10
1-3-94 JSD

SANDIA REPORT

SAND93-0280 • UC-706

Unlimited Release

Printed November 1993

A Review and Development of Correlations for Base Pressure and Base Heating in Supersonic Flow

J. Parker Lamb, William L. Oberkampf

Prepared by
Sandia National Laboratories
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185 and Livermore, California 94550
for the United States Department of Energy
under Contract DE-AC04-84AL85000

Issued by Sandia National Laboratories, operated for the United States Department of Energy by Sandia Corporation.

NOTICE: This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, 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. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government, any agency thereof or any of their contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, any agency thereof or any of their contractors.

Printed in the United States of America. This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
PO Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Prices available from (615) 576-8401, FTS 626-8401

Available to the public from
National Technical Information Service
US Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Rd
Springfield, VA 22161

NTIS price codes
Printed copy: A05
Microfiche copy: A01

SAND93-0280
Unlimited Release
Printed November 1993

**A REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF CORRELATIONS FOR
BASE PRESSURE AND BASE HEATING IN SUPERSONIC FLOW**

J. Parker Lamb
Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

William L. Oberkampf
Aerodynamics Department
Sandia National Laboratories
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185

Abstract

A comprehensive review of experimental base pressure and base heating data related to supersonic and hypersonic flight vehicles has been completed. Particular attention was paid to free-flight data as well as wind tunnel data for models without rear sting support. Using theoretically based correlation parameters, a series of internally consistent, empirical prediction equations has been developed for planar and axisymmetric geometries (wedges, cones, and cylinders). These equations encompass the speed range from low supersonic to hypersonic flow and laminar and turbulent forebody boundary layers. A wide range of cone and wedge angles and cone bluntness ratios was included in the data base used to develop the correlations. The present investigation also included preliminary studies of the effect of angle of attack and specific-heat ratio of the gas.

MASTER

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Mary McWherter Walker of the Computational Fluid Dynamics Department at Sandia National Laboratories for computing the inviscid and parabolized Navier-Stokes solutions used in this study. The authors also thank David Kuntz and Vincent Amatucci of the Thermophysics Department at Sandia for reviewing this report and making a number of valuable suggestions.

Contents

Abbreviations and Symbols.	8
Introduction	9
General Description of Near Wake Flows	10
Review of Correlation Parameters From Previous Studies	13
Development of New Correlation Parameters	14
Experimental Flow Conditions and Geometries	18
Laminar Flow Correlations	19
Axisymmetric Flow	19
Planar Flow	22
Turbulent Flow Correlations	23
Axisymmetric Flow	23
Planar Flow	26
Base Heat Transfer for Axisymmetric Bodies	27
Laminar Flow	29
Turbulent Flow	30
Angle-of-Attack Effects	30
Ratio of Specific Heat Effects	33
Estimation of Edge Conditions	34
Summary	35
References	37

Figures

1	Components of total drag for a slender sharp cone, $\theta_c = 2.9^\circ$	45
2	Representation of flow features of a blunted cone in free flight at supersonic/hypersonic speeds	46
3	Shadowgraph of sharp cone, $\theta_c = 9^\circ$, near zero angle of attack at a Mach number of 4.81	47
4	Schematic of base flow features	48
5	Base flow in the presence of a sting support	49
6	Variation of base pressure in axisymmetric laminar flow showing effect of reference pressure	50
7	Variation of base pressure in axisymmetric laminar flow for total data set used in present study	51
8	Final correlation of base pressure in axisymmetric laminar flow	52
9	Variation of laminar boundary layer thickness for hypersonic flow over a 10° cone at $M_\infty = 14$	53
10	Variation of base pressure in planar laminar flow for total data set used in present study	54
11	Final correlation of base pressure in planar laminar flow	55
12	Variation of base pressure for turbulent flow past long cylinders	56
13	Correlation of base pressure for turbulent flow over cylinders	57
14	Variation of base pressure for turbulent flow over blunted 9° cones using free stream reference conditions	58
15	Variation of base pressure for turbulent flow over blunted 9° cones using shoulder reference conditions	59
16	Variation of scaled base pressure for turbulent flow over cones using shoulder reference Crocco number	60
17	Correlation of base pressure in axisymmetric turbulent flow over cones using edge conditions for reference	61
18	Correlation of base pressure in axisymmetric turbulent flow using axial flow conditions for reference	62
19	Correlation of base pressure for turbulent flow past cones of various angles	63
20	Correlation of base pressure in planar turbulent flow using axial flow conditions for reference	64
21	Variation of base Stanton number with correlation parameter for laminar flow over cones	65
22	Correlation of base Stanton number with base pressure parameter for laminar flow over cones	66
23	Correlation of base Stanton number for turbulent flow over a blunted 9° cone	67
24	Effect of angle of attack on base pressure for laminar flow over a blunted 10° cone	68

Figures (continued)

25	Variation of normalized base pressure with angle of attack	69
26	Correlation of normalized base pressure for a cone at angle of attack	70
27	Normalized base pressure for an ogive-nose cylinder at angle of attack	71
28	Correlation of normalized base pressure for an ogive-nose cylinder at angle of attack	72
29	Effect of specific heat ratio on normalized base pressure	73
30	Computed inviscid flow parameters across the shock layer for $\theta_c = 9^\circ$, $r_n/r_b = 0.29$, and $s/r_n = 30.4$	74
31	Comparison of computed flow parameters in the shock layer for inviscid and viscous flow	75

Tables

1	Laminar Base Pressure Experimental Conditions	42
2	Turbulent Base Pressure Experimental Conditions	43
3	Summary of Correlations for Zero Angle of Attack	44

Abbreviations and Symbols

C	Crocco number
C_D	Drag coefficient
C_p	Pressure coefficient
D	Base diameter
h	Static enthalpy
H	Total (stagnation) enthalpy
H	Base height or base radius
L	Body length
M	Mach number
P	Pressure
$\dot{q}$	Convective heat transfer rate per unit area
r_b	Body or base radius
r_n	Nose radius
R	Reynolds number
R'	Unit Reynolds number
s	Body surface length
St	Stanton number
T	Temperature
u	Velocity
x	Longitudinal coordinate
y	Transverse coordinate
α	Angle of attack
γ	Ratio of specific heats
δ	Boundary layer thickness
ξ	Longitudinal coordinate in Lees-Dorodnitsyn transformation
θ	Boundary layer momentum thickness
θ_c	Cone half-angle
ν	Prandtl-Meyer angle
η	Transverse coordinate in Lees-Dorodnitsyn transformation
ρ	Fluid density

Subscripts

a	Axial direction
b	Base plane
e	Edge of boundary layer
ef	Effective value
g	Arbitrary gas
o	Stagnation conditions
s	Body surface length
w	Wall conditions
∞	Free stream condition
1	Conditions upstream of cylinder shoulder

A REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF CORRELATIONS FOR BASE PRESSURE AND BASE HEATING IN SUPERSONIC FLOW

Introduction

Base drag of projectiles is one of the oldest topics of applied aerodynamics. Although base drag has been studied and analyzed for well over a century, its reliable prediction is still beyond the reach of modern numerical simulation. The importance of base drag in supersonic or hypersonic flight is illustrated in Fig. 1. Recall that (1) base drag represents the axial component of the integral of base pressure over the base area, (2) wave drag represents the axial component of the integral of surface pressure over the forebody area, and (3) skin friction drag represents the axial component of shear stress over the forebody. The relative size of these three major components of drag (base, wave and skin friction) for a slender cone are plotted in Fig. 1 against free-stream Mach number (Stivers 1971). For a specific value of cone angle (even on blunted cones), the absolute value of skin friction drag and wave drag are nearly constant with free-stream Mach number. However, the base drag decreases in absolute value as the Mach number increases. As the slenderness ratio of the vehicle decreases, the base drag becomes a smaller portion of the total drag, primarily because the wave drag increases significantly. Regardless of the proportion of total drag, to compute trajectories for flight vehicles we must have accurate and reliable estimates of the base drag component and thus base pressure.

Although computational techniques have advanced in recent years to a level that includes reasonable prediction of near-wake flow fields in the laminar regime, less accuracy can be obtained for turbulent wakes because of the lack of reliable models for turbulence. Also, near wake flow computations are complex, extremely computer intensive, and often expensive. Therefore, we must turn to correlations of test data to obtain estimates of base pressure for most cases of practical interest.

During the summer of 1991, we conducted a comprehensive review of experimental base pressure and base heat transfer data. From this extensive data base, we developed a new set of correlations that researchers and flight vehicle designers could use. For example, base pressure correlations developed in this report could be applied to ballistic and maneuvering reentry vehicles, kinetic energy penetrators, and cannon shells. A primary requirement for the

present study was that, if possible, scaling parameters would show a clear theoretical basis and not be "invented" for convenience. In this way we could be assured of the broadest possible applicability and generality of the resulting correlations. The major effort of this study was to develop base pressure and base heat transfer correlations for zero angle of attack. We considered laminar and turbulent boundary layers upstream of the base region as well as axisymmetric and planar geometries. Emphasis was placed on slender cones with a range of bluntness, along with wedges in planar flows. We also considered modifications of base pressure levels because of angle of attack and specific heat ratio of the gas.

General Description of Near Wake Flows

To better understand the correlations developed in this report and the richness of the fluid dynamics involved, a brief description of the base flow field will be given. An excellent summary of early theoretical developments relating to base pressure prediction is found in the review paper by Murthy and Osborn (1976). Much of the following discussion is abstracted from this article. Figure 2 schematically illustrates some of the flow features in the near wake of a blunt cone at hypersonic speeds. As the base pressure is less than the pressure in the approach flow, the viscous shock layer expands around the shoulder, forming free shear layers that coalesce at the wake neck. A velocity profile defect characterizes the wake neck region, which continues downstream as the viscous wake region. A portion of the shear layer flow must be recirculated to satisfy continuity requirements, thus producing a toroidal, vortex pattern that is adjacent to the base of the cone. A complex inviscid wave structure often includes a lip shock (associated with the corner expansion) and a wake shock (adjacent to the shear layer confluence). At very high Mach numbers, these wave patterns often interact with each other.

