210
9-28 c

SC-CR-70-6125

May 1970

A STUDY OF TURBULENT BOUNDARY LAYER MODELS
PART II, MEAN TURBULENT FIELD CLOSURE

Prepared by

George L. Mellor
H. James Herring
Princeton University

THIS DOCUMENT CONFIRMED AS
UNCLASSIFIED
DIVISION OF CLASSIFICATION
BY 9H Kahn/asmh
DATE 9/29/76

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

SANDIA LABORATORIES

OPERATED FOR THE UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION BY SANDIA CORPORATION | ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, LIVERMORE, CALIFORNIA

P6806

DISCLAIMER

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, 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 or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

Issued by Sandia Corporation,
a prime contractor to the
United States Atomic Energy Commission

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights, or

B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.

Printed in the United States of America
Available from
Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information
National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151
Price: Printed Copy \$3.00; Microfiche \$0.65

SC-CR-70-6125

A STUDY OF
TURBULENT BOUNDARY LAYER MODELS
PART II, MEAN TURBULENT FIELD CLOSURE

(Final Report May 1970)

Prepared by

George L. Mellor

H. James Herring

Princeton University

for

Sandia Corporation

under

Contract No. 48-7837

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, 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.

ABSTRACT

In order to close the mean velocity equations appeal is made to the mean turbulent equations of motion obtained by taking the first moment (in velocity) of the Navier Stokes equations. To close the resulting equation set, assumptions are required, the consequence of which has been labeled Mean Turbulent Field closure. Whenever possible, an attempt at supplying a rational basis for each assumption is made. In any event, the central hypothesis is that already proposed by Rotta. Various simplified sub-models may be identified including Mean Velocity Field closure.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

1. INTRODUCTION

Although in Part I of this series considerable success was claimed for Mean Velocity Field (MVF) closure, several major difficulties were encountered. The most important was that the very concept of an eddy viscosity, although heuristically plausible in the spirit of Prandtl's mixing-length argument did not seem to evolve directly from the equations of motion. Part II is, therefore, devoted to a discussion of the turbulent transport equations in an attempt to disclose an underlying basis for some type of constitutive equation, to determine guide lines for a conceptional view of turbulent flow and to increase predictive capability.

The most plausible overall framework for this analysis is that proposed by Prandtl and Rotta and quite a bit of the material included here will be found in the papers by Rotta (1951). The basis of Mean Turbulent Field (MTF) closure is the complete equations for both the mean velocity field and the mean turbulent field. Flux-gradient constitutive equations are proposed and their coefficients are related directly to mean turbulent field variables rather than the mean velocity field. Although more empirical constants are required, the additional capability is provided of calculating the turbulent field quantities for comparison with experiment. This is important because it would seem that as models become complex the additional complexity should be supported by additional data.

As mentioned above, the overall framework described in this last part was originally conceived by Prandtl and developed much further by

Rotta. Variants of the MTF closure have been applied by Glushko (1965), Beckwith and Bushnell (1968), Mellor and Herring (1968-II), which is described further in this paper, and most recently Donaldson and Rosenbaum (1968). It is clear that, given the general framework, the theory has nevertheless not evolved to a point of consensus as has the MVF closure. Furthermore, within the MTF closure there does appear to be more than one valid level of empiricism which differ in degree of complexity. One purpose of this paper is to emphasize what are believed to be the important elements of MTF closure so as to provide some organization for future research.

As in Part I, the Method of Matched Asymptotic Expansions suggests a framework to systematically determine the necessary empirical constitutive coefficients.

2. THE BASIC EQUATIONS

The field equations of motion for incompressible flow when decomposed into ensemble mean velocities, U_i , plus fluctuation velocities, u_i , and their concomitant pressures P and p are

$$\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_i} = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial U_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (U_k U_j + \overline{u_k u_j}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (-\delta_{kj} P + T_{kj}), \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i} = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (U_k u_j + U_j u_k + u_k u_j - \overline{u_k u_j}) \\ = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (-\delta_{kj} p + \tau_{kj}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$T_{ij} \equiv \nu \left(\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} \right); \quad \tau_{ij} \equiv \nu \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \right) \quad (5a,b)$$

are the mean and fluctuating viscous stresses respectively. In the MVF closure of Part I only equation (1) and (2) were used and closure was achieved by empirically relating $\overline{u_i u_j}$ directly to the mean velocity strain where only one component of $\overline{u_i u_j}$ was required by virtue of the boundary layer approximation. Here, however, an equation for $\overline{u_i u_j}$ is obtained by taking a moment of (4) with u_i and adding this to another moment of (4)

after the indices have been interchanged. The result is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_j}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} [U_k \overline{u_i u_j} + \overline{u_k u_i u_j}] &= - \overline{u_k u_i} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k} - \overline{u_k u_j} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} \\
&\quad - \overline{u_i} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j} - \overline{u_j} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} \\
&\quad + \overline{u_i} \frac{\partial \tau_{kj}}{\partial x_k} + \overline{u_j} \frac{\partial \tau_{ki}}{\partial x_k} .
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Another form of (6) is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_j}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} [U_k \overline{u_i u_j} + \overline{u_k u_i u_j} + \overline{u_i (\delta_{kj} p - \tau_{kj})} + \overline{u_j (\delta_{ki} p - \tau_{ki})}] \\
= - \overline{u_k u_i} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k} - \overline{u_k u_j} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} \\
+ p \frac{\partial \overline{u_i}}{\partial x_j} + p \frac{\partial \overline{u_j}}{\partial x_i} \\
- \overline{\tau_{kj}} \frac{\partial \overline{u_i}}{\partial x_k} - \overline{\tau_{ki}} \frac{\partial \overline{u_j}}{\partial x_k} .
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Whether (6) or (7) is the preferable form is more easily decided with regard to the trace of (6) or (7). If we contract (7), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{q^2}{2} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left[u_k \frac{q^2}{2} + \overline{u_k \frac{u_i^2}{2}} + \overline{u_k p} - \overline{u_i \tau_{ki}} \right] \quad (8)$$

local rate of change of turbulent energy	turbulent energy advection	turbulent kinetic diffusion	turbulent pressure diffusion	turbulent viscous diffusion
---	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

$$= \overline{(-u_k u_i)} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} - \overline{\tau_{ki} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}},$$

turbulent energy production	turbulent energy dissipation
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

where $q^2 \equiv \overline{u_i^2}$. The above is a relatively familiar* identification of terms. The reason that (8), as opposed to the trace of (6), is attractive is that the dissipation term

$$\epsilon = \overline{\tau_{ki} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}} = \frac{\nu}{2} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_i} \right)^2} \quad (9)$$

is positive definite; in (8) it is always a "sink" term. In fact, consideration of the second law of thermodynamics shows that this must be so and the assumed constitutive equation (5a,b) of Navier and Stokes, where ν is positive, satisfies this requirement. Similarly, a "second law of turbulence" might be hypothesized to require that the production, $-\overline{u_k u_i} \partial u_i / \partial x_k$ be a positive, source term.† A linear constitutive equation for $-\overline{u_k u_i}$ involving a positive, scalar eddy viscosity would satisfy this requirement. Of course, a "second law of turbulence", if valid at all, can only be approximate and, for example, small regions of

* However, as noted by Corrsin (1953), the viscous terms are often misinterpreted. This continues to be true.

† And which appears as a sink term in the mean velocity kinetic energy equation; see Table I.

negative production in the case of wall jets have apparently been measured. Nevertheless, the predominant role of the production term as a positive source is hardly disputable.

Table I displays the complete hierarchy of energy equations where the energy flows from the mean velocity kinetic energy through the turbulent kinetic energy and finally to internal energy. By adding all equations the conservative nature of the system may be seen.

It should be pointed out that the diagonal equations in (7), either as summed or individually, all display a conservative nature, thus coloring our semantics. However, this property disappears when off diagonal equations are considered.

