HEDU(4),HEDV(4),HEDW(4),HEDP(4),HEDC(4),HEDF(4),HEDD(4),HEDVIS(4),
1INCALJ,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,INCALR(14),INTURB,INDIFF,
1NSWPV,NSWPV,NSWPW,NSWPP,NSWPC,NSWPR,
1MODEL,MJUEC,MRW,MCH,IQUE,IDIF,IJET,ITEST,ITESU,ITESC,ICON,
1IRJN,IU,IHT,IU1,IU2,IC1,IC2,I1,I2,INDCOS,FRA,
1K,DZ,ISTEP,ISTPL,NRS,INDEX,DPOZ,
1FLDWIN,VMEAN,QLENT4,SMALL,GREAT,XTOT,YTOT,RSWALL(14),
1ZDPRO(18),IPRO,IEND,INDPRI,NUMPRI,BVE,BVW,BVS,BWS
CGMNDV
5. 0000008 1ET(15),ETU(15),DET(15),DETU(15),DYW,NJP,NJP1,NJPM1,IWALL,
1ROUTER,RINNER,ECCEN,ES,NJO,YTOTO,EXCHAW,NJDM1
6. 0000008 COMMON OLDU(30),OLDV(30),OLDW(30),OLDP(30),
1 OLDJU(30),OLDUV(30),OLDUW(30),OLDVV(30),OLDVW(30),
1 OLDWW(30),OLDTE(30),OLDED(30),OLOFF(30),
1 OLDGEN(30),OLDVIS(30),OVISUU(30),OVISVV(30),
1 ULDTA,DPOZ
7. 0000008 LOGICAL INCALU,INCALV,INCALW,INCALP,INCALC,INPRO,
1 INCALR,INTJRB,INDIFF
8. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (X(1),SAVE(1))
9. 0000008 EQUIVALENCE (CLOU(1),TRANS(1))
10. 0000008 DIMENSION PHI1(15,30,2),PHI(15,30,2),A(30),B(30),CA(50),D(30)
C*****
C*****WEST-EAST SWEEP
11. 0000008 JSTM1=JSTART-1
C INITIALISE PHI ARRAY.
12. 0020218 DO 10 I=1,NI
13. 0020238 DO 10 J=1,NJ
14. 0020268 IF(N.EQ.1)PHI(I,J,1)=PHI1(I,J,1)
15. 0020358 10 PHI(I,J,2)=PHI1(I,J,KP)
16. 0020518 A(JSTM1)=0.0
C-----COMMENCE W-E SWEEP
17. 0020518 DO 100 I=IM1,IM2
18. 0020548 CA(JSTM1)=PHI(I,JSTM1,K)

```

```

LISOLV.2
COMALL.2
COMALL.3
COMALL.4
DIM3.1
DIM3.2
COMALL.6
DIM3.3
DIM3.4
DIM3.5
DIM3.6
DIM3.7
DIM3.8
DIM3.9
DIM3.10
DIM3.11
DIM3.12
DIM3.13
DIM3.14
COMALL.19
COMALL.20
COMALL.21
COMALL.22
COMALL.23
COMALL.24
COMALL.25
COMALL.26
COMALL.27
COMALL.28
COMALL.29
COMALL.30
COMALL.31
DIM3.15
DIM3.16
DIM3.17
DIM3.18
DIM3.19
DIM3.20
DIM3.21
DIM3.22
COMALL.32
COMALL.33
COMALL.34
DIM3.23
DIM3.226
LISOLV.6
LISOLV.7
LISOLV.8
LISOLV.9
LISOLV.10
LISOLV.11
LISOLV.12
LISOLV.13
LISOLV.14
LISOLV.15
LISOLV.16
LISOLV.17

```

0000490-383170

LISOLV

SUBROUTINE LISOLV (ISTART,JSTART,PHI1,N,KP,NS,IM1,IM2)

PAGE 2