Figure 3 shows a spark shadowgraph of a 9° half-angle cone with a sharp nose at a Mach number of 4.81. This excellent photograph reveals many detailed features of the flow in the shock layer and the turbulent flow in the boundary layer and base region.* For analysis, the base flow is generally divided into four major components that exist in the near wake: corner expansion, free shear layer, recompression zone, and recirculating flow region (Fig. 4). The corner expansion process is a modified Prandtl-Meyer pattern

*Mr. Richard Matthews of the Air Force Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, TN provided this photograph. It was taken in Ballistic Range K in the Von Karman Gas Dynamics Facility, AEDC. The test gas was air, $V_\infty = 5450$ ft/sec, $D_b = 1.75$ in., $P_\infty = 14.2$ lb/in², $T_\infty = 75^\circ$ F.

distorted by the presence of the approaching boundary layer. A Stokes-like flow field in the immediate vicinity of the corner allows the flow to expand (as it turns the corner) to a pressure lower than the base pressure. As the flow breaks away from the base plane, it is brought back to the base pressure by a weak shock wave known as the "lip shock"; downstream from the lip shock, the free shear layer begins to form. Figure 3 shows how the lip shock emerges from the shear layer and propagates downstream at an angle near the cone half-angle.

A free shear layer (in contrast to a boundary layer) is characterized by nearly zero velocity derivatives (shear stresses) at each edge of the layer. The maximum stress occurs near the center of the shear layer. Also near the center of the layer is a "dividing" (or separating) streamline that separates that portion of the flow which originated in the approaching boundary layer from the portion that was entrained by the shear stress acting along the dividing streamline. As free shear layers from both corners coalesce near the vehicle centerline, a region of increasing pressure (i.e., recompression) results. For cases where no mass is injected into or removed from the base region, the dividing streamline eventually becomes the "stagnating" streamline.

The resulting wake stagnation point marks the downstream extent of the recirculation region that exists, because the mass entrained by the free shear layers must be reversed to flow back toward the cone base. Thus, the base plane sees another stagnation point flow. We know that reverse flow velocities near the wake stagnation point are as high as 30 percent of the free stream velocity exterior to the shear layer, with reverse flow Mach numbers as high as 0.5. However, as this reverse flow approaches the base plane, maximum velocities near the centerline become much lower. For turbulent wakes, mean values of fluctuation velocities near the base plane compare in size to the mean velocity, i. e., extremely high turbulence intensity. In contrast to base pressure, the relatively low velocities adjacent to the base plane significantly effect the level of base plane heat convection.

Figure 4 suggests that the base plane sees a modified stagnation point flow. Although the base plane pressure at the stagnation point is slightly higher than the base static pressure, the maximum increase in pressure and its lateral extent are quite small because of the low velocities in the recirculating zone. Therefore, the static pressure in the base region is usually taken as the "base pressure." Downstream of the wake stagnation point is the "wake neck," representing the minimum lateral extent (i.e., diameter) of the viscous region that originated with the boundary layers on the conical surfaces.

If we could make accurate and efficient theoretical or numerical predictions of the recirculation flow characteristics, we could determine base pressure and base heating levels. The theoretical difficulty is a result of the "free interaction" nature of the near wake flow field. The recirculation region is a subsonic, variable pressure flow, elliptic in its mathematical character, while the supersonic external flow, hyperbolic in nature, contains complex wave patterns. Conversely, downstream of the wake neck, the far-wake flow is a unidirectional, essentially constant pressure field, which is typically supersonic.

Despite the foregoing similarities, significant quantitative differences exist between near wake flows with laminar shear layers and those with turbulent shear layers. For a given base diameter, the growth (or spread) rate of the free shear layers determines the location at which the two layers begin to interfere with each other. This point of initial interference marks the beginning of the recompression zone and determines the length scale of the near wake. Virtually all theoretical predictions and most experiments identify two flow regimes: (1) a low Reynolds number regime in which the shear layers are laminar at least as far downstream as the wake neck, and (2) a high Reynolds number regime in which the shear layers are turbulent as far upstream as the corner (or shoulder). The inclusion of laminar to turbulent transition within the near wake region is an additional complication that has rarely been explored. The early work of Chapman et al (1957) indicates some major features of transitional near wakes.

Traditional wind tunnel tests have used models supported from the rear by slender sting-mounts. While such an arrangement is satisfactory for obtaining forebody flow data, it is not suited for accurately measuring base pressure variations. As shown schematically in Fig. 5, the presence of a sting-support, no matter how small in diameter, completely destroys the structure of the shear layer confluence at the wake neck. The strong interactions that occur at the wake neck, in free flight, contain the primary physical mechanisms that determine the base pressure.

Numerous experimental studies have erroneously concluded that because base pressure stabilized at a constant value when the sting was decreased in diameter, support interference was negligible. Although, a constant base pressure was achieved, it was not the same value as would have been measured without the sting.* Even for a sting diameter of "zero," the boundary condition on the sting is a no-slip condition; without a sting, the

*Cassanto's 1968 data (Figure 7) illustrates the sting effect.

boundary condition at the centerline is a zero radial gradient. During this study we emphasized test data obtained without rear supports. For axisymmetric bodies, such support-free data is not only obtained with actual flight tests but also in wind tunnels with free flight model injection systems, magnetic support mechanisms, thin wire supports, or side-strut mounts.

Review of Correlation Parameters From Previous Studies

The pioneering study of Chapman (1951) included cones, ogives, cone-cylinders, ogive-cylinders, and wedges at low supersonic Mach numbers. For laminar boundary layers, he was able to correlate base pressures for different geometries using the parameters C_{p_b} and $(L/H)(R_L)^{-1/2}$, where L is the body length, H is the base height or base radius, and R_L is the Reynolds number based on body length. This Reynolds number parameter is known to be proportional to the trailing edge boundary layer thickness δ/H . In this study Chapman did not attempt to correlate the effect of free stream Mach number. For cylindrical afterbodies the characteristic Mach number of both pressure coefficient and Reynolds number was the value just before separation. For cones he used a hypothetical axial Mach number that would exist if the cone (or wedge) flow were expanded to the approach flow (axial) direction. Chapman also demonstrated that, for the thin boundary layers in his experiments, base pressure in turbulent flow is essentially independent of the Reynolds number and thus, by implication, is a function primarily of the Mach number.

Another early study by Kurzweg (1951) included cone-cylinders at Mach numbers up to 3 with laminar and turbulent boundary layers. Results were presented as P_b/P_∞ versus Reynolds number (based on body length); no attempt was made to correlate Mach number effects. Kavanau (1956) found, by trial-and-error, that his data for laminar flow over cones could be correlated with P_b/P_∞ vs. $R^{1/2}/M^2$, where both Mach number and Reynolds number were based on free stream conditions. Kavanau stated that there was no obvious theoretical reasons why the second power of Mach number was successful for correlation. Lehnert and Schermerhorn (1959) were the first investigators to use local shoulder (i.e., just before the base plane) parameters (P_e , M_e) for scaling cone base pressures. They obtained data for 10° cones with sharp and blunt noses for smooth and rough surfaces. They presented data in the form of a base pressure ratio vs. Reynolds number based on boundary layer momentum thickness.

Lockman (1967) conducted tests on 10° and 15° cones at $M_\infty = 14$ and relatively low Reynolds numbers. He also correlated data with local shoulder conditions. However, he used $M_e(R_{e,s})^{-1/2}$ to correlate P_b/P_∞ . His reason for

using this particular flow parameter was its proportionality to Knudsen number. Murman (1969) used three exponents ($n=1, 2, 3$) for the parameter $M_\infty^n (R_{\infty,s})^{-1/2}$ in attempting a correlation. He found that $n = 3$ (i.e., yielding the hypersonic interaction parameter) resulted in the best correlation of laminar base pressures on 9° and 10° cones at Mach numbers between 8 and 20.

Bulmer's (1975b) extensive study of laminar base pressures on slender cones explored the use of an effective cone Reynolds number. This Reynolds number, R_{ef} , was formed by multiplying the usual cone Reynolds number, raised to the 0.9 power, by the geometric parameter $(s/r_b)^{0.1}$. Data were plotted as $(P_b/P_\infty)(R_{ef})^{-1}$ versus R_{ef} . Also explored were correlations of P_b/P_∞ and P_b/P_e vs. R_{eq} , and P_b/P_e vs. a theoretical parameter developed by Reeves and Buss (1968). The Reeves and Buss parameter has the form

$$M_e (T_e/T_o)^{3/2} R^{-1} (1 + 4h_w/H_e)^{-3/2}$$

where R is based on shoulder properties and base radius, h_w is the enthalpy at the wall, and H_e is the total enthalpy at the edge of the boundary layer at the shoulder.

A correlation study by Kawecky (1977) included both laminar and turbulent flow over cones. For laminar boundary layers his correlation used the ratio P_b/P_∞ modified by a function of M_e and the ratio of nose-to-base radius. This function of Mach number, pressure, and geometry was plotted versus Reynolds number based on cone surface length and edge properties. Kawecky used the same Reynolds number parameter to correlate turbulent flow data using P_b/P_∞ . Also, Starr (1977) correlated base pressure, P_b/P_∞ , for cones using an effective Mach number that was a weighted function of the bluntness ratio and three reference values of Mach number: free stream value, shoulder value, and a hypothetical downstream axial-flow value.

Development of New Correlation Parameters

Although a wide variety of correlation parameters have been used, we know from the previous work that a base pressure parameter is usually correlated against a flow parameter. The general form of the base pressure parameter can be written as

$$\frac{P_b}{P_{ref}} f(M) \quad (1)$$

The flow parameter for laminar boundary layers will be a function of Mach number and Reynolds number, whereas for turbulent boundary layers, the parameter will be Mach number or Reynolds number. Also, flow conditions used before separation generally have been more successful in correlations than free stream conditions. The flow conditions before separation contain the history of the flow processes on the vehicle, for example, nose bluntness effects and boundary layer thickness. Laminar and turbulent flows require different sets of scaling parameter because of the fundamental differences in the effects of Mach number and Reynolds number on the development of free shear layers in each regime. As noted earlier in this report, the shear layer structure is important for the base pressure level.

The traditional base pressure coefficient used in both compressible and incompressible flow is defined as

$$C_{p_b} = \frac{P_\infty - P_b}{P_\infty} \frac{1}{\frac{\gamma}{2} M_\infty^2} \quad (2)$$

Comparing this with the general form of the base pressure parameter given above, we find that $P_{ref} = P_\infty$ and $f(M) = M^{-2}$ is the scaling function of Mach number. However, in the hypersonic regime, large values of Mach number in the denominator of this equation tend to mask small variations in the base pressure ratio P_b/P_∞ . Frequently, such small variations indicate important physical mechanisms. Thus, we should consider velocity parameters other than Mach number.