TABLE I

<u>Advection</u>	<u>Turbulent Diffusion and Heat Transfer</u>	<u>Turbulent Energy Transfer</u>	<u>Mean Viscous Transfer</u>	<u>Turbulent Viscous Transfer</u>
$\frac{D(U_i^2/2)}{Dt}$	$+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} [U_k p + U_j (-\overline{u_k u_j} + \tau_{kj})]$	$= - (\overline{u_i u_j}) \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i}$	$- \tau_{ij} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i}$	
$\frac{D(q^2/2)}{Dt}$	$+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} [\overline{u_k p} + \overline{u_k u_j^2/2} - \overline{u_j \tau_{ki}}]$	$= (\overline{u_i u_j}) \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i}$		$- \overline{\tau_{ij} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i}}$
$+ \frac{DE}{Dt}$	$+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\overline{u_k e} + Q_k)$	$=$	$+ \tau_{ij} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i}$	$+ \overline{\tau_{ij} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i}}$
<hr/>				
$\frac{D}{Dt} \left[E + \frac{U_i^2}{2} + \frac{q^2}{2} \right] + [\text{Turbulent Diffusion and Heat Transfer}]^* = 0$				

[†] E = mean internal energy; e = fluctuating internal energy; Q_k = mean heat flux.

* If the equation is integrated through a volume bounded by stationary and adiabatic surfaces, this term integrates to zero.

3. KINETIC THEORY AND NEARLY ISOTROPIC TURBULENT FLOW

The kinetic theory of dilute gases represents a complete (so long as intermolecular forces are known) and purely mechanistic theory of molecular scale fluctuations which yields an energy equation similar to (8) but lacking terms involving p and τ_{ki} , and where u_i may be interpreted as the random molecular or "peculiar" velocity. However, kinetic theory also yields simple constitutive equations for $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and $\overline{u_k u_l^2}/2$ in the case of nearly isotropic molecular velocity fields; that is where $\overline{u_i u_j} = \delta_{ij} q^2/3 \ll q^2$ and $\overline{u_i u_j u_k} = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3} \overline{u_k u_l^2} \ll q^3$. The fact that similar constitutive equations do not seem to be available for turbulent flow represents one of its major difficulties. Therefore, it is instructive to compare the kinetic theory equations (see, for example, Chapman and Cowling, 1958 or Patterson, 1956) with the turbulent equations, insofar as is possible. For this purpose, equation (6) seems to be more convenient than (7). To specifically identify departures from isotropy, a non-dimensional tensor, a_{ij} , maybe defined, such that

$$\overline{u_i u_j} = (\delta_{ij} + a_{ij}) \frac{q^2}{3}, \quad (10)$$

where $a_{ii} = 0$. Next, one can contract (6), (which, of course, is (8)), multiply each term by $\delta_{ij}/3$ and subtract from (6) again. Using (10) and rearranging, the result is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{q}{3} \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial x_n} (\delta_{jm} \delta_{in} + \delta_{im} \delta_{jn} + a_{nj} a_{im} + a_{ni} \delta_{jm} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} a_{nm}) \\
& + \frac{D}{Dt} (a_{ij} \frac{q^2}{3}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\overline{u_k u_i u_j} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3} \overline{u_k u_l^2}) \\
& = - \overline{u_i \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j}} - \overline{u_j \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i}} + \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} \overline{u_k \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_k}} \\
& + \overline{u_i \frac{\partial \tau_{kj}}{\partial x_k}} + \overline{u_j \frac{\partial \tau_{ki}}{\partial x_k}} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} \overline{u_l \frac{\partial \tau_{kl}}{\partial x_k}}, \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\frac{Df}{Dt} \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (u_k f) .$$

Note that if equation (11) is contracted the result is null so that (11) is clearly independent of (8).

Now the point is that the terms appearing on the left side of (11) are identical to terms appearing in the kinetic theory, transport equations. Attention may then be directed to the right-hand side of (11). In kinetic theory, the viscous terms do not appear. In turbulent flow it can be argued that the viscous terms are negligible since they relate to the smallest scales of turbulent motion which tend more to isotropy than the larger scales. Formally, this means that

$$\overline{u_i \partial \tau_{kj} / \partial x_k} \propto \delta_{ij} \text{ and the viscous terms in (11) cancel. Therefore,}$$

it may be seen that it is the velocity pressure gradient correlations that distinguish the turbulent flow transport equations from their kinetic theory counterpart where the Boltzman collision integrals appear

instead. Before returning to this point it is enlightening to examine the consequences of isotropy on the left side of (11); that is, to determine its asymptotic form as $a_{ij} \rightarrow 0$.

The first term in (11) is $(q^2/3) (\partial U_m / \partial x_n) [\delta_{jm} \delta_{in} + \delta_{im} \delta_{jn} + O_{ijmn}(a)]$ where, say $a^2 = a_{ij}^2$; therefore, its asymptotic behavior is clear. To estimate the behavior of the second term, equation (8) may be used to demonstrate that $D(q^2/2)/Dt$ is at most of the order of the turbulent energy production or dissipation term. Thus, $D(a_{ij} q^2/3)/Dt = (q^2/3) (\partial U_k / \partial x_m) O_{ijkm}(a^2)$. For the third diffusion-like term, one should appeal to a triple correlation equation; however, in kinetic theory the diffusion term in the equation corresponding to (11) is $O(a^2)$ and this will be assumed to be the case here. Therefore, as $a \rightarrow 0$, equation (11) reduces to

$$\frac{q^2}{3} \left(\frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} \right) = - \overline{u_i \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j}} - \overline{u_j \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i}} + \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} \overline{u_k \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_k}} \quad (12)$$

asymptotically as $a \rightarrow 0$ in both near isotropic turbulent flow and kinetic theory; however, in kinetic theory the right side is replaced by the Boltzman integral.*

* The Boltzman integral can be evaluated and shown to be proportional to $(q/\lambda) (\overline{u_i u_j} + \delta_{ij} q^2/3)$; here λ is interpreted as the mean free path and $\overline{u_i u_j}$ and q^2 the molecular velocity correlations. If $\partial U_i / \partial x_j \equiv O_{ij}(U/L)$ then it may be seen that $a = O[(\lambda/L) (U/q)] = O[(\text{Knudsen number}) (\text{Mach number})]$.

In principle, one can conceive of a nearly isotropic flow field on which is superposed a small mean strain (see Rose, 1966). In such a case, equations (1), (2), (8), and (12) should apply and it appears that a closure scheme must involve assumptions for the turbulent diffusion transport terms and the dissipation term in (8). Since (12) is the Reynolds stress transport equation,[†] a closure assumption must relate $\overline{u_i \partial p / \partial x_j}$ (or, what is nearly equivalent, an assumption for $\overline{p \partial u_i / \partial x_j}$ as discussed later) to $\overline{u_i u_j}$. If this is done by analogy to kinetic theory, a conventional Newtonian or Boussinesq constitutive relation will result.

[†] The logic behind the constructions of Bradshaw, Ferriss, and Atwell (1967), is not at all clear, in light of this, since an equation for $-\overline{uv}$ is obtained from the energy equation. It would seem that assumptions are being made about the wrong terms in the wrong equation.

4. TYPICAL TURBULENT FLOWS

The purpose of examining nearly isotropic turbulent flows was to preceive, under such simplifying circumstances, a framework for a model theory. Now an attempt will be made to set up model equations which certainly would include but not be restricted to nearly isotropic flow, and where, typically, the characteristic length scale is not particularly small. However, in seeking generality assumptions must be used as economically as possible. That is, wherever justified terms will be neglected in order to reduce the empiricism required while maintaining a maximum correlation with experiment. This will also serve to identify the most important empirical ingredients which can then be the focus of further research and improvement.

Although most flows of interest are of the parallel flow or boundary layer type where simplifications of the basic equations are possible, in the hope of achieving greater generality the initial treatment will be in terms of the full tensorial forms of the equations similar to the approach of Rotta (1951) and Donaldson and Rosenbaum (1968). The object will be to relate all terms in equation (7) to $\overline{u_i u_j}$.