```

19. 0020608 C-----COMMENCE S-N TRAVERSE
      DO 101 J=JSTART,NJM1
20. 0020648 C-----ASSEMBLE TQMA COEFFICIENTS
      A(J)=AN(I,J)
21. 0020678      B(J)=AS(I,J)
22. 0020708      CA(J)=AE(I,J)*PHI(I+1,J,K)+AW(I,J)*PHI(I-1,J,K)+
      1AU(I,J)*PHI(I,J,K-1)+SU(I,J)
23. 0021038      D(J)=AP(I,J)
      C-----CALCULATE COEFFICIENTS OF RECURRENCE FORMULA
24. 0021048      TERM=1./(D(J)-B(J)*A(J-1))
25. 0021078      A(J)=A(J)*TERM
26. 0021118      101 CA(J)=(CA(J)+B(J)*CA(J-1))*TERM
      C-----OBTAIN NEW PHI,S
27. 0021168      DO 102 JJ=JSTART,NJM1
28. 0021208      J=JJ+JSTM1-JJ
29. 0021218      102 PHI1(I,J,KP)=A(J)*PHI1(I,J+1,KP)+CA(J)
30. 0021328      100 CONTINUE
31. 0021358      IF(NS.EQ.2) GO TO 150
32. 0021378      DO 11 I=ISTART,NIM1
33. 0021418      DO 11 J=JSTART,NJM1
34. 0021448      PHI1(I,J,KP)=PHI1(3,J,KP)
35. 0021538      11 PHI1(I,J,K)=PHI1(3,J,KP)
36. 0021658      RETURN
37. 0021678      150 CONTINUE
38. 0021678      DO 155 I=ISTART,NIM1
39. 0021718      DO 155 J=JSTART,NJM1
40. 0021748      155 PHI1(I,J,K)=PHI1(I,J,KP)
      C*****
      C*****SOUTH-NORTH SWEEP
41. 0022128      ISTM1=ISTART-1
42. 0022138      A(ISTM1)=0.0
      C
43. 0022138      COMMENCE S-N SWEEP
      DO 200 J=JSTART,NJM1
44. 0022168      CA(ISTM1)=PHI(ISTM1,J,K)
      C
45. 0022228      COMMENCE W-E TRAVERSE
      DO 201 I=ISTART,NIM1
      C
      ASSEMBLE TQMA COEFFICIENTS
46. 0022268      A(I)=AE(I,J)
47. 0022308      B(I)=AW(I,J)
48. 0022328      CA(I)=AN(I,J)*PHI(I,J+1,K)+AS(I,J)*PHI(I,J-1,K)
      1      +AU(I,J)*PHI(I,J,K-1)+SU(I,J)
49. 0022458      D(I)=AP(I,J)
      C
      CALCULATE COEFFICIENTS OF RECURRENCE FORMULA
50. 0022468      TERM=1./(D(I)-B(I)*A(I-1))
51. 0022518      A(I)=A(I)*TERM
52. 0022538      201 CA(I)=(CA(I)+B(I)*CA(I-1))*TERM
      C
      OBTAIN NEW PHI,S
53. 0022608      DO 202 II=ISTART,NIM1
54. 0022628      I=II+ISTM1-II
55. 0022638      202 PHI1(I,J,KP)=A(I)*PHI1(I+1,J,KP)+CA(I)
56. 0022748      200 CONTINUE
57. 0022778      RETURN
58. 0023018      END

```

LISOLV.18
 LISOLV.19
 LISOLV.20
 LISOLV.21
 LISOLV.22
 LISOLV.23
 LISOLV.24
 LISOLV.25
 LISOLV.26
 LISOLV.27
 LISOLV.28
 LISOLV.29
 LISOLV.30
 LISOLV.31
 LISOLV.32
 LISOLV.33
 LISOLV.34
 LISOLV.35
 LISOLV.36
 LISOLV.37
 LISOLV.38
 LISOLV.39
 LISOLV.40
 LISOLV.41
 LISOLV.42
 LISOLV.43
 LISOLV.44
 LISOLV.45
 LISOLV.46
 LISOLV.47
 LISOLV.48
 LISOLV.49
 LISOLV.50
 LISOLV.51
 LISOLV.52
 LISOLV.53
 LISOLV.54
 LISOLV.55
 LISOLV.56
 LISOLV.57
 LISOLV.58
 LISOLV.59
 LISOLV.60
 LISOLV.61
 LISOLV.62
 LISOLV.63
 LISOLV.64
 LISOLV.65
 LISOLV.66
 LISOLV.67
 LISOLV.68
 LISOLV.69
 LISOLV.70

PRINT

SUBROUTINE PRINT (ISTART,JSTART,NI,NJ,IT,JT,KT,X,Y,PHI,HEAD,K)

PAGE 1