Basic texts in compressible flow usually include four common dimensionless velocities for a perfect gas:

$$M = \frac{V}{a} = \frac{V}{(\gamma R T)^{1/2}} = \frac{V}{[\gamma R T_o (T/T_o)]^{1/2}}$$

$$M^* = \frac{V}{a^*} = \frac{V}{(\gamma R T^*)^{1/2}} = \frac{V}{[\gamma R T_o (T^*/T_o)]^{1/2}}$$

$$M_o = \frac{V}{a_o} = \frac{V}{(\gamma R T_o)^{1/2}}$$

$$C = \frac{V}{V_{\max}} = \frac{V}{(2 C_p T_o)^{1/2}} = \frac{V}{\left[\gamma R T_o \left(\frac{2}{\gamma - 1} \right) \right]^{1/2}} \quad (3)$$

The last ratio is often called "Crocco number," in honor of the distinguished gas dynamicist L. Crocco. These defining relations show that for constant T_o , Crocco number is related linearly to local velocity. In contrast, the velocity-Mach number relationship is nonlinear because the value of T/T_o is itself a function of Mach number and, therefore, of velocity.

To investigate the upper limits of these four dimensionless velocities, we express the temperature ratio T/T_o in terms of each velocity ratio. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T}{T_o} &= \left(1 + \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M^2 \right)^{-1} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma + 1} M^{*2} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} M_o^2 \\ &= 1 - C^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In the limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$, $T/T_o \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, for fixed T_o ,

$$M^* \rightarrow \left(\frac{\gamma + 1}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{1/2} \quad (M^* = 2.45 \text{ for } \gamma = 1.4)$$

$$M_o \rightarrow \left(\frac{2}{\gamma - 1} \right)^{1/2} \quad (M_o = 2.24 \text{ for } \gamma = 1.4)$$

$$C \rightarrow 1 \quad (\text{for any } \gamma)$$

If we choose M^* , M_o or C as a scaling parameter, the resulting numerical values will be bounded. Hence, when used as reference parameters, they will not mask small variations in base pressure ratio at high Mach numbers. One notes from Eq. (4) that Crocco number can be computed easily for adiabatic, perfect gas flow using

$$C = [1 - (T/T_o)]^{1/2}$$

This relation can be expressed in terms of Mach number as

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \left[\frac{(T_o/T) - 1}{T_o/T} \right]^{1/2} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma - 1} M^{-2} \right)^{-1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Because the Crocco number varies between zero and unity, it is an attractive scaling parameter for base pressure ratio P_b/P_{ref} , which also varies between zero and some small positive value. Consequently, we used the Crocco number extensively in this study, although final correlation results are expressed in terms of Mach number for convenience.

As noted in the review of the literature, the usual flow parameter for laminar flow correlations is

$$M^n (R)^{-1/2} \quad (6)$$

where n is 1, 2, or 3. The fact that various exponents for Mach number have been used for different sets of data suggests that the selection of a value of n was based on an inspection of the accuracy of the resulting correlation. A more general and theoretically sound approach would be to examine a simplified analysis of laminar boundary layer compressibility effects. The most direct approach begins with the usual Lees-Dorodnitsyn transformation (Dorrance 1962) of the laminar boundary layer equations in the form

$$\xi(s) = \int_0^s \rho_e u_e \mu_e r_b^2 ds$$

$$\rho_e u_e r_b (2\xi)^{-1/2} y = \int_0^\eta (\rho_e/\rho) d\eta$$

where ξ and η are boundary layer similarity variables and r_b is the body radius. Integrating the last equation across the boundary layer for the case of an external flow, with no pressure gradients, yields the following expression

$$\frac{\delta}{s} R_{e,s}^{1/2} = \sqrt{2} \int_0^{\eta_e} (\rho_e/\rho) d\eta = f(M_e, T_w/T_{o,e})$$

Solutions of velocity profiles for various edge Mach numbers and wall temperature ratios are plotted in most advanced texts, e.g., White (1974). From these velocity distributions we can make estimates of the left side of the above equation which, when plotted versus Mach number, show that for M_e greater than 3, the data are correlated when the exponent for M_e is approximately 2. That is,

$$\frac{\delta}{s} R_{e,s}^{1/2} \sim M_e^2 \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\delta}{s} \sim M_e^2 R_{e,s}^{-1/2}$$

for each $T_w/T_{o,e}$. Recalling that the Lees-Dorodnitsyn transformation applies equally well to free shear layers and boundary layers, we can expect that parameters in the near wake region could also be correlated with this Mach number-Reynolds number parameter. This result allows us to establish a theoretical basis for using

$$M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2} \tag{7}$$

as a correlation parameter for laminar base pressure.

The result for laminar flow can be contrasted with the case of turbulent wakes, in which the shear layer growth is independent of Reynolds number. The minor exception to this experimental observation is the small effect of the initial boundary layer thickness before separation. Thus, turbulent base pressures will be primarily a function of Mach number and secondarily of wall temperature ratio.

Experimental Flow Conditions and Geometries

The initial review of the literature in this study consisted of about 50 sources of experimental data. Some of the data could not be used because they were presented only in a correlated form. Thus, we could not retrieve basic information and recast it into other correlations. For other sources of data, missing parameters also prohibited us from confidently constructing new correlations. However, for some of these cases, we could perform computations using given data and thereby infer the values of unknown parameters. Other

sources of data were not used because they were narrow in the range of flow conditions, or they overlapped more extensive sets of data. We used results for sting-supported models only when necessary to include a specific range of Mach numbers or Reynolds numbers, or a certain geometry.

Table 1 summarizes flow conditions and body geometries for the eleven laminar flow data sources included in this study. The most interesting data are Bulmer's 1975b flight test results on 9° half-angle cones with 5% and 6% blunting. Additional flight data are available from Cassanto [7] on 10° cones with blunting ratios up to 0.6. The data of Lockman (1967) using wire-supported models in a wind tunnel exhibited a systematic variation of nose blunting. Pick (1972) fired free flight sharp cones in a wind tunnel over a range of Mach number, Reynolds number, and angle of attack. Supplementing these data on spherically blunted cones are data on cylinders with various forebodies. Badrinarayanan (1961) obtained data on very long cylinders and Chapman (1951), Kurzweg (1951), and Reller and Hamaker (1955) obtained data on cone-cylinders and ogive-cylinders. Few planar base pressure data are available. Batt and Kubota (1968), Chapman (1951) and Dewey (1965) tested wedge half-angles between 2° and 22.5° .

Table 2 summarizes experimental parameters for 14 turbulent flow sources used in this study. Bulmer's 1976 data on spherically blunted cones is foundational data because it comprises the largest range of Mach number. The data of Mark (1978), Tanner (1991), Uselton and Cyran (1980), and Zarin (1966) comprise lower Mach numbers and cover the range of cone half-angles from 3.4° to 9° . The data of Pepper and Holland (1958) and Wehrend (1963) contain information at very low Mach numbers and relatively large cone half-angles. For cylindrical geometries with cone and ogive forebodies, we used the data of Chapman (1951), Kayser (1984), Reller and Hamaker (1955) and Moore, Hymer and Wilcox (1992). Also included is the data from various wind tunnel investigators compiled by Seiling and Page (1970). In addition, we used planar base pressure data of Goecke (1971) from the X-15 flight test program and a compilation of data by McDonald (1965).

Laminar Flow Correlations

Axisymmetric Flow

Bulmer's flight data are plotted in Fig. 6a using the coordinates P_b/P_e as a function of $M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}$. The Reynolds number is based on boundary layer

edge fluid properties and body surface length from the stagnation point. Because the data for Mach 20 and 6% bluntness fall below the data for Mach 16 and 5% bluntness, P_e is not the most appropriate reference pressure when comparing data for different geometries or flight conditions. As previous correlations show, an alternative reference pressure is one that would exist if the flow at the shoulder (P_e, M_e) were expanded through an angle θ_c to the axial direction. For slender sharp cones, $\theta_c < 15^\circ$, simple computations show that the static pressure for a flow expanded to the axial direction is approximately 75% of the free stream pressure for Mach numbers between 2 and 15. The hypothesis that the axial pressure ($\approx P_\infty$) is an appropriate reference pressure is tested in Fig. 6b. This figure shows that P_b/P_∞ does bring the two sets of data into better agreement. For larger cone angles, $\theta_c > 15^\circ$, the approximation that the axial pressure $\approx P_\infty$ would not be as accurate. For this case, we could obtain a more appropriate reference pressure by computing the pressure that would result from the flow passing through an Prandtl-Meyer expansion to the axial direction.

Figure 7 shows the entire set of laminar flow data in terms of P_b/P_∞ where, for the cylinder data of Badrinarayanan, P_∞ is the shoulder pressure. For this plot, edge conditions (if not reported by the investigator) were determined by taking the computational results from inviscid flow predictions using an Euler code (SANDIAC).^{*} For each M_∞ , the data for a given body correlate satisfactorily (as did Bulmer's cone data); however, the lower Mach number data are displaced upward from the hypersonic flow cases (except for the Lockman data). In addition, Fig. 7 provides an indication of possible differences between data for free-flight and sting-supported models. Cassanto's flight data (symbols with flags) and that from sting-supported models indicate that the rear supports produced base pressure levels that were 25% to 50% higher than flight data. However, these differences are generally within the band of Bulmer's flight data. As Table 1 shows, the data of Lockman were obtained at a free stream Reynolds number which is approximately 100 times lower than all other data sets. The resulting low Reynolds number influence is discussed below.

The results seen in Fig. 7 confirm earlier correlations; that is, the parameter $M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{1/2}$ successfully correlates data for a variety of geometries over a small range of approach Mach numbers. Because P_b/P_∞ does not correlate data over a broad range of Mach numbers, additional scaling is

^{*}The Euler code, SANDIAC, has been used at Sandia National Laboratories for many years. The code has been validated for a large number of vehicle geometries and flow fields. Reference Daywitt et al (1978), McWherter et al (1986), and Noack and Lopez (1988) for additional details.

required for the complex interaction of coalescing shear layers at the wake neck. As noted earlier, this coalescence is a crucial component in the determination of base pressure. The theoretical basis for this assertion is found in the early work of Reeves and Lees (1965), who showed that the wake neck is characterized by a strong interaction between the interior viscous flow (which contains regions of subsonic flow) and the external, inviscid supersonic flow.