Viscous terms: The viscous diffusion terms should be simple to deal with since

$$\overline{u_i \tau_{kj}} + \overline{u_j \tau_{ki}} = \nu \left[\overline{u_i \left(\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k} \right)} + \overline{u_j \left(\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} \right)} \right]$$

and it appears that the right side could be expressed in terms of gradients of $\overline{u_k u_i}$, etc., with no assumptions. However, it is easy to show that

$$\overline{u_i \tau_{kj}} + \overline{u_j \tau_{ki}} = \nu \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_j u_k}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_k}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_j}}{\partial x_k} \right), \quad (13)$$

plus, however, the additional non-conformal term

$$- \overline{u_k \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \right)} = - \left(\frac{\partial R_{ij}}{\partial r_j} + \frac{\partial R_{kj}}{\partial r_i} \right)_{\underline{r} = 0}, \quad (14)$$

where $R_{ij}(\underline{x}, \underline{r}) = \overline{u_i(\underline{x}) u_j(\underline{x}')}$ and $\underline{x}' = \underline{x} + \underline{r}$. Local isotropy is now assumed in the sense that, for small $\underline{r}$, R_{ij} is given by (see Batchelor, for example):

$$R_{ij}(\underline{x}, \underline{r}) \sim F(\underline{x}, r) r_i r_j + G(\underline{x}, r) \delta_{ij}, \quad \underline{r} \rightarrow 0 \quad (15)$$

and $4F + r(\partial F / \partial r) + (1/r) \partial G / \partial r = 0$. For small $\underline{r}$,

$$G = (q^2/3) [1 - r^2/\lambda^2 + O(r^4)] \quad \text{and} \quad F = (q^2/2) [1/(\lambda^2) + O(r^2)]$$

where λ is the Taylor microscale and $r = |\underline{r}|$. Therefore, it follows that the right-hand side of (14) is zero and (13) is complete. The validity of local isotropy has been debated since it was first proposed by Kolmogoroff (1941). However, for the present purposes it is probably approximately and sufficiently valid.

The same assumption simplifies the other viscous terms (which on contraction become the viscous dissipation). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\tau_{kj} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}} + \overline{\tau_{ki} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}} &= \nu \left(\overline{\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}} \right) \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} + \nu \left(\overline{\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}} \right) \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k} \\
&= \nu \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} + \nu \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k} + 2\nu \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}. \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

Each of the terms on the right side of (16) may be considered. First, it can be shown that

$$\left(\overline{\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_j}} \right) \left(\overline{\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}} \right) = - \left(\frac{\partial^2 R_{ik}}{\partial r_j \partial r_k} \right) \underline{r} = 0 + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[\left(\frac{\partial R_{ik}}{\partial r_k} \right) \underline{r} = 0 \right].$$

Once again assuming (15) to be valid, this term is seen to be zero.

The same is true for the second term. However, for the third term one obtains

$$\left(\overline{\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}} \right) \left(\overline{\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}} \right) = - \left(\frac{\partial^2 R_{ij}}{\partial r_k^2} \right) \underline{r} = 0 + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left[\left(\frac{\partial R_{ij}}{\partial r_k} \right) \underline{r} = 0 \right].$$

The second term on the right side of the above expression is again zero whereas, the first term is $(5q^2/3) \delta_{ij}/\lambda^2$. Therefore,

$$\overline{\tau_{kj} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}} + \overline{\tau_{ki} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}} = \frac{2}{3} \epsilon \delta_{ij}, \quad (17a)$$

where

$$\epsilon = \nu \frac{5q^2/3}{\lambda^2} \quad (17b)$$

is the dissipation function as defined in (9).

The expression for the dissipation is now assumed to be of the form,

$$\epsilon = \frac{q^3}{\Lambda}, \quad (18)$$

where later on the stipulation will be made that the dissipation length, Λ , is independent of viscosity except near a wall. The jump from (17b) to (18) is, of course, an important step which most researchers who have designed turbulent flow models have adopted. It is based on the experimental evidence in wakes, jets, and in homogeneous turbulence that, so long as the Reynolds number is large, the dissipation of energy is essentially independent of viscosity. The accepted explanation is that ϵ is determined by the large scale eddies, that is to say it is fixed by (18). In spectral wave number space the energy cascades toward larger wave numbers (and smaller eddies) until it is dissipated according to (17b) at some large wave number proportional to λ^{-1} , so that λ adjusts itself in order that (17b) is satisfied. Thus, in a given flow with fixed large scales and velocities (Λ and q are fixed) it develops that $\lambda^2 \propto \nu$. Although this is a widely accepted explanation, it lacks mathematical precision. (It is likely that this situation can be corrected by application of the Method of Matched Asymptotic Expansion to the two point correlation equations; this point of view will be developed in a future paper.)

Very near a wall, viscosity should reappear in equation (18) so that $\Lambda \sim (q/\nu)$ (length scale)² as $y \rightarrow 0$.

Summarizing, (17a) and (18) can be combined and written

$$\overline{\tau_{kj} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k}} + \overline{\tau_{ki} \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_k}} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{q^3}{\Lambda} \delta_{ij}, \quad (19)$$

which together with (13) represents a model for the viscous terms.

Pressure-velocity terms: The important hypothesis which will be adopted for the pressure-velocity terms in equation (7) is that due to Rotta (1951);* that is

$$\overline{p \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}} \approx - \frac{1}{6} \frac{q}{\ell_1} \left(\overline{u_i u_j} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3} q^2 \right), \quad (20)$$

to which we add the traditional assumption for the flux of a scalar quantity

$$\overline{p u_i} = \frac{q \ell_2}{3} \frac{\partial q^2}{\partial x_i}. \quad (21)$$

The length scale quantities ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 will be discussed later.

Rotta (1951) discussed the physical basis of (20) so that here it is noted that formally the hypothesis may be broken down into three separate statements: (1) that $\overline{p \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}} = C_{ijklm} \overline{u_k u_m}$; (2) that the constitutive coefficient is an isotropic tensor, and (3) that $\overline{p \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i}}$ vanishes. The first two statements are assumptions; the third, of course, is not.

Note that in equation (7) the component equations for $\overline{u_1^2}$, $\overline{u_2^2}$, $\overline{u_3^2}$, involve the terms $\overline{p \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1}}$, $\overline{p \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x_2}}$, and $\overline{p \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x_3}}$, respectively. As pointed out by Rotta, these terms represent energy flows between the

* The material in Section 3, was presented by the first author at the Symposium on Turbulent Structure, Southampton, 1967, and was the basis for proposing (20) in ignorance of Rotta's work 16 years earlier.

component energies depending on the level of anisotropy. Their sum is zero so that they do not represent a net flow of total kinetic energy. Equation (20) conforms to these notions.

Equation (21) is only one of two candidates[†] which coalesce, however, in the limit as isotropy is approached.

Triple-velocity terms: The terms remaining are $\overline{u_k u_i u_j}$ in equation (7). In principle, one could appeal to higher moments of equation (4) - and so on and so on. However, this model will be closed by assuming that

$$\overline{u_i u_j u_k} = q \ell_3 \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_j u_k}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_k}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_j}}{\partial x_k} \right). \quad (22)$$

Equation (22) is only one of three candidates;^{*} it is chosen simply by analogy to equation (13) which can be termed viscous diffusion whereas (22) could be termed kinetic diffusion.

[†] If one assumes that $\overline{p u_i} = C_{ijk m} \partial \overline{u_j u_k} / \partial x_m$, and that $C_{ijk m}$ is an isotropic tensor, we obtain a term proportional to $\partial \overline{u_i u_m} / \partial x_m$ in addition to (21).

^{*} If one assumes that $\overline{u_i u_j u_k} = C_{ijklmn} \partial u_l u_m / \partial x_n$, requires that C_{ijklmn} be isotropic and requires symmetry in i, j, k , C_{ijklmn} would reduce to a form such that we obtain terms proportional to $\delta_{ij} \partial q^2 / \partial x_k + \delta_{jk} \partial q^2 / \partial x_i + \delta_{ki} \partial q^2 / \partial x_j$ and $\delta_{ij} \partial \overline{u_k u_m} / \partial x_m + \delta_{jk} \partial \overline{u_i u_m} / \partial x_m + \delta_{ik} \partial \overline{u_j u_m} / \partial x_m$ in addition to (22). In the isotropic limit all of the expressions would collapse to the first expression.