```

1. 0000008 SUBROUTINE PRINT (ISTART,JSTART,NI,NJ,IT,JT,KT,X,Y,PHI,HEAD,K)
2. 0000008 DIMENSION PHI(IT,JT,KT),X(20),Y(50),HEAD(4),STORE(50)
3. 0000008 DIMENSION F(7),F4(11)
4. 0000008 DATA F/4H(1H ,4H,A6,,4H13, ,4H11I ,4H10, ,4H7X, ,
14H45) /
5. 0000008 DATA F4/4H 1I ,4H 2I ,4H 3I ,4H 4I ,4H 5I ,4H 6I ,
1 4H 7I ,4H 8I ,4H 9I ,4H10I ,4H11I /
6. 0000008 DATA HI,HY/6H I = , 6H Y = /
7. 0000008 ISKIP=1
8. 0001068 JSKIP=1
9. 0001073 WRITE(6,110)HEAD
10. 0001158 ISTA=ISTART-12
11. 0001168 100 CONTINUE
12. 0001178 ISTA=ISTA+12
13. 0001208 IEND=ISTA+11
14. 0001218 IEND=MIN0(NI,IEND)
15. 0001238 F(4)=F4(IEND-ISTA)
16. 0001258 WRITE(6,F) HI, (I,I=ISTA,IEND,ISKIP), HY
17. 0001458 WRITE(6,112)
18. 0001508 DO 101 JJ=JSTART,NJ,JSKIP
19. 0001538 J=JSTART+NJ-JJ
20. 0001548 DO 120 I=ISTA,IEND
21. 0001608 A=PHI(I,J,K)
22. 0001658 IF(ABS(A).LT.1.E-20) A=0.0
23. 0001728 120 STORE(I)=A
24. 0001768 101 WRITE(6,113) J,(STORE(I),I=ISTA,IEND,ISKIP),Y(J)
25. 0002178 WRITE(6,114) (X(I),I=ISTA,IEND,ISKIP)
C-----
26. 0002328 IF(IEND.LT.NI)GO TO 100
27. 0002348 RETURN
28. 0002368 110 FORMAT(1H0,20(2H*-),5X,4A10,5X,20(2H*-))
29. 0002368 112 FORMAT(3H J)
30. 0002368 113 FORMAT(1H ,13,1P12E10.2,OPF7.3)
31. 0002368 114 FORMAT(4H0X= ,12E10.3)
32. 0002368 END

```

```

PRINT.2
PRINT.3
PRINT.4
PRINT.5
PRINT.6
PRINT.7
PRINT.8
PRINT.9
PRINT.10
PRINT.11
PRINT.12
PRINT.13
PRINT.14
PRINT.15
PRINT.15
PRINT.17
PRINT.18
PRINT.19
PRINT.20
PRINT.21
PRINT.22
PRINT.23
PRINT.24
PRINT.25
PRINT.26
PRINT.27
PRINT.28
PRINT.29
PRINT.30
PRINT.31
PRINT.32
PRINT.33
PRINT.34
PRINT.35
PRINT.36

```

00004902385-71

(a) Single Wall

(b) Two Parallel Walls

(c) Inside a Cylinder

Fig. A.1 Near-Wall Geometries

Fig. E.1 Staggered Grid in ω -Space

Fig. F.1 Calculation Domain

Note:

$$\begin{aligned}
 DXEP(I) &= SEW(I) & ; & & DYNPV(J) &= SNS(J) & ; \\
 DXPW(I) &= SEW(I-1) & ; & & DYPSV(J) &= SNS(J-1) & ; \\
 SEW(I) &= DXPW(I) & ; & & SNSV(J) &= DYPS(J) & .
 \end{aligned}$$

Fig. F.2 Grid and Related Dimensions.

This report was done with support from the United States Energy Research and Development Administration. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the United States Energy Research and Development Administration.