In seeking a method of scaling P_b/P_∞ , the use of the Crocco number is desirable because of its variation between zero and unity. Therefore, using a trial-and-error procedure, we can demonstrate that, by scaling the pressure ratio with

$$C_e^4 = [1 - (T/T_o)]_e^2,$$

all data sets (except for that of Lockman) fall along a single line (Fig. 8). The slope of the line in log-log coordinates is 0.6. Thus, the final correlation equation for axisymmetric laminar flow is given by

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} C_e^4 = 3.05 [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{0.6}. \quad (8a)$$

In terms of Mach number, the foregoing equation can be written as

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = 3.05 \left[1 + \frac{2}{\gamma - 1} M_e^{-2} \right]^2 [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{0.6}. \quad (8b)$$

Why were Lockman's measurements displaced from the remaining body of data? It was suspected that the root cause was the unusually low Reynolds numbers for these tests (Table 1). To investigate these conditions, a series of computations were made for Lockman's spherically blunted 10° cone using a Parabolized Navier-Stokes code (SPRINT)*. The boundary layer thickness was computed at $M_\infty = 14$ for various flight altitudes. Based on the earlier discussion concerning boundary layer similarity variables, one suspects that the parameter $(\delta/s) (R_{e,s}^{1/2}/M_e^2)$ should be a simple power-law function of edge Reynolds number. As Fig. 9 shows, the trend changes at low Reynolds numbers because the boundary layer growth becomes inversely proportional to

*The Parabolized Navier-Stokes code, SPRINT, has been used at Sandia National Laboratories for several years. The code has been validated for a large number of vehicle geometries over a wide range of Mach and Reynolds number. Reference Stalnaker et al (1986), Walker and McBride (1986) and Oberkampf et al (1992) for additional details.

a power of Reynolds number greater than the usual one-half. Thus, the Lockman data can be made to coincide with the foregoing correlation equation for axisymmetric flow by using $R_e^{0.65}$ rather than $R_e^{0.5}$. Similar low Reynolds number effects on a flat plate in incompressible flow are discussed by White (1974, p. 266). Based on Lockman's data, the present laminar base pressure correlations are not expected to be reliable for $R_{e,s} < 10^5$.

Planar Flow

The four sets of data for planar laminar flow are shown in Fig. 10. As before, use of $M^2 R^{-1/2}$ correlates each data set, but the base pressure ratio requires further scaling by C_e to achieve agreement between data sets. Figure 11 shows that $C_e^6 = (1 - T/T_0)_e^3$ is required for full correlation. Thus, we obtain a correlation equation in the form

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} C_e^6 = [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{0.6}.$$

Note that the constant of proportionality comes out to be unity. In terms of Mach number, it is

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = \left[1 + \frac{2}{\gamma - 1} M_e^{-2} \right]^3 [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{0.6}. \quad (9)$$

The 0.6 exponent on the parameter $M^2 R^{-1/2}$ is the same for axisymmetric and planar flows, thus making us confident of the present approach.

The primary reason for the different powers of C_e (required to correlate axisymmetric and planar base pressures) is the different flow structures for the two geometries. As stated in the earlier discussion of near wake structure, the interaction of converging shear layers at the wake neck largely determines base pressure. For axisymmetric geometries, there is a strong effect of transverse curvature that is not present in planar flow. (A similar comparison is seen in inviscid solutions by the method of characteristics for axisymmetric and planar geometries.) Another distinguishing feature of base flow in the two geometries is the existence of a much larger core of subsonic flow near the centerline of an axisymmetric near wake than that near the centerplane of a planar wake. From this, we would expect that the effect of C_e would not be scaled the same for both geometries.

Turbulent Flow Correlations

Axisymmetric Flow

As noted in the review of previous correlations, the effect of Reynolds number in turbulent free shear flow is quite small because the shear layers are governed by large-scale turbulent structures. The influence of an approaching boundary layer (characterized by a specific Reynolds number) has been correlated in previous studies through the parameter θ/H , where θ is the boundary layer momentum thickness and H is the base radius or base height in planar flow. Both Chapman (1956) and Korst (1956) showed theoretically that the minimum base pressure occurs when $\theta/H \rightarrow 0$. Thus, when the boundary layer thickness increases, the base pressure is slightly increased. This consequence does not affect operational flight vehicles because relatively thick boundary layers occur only in the laminar regime. As a result, thick turbulent boundary layers are not included in this study.

Figure 12 shows a set of data (Seiling and Page 1970) for long cylinders (having no rear support) with shoulder Mach numbers, M_1 , between 1.5 and 4. The scatter of these data is caused by the values of larger θ/H as noted above. This traditional presentation of turbulent flow data shows how P_b/P_1 varies with M_1 and illustrates the problem of comparing and correlating hypersonic measurements with data from low supersonic flows.

Use of C_1 (which is related linearly to velocity) in lieu of M_1 on the horizontal scale allows the hypersonic range to be displayed in a more physically realistic manner. Figure 13 shows the compiled data of Seiling and Page, and data from Chapman (1951), Kayser (1984), and Reller and Hamaker (1955) plotted as P_b/P_1 vs. C_1^2 . The parameter C_1^2 groups the wider range of Mach number data reasonably well. For the limit of infinite Mach number ($C_1 \rightarrow 1$), the theoretical mean line would approach the physical singularity with an infinite slope.

The correlation equation for the linear portion of the variation is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{P_b}{P_1} &= 0.05 + 0.967 (1 - C_1^2) \\ &= 0.05 + 0.967 (T/T_o)_{M_1}\end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{P_b}{P_1} = 0.05 + 0.967 \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_1^2 \right)^{-1} . \quad (10)$$

It is seen that the intercept of the above equation for $C_1 = 1$ is a value of 0.05. For values of C_1 above 0.98 ($M_1 > 15$), one could account for the curvature of the correlation curve (dashed line).

Is it possible to scale base pressures for cones in such a way as to correlate them with the cylinder data? Because the flight test data for $\theta_c = 9^\circ$ (Bulmer 1976) form the most complete set of turbulent, hypersonic base pressure data available, they were used for the initial part of this phase. Bulmer's data for two different trajectories are plotted in Fig. 14 as P_b/P_∞ vs. M_∞ . The resulting distributions exhibit a surprising double-valued feature; i.e., two values of M_∞ can produce the same P_b/P_∞ value. Bulmer obtained some improvement when he used edge conditions at the cone shoulder (P_e and M_e) as scaling parameters, i.e., P_b/P_e . Insight into the variation of the ratio P_b/P_e can be obtained by expressing it in terms of the original ratio P_b/P_∞ . Thus, we have

$$\frac{P_b}{P_e} = \frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(\frac{P_e}{P_\infty} \right)^{-1} .$$

As shown in Fig. 15, the resulting variation has no dual-values but does exhibit a sharp "knee," which would be difficult to correlate successfully. During this investigation, we attempted to do this, but we were only partially successful. We also realized that the knee occurs because the upward trend of P_b/P_∞ at high Mach numbers (Fig. 14) tends to partially cancel the corresponding decrease in the ratio P_∞/P_e . Conditions at which the knee occurs are not universal but are related to the nose bluntness and cone angle. As the upward trend of P_b/P_∞ in Fig. 14 was partially cancelled by normalizing with P_e/P_∞ , we suspect that additional improvement could be attained by using $(P_e/P_\infty)^2$ as a normalizing parameter for P_b/P_∞ . Thus, we can plot Bulmer's data using the base pressure ratio

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(\frac{P_e}{P_\infty} \right)^{-2} = \frac{P_b}{P_e} \frac{P_\infty}{P_e} .$$

The Euler code SANDIAC was used to generate values of P_e/P_∞ , M_e , and C_e (Figs. 16 and 17). As with cylinders, the parameter M_e (Fig. 15) was replaced by C_e^2 . The resulting distribution (Fig. 16) of the modified base

pressure parameter as a function of C_e^2 displays little effect of the knee at higher values of M_e (or C_e^2). This distribution also suggests that a fractional power of the pressure parameter would reduce the curvature and, thus, could yield the desired linear variation. For the case of $\theta_c = 9^\circ$ (Fig. 16), the exponent was approximately one-half of that indicated in Fig. 17, which shows

$$\left[\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(\frac{P_e}{P_\infty} \right)^{-2} \right]^{1/2}$$

as a function of C_e^2 . It is also seen in Fig. 17 that the cone base pressure distribution lies somewhat below the cylinder correlation of Fig. 13.

However, to bring these two curves into congruence, it is necessary to recall that, for laminar flow, the pressure in a hypothetical axial flow downstream of the cone shoulder was a satisfactory reference pressure (Fig. 6). Similar reasoning can be used for comparing cylinders and cones in turbulent flow. Thus, the axial Crocco number, C_a^2 , is expected to be equivalent to the value of C_1^2 for cylinders. The value of C_a^2 is determined by the relation

$$v_a (C_a^2) = v_e (C_e^2) + \theta_c$$

where v is the Prandtl-Meyer angle and θ_c is the cone half-angle.

Replotting the flight data of Fig. 17 in terms of C_a^2 is shown in Fig. 18. This figure shows that the two correlations (cylinder and cone) of Fig. 17 are brought into congruence, which also implies that the near wake structure for the two congruent cases would be the same.

Although the exercise of using C_a^2 provides confidence in the generality of the present correlation scheme, a more direct working correlation would use C_e^2 . The solid line correlation shown in Fig. 17 is given by the following equation:

$$\left[\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(\frac{P_e}{P_\infty} \right)^2 \right]^N = 0.025 + 0.906 (1 - C_e^2)$$

or

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = \left(\frac{P_e}{P_\infty} \right)^2 \left[0.025 + 0.906 \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_e^2 \right)^{-1} \right]^{1/N}$$

where $N \approx 0.5$ for $\theta_c = 9^\circ$.

Unfortunately, extensive data for cone angles other than 9° are not available. However, for the limited information available for other cone angles, it was found that the exponent N takes a different value for each θ_c . Data for a range of cone half-angles is plotted in Fig. 19, which includes the same correlation line as in Fig. 17 (also given above). Thus, the final correlation equation for cones is

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = \left(\frac{P_e}{P_\infty} \right)^2 \left[0.025 + 0.906 \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_e^2 \right)^{-1} \right]^J \quad (11)$$

where

$$J = 1.7 / \ln \left(\frac{21}{\theta_c} \right) \quad \text{where } \theta_c \text{ is in deg.}$$

The exponent J cannot be used for $\theta_c > 20^\circ$; therefore, we must consider this correlation to be valid for slender cones only. For larger cone angles, we would expect the character of the near wake flow to be considerably different from that shown in Figs. 3 and 4. In particular, as θ_c increases, the Mach number at the edge of the boundary layer will decrease markedly. In addition, the corner expansion process will become much more prominent because of the larger turning angles and a stronger interaction with the outer portions of the shock layer. Therefore, we would expect that the base pressure would have virtually no relationship to cone surface flow parameters M_e and C_e . Entirely different scaling parameters would be required. The lack of systematic data for large-angle cones precluded work in this area. However, the experimental results of McAlister et al (1971) suggest that the value of C_{pb} , Eq. (2), becomes constant for very large cone angles at hypersonic speeds.