5. MTF EQUATIONS - VISCOELASTIC FORM

If equations (13), (17a), and (18), (20), (21), and (22) are substituted into (7) the result is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D}{Dt} \overline{u_i u_j} = & \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left[(\nu + q \ell_3) \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_j u_k}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_k}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_j}}{\partial x_k} \right) + \frac{q \ell_2}{2} \left(\delta_{ki} \frac{\partial q^2}{\partial x_i} + \delta_{ki} \frac{\partial q^2}{\partial x_j} \right) \right] \\ & - \overline{u_k u_i} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_k} - \overline{u_k u_j} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_k} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{q}{\ell_1} (\overline{u_i u_j} - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3} q^2) - \frac{2}{3} \frac{q^3}{\Lambda} \delta_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Note that the system of equations represented by (1), (2), and (23) is closed providing empirical statements concerning ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , ℓ_3 , and Λ can be meaningfully postulated. The energy equation, corresponding to equation (8) may be obtained by contracting (23) and dividing by 2.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D}{Dt} \overline{q^2/2} = & \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left[(\nu + q \ell_3) \left(\frac{\partial \overline{q^2/2}}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_i u_k}}{\partial x_i} \right) + q \ell_2 \frac{\partial q^2/2}{\partial x_k} \right] \\ & - \overline{u_k u_i} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_k} - \frac{q^3}{\Lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The Two-Dimensional Boundary Layer Approximation: The boundary layer approximation to equations (1), (2), and (23), whereby derivatives with respect to x are neglected relative to derivatives with respect to y are as follows:

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{DU}{Dt} = - \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(-\overline{uv} + v \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right), \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D\overline{v^2}}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[3 (v + q\ell_3) \frac{\partial \overline{v^2}}{\partial y} + q\ell_2 \frac{\partial q^2}{\partial y} \right] \\ - \frac{1}{3} \frac{q}{\ell_1} (\overline{v^2} - \frac{1}{3} q^2) - \frac{2}{3} \frac{q^3}{\Lambda}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$\frac{D\overline{u^2}}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[(v + q\ell_3) \frac{\partial \overline{u^2}}{\partial y} \right] - \frac{1}{3} \frac{q}{\ell_1} (\overline{u^2} - \frac{1}{3} q^2) - \frac{2}{3} \frac{q^3}{\Lambda} - 2\overline{uv} \frac{\partial U}{\partial y}, \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{D\overline{w^2}}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[(v + q\ell_3) \frac{\partial \overline{w^2}}{\partial y} \right] - \frac{1}{3} \frac{q}{\ell_1} (\overline{w^2} - \frac{1}{3} q^2) - \frac{2}{3} \frac{q^3}{\Lambda}, \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{D\overline{uv}}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[2(v + q\ell_3) \frac{\partial \overline{uv}}{\partial y} \right] - \frac{1}{3} \frac{q}{\ell_1} \overline{uv} - \overline{v^2} \frac{\partial U}{\partial y}. \quad (30)$$

The equations have here been specialized to two-dimensional mean flow, but, of course, the full three-dimensional equations are easily obtained.

6. MTF EQUATIONS - NEWTONIAN FORM

The Newtonian version of equation (23) is attractive since the number of equations to be solved is considerably reduced. The equations are

$$\frac{Dq^2/2}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left[\left(\frac{5}{3} v + \frac{5}{3} q \ell_3 + q \ell_2 \right) \frac{\partial q^2/2}{\partial x_k} \right] - \overline{u_k u_i} \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_k} - \frac{q^3}{\Lambda}, \quad (31)$$

and

$$- \overline{u_i u_j} + \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3} q^2 = q \ell_1 \left(\frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} \right). \quad (32)$$

Together with (1) and (2), (31) and (32) comprise a closed set of equations after ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , ℓ_3 , and Λ have been specified.

As discussed in Section 3, equation (31) may be obtained formally from (23) by contraction. Then one substitutes $\overline{u_i u_j} = (\delta_{ij} + a_{ij}) q^2/3$ in (23) and subtracts the product of (31) and $\delta_{ij}/3$ - term by term. One then lets $a = [a_{ij}]^{1/2} = (U/q) O(\ell/L)$ as $\ell/L \rightarrow 0$ and obtains equation (32).

Boundary Layer Approximation: The boundary layer approximation to (31) and (32) is

$$\frac{Dq^2/2}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[\left(q \ell_2 + \frac{5}{3} v + \frac{5}{3} q \ell_3 \right) \frac{\partial q^2/2}{\partial y} \right] - \overline{uv} \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} - \frac{q^3}{\Lambda} \quad (33)$$

$$- \overline{uv} = q \ell_1 \frac{\partial U}{\partial y}, \quad (34)$$

which together with (25) and (26) form a closed set of boundary layer equations. Furthermore, (34) may be inserted into (26) so that (26) and

(33) are similar in form and may be solved simultaneously for $U(x,y)$ and $q(x,y)$; such a relatively simple system is attractive from a computational point of view.

Now (33) and (34) may be compared with (27) - (30). First of all, (33) can be obtained directly from (27), (28), and (29) by addition and by approximating $\overline{3v^2} + \overline{u^2} + \overline{w^2} = (1.67) q^2$ which is, of course, true only for isotropic turbulence. Based on the channel flow data of Laufer (1954) and the boundary layer data of Klebanoff (1955) one finds that

$$a_{ij} \approx \begin{bmatrix} .70, & .40, & 0 \\ .40, & .55, & 0 \\ 0, & 0, & .15 \end{bmatrix} \quad (35)$$

over a large portion of the layers. Therefore, one obtains $\overline{3v^2} + \overline{u^2} + \overline{w^2} = (2.13) q^2$. In jets and wakes a result closer to the isotropic expression is obtained.

However, the most significant difference between the "viscoelastic" and "Newtonian" forms is, in fact, that associated with their labels; the former contains the term $\overline{Duv}/Dt$ (which, if equated to $\overline{v^2} \partial U / \partial y$ would represent elastic behavior) in (30), whereas it has been neglected in (34). To assess the importance of this Reynolds stress advective term the best test might be to compare the ratio of $\overline{D(q^2/2)}/Dt$ to $\overline{uv} \partial U / \partial y$ with the ratio of $\overline{Duv}/Dt$ to $\overline{v^2} \partial U / \partial y$. Thus, from the values of a_{ij} given above and neglecting $\overline{D a_{ij}}/Dt$ we obtain

$$\frac{\overline{Duv}/Dt}{\overline{Dq^2/2}/Dt} \frac{\overline{v^2} \partial U / \partial y}{\overline{uv} \partial U / \partial y} \approx \frac{2a_{12}^2}{3(1 + a_{22})} \approx 0.25. \quad (36)$$

Similarly, in assessing the relative role of the diffusion terms in (30) and (34) one obtains a value of about 0.15.

Finally, it should be noted that after neglecting the advective and diffusion terms in (30) one would obtain $-uv = 3(\overline{v^2}/q) \ell_1 \partial U/\partial y$. Again referring to the a_{ij} numbers one finds that $3\overline{v^2}/q = .45 q$. Thus, due to the isotropy assumption, the constitutive coefficient in (34) is "in error" by factor of about 2. However, in practice this factor is simply absorbed into the definition of ℓ_1 .

7. MVF CLOSURE REVISITED

The relationship between the Newtonian form of the MTF equation and the viscoelastic form has been shown. Structurally, the difference amounts to the neglect of the diffusion-like term and the advective term in the Reynolds stress transport equation. By the same token one can now see how the still simpler MVF closure is related to MTF closure. Thus, if one also neglects the diffusion and advective terms in the energy equation (33) and combines with (34), the result is

$$-\overline{uv} = (\Lambda^{1/3} \ell)^{3/2} \left| \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right| \frac{\partial U}{\partial y},$$

including the correct placement of the modulus symbol. The same result may be obtained by neglecting the diffusion and advection terms in equations (27) - (30). Thus, MVF closure, as discussed in Part I, may now be regarded as an approximation to MTF closure.*

The question is now: which of the three possible closure schemes (or even some intermediate scheme) is to be preferred? There is no clear answer to this question. Obviously, since MVF closure yields such good results in the case of boundary layer flows and since it is relatively simple, it will continue to be useful. Also, it stands as a warning with respect to the evaluation of new or more complicated models; that is, models that are more complex or purport to contain more physics may seem to work well even if the physics are wrong so long as the model is dominated by MVF-like elements.

* It may also be shown that the functional forms cited in Section 8 may be transformed to the functional forms for v_t in Part I. To a fair approximation the specific functions are the same.

8. EMPIRICAL POSTULATES FOR ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , ℓ_3 , AND Λ AS USED IN EQUATIONS (33) AND (34)

There are, however, several incentives to move on to the consideration of more complicated models - and the authors believe that this automatically implies MTF closure as the next logical step. The first is the purely scientific motivation to try and understand the nature of turbulent flow fields as well as their concomitant velocity fields; furthermore, it is satisfying to create the ability to predict turbulent fields for comparison with data. And, as has been shown, the consideration of MTF closure allows one to look back and view MTF closure in proper perspective; later an attempt will be made to understand why MTF closure seems to work well. A second incentive is simply that one would hope to continue embracing a larger range of flow cases with less empirical content or at least empirical content which need not be altered to fit specific classes of flows.

Having decided to pursue MTF closure, it was natural to exploit the simpler Newtonian form first and leave the viscoelastic form for future work. It was felt that the Newtonian form of MTF closure deserved clear identification in a systematic investigation of closure schemes. The Newtonian form is closest to classic concepts of transport physics and it will be seen that, at this level, there are things to be learned. Specifically, it is a relatively simple basis on which to seek out empirical determinations of ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 , ℓ_3 , and Λ which, according to this paper, can be corrected and applied to the viscoelastic form. Furthermore, when work is extended to the viscoelastic form there will be some background against which to measure its efficacy.

Trial and error calculations indicate that $(5\ell_3/3 + \ell_2)/\ell_1 = 1 \pm .10$. Therefore, a first simplifying assumption that $\ell = \ell_1 = (5\ell_3/3 + \ell_2)$ may be made. Thus one need only search for empirical statements for ℓ and Λ . From experience gained in Part I and in Mellor (1970) there is very little doubt as to the next step. Therefore,

- i. near a wall one assumes that $\ell = \text{fcn}(y, q, \nu)$. Therefore^{*}

$$\frac{\ell q}{\nu} = \varphi_{\ell}(\chi) ; \chi = \frac{qy}{\nu} ,$$

- ii. far from the wall one assumes that $\ell = \text{fcn}(y, q, Q)$ where Q is as yet undefined except that it will have dimensions of kinematic viscosity. Thus,

$$\frac{\ell q}{Q} = \bar{\varphi}_{\ell}(X) ; X = \frac{qy}{Q} ,$$

- iii. it is assumed that an overlap layer exists such that $\nu\varphi = Q\bar{\varphi}$. Since φ_{ℓ} and $\bar{\varphi}_{\ell}$ are universal and the right side of this expression is independent of viscosity, then

$$\varphi_{\ell} = k_{\ell} \chi \text{ and } \bar{\varphi}_{\ell} = k_{\ell} X$$

in the overlap layer. k_{ℓ} is an arbitrary constant. Now as before the above procedure is regarded as a way of obtaining inner and outer functions as in the MMAE (the small parameter can be identified as ν/Q). Thus φ_{ℓ} is the

* Note the question of "eddy viscosity" models versus "mixing length" models is now eliminated since $\nu_t \equiv q\ell$.

inner function whose outer asymptote is $k_\ell X$ whereas Φ_ℓ is the outer function whose inner asymptote is $k_\ell X$. Therefore, a composite function can be written

$$\ell q = v\varphi_\ell(X) + Q\Phi_\ell(X) = k_\ell \begin{cases} vX \\ \text{or} \\ QX \end{cases}, \quad (37)$$

where $X = X(v/Q)$.

Similarly, two functions φ_Λ and Φ_Λ are needed to specify Λ according

to

$$\Lambda q = v\varphi_\Lambda(X) + Q\Phi_\Lambda(X) = k_\Lambda \begin{cases} vX \\ \text{or} \\ QX \end{cases}. \quad (38)$$

As with the quantity N in Part I the quantity Q can probably be defined in a number of ways; viz, $Q \equiv \delta q$ where δ is some edge of the boundary layer or $Q \equiv \int_0^\infty q \, dy$ where the assumption is made that $q \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$ (otherwise use the quantity $q - q_\infty$). Here, the latter was chosen for the reason that it is well defined mathematically, and it is consistent with the authors' earlier MVF work which enjoyed considerable success. However, the former definition would probably work well.

9. COMPARISON WITH DATA

With due regard for the asymptotic behavior of φ_λ and φ_Λ as $\chi \rightarrow 0^*$ (see Mellor and Herring 1968), the functions shown in Figure 1 are proposed where the constants have been adjusted to best match the velocity and kinetic energy profiles of Klebanoff's (1955) constant pressure case and, in the inner layer, the pipe flow data of Laufer (1954). The calculations (see Herring and Mellor 1970 for numerical program details) are based on equations (1), (2), (33), (34), (37), and (38) of the present paper.

The boundary conditions are

$$U(x,0) = 0, \quad (39a)$$

$$V(x,0) = 0, \quad (39b)$$

$$U_\infty(x) - U(x,y) \sim y^{-n} \text{ as } y \rightarrow \infty, \quad (39c)$$

$$U(y, x_0) = U_0(y), \quad (39d)$$

$$q(x,0) = 0, \quad (40a)$$

$$q(x,y) \sim y^{-n} \text{ as } y \rightarrow \infty, \quad (40b)$$

$$q(x_0, y) = q_0(y), \quad (40c)$$

where $n > 1$.

* Near the wall (33) reduces to $(5\nu/3) \partial^2(q^2/2)/\partial y^2 = q^3/\Lambda$. In order that $q^2 = O(y^2)$ one must have $\Lambda \sim (3/5) qy^2/\nu$ or $\varphi_\Lambda \sim (3/5) \chi^2$ as $y \rightarrow 0$ which is consistent with the previous discussion of equation (18). The factor 5/3 was not carried along in Mellor and Herring (1968), but the final results are equivalent. In this regard it is noted that the actual empirical numbers associated with Λ in equations (27) - (29) will differ somewhat from Λ in (33) since the factor (5/3) in (33) derives from the stipulation of isotropic velocity field which would not, in fact, be obtained from (27) - (30).

Figure 1. Inner and outer functions which together with equations (37) and (38) completely specify ℓ and Λ .

Thus, the five free constants in φ_ℓ , φ_Λ , $\bar{\varphi}_\ell$, $\bar{\varphi}_\Lambda$ have been adjusted so that the close agreement of theory and data shown in Figure 2 is achieved. As in previous MVF experience the hope is that, without further empirical adjustment, the basic theory will correctly predict velocity and turbulent energy profiles for arbitrary pressure gradients and other boundary layer variables.

A good deal of comparison with data has fortunately already been achieved, since in Mellor and Herring (1968 II), calculations showed that all of the integral parameters of the Stanford Symposium could be predicted quite well. The surprising result was that the predictions were no better nor worse than predictions using the simple MVF model. This will be discussed below. Lacking in the material presented at the Stanford meeting - aside from the supporting analytical work presented here - was a comparison of turbulent energy profile predictions with data. Therefore, in Figure 3 and 4 calculated profiles are compared with some data obtained by Bradshaw (1965, 1969). The mean velocity profile comparison of Figure 3 is not especially favorable but it must be noted that the calculations of this particular flow by almost all participants of the Stanford Conference compared badly with the data. Despite the peculiarly poor prediction of mean velocities in Figure 3, the overall evidence (including a great many other comparisons of velocity profiles where turbulence measurements were not available), indicates that both velocity and turbulent energy profiles can be predicted quite well.

A somewhat more detailed way of looking at the output of the model is to examine profiles of advection, production, dissipation, and diffusion. Thus we define,

Figure 2a. Mean velocity and turbulent energy in the wall region.
Data by Klebanoff (1955).

Figure 2b. Mean velocity and turbulent energy in the outer region.
Data by Klebanoff (1955).