Planar Flow

The variation of base pressure in planar turbulent flows is similar to that shown in Fig. 12 for cylinders; that is, the value of P_b decreases with Mach number upstream of the base plane. Following the same procedure as in axisymmetric flow, we can plot a base pressure ratio versus either C_a or C_a^2 . The correlation is shown in Fig. 20, which includes data for both wedges and backsteps. Unlike cylinder flows, a linear relation is obtained when the planar base pressure ratio is plotted versus C_a rather than C_a^2 . For backsteps, P_∞ and C_a represent the free stream flow upstream of the corner, whereas for wedges, these two parameters represent a hypothetical axial flow downstream of the corner. As with the cylinder data, much of the scatter is due to boundary layer

effects, before separation, which were manifested as widely varying values of δ/H . The equation for this correlation line is

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = 0.01 + 1.03 (1 - C_a) \quad (\text{turbulent, planar}) \quad (12)$$

Base Heat Transfer for Axisymmetric Bodies

It is well known that convection heat transfer can be correlated using either Stanton or Nusselt number. A characteristic Nusselt number for the base plane can be written as

$$Nu_b = \frac{\tilde{h}_b r_b}{k_b}$$

where $\tilde{h}_b$ is the convective heat transfer coefficient and k_b is the thermal conductivity of the gas. Conversely, the base Stanton number can be expressed as a ratio of two convective heat transfer rates. Thus,

$$St_b = \frac{\dot{q}_b}{\dot{q}_{ref}} = \frac{\dot{q}_b}{\rho_\infty u_\infty (H_\infty - h_w)}$$

where H_∞ is the stagnation enthalpy and h_w is the static enthalpy. Unlike Nusselt number, the base Stanton number does not include the size of the base surface or any fluid properties other than density. Thus, the Stanton number is the preferred parameter for base heating. In particular, the lack of a length scale in Stanton number allows us to use a Reynolds number with unit length or, preferably, the unit Reynolds number R' for correlation. (These two parameters have the same value, but only the Reynolds number is non-dimensional.) Thus, we can write

$$St_b = f(R'_b) \quad (13)$$

to express a base heating correlation, where $R'_b = (\rho u/\mu)_b$.

It is possible to greatly simplify the correlation of base convection by relating the base plane unit Reynolds number to the base pressure. Comparing the values of R' on the base and in the edge flow adjacent to the shoulder shows that

$$R'_b = R'_e \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_e} \frac{\mu_e}{\mu_b} \frac{u_b}{u_e}$$

where $R'_e = (\rho u / \mu)_e$. First recall that velocity is linearly related to Crocco number. Therefore, using the viscosity approximation $\mu \sim T^\omega$, allows us to write the above equation as

$$R'_b = R'_e \frac{P_b}{P_e} \left(\frac{T_e}{T_b} \right)^{1+\omega} \frac{C_b}{C_e} \left(\frac{T_{ob}}{T_{oe}} \right)^{1/2}$$

Because recirculation velocities are small, C_b is much less than C_e and, therefore, $T_b = T_{ob}$. Also, in the absence of significant heat transfer across the shear layer, the approximation can be made, $T_{ob} \approx T_{oe}$. Thus, we can write

$$\frac{T_e}{T_b} = \frac{T_e}{T_{oe}} \frac{T_{oe}}{T_{ob}} \frac{T_{ob}}{T_b} = \frac{T_e}{T_{oe}} = F(M_e)$$

The fundamental nature of the recirculating flow field suggests that because u_b (or C_b) remains nearly constant over a wide range of C_e values, it can be removed from further consideration. Therefore, the relation between the two unit Reynolds numbers becomes

$$R'_b \sim R'_e \frac{P_b}{P_e} F(M_e) C_e^{-1} \quad (14)$$

This shows that the characteristic base plane unit Reynolds number and the base Stanton number are functions of base pressure ratio, edge Mach number, and edge Reynolds number. However, in the foregoing base pressure correlations, we already developed relationships between the latter three parameters. This result suggests that the same parameters that correlated base pressure might be used to correlate base Stanton number.

As demonstrated in the following section, this supposition is true for laminar flow. Thus, for laminar flow cases,

$$St_b = f[M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}] \quad (15)$$

However, for the turbulent flow regime St_b is only a function of M_e , since Reynolds number plays no significant role.

Unfortunately, there is little test data for base heat transfer because such measurements are more difficult to make than corresponding pressure measurements. As before, Bulmer's (1975a, 1977) flight measurements on 9° cones (in both laminar and turbulent regimes) form the primary set of data to be correlated.

Laminar Flow

Shown in Fig. 21 is Bulmer's laminar flight data for 9° cones with Lockman's (1967) measurements on 15° cones with blunting from zero to 40%. Lockman's data fall below the correlation line for Bulmer's data just as did the corresponding pressure measurements (Fig. 8). As explained earlier, the problem is the low Reynolds number conditions that led to a different exponent of Reynolds number.

The correlation line of Fig. 21 is given by the expression

$$St_b = 8.0 \times 10^{-4} [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{1.1}.$$

Recall the correlation of base pressure from Fig. 8, Eq. (8a), as

$$\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} C_e^4 = 3.05 [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{0.6}.$$

We can eliminate the M_e and R_e parameters in brackets from these equations and obtain a correlation for Stanton number in terms of base pressure. This correlation is shown in Fig. 22 and can be expressed as

$$St_b = 1.0 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} C_e^4 \right)^{1.8} \quad (16)$$

Writing in terms of M_e , we have

$$St_b = 1.0 \times 10^{-4} \left[\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma-1} M_e^{-2} \right)^{-2} \right]^{1.8} \quad (17)$$

Figure 22 plots the correlation of Stanton number with base pressure, Eq. (16). Also shown in the figure are two additional data sets of Muntz and Softly (1966) which were compiled by Bulmer. These data encompass cone angles of 9° and 10°, with Mach numbers of 12.6 and 18, and bluntness ratios of 0.05 and 0.3.

Turbulent Flow

Bulmer's turbulent heat transfer measurements, converted to Stanton number, are shown in Fig. 23. The correlation line given in Fig. 23 is expressed as

$$St_b = 8.3 \times 10^{-4} \left\{ \left[\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(\frac{P_\infty}{P_e} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \right\}^{1.85} \quad (18)$$

The correlation is satisfactory for the very limited amount of data available, i.e., a single cone geometry. Before a comprehensive correlation can be developed, additional data is required for various cone angles, bluntness ratios, and Mach numbers. This equation could be used to make estimates of convection levels for other values of θ_c between 6° and 12° . However, in the interim, we could make estimates of convection levels for other cone angles by replacing the one-half power of the bracketed pressure terms in Eq. (18) by the exponent J^{-1} , which is defined in conjunction with Eq. (11).

For easy reference, Table 3 gives a compilation of all the correlations developed in this study for zero angle of attack.

Angle-of-Attack Effects

When a body of revolution is inclined to the free stream direction, the result is a highly three-dimensional flow field over the body surface and in the wake region. In such flows, the difficulties of obtaining measurements without support interference are even greater than for zero angle of attack. Consequently, the amount of reliable base pressure data is extremely limited. During this study a total of seven sources of data were found; unfortunately, all but two had sting-interference effects. Thus, the present study represents only a preliminary identification of possible influential parameters related to angle-of-attack effects.

Pick (1972) launched 10° sharp cones into a hypersonic stream at angles of attack up to 75° . Through telemetered data and trajectory analysis from motion pictures, he was able to determine base pressure for three Mach numbers and two unit Reynolds numbers. Boundary layers in the unseparated region of the cone surface were determined to be laminar. Pick's data for $\alpha = 0^\circ$, 10° and 20° are plotted in Fig. 24 on the same coordinates used in Fig. 8

to correlate cone base pressure for $\alpha = 0$. Also plotted in each part of Fig. 24 is the correlation developed in the present work for $\alpha = 0$, Eq. (8b). Pick's measured base pressures for $\alpha = 10^\circ$ and 20° are virtually identical and fall somewhat below his data for zero angle of attack. For angles of attack larger than 20° (i.e., twice the cone half-angle), Pick found that the base pressure begins to increase. Despite the large differences between Pick's data for $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and the correlation developed, it is possible to use this information to estimate the effect of α on P_b .

To achieve a correlation and, eliminate discrepancies between Pick's data and the present correlation, the base pressure for $\alpha > 0$ was normalized by the corresponding value at $\alpha = 0$. Then for each Mach number, the two measured base pressure ratios (at different unit Reynolds numbers) were averaged. Data for $\alpha = 5^\circ$ were obtained from interpolation of his measured values. The result is displayed in Fig. 25. Although similar in shape, the three distributions exhibit a small effect of Mach number, which we expect. From the previous discussions, the effect of approach Mach number can be eliminated by using the Crocco number. Because the proper geometric scaling parameter for the flow field of cones at angle of attack is the cone half-angle, the data are replotted in Fig. 26 using the new correlation parameter $\alpha C_L^2/\theta_c$. In practice, we could use the distribution shown in Fig. 26 in conjunction with the laminar base pressure correlation, Eq. (8a), to estimate cone base pressure for angles of attack up to twice the half-angle of the cone. However, the distribution shown in Fig. 26 must be considered a provisional distribution because of the limited data and the discrepancy between the measured base pressures and those discussed earlier.

Additional data are needed to determine if this variation is the same for larger cone angles and turbulent boundary layers. Specific measurements or computations are also needed for the circumferential variation of Mach number (M_ϕ) before separation, as well as the turning angle of the flow external to the boundary layer. We expect that a circumferentially averaged edge Mach number and pressure, along with an average turning angle, could be used to develop a more general correlation for angle-of-attack influences.

Another study of angle-of-attack effects concerned slender cylindrical bodies. Moore et al (1992) obtained data on a cylinder with a two-caliber tangent ogive nose whose total length-to-diameter ratio (L/D) was 7.2. The experiments were made at approach Mach numbers between 2 and 4.5 and at angles of attack up to 16° . The unit Reynolds number for these tests was constant and high enough (2 million per foot) to ensure a turbulent boundary

layer. Data for the zero angle-of-attack tests on this configuration fell near the correlation line for cylinders given in Fig. 13.

To illustrate the effect of α on this geometry, Fig. 27 plots, as a function of M_∞ , the ratio of base pressure for $\alpha \neq 0$ to base pressure for $\alpha = 0$. We see number of unusual features in the trends of this graph. First, similar to the laminar data for cones, the base pressure initially decreased as angle of attack increased. The data also showed (except at $M_\infty = 2$) that base pressure reached a minimum value and then began to increase sharply. If the angle of attack had been increased for the $M_\infty = 2$, we would have expected that it would also have shown a minimum value and then a sharp increase. At large angles of attack, an almost constant value of base pressure was attained. This constant value of P_b appeared to be less sensitive to approach Mach number than the corresponding variations in the low- α regime.