Figure 3. Comparison of mean velocity, Reynolds stress, mean turbulent energy calculations, and data for a boundary layer responding to a sudden removal of pressure gradient. Data by Bradshaw and Ferriss (1965).

Figure 4. Comparison of mean velocity, Reynolds stress, mean turbulent energy calculations, and data for a boundary layer responding to a sudden application of an adverse pressure gradient. Data by Bradshaw (1969).

$$A^* \equiv \frac{\nu}{u_\tau^4} \left[U \frac{\partial q^2/2}{\partial x} + \nu \frac{\partial q^2/2}{\partial y} \right], \quad (41a)$$

$$P^* \equiv \frac{\nu}{u_\tau^4} \left[- \overline{uv} \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right], \quad (41b)$$

$$D^* \equiv \frac{\nu}{u_\tau^4} \left[\frac{q^3}{\Lambda} \right], \quad (41c)$$

$$C^* \equiv \frac{\nu}{u_\tau^4} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left\{ \left(\frac{5}{3} \nu + q\ell \right) \right\} \frac{\partial q^2/2}{\partial y} \right], \quad (41d)$$

where $A^* + P^* + D^* + C^* = 0$. Typical results are given in Figures 5 and 6.

The results shown in Figure 5 can be compared to the data obtained by Klebanoff (1955) which is also cited and discussed by Townsend (1956) and Rotta (1962). First of all, A^* and P^* appear to be correct. This is not surprising since these are terms about which no empiricism is required. Correspondingly, the data are relatively easy to obtain. However, there are differences in D^* and C^* which might indicate that future adjustments may be in order (for example, the value of $-D^*$ appears too large in the vicinity of $yu_\tau/\nu \simeq 10$). However, it is just these terms about which there exists some experimental uncertainty. Therefore, judgment on such a detailed level as that required by Figure 5 will, for the present, be withheld.

Figure 5a. Advection, production, dissipation, and diffusion terms in the wall region. From calculations also plotted in Figure 2a. A^* is essentially zero in this region.

Figure 5b. Advection, production, dissipation, and diffusion terms in the outer region. From calculations also plotted in Figure 2b.

Figure 6a. Advection, production, dissipation, and diffusion terms in the wall region. From calculations also plotted in Figure 3. A^* is essentially zero in this region.

Figure 6b. Advection, production, dissipation, and diffusion terms in the outer region. From calculations also plotted in Figure 4.

10. HISTORY

At the Stanford Symposium there was a great deal of discussion concerning the importance of "history" in turbulent boundary layer development although the definition of the word itself remained somewhat obscure. Here, "history" is interpreted to mean the terms DU/Dt , Dq^2/Dt (or its components) and $\overline{Duv}/Dt$ in the mean momentum, energy and Reynolds stress equations. From the discussion in Section 6, $\overline{Duv}/Dt$ was concluded to be relatively less important than Dq^2/Dt . Here the assertion is made that in the prediction of mean velocity profiles it is possible to neglect Dq^2/Dt ; while this can result in errors in q^2 , the error in predicting all of boundary layer velocity profile data collected at the Stanford Symposium is negligible. Thus, MVF closure does represent a useful and simple procedure in many cases.

11. CONCLUDING REMARKS

While MVF models perform rather well, MTF models hold considerable promise in advancing our understanding and the capability to predict a wider range of turbulent flows. Furthermore, the turbulent energy profiles themselves are also predicted.

The basic framework for modeling transiting flows exists in MTF models. Although Glushko (1965) and Donaldson (1969) did not succeed quantitatively in predicting transition in their MTF models, nevertheless the possibility for future improvements does exist. Perhaps the greatest potential exists in treating flow with body force effects, such as centrifugal or buoyancy terms, in which case new terms appear that feed energy directly into $\overline{v^2}$, equation (27), and therefore directly effect $\overline{uv}$ through equation (30). The question is: can equations (25) - (30) correctly account for these effects without empirical alterations of the functions, ℓ and Λ ? (With MVF closure empirical alterations are clearly necessary. For stratified flow the necessity of introducing a Monin-Obukhov length, for example, exists.) This question remains to be answered.

This paper has been concerned with the proposal of a reasonable framework for MTF closure. Central to MTF models (and MVF models as well since they are a simplification of MTF models) is the Rotta hypothesis, equation (20). Because of its importance one would expect it to be the focus of future research. An integral expression can be obtained for either $\overline{p \partial u_i / \partial x_j}$ or $\overline{u_i \partial p / \partial x_j}$. The latter yields the simplest expression and it is advantageous to proceed on that basis. Note that if $\overline{\partial p u_i / \partial x_j} = 0$ as it would be for homogenous flow the two terms are equal. On the

other hand, the terms, $\overline{u_i \partial p / \partial x_j}$, appear directly in (6) and perhaps, in the first place, need not have been reconstituted as in (7).

By taking the divergence of (4) Poisson's equation for p is obtained. Poisson's integral may then be written

$$p(\underline{x}) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \iiint \left[2 \frac{\partial U'_\ell}{\partial x'_m} \frac{\partial u'_m}{\partial x'_\ell} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'_j \partial x'_m} (u'_\ell u'_m - \overline{u'_\ell u'_m}) \right] \frac{dx'_j}{r},$$

where $\underline{x}' = \underline{x} + \underline{r}$ and $U'_\ell = U_\ell(\underline{x}')$, etc.

Finally,

$$\overline{u_i \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \iiint \left[2 \frac{\partial U'_\ell}{\partial r_m} \frac{\partial R_{im}}{\partial r_\ell} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_\ell \partial r_m} S_{ilm} \right] \frac{r_j}{r^3} d\underline{r}, \quad (41)$$

where $R_{im}(\underline{x}, \underline{r}) = u_i(\underline{x}) u_m(\underline{x} + \underline{r})$ and $S_{ilm} = \overline{u_i(\underline{x}) u_\ell(\underline{x} + \underline{r}) u_m(\underline{x} + \underline{r})}$.

No further discussion is offered except to note that it must be considered a challenge of future research to either rationally justify the jump from (41) to the expression, $\overline{u_i \partial p / \partial x_j} \propto u_i u_j - \delta_{ij} q^2/3$ or suggest an alternative.

A further challenge to future research is to provide equations or a more rational means of proscribing the length scales ℓ and Λ . In this regard Rotta (1951) has already made some proposals.

REFERENCES

- Beckwith, I.E. and Bushnell, D.M. (1968) Calculation of mean and fluctuating properties of the incompressible turbulent boundary layer. Proceedings - Computation of Turbulent Boundary Layers, Vol. I - 1968 AFOSR-IFP - Stanford Conference, Stanford University Mechanical Engineering Dept.
- Bradshaw, P. (1969) The response of a constant pressure turbulent boundary layer to the sudden application of an adverse pressure gradient. A.R.C. R. & M. No.3575.
- Bradshaw, P. and Ferriss, D.H. (1965) The response of a retarded equilibrium turbulent boundary layer to the sudden removal of pressure gradient. N.P.L. Aero Rept. 1145. A.R.C. 26758.
- Bradshaw, P., Ferris, D.H., and Atwell, M.P. (1967) Calculation of boundary layer development using the turbulent energy equation. J. Fluid Mech. 28, 593.
- Cebeci, T., Smith, A.M.O. and Mosinskis, C. (1969) Calculation of compressible adiabatic turbulent boundary layers, AIAA Paper No. 69, 687.
- Corrsin, S. (1953) Interpretation of viscous terms in the turbulent energy equation. J. Aero Sc. (Dec.).
- Donaldson, C. duP. and Rosenbaum, H. (1968) Calculation of the turbulent shear flows through closure of the Reynolds equations by invariant modeling. ARAP Rept. No. 127.
- Donaldson, C. duP. (1969) A computer study of an analytical model of boundary layer transition. AIAA Jour. Vol. 7, No. 2, 271-278.
- Glushko, C.S. (1965) Turbulent boundary layer on a flat plate in an incompressible fluid. Acad. Nauk, U.S.S.R., S. Mekhan, No. 4, 13. (Translation, NASA TT-F-10,080).
- Herring, H.J. and Mellor, G.L. (1968) A method of calculating compressible turbulent boundary layers. NASA CR-1144.
- Herring, H.J. and Mellor, G.L. (1970) A computer program to calculate incompressible laminar and turbulent boundary layer development. NASA CR-1564.
- Klebanoff, P.S. (1955) Characteristics of turbulence in a boundary layer with zero pressure gradient. NACA Rept. 1247.
- Kolmogoroff, A.N. (1941) The local structure of turbulence in incompressible viscous fluid for very large Reynolds number. C.R. Acad. Sci., U.S.S.R., 30, 301: for English translation see Friedlander, S.K. and Topper, L. (Editors) (1961) Turbulence, classic papers on statistical theory, Interscience Publishers, Inc.

Laufer, J. (1954) The structure of turbulence in fully developed pipe flow. NACA Rept. 1247.

Mellor, G.L. and Herring, H.J. (1968) Two methods of calculating turbulent boundary layer behavior based on numerical solutions of the equations of motion. I, Mean Velocity Field Method; II, Mean Turbulent Field Method. Proceedings - Computation of Turbulent Boundary Layers, Vol. I - 1968 AFOSR-IFP - Stanford Conference, Stanford University Mechanical Engineering Dept.

Prandtl, L. (1925) Über die ausgebildete turbulenz. Z. Angew. Math. Mech. 5, 136; also (1926) Proceedings of the 2nd International Congress of Applied Mechanics, Zurich.

Rotta, J.C. (1951) Statistische theorie nichthomogener turbulenz. Z. Physik 129, 547-572, and 131, 51-77.

Rotta, J.C. (1962) Turbulent boundary layers in incompressible flow. Progress in Aeronautical Sciences, Vol. 2, Pergamon Press.

Townsend, A.A. (1956) The structure of turbulent shear flow, Cambridge University Press.

DISTRIBUTION:

Arizona State University
Mech. Eng. Dept.
Attn: Prof. Warren Rice,
Chairman
Tempe, Arizona 85281

Brown University
Div. of Engineering
Attn: Prof. William Prager
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

California Insti. of Tech.
Graduate Aeronautical Labs.
Attn: Prof. Toshi Kubota
Pasadena, California 91100

Carnegie Mellon Insti. of Tech.
College of Eng. and Science
Attn: Prof. M. Gurtin
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Case Western Reserve University
Fluid, Thermal and Aerospace
Sciences Dept
Attn: Prof. S. Ostrach,
Chairman
10900 Euclid Ave
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Catholic University of America
School of Eng. and Architecture
Attn: Prof. C. C. Chang
620 Michigan Ave, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20017

Colorado State University
Engineering College
Attn: Prof. B. Marschner, Dean
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

Cornell Aeronautical Lab., Inc.
4455 Genesee Street
P. O. Box 235
Buffalo, New York 14225

Cornell University
Graduate School of Aerospace Eng.
Attn: Prof. E. J. Resler, Jr.
Ithaca, New York 14850

Georgia Insti. of Tech.
Department of Aerospace Engineering
Attn: Prof. A. L. Ducoffe,
Chairman
225 North Ave., N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Harvard University
Div of Eng. and Applied Science
Attn: Prof. G. F. Carrier
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Illinois Institute of Tech
Dept of Mech & Aerospace Eng.
Attn: Prof. A. A. Fejer,
Chairman
Chicago, Illinois 60616

IIT Research Institute
Attn: Dr. H. Obremski
Chicago, Illinois 60616

Iowa State University of Science
& Technology
College of Engineering
Dept of Aerospace Eng.
Attn: Prof. E. W. Anderson
Chairman
Ames, Iowa 50010

Johns Hopkin University
Applied Physics Laboratory
Attn: Prof. S. Corrsin
Charles & Thirty-Fourth St.
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Kansas State University
College of Engineering
Mechanical Engineering Dept.
Attn: Prof. Fred Appl
Manhattan, Kansas 66504

Lehigh University
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. J. A. Owczarek
Bethlehem, Penn. 18105

Louisiana State University &
Agricultural and Mechanical
College
College of Engineering
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Massachusetts Insti. of Tech.
Air Force Lincoln Lab Liaison
Office
P. O. Box 73
Lexington, Massa. 02173

Massachusetts Insti. of Tech.
Dept of Mech. Eng.
Attn: Prof. Ronald F. Probststein
Prof. James A. Fay
Cambridge, Massa. 02139

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

Massachusetts Insti. of Tech.
Naval Supersonic Lab.
560 Memorial Drive

Attn: Prof. Eugene E. Covert
Cambridge, Massa. 02139

Mississippi State University
School of Engineering
State College, Mississippi 39762

New Mexico State University
College of Engineering
Mech. Eng. Dept.

Attn: Prof. Quinton Ford,
Head
University Park, New Mexico 88070

New Mexico State University
Physical Science Laboratory
University Park, New Mexico 88070

New York University
Guggenheim Aerospace Labs.

Attn: Prof. V. Zakkay
University Heights
Bronx, New York 10453

North Carolina State University
at Raleigh

School of Mechanical Eng.
Dept of Mech. Eng.
Attn: Prof. H. A. Hassan
Prof. Robert W. Truitt
Hillsboro Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Northeastern University
College of Engineering
360 Huntington Ave.
Boston, Massa. 02115

Northwestern University
Technological Institute
Attn: Prof. David Mintzer
619 Clark
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Oklahoma State University
College of Engineering
Mechanical Engineering
Attn: Prof. W. Bryan Brooks
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Oregon State University
School of Engineering
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Pennsylvania State University
College of Engineering
Dept of Aeronautical Eng.

Attn: Prof. G. F. Wislicenus,
Chairman
University Park, Pennsylvania
16801

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Graduate Center of Engineering
Dept of Aerospace Eng.

Attn: Dean Martin H. Bloom
Prof. Gino Moretti
Route 110
Farmingdale, New York 11735

Princeton University (150)
Dept of Aerospace and Mechanical
Engineering

Forrestal Research Center
Attn: George L. Mellor
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Purdue University
School of Engineering
Mech. Eng. Dept.

Attn: Prof. Peter McFadden
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
School of Engineering

Attn: Prof. J. V. Foa
Troy, New York 12100

Rice University
Div. of Science and Eng.
Mech. Eng. Dept.

Attn: Prof. Allen Chapman,
Chairman
Houston, Texas 77001

San Diego State College
School of Engineering
Dept of Aerospace Eng.

Attn: Prof. S. Dharmarajan,
Chairman
5402 College Avenue
San Diego, California 92115

Stanford University
Dept of Aeronautics and Astro-
nautics

Attn: Prof. Nicholas J. Hoff
Prof. D. Bershader
Stanford, California 94305

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

State University of Iowa
College of Engineering
Mech. Eng. Dept.
Attn: Prof. T. P. Anderson
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Stevens Insti. of Tech.
Castle Point Station
Attn: Prof. J. P. Breslin
Hoboken, New Jersey 07030

State U. of N. Y. at Buffalo
Dept. of Eng. and Appl. Science
Attn: Prof. J. Gordon Hall
Buffalo, New York 14214

Syracuse University
L. C. Smith College of Eng.
Syracuse, New York 13210

The Ohio State University
College of Eng.
Aeronautics & Astronautics
Research Laboratory
Attn: Prof. John Lee,
Director
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Texas Agri. and Mech. University
Dept of Aerospace Eng.
Attn: Prof. A. E. Cronk
Chairman
College Station, Texas 77843

University of Alabama
College of Eng.
University, Alabama 35486

University of Arkansas
College of Engineering
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

University of California
College of Eng.,
Berkeley Campus
Aero Sciences Dept
Attn: Prof. Lawrence Talbot
Berkeley, California 94720

University of California at Davis
Dept. of Mech. Eng.
Attn: Prof. Harry A. Dwyer
Davis, California

U. of California at L. A.
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. A. F. Charwat
405 Hilgard Ave.
Los Angeles, California 90024

U. of Southern California
Aerospace Science Lab.
Attn: Prof. H. K. Cheng
Prof. John Laufer
University Park
Los Angeles, California 90007

U. of Cincinnati
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. R. P. Harrington
Clifton Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