A possible explanation for these trends, which accounts for this dual-regime of base pressure (Fig. 27), is as follows. At low angles of attack, a region of moderate cross-flow separation exists because of symmetric body vortices on the leeward side of the cylinder. The strength of the body vortex wake increases as the angle of attack increases and as the L/D of the body increases (Oberkampf and Bartel, 1980). At the aft end of the body this leeside vortex wake interacts with the recirculation zone associated with the base. For the large angle-of-attack (or large L/D) regime, the body vortex wake becomes increasingly stronger and elongated in the direction normal to the cylinder axis. We postulate that the interaction of the body vortex wake and the recirculating base flow fundamentally changes character for very strong, elongated body vortices. This dissimilar interaction could explain the reversal of the base pressure trends illustrated in Fig. 27.

For this investigation, we considered a correlation only for the low angle-of-attack regime, that is, before the base pressure began a sharp rise with angle of attack. As Fig. 27 shows, curves for all Mach numbers were essentially linear with angle of attack, and were shifted lower in direct relation to M_∞ . Recalling that the laminar data of Pick (1972) could be correlated by a parameter proportional to αC_∞^2 (Fig. 26), we considered αC_∞^n for correlating this turbulent data and found that αC_∞^3 produced satisfactory results. The parameter that was neglected in this function was the length-to-diameter ratio of the body. Experimental data of Oberkampf and Bartel (1980) showed that the body vortex strength was approximately quadratic with angle of attack and linear with L/D . Because base pressure is linearly related to angle of attack, this implied that base pressure should have been proportional to $(L/D)^{1/2}$.

Figure 28 shows the correlation of $P_b(\alpha \neq 0)/P_b(\alpha = 0)$ with $\alpha(L/D)^{1/2} C_\infty^3$. Additional data for other L/D values are needed to validate the use of such a correlation. Also note that the angle of attack at which the minimum value of base pressure occurs also depends on L/D . For example, bodies with an L/D higher than 7.2 will have an angle of attack that is lower than that shown in Fig. 27, after which the base pressure will begin a sharp rise.

Ratio of Specific Heat Effects

If we wanted to determine trajectories of vehicles in various planetary atmospheres or in geometries with combustion gases approaching the base region, we could extend the current correlations to gases other than air. Such an extension is not simple; however, the generalized design of the present correlations would allow one. If sufficient base pressure data were available, we could construct new correlations that differ from the present results only in the values of empirical multipliers and exponents.

A first-order estimate of the effect of gas properties on base pressure for planar or cylindrical geometries in the turbulent regime can be obtained by using the classic theory of Korst (1956), which assumes a uniform supersonic flow approaching the shoulder. This flow passes through a Prandtl-Meyer expansion and develops a free shear layer, within which is a stagnating streamline determined from continuity requirements. The external inviscid flow passes through an oblique shock (or Prandtl-Meyer compression) at the recompression region, i.e., wake neck. The correct base pressure occurs when the static pressure downstream of the oblique shock is equal to the stagnation pressure produced by the Mach number of the stagnating streamline (Fig. 4). Thus, the only gas property required for this first-order theory is the ratio of specific heats, γ . The entire computation can be automated easily, and a parametric variation of the ratio P_b/P_1 can be obtained for various values of approaching Crocco number, C_1 or C_a , upstream of the base.

The effect of γ is shown in Fig. 29, which displays the variation of $P_{b_{\text{gas}}}/P_{b_{\text{air}}}$ versus C_a^2 . A comparison of flows with the same value of M_1 shows a similar distribution. Besides combustion products ($\gamma \approx 1.2$), the range of γ values in this plot encompasses gases such as carbon dioxide, methane ($\gamma \approx 1.2$ to 1.3), and helium ($\gamma = 1.67$). Of course, air, nitrogen, and hydrogen have $\gamma \approx 1.3$ to 1.4, depending on temperature. It is seen that, for a given approach flow, as γ increases above the value for air, the base pressure also increases,

and vice versa. The change in base pressure at constant C_a , or C_1 , is also nearly symmetrical with respect to increasing or decreasing γ . That is, $|\Delta P_b|$ is proportional to $|\Delta \gamma|$, for a constant Crocco number.

Figure 29 also shows that the influence of γ becomes large at higher Mach numbers. The actual effect of γ on base drag, however, at hypersonic conditions should be small because the base pressure is very low at these conditions.

Estimation of Edge Conditions

Laminar and turbulent base pressure correlations for cones depend strongly on the values of Mach number (or Crocco number) and/or Reynolds number (as well as static pressure) at the edge of the boundary layer before separation. These edge parameters are important because they characterize the inviscid flow that expands around the shoulder. In this study, satisfactory estimates of these parameters could be obtained from numerical solutions to the inviscid flow equations. For a sharp cone, the inviscid solutions display a nearly constant value of pressure, velocity, and Mach number between the cone surface and the bow shock. However, for blunted cones the shock layer contains a region of rotational flow because of the curved portion of the bow shock wave. The rotationality of the flow is manifested as an entropy gradient in the shock layer. Thus, we observe surface normal gradients of velocity, pressure, temperature, and Mach number outside of the boundary layer. The entropy gradient in the shock layer tends to flow into (i.e., be swallowed by) the boundary layer as the axial distance along the cone increases. This can be seen graphically in CFD Navier-Stokes solutions by tracing streamlines from the curved portion of the bow shock along the body through the shock layer.

Figure 30 illustrates a typical inviscid solution for a 9° cone with 29% blunting at Mach numbers of 4 and 9. This geometry and flow condition are taken from Zarin's (1966) experiment. The plot shows profile shapes for total velocity, Mach number, and static pressure between the cone surface and the bow shock. It was found that for inviscid solutions, the edge conditions required for the present base pressure and heat transfer correlations could usually be estimated from the values at the edge of the entropy layer. The thickness of the entropy layer can be approximated by noting the point at which the large velocity gradient near the wall disappears. Results such as these suggest that data from a viscous solution is often not essential for estimating base pressures using the present correlations. However, there are limits to the foregoing approximations; they become increasingly less reliable

as the entropy layer becomes a larger percentage of the shock layer thickness. For example, this occurs on a short vehicle, $s/r_n < 10$.

An example of how a viscous flow solution differs from an inviscid solution is illustrated in Fig. 31. This geometry and flow condition are from one of Lockman's (1967) experiments. The figure shows profiles computed by an Euler code (SANDIAC) and a Parabolized Navier-Stokes code (SPRINT). For this geometry, flow conditions, and s/r_n value, the entropy layer is swallowed (i.e., diffused) within the boundary layer. The computed values of edge Mach number and pressure, as well as wall pressure, are essentially the same for both cases. For this case the percentage differences between Euler and PNS solutions near the edge of the entropy layer are as follows: Mach number, inviscid is 5% lower; P_e/P_∞ , inviscid is 3% lower; and P_w/P_∞ , inviscid is 3% higher. Errors of this magnitude are generally less than those associated with either the original experimental data or the accuracy of the correlation's developed in this work.

Summary

A comprehensive review of experimental base pressure and base heating data related to supersonic and hypersonic flight has been completed. We paid particular attention to flight data as well as wind tunnel data for models without rear sting support. Using theoretically based correlation parameters, we developed a series of internally consistent, empirical prediction equations developed for both planar and axisymmetric geometries. These equations are applicable over a wide range of Reynolds and Mach number for laminar and turbulent boundary layers. A wide range of cone and wedge angles and nose bluntness was also included in the data base and correlations.

A feature of this study has been the use of Crocco number which, unlike Mach number, is linearly related to velocity. Also unlike Mach number, Crocco number has an upper limiting value of unity. This parameter permits the hypersonic regime to be treated in a more straight-forward manner than in past correlations. Improved and wider ranging correlations are obtained by using hypothetical, axial-flow, downstream conditions. It is also shown that base plane heat transfer is related to base pressure in a simple power-law relationship and is therefore correlated with the same parameters.

A preliminary study of the effect of angle of attack on base pressure for cones and cylinders was also included in this investigation. A new,

nondimensional angle-of-attack parameter appears to be capable of correlating base pressure to that of base pressure at $\alpha = 0$. Also included in this analysis is an approximate result for gases with a ratio of specific heats different than air. This correlation would be useful for estimating the drag of vehicles entering different planetary atmospheres or the drag of objects in combustion gases.

The results of the present study should permit the estimation of base pressure and base heating levels with considerably more confidence and over a wider range of conditions than in the past. For example, in addition to the specific geometries examined, the present results would apply to multiconic configurations if the maximum θ_c was less than 20° . Also, based on data reviewed, average base pressures for cones with a small amount of slicing on one side could fall within the general scatter of test data used in developing these correlations. On the other hand, a bent-cone body would likely produce sufficiently asymmetric flow approaching the base so that the present correlations should be used with considerable caution.

References

- M. A. Badrinarayanan, "An Experimental Investigation of Base Flows at Supersonic Speeds", *J. of the Royal Aeronautical Society*, Vol. 65, July 1961, pp. 475-482.
- R. G. Batt and T. Kubota, "Experimental Investigation of Laminar Near Wakes behind 20° Wedges at $M_\infty = 6$ ", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 11, November 1968, pp. 2077-2083.
- B. M. Bulmer, "Re-Entry Vehicle Base Pressure and Heat Transfer Measurements at $M_\infty = 18$ ", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 4, April 1975, pp. 522-524.
- B. M. Bulmer, "Study of Base Pressure in Laminar Hypersonic Flow: Re- entry Flight Measurements", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 10, October 1975, pp. 1340-1348.
- B. M. Bulmer, "Flight-Test Base Pressure Measurements in Turbulent Flow", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 12, December 1976, pp. 1783-1785. (Also Report SAND 76-0267, June 1976).
- B. M. Bulmer, "Heat Transfer Measurements in a Separated Laminar Base Flow", *J. Spacecraft and Rockets*, Vol. 14, No. 11, November 1977, pp. 701-702.
- J. M. Cassanto, "Base Pressure Results at $M = 4$ using Free-Flight and Sting-Supported Models", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 7, July 1968, pp. 1411-1414.
- D. R. Chapman, "An Analysis of Base Pressure at Supersonic Velocities and Comparison with Experiment", NACA Report 1051, 1951.
- D. R. Chapman, "A Theoretical Analysis of Heat Transfer in Regions of Separated Flow," NACA TN-3792, 1956.
- D. R. Chapman, D. M. Kuehn and H. K. Larson, "Investigation of Separated Flows in Supersonic and Subsonic Flow with Emphasis on the Effect of Transition," NACA TN-3869, 1957.

- J. E. Daywitt, D. Brant and F. Bosworth, "Computational Technique for Three-Dimensional Inviscid Flowfields About Reentry Vehicles," Space and Missile Systems Organization TR-79-5, April 1978.
- C. F. Dewey, "Near Wake of a Blunt Body at Hypersonic Speeds", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 6, June 1965, pp. 1001-1010.
- W. H. Dorrance, *Viscous Hypersonic Flow*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962.
- S. A. Goecke, "Comparison of Wind-Tunnel and Flight-Measured Base Pressures from the Sharp-Leading-Edge Upper Vertical Fin of the X-15 Airplane for Turbulent Flow at Mach Numbers from 1.5 to 5.0", NASA Technical Note D-6348, May 1971.
- L. L. Kavanau, "Base Pressure Studies in Rarefied Supersonic Flows," *J. Aeronautical Sciences*, Vol. 23, No. 3, March 1956, pp. 193-207.
- E. J. Kawecki, "Comparison of Several Re-Entry Vehicle Base Pressure Correlations," *J. Spacecraft and Rockets*, Vol. 14, No. 5, May 1977, pp. 284-289.
- L. D. Kayser, "Base Pressure Measurements on a Projectile Shape at Mach Numbers from 0.91 to 1.20", Ballistic Research Laboratory, Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-03353, April 1984.
- H. H. Korst, "A Theory for Base Pressures in Transonic and Supersonic Flow," *J. Applied Mechanics*, Vol. 23, *Trans. ASME*, Vol. 78, 1956, pp. 593-600.
- H. H. Kurzweg, "Interrelationship Between Boundary Layer and Base Pressure", *Journal of Aeronautical Sciences*, Vol. 18, No. 11, November 1951, pp. 743-748.
- R. Lehnert. and V. L. Schermerhorn, "Correlation of Base Pressure and Wake Structure of Sharp and Blunt-Nose Cones with Reynolds Number Based on Boundary Layer Momentum Thickness," *J. Aero/Space Sciences*, Vol. 26, No. 3, Mar. 1959, pp. 185-186.
- W. K. Lockman, "Free-Flight Base Pressure and Heating Measurements on Sharp and Blunt Cones in a Shock Tunnel", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 10, October 1967, pp 1898-1900.

- A. Mark, "Free Flight Base Pressure Measurements on 8° Cones," AIAA Paper No. 78-1347, 1978.
- K. W. McAlister, D. A. Stewart and V. L. Peterson, "Aerodynamic Characteristics of a Large-Angle Blunt Cone with and without Fence-Type Afterbodies," NASA TN D-6269, April 1971.
- H. McDonald, "The Turbulent Base Pressure Problem; A comparison Between a Theory and Some Experimental Evidence", Report No. Ae 194, British Aircraft Corp., April 1965.
- M. McWherter, R. W. Noack and W. L. Oberkampf, "Evaluation of Boundary-Layer and Parabolized Navier-Stokes Solutions for Re-entry Vehicles," *J. of Spacecraft and Rockets*, Vol. 23, No. 1, Jan-Feb. 1986, pp. 70-78.
- Moore, F. G., Hymer, T., and Wilcox, F. J., "Improved Empirical Model for Base Drag Prediction on Missile Configurations Based on New Wind Tunnel Data," Naval Surface Warfare Center Report, NSWCDD/TR-92/509, October 1992.
- E. P. Muntz and E. J. Softly, "A Study of Laminar Near Wakes," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 6, June 1966, pp. 961-968.
- E. M. Murman, "Experimental Studies of a Laminar Hypersonic Cone Wake," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 9, Sept. 1969, pp. 1724-1730.
- S. N. B. Murthy and J. R. Osborn, "Base Flow Phenomena with and without Injection: Experimental Results, Theories, and Bibliography," *Aerodynamics of Base Combustion*, Vol. 40, *AIAA Progress in Astronautics and Aeronautics*, S. N. B. Murthy, Ed., MIT Press, 1976, pp. 7-210.
- R. W. Noack and A. R. Lopez, "Inviscid Flow Field Analysis of Complex Reentry Vehicles: Volume 1, Description of Numerical Methods," Sandia National Laboratories, Rept. No. SAND87-0776/1, Oct. 1988.
- W. L. Oberkampf and T. J. Bartel, "Symmetric Body Vortex Wake Characteristics in Supersonic Flow," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 11, Nov. 1980, pp. 1289-1297.

- W. L. Oberkampf, D. P. Aeschliman and M. M. Walker, "Joint Computational/Experimental Aerodynamics Research on Hypersonic Vehicle," AGARD Conf. on Theoretical and Experimental Methods in Hypersonic Flows, Paper No. 23, Torino, Italy, May 1992.
- W. B. Pepper and T. R. Holland, "Transonic Pressure Measurements on Blunt Cones", Sandia Corporation Report SC-4157 (TR), May 1958.
- G. S. Pick, "Base Pressure Distributions on a Cone at Hypersonic Speeds", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 12, December 1972, pp. 1685-1686.
- B. L. Reeves and L. Lees, "Theory of Laminar Near Wake of Blunt Bodies in Hypersonic Flow," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 11, Nov. 1965, pp. 2061-2074.
- B. L. Reeves and H. Buss, "The Near Wake of Axisymmetric Bodies in Hypersonic Flow," Proceedings of the XVIII International Astronautical Conference, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, Sept. 1967, Vol. 3, *Propulsion and Re-entry*, M. Lunc, et al., Eds., 1968, pp. 213-219.
- J. O. Reller and F. M. Hamaker, "An Experimental Investigation of the Base Pressure Characteristics of Nonlifting Bodies of Revolution at Mach Numbers form 2.73 to 4.98", NACA Technical Note 3393, March 1955.
- W. R. Seiling and R. H. Page, "A Re-Examination of Sting Interference Effects", AIAA Paper No. 70-585, May 1970.
- J. F. Stalnaker, L. A. Nicholson, D. S. Hanline and E. H. McGraw, "Improvements to the AFWAL Parabolized Navier-Stokes Code Formulation," AFWAL-TR-86-3076, Sept. 1986.
- R. F. Starr, "Base Pressure on Sharp and Blunt Conical Bodies at Supersonic Speeds," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 5, May 1977, pp.753-755.
- L. S. Stivers, "Calculated Pressure Distributions and Components of Total Drag Coefficients for 18 Constant-Volume, Slender Bodies of Revolution at Zero Incidence for Mach Numbers from 2.0 to 12.0, with Experimental Aerodynamic Characteristics for Three of the Bodies," NASA TN D-6536, 1971.

- M. Tanner, "Base Pressure Measurements on a Cone at Mach Numbers from $M_{\infty} = 5$ to 7", *Experiments in Fluids*, Vol. 12, No. 1/2, 1991, pp. 113-118.
- B. L. Uselton and F. B. Cyran, "Sting Interference Effects as Determined by Measurements of Dynamic Stability Derivatives, Surface Pressure, and Base Pressure for Mach Numbers 2 through 8", AEDC Technical Report TR 79-89, October 1980.
- M. M. Walker and D. D. McBride, "Comparisons of CFD Flow Field Solutions with Experimental Data at Mach 14," AIAA Aerodynamic Testing Conference, Paper No. 86-0742-CP, Mar. 1986.
- W. R. Wehrend, "An Experimental Evaluation of Aerodynamic Damping Moments of Cones with Different Centers of Rotation", NASA Technical Note D-1768, March 1963.
- F. M. White, *Viscous Fluid Flow*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974.
- N. A. Zarin, "Base Pressure Measurements on Sharp and Blunt 9° Cones at Mach Numbers from 3.5 to 9.2", *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 4, April 1966, pp. 743-745.

Table 1. Laminar Base Pressure Experimental Conditions

Investigator	Geometry	M_∞	$R_\infty L$	Test Condition
Bulmer (1975b)	9° cone $r_n/r_b = 0.05$	16	0.2 to 48 x 10 ⁶	free flight (RV)
	9° cone $r_n/r_b = 0.06$	20		
Cassanto (1968)	10° cone $r_n/r_b = 0, 0.3, 0.6$	4	0.5 to 10 x 10 ⁶	wind tunnel (sting) free flight (RV)
Lockman (1967)	10°, 15° cone $r_n/r_b = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5$	14	2 to 7 x 10 ⁴	wind tunnel (wire)
Pick (1972)	10° cone $r_n/r_b = 0$	5.3 to 9.9	1.5 to 5.6 x 10 ⁵	free flight (wind tunnel)
Badrinarayanan (1961)	cylinder $L/D = 24$	2	0.7 x 10 ⁶	wind tunnel (side strut)
Kurzweg (1951)	cone-cylinder $L/D = 4$	3	0.5 to 3 x 10 ⁶	wind tunnel (sting)
Chapman (1951)	ogive $L/D = 3$ to 7	1.5, 2	0.5 to 2 x 10 ⁶	wind tunnel (sting)
	cone-cyl $L/D = 4$ to 9	1.5, 2		
Reller et al (1955)	ogive/cylinder $L/D = 5$	2.7 to 5	1.4 to 4 x 10 ⁶	wind tunnel (sting)
Chapman (1951)	2° wedge	2	1.5 to 2.4 x 10 ⁵	wind tunnel
Batt et al (1968)	10° wedge	6.1	0.3 to 2.4 x 10 ⁵	wind tunnel
Dewey (1965)	15°, 22.5° wedge	6	0.15 to 2.0 x 10 ⁵	wind tunnel

Table 2. Turbulent Base Pressure Experiment Conditions

Investigator	Geometry	M_∞	$R_\infty L$	Test Condition
Bulmer (1976)	9° cone $r_n/r_b = 0.05, 0.06$	2 to 15	2 to 17×10^7	free flight (RV)
Zarin (1966)	9° cone $r_n/r_b = 0, 0.286$	3.5 to 9.2	0.5 to 10×10^6	wind tunnel (sting)
Mark (1978)	8° cone $r_n/r_b = 0.01$	2 to 3	3 to 3.6×10^7	wind tunnel (injection)
Uselton et al (1980)	6° cone $r_n/r_b = 0.1, 0.15$	2 to 10	2 to 4×10^7	wind tunnel (sting)
Tanner (1991)	3.4° cone $r_n/r_b = 0.15$	5 to 6.8	N/A	wind tunnel (side strut)
Pepper et al (1958)	15° cone $r_n/r_b = 0, 0.4, 0.6$	1.3	N/A	wind tunnel (wires)
Wehrend (1963)	12° cone $r_n/r_b = 0$	1.3 to 2.2	N/A	wind tunnel (sting)
Chapman (1951)	cone/cylinder $L/D = 5$	2 to 4	3 to 6×10^6	free flight
Kayser (1984)	ogive/cylinder $L/D = 6$	1.2	4.5×10^6	wind tunnel (sting)
Reller et al (1955)	ogive/cylinder $L/D = 10$	2.7 to 5	5×10^6	wind tunnel (sting)
Seiling et al (1970)	cylinders	1.5 to 4	N/A	wind tunnel (forward support)
Moore et al (1992)	ogive/cylinder $L/D = 7.2$	2 to 4.5	6×10^6	wind tunnel (side strut)
Goecke (1971)	5° wedge	1.5 to 5	0.4 to 2×10^7	free flight (X-15)
McDonald (1965)	wedges/backsteps	1.25 to 3	N/A	wind tunnel