University of Colorado
Dept of Aerospace Eng. Science
Attn: Prof. M. S. Uveroi,
Chairman
1200 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302

University of Detroit
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. G. Nevill
4001 McNichols Road, W.
Detroit, Michigan 48223

University of Florida
College of Engineering
Gainesville, Florida 32601

University of Idaho
College of Engineering
Moscow, Idaho 83843

University of Illinois
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. H. H. Korst
Prof. H. S. Stillwell
Urbana, Illinois 61801

University of Ill. at Chicago
Circle
College of Engineering
Dept. of Energy Eng.
Attn: Prof. P. M. Chung
Chicago, Illinois 60680

University of Kansas
School of Eng. & Arch.
Dept. of Aero and Mech. Eng.
Attn: Prof. D. L. Kohlman
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

University of Kentucky
College of Engineering
Mech. Eng. Dept.
Attn: Prof. R. Eichhorn,
Chairman
S. Limestone & Euclid
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

University of Maryland
Glen L. Martin College of
Engineering
Attn: Prof. R. Thomas
College Park, Maryland 20742

University of Michigan
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. Pauline Sherman
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

University of Minnesota
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. E. R. G. Eckert
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

University of Missouri
College of Engineering
Mech. Eng. & Astro Sciences
Attn: Prof. R. C. Warder
Columbia, Missouri 65201

University of Nebraska
College of Eng. & Arch.
Mech. Eng. Dept.
Attn: Prof. Don Hayward,
Chairman
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

University of New Mexico
College of Engineering
Mech. Eng. Dept.
Attn: Prof. V. Skoglund
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

University of Notre Dame
College of Engineering
Dept of Aerospace Eng.
Attn: Prof. T. J. Muller
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

University of Oklahoma
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. T. J. Love, Jr.
Chairman
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

University of Pennsylvania
Towne School of Civil and
Mechanical Engineering
Attn: Prof. I. B. Cohen
Philadelphia, Penn 19104

University of Pittsburgh
School of Eng. and Mining
Pittsburgh, Penn. 15213

University of Rhode Island
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. F. M. White
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881

University of Santa Clara
School of Engineering
Santa Clara, California 95050

University of Texas
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. John Westkaemper
Austin, Texas 78712

University of Utah
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. L. K. Isaacson
Salt Lake City, 84112

University of Virginia
School of Eng. and Appl. Science
Attn: Prof. J. E. Scott,
Chairman
Charlottesville, Virginia 22904

University of Washington
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. Abraham Hertzberg
Prof. Morris Childs
Seattle, Washington 98105

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. Joseph A. Schetz
Aerospace Engineering
Prof. R. T. Davis
Engineering Mechanics
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Washington State University
College of Engineering
Pullman, Washington 99163

Wayne State University
College of Engineering
Attn: Prof. A. B. Cambel, Dean
4841 Cass Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202

West Virginia University
College of Engineering
Dept of Aerospace Eng.
Attn: Prof. Jerome B. Fanucci
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

Wichita State University
School of Engineering
Dept of Aeronautical Eng.
Attn: Prof. Glenn W. Zumwalt
1845 Fairmount
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Yale University
Dept of Appl. Science
Attn: Prof. Peter P. Wegener
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

U. of California at San Diego
Dept of Aerospace and Mech.
Engineering Science
Attn: Prof. S. S. Penner,
Chairman
La Jolla, California 92037

U. of California at Santa Cruz
Science and Engineering
Attn: Prof. F. H. Clauser,
Vice-Chancellor
Santa Cruz, California 95060

AC Electronic Defense Research
Laboratories
General Motors Corporation
Attn: Dr. K. S. Wen
Santa Barbara, California

AIAA Journal
Technical Literature Digest
500 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

AeroChem Research Labs, Inc.
Attn: Dr. D. E. Rosner
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Aerojet-General Corp.
Sacramento Plant
P. O. Box 1947
Sacramento, California 95809

Aerospace Corporation
Attn: Dr. Harold Mirels
2350 E. El Segundo Blvd.
El Segundo, California 90245

Aerospace Corporation
Attn: Dr. R. A. Hartunian
P. O. Box 1308
San Bernardino, California 92401

Aerotherm Corporation
800 Welsh Road
Palo Alto, California 94304

Allied Research Asso., Inc.
43 Leon Street
Boston, Mass.

ARO, Inc.
von Karman Gas Dynamics Facility
Attn: Jack Whitfield, Mgr.
VKGDF
Arnold Air Force Station,
Tennessee 37389

AVCO Corporation
AVCO-EVERETT Research Lab.
Attn: Dr. George W. Sutton
2385 Revere Beach Parkway
Everett, Mass.

AVCO Corporation
Missile Systems Division
Attn: Dr. A. J. Pallone
201 Lowell Street
Wilmington, Mass. 01887

AVCO Corporation
Space Systems Division
Attn: Dr. R. R. John,
Director
201 Lowell Street
Wilmington, Mass. 01887

Bell Aerosystems Company
P. O. Box 1
Buffalo, New York 14240

The Boeing Company
Aero-Space Division
Attn: W. C. Harris, Chief
Flight Tech. Lab.
P. O. Box 3707
Seattle, Washington 98124

The Boeing Company
Boeing Scientific Research Lab.
Seattle, Washington 98124

Dynamic Science
A Division of Marshall Industries
1900 Walker Ave
Monrovia, California 91016

Fluidyne Eng. Corp
Attn: Dr. Jim Holdhusen
4900 Olson Memorial Highway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55422

Ford Motor Company
Philco Corp.
Aeronutronic Division, Ford Rd.
Newport Beach, California 92660

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

General Applied Science Labs, Inc.
Merrick & Steward Avenues
Westbury, New York 11590

General Dynamics Corp.
Astronautics Division
5001 Kearny Villa Road
P. O. Box 1128
San Diego, California 92112

General Dynamics Corp
Fort Worth Division
P. O. Box 748
Fort Worth, Texas 76101

General Dynamics Corp.
Pomona Division
1675 West Fifth Street
P. O. Box 1011
Pomona, California 91769

General Electric Company
Missile & Space Division
Space Sciences Lab.
Valley Forge Space Tech Center
P. O. Box 8555
Philadelphia, Penn. 19101

General Electric Company
Reentry Systems Dept
Attn: John Arnaiz, Mgr.
Aerodynamics Oper.
3198 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Penn. 19104

General Electric Company
Research Laboratory
P. O. Box 1088
Schenectady, New York 12301

Goodyear Aerospace Corporation
1210 Massillon Road
Akron, Ohio 44315

Grumman Aircraft Eng. Corp.
Bethpage, L. I., N. Y. 11714

Heliodyne Corp.
A Division of KMS Industries, Inc.
7810 Burner Ave
Van Nuys, California 91405

Hughes Aircraft Company
Culver City, California 90230

Kaman Nuclear
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc.
LTV Vought Aeronautics Div.
Engineering Test and Evaluation
Attn: R. C. McWherter, Mgr.
P. O. Box 5907
Dallas, Texas 75222

Lockheed Missile & Space Co.
P. O. Box 504
Sunnyvale, California

Lockheed-California Co.
Fluid Dynamics Laboratory
Attn: Mr. G. Sim, Div. Eng.
P. O. Box 551
Burbank, California 91503

Lockheed-Georgia Co.
Experimental Fluid Dynamics
Dept 72-14
Attn: Mr. B. H. Little
86 South Cobb Drive
Marietta, Georgia 30061

Martin-Marietta Corp.
Baltimore Division
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Martin Company
Denver Division
Attn: Dr. T. E. Bowman
P. O. Box 179
Denver, Colorado 80201

McDonnell Douglas Corporation
Missile & Space System Division
Attn: H. Hurwicz, Mgr
3000 Ocean Park Boulevard
Santa Monica, California 90406

McDonnell Douglas Corp.
Aero Physics Lab. (LOC A-10)
3000 Ocean Park Blvd
Santa Monica, California 98406

McDonnell Douglas Corp.
Attn: Dr. A. Lombard
Director of Research
P. O. Box 516
St. Louis, Missouri 63166

Midwest Research Institute
Attn: Librarian