Table 3. Summary of Correlations for Zero Angle of Attack

Laminar

Axisymmetric $\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = 3.05 \left[1 + \frac{2}{\gamma-1} M_e^{-2} \right]^2 [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{0.6}$

Planar $\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = \left[1 + \frac{2}{\gamma-1} M_e^{-2} \right]^3 [M_e^2 (R_{e,s})^{-1/2}]^{0.6}$

Cone $St_b = 1.0 \times 10^{-4} \left[\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\gamma-1} M_e^{-2} \right)^2 \right]^{1.8}$

Turbulent

Cylinder $\frac{P_b}{P_1} = 0.05 + 0.967 \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_1^2 \right)^{-1}$

Cone $\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = \left(\frac{P_e}{P_\infty} \right)^2 \left[0.025 + 0.906 \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_e^2 \right)^{-1} \right]^J$
 where $J = 1.7 / \ln \left(\frac{21}{\theta_c} \right)$ and $\theta_c \leq 20^\circ$

Planar $\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} = 0.01 + 1.03 \left\{ 1 - \left[1 - \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2} M_a^2 \right)^{-1} \right]^{1/2} \right\}$

Cone $St_b = 8.3 \times 10^{-4} \left\{ \left[\frac{P_b}{P_\infty} \left(\frac{P_\infty}{P_e} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \right\}^{1.85}$

Figure 1
Components of total drag for a slender sharp cone, $\theta_c = 2.9^\circ$. (From Stivers 1971)

Figure 2
Representation of flow features of a blunted cone in free flight at
supersonic/hypersonic speeds.

Figure 3

Shadowgraph of sharp cone, $\theta_c = 9^\circ$, near zero angle of attack at a Mach number of 4.81.
(Photograph courtesy of Richard Matthews, AEDC.)

Figure 4
Schematic of base flow features.

Figure 5
Base flow in the presence of a sting support.

a) P_e reference pressure

b) P_∞ reference pressure

Figure 6
Variation of base pressure in axisymmetric laminar flow showing effect of reference pressure. (Data from Bulmer 1975b)

Figure 7
Variation of base pressure in axisymmetric laminar flow
for total data set used in present study.

Figure 8
Final correlation of base pressure in axisymmetric laminar flow.
(Symbols as defined in Fig. 7)

Figure 9
Variation of laminar boundary layer thickness for hypersonic flow over a
 10° cone at $M_\infty = 14$.

Figure 10
Variation of base pressure in planar laminar flow for total data set used in present study.

Figure 11
Final correlation of base pressure in planar laminar flow. (Symbols as defined in Fig. 10)

Figure 12
Variation of base pressure for turbulent flow past long cylinders.
(From Seiling and Page 1970)

Figure 13
Correlation of base pressure for turbulent flow over cylinders.

Figure 14
Variation of base pressure for turbulent flow over blunted 90° cones using free stream reference conditions. (Data from Bulmer 1976)

Figure 15
Variation of base pressure for turbulent flow over blunted 90° cones using shoulder reference conditions. (Data from Bulmer 1976)

Figure 16
Variation of scaled base pressure for turbulent flow over cones
using shoulder reference Crocco number. (Data from Bulmer 1976)

Figure 17
 Correlation of base pressure in axisymmetric turbulent flow over cones
 using edge conditions for reference. (Data from Bulmer 1976)

Figure 18
Correlation of base pressure in axisymmetric turbulent flow using axial flow conditions for reference. (Correlation line is same as Fig. 10. Data from Bulmer 1976)

Figure 19
Correlation of base pressure for turbulent flow past cones of various angles.
(Correlation line is same as Fig. 14)

Figure 20
 Correlation of base pressure in planar turbulent flow using axial flow
 conditions for reference.

Figure 21
Variation of base Stanton number with correlation parameter
for laminar flow over cones.

Figure 22
 Correlation of base Stanton number with base pressure parameter
 for laminar flow over cones.

Figure 23
Correlation of base Stanton number for turbulent flow
over a blunted 90° cone. (Data from Bulmer 1976)

Figure 24
 Effect of angle of attack on base pressure for laminar flow
 over a blunted 10° cone. (Data from Pick 1972)

Figure 25
Variation of normalized base pressure with angle of attack.
(Data from Pick 1972)

Figure 26
Correlation of normalized base pressure for a cone at angle of attack.
(Data from Pick 1972)

Figure 27
 Normalized base pressure for an ogive-nose cylinder at angle of attack
 (Data from Moore et al 1992)

Figure 28
Correlation of normalized base pressure for an ogive-nose cylinder at angle of attack
(Data from Moore et al 1992)

Figure 29
Effect of specific heat ratio on normalized base pressure.

Figure 30
 Computed inviscid flow parameters across the shock layer for $\theta_c = 90^\circ$,
 $r_n/r_b = 0.29$, and $s/r_n = 30.4$. (Conditions from Zarin 1966)

Figure 31
 Comparison of computed flow parameters in the shock layer for inviscid and viscous flow.
 ($M_\infty = 14$, $\theta_c = 15^\circ$, $r_n/r_b = 0.2$, and $s/r_n = 15.7$. Conditions from Lockman 1967)

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION:

- 1 A. D. Addy
 Dept. of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
 Univeristy of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 1206 Green St.
 Urbana, IL 61801

- 2 Air Force Wright Laboratories
 Attn: Jerold L. Patterson/FIMG
 Bldg. 450, Suite 30
 Joseph Shang/FIM
 Bldg. 450, Suite 6
 2645 Fifth St.
 Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-7936

- 2 Army Missile Command
 Attn: AMSMI-RD-SS-AT
 B. Walker
 D. Washington
 Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5010

- 3 Army Research Laboratories
 Weapons Technology Directorate
 AMSRL-WT-PB
 Attn: Charles Nietubicz
 James Danberg
 Paul Weinacht
 Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066

- 1 David Belk
 WL/MNAA
 101 W. Eglin Blvd, Suite 219
 Eglin AFB, FL 32542-6810

- 1 Calspan Field Services/AEDC
 Attn: Richard Matthews, MS 4401
 John Benek, MS 6001
 Arnold Air Force Station, TN 37389

- 2 Donald Daniel
 Chief Scientist
 AEDC/CA
 Arnold Air Force Station, TN 37387

- 1 J. Craig Dutton
Dept. of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
Univeristy of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1206 Green St.
Urbana, IL 61801
- 2 Director ERDEC
Attn: SCBRD-RT
Miles Miller
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5423
- 1 Leroy S. Fletcher
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843
- 1 Michael Holden
Calspan Corp.
P. O. Box 400
Buffalo, NY 14225
- 1 Helmut Korst
Dept. of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering
Univeristy of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1206 Green St.
Urbana, IL 61801
- 5 J. Parker Lamb
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712
- 1 Michael Mendenhall
Nielsen Engr. and Research, Inc.
510 Clyde Ave.
Mountain View, CA 94043
- 1 Thomas Mueller
Dept. of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

- 2 Naval Surface Warfare Center
 Dahlgren Div.
 Attn: Frank Moore
 Tom Hymer
 Weapon Systems Dept.
 Dahlgren, VA 22448
- 1 Patrick Roache
 Ecodynamics Research Assoc.
 P. O. Box 9229
 Albuquerque, NM 87119
- 1 SAIC
 Attn: Thomas Harris
 501 Office Center Drive
 Suite 420
 Fort Washington, PA 19034
- 1 Sverdrup/AEDC
 Attn: William Phares, MS 9013
 Arnold Air Force Station, TN 37389
- 3 NASA/Ames Research Center
 Attn: Paul Kutler, MS 258-3
 Terry Holtz, MS 258-1
 George Deiwert, MS 230-2
 Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000
- 3 NASA/Langley Research Center
 Attn: Lana Couch, MS 353
 Douglas Dwoyer, MS 197
 Wally Sawyer, MS 410
 Hampton, VA 23681-0001
- 1 Robert Page
 Dept. of Mechanical Engineering
 Texas A&M University
 College Station, TX 77843
- 2 TRW/Ballistic Missiles Division
 Attn: T. Shivananda
 Bldg. SB2/Rm. 1011
 P. O. Box 1310
 San Bernardino, CA 92402-1310

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION:

1	MS	0841	D. J. McCloskey, 1500
1		0836	C. W. Peterson, 1501
			Route to: 1512, 1513
1		0827	P. J. Hommert, 1502
1		0827	J. S. Rottler, 1511
1		0827	F. G. Blottner, 1511
1		0827	M. A. Walker, 1511
1		0832	W. P. Wolfe, 1551
1		0832	K. V. Chavez, 1551
1		0832	J. K. Cole, 1551
1		0832	T. M. Jordan, 1551
1		0832	L. R. Rollstin, 1551
1		0832	H. R. Spahr, 1551
1		0833	C. E. Hailey, 1552
1		0826	W. L. Hermina, 1553
1		0826	V. A. Amatucci, 1553
1		0826	S. G. Beard, 1553
1		0826	D. W. Kuntz, 1553
1		0826	T. M. Sterk, 1553
1		0825	W. H. Rutledge, 1554
1		0825	E. L. Clark, 1554
1		0825	W. T. Gutierrez, 1554
1		0825	J. L. Payne, 1554
20		0825	W. L. Oberkampff, 1554
1		0825	C. C. Wong, 1554
1		0127	J. J. Bertin, 4503
1		0574	D. F. Wolf, 5941
1		0301	D. J. Rigali, 9800
1		0314	J. L. McDowell, 9811
1		0314	B. M. Bulmer, 9811
1		0313	D. L. Keese, 9812
1		0312	W. E. Williamson, 9814
1		0310	A. C. Bustamante, 9816
1		0307	E. W. Reece, 9817
1		9018	Central Technical Files, 8523-2
5		0899	Technical Library, 7141
1		0619	Technical Publications, 7151
10		1119	Document Processing, 7613-2 for DOE/OSTI

END

DATE

FILMED

3/2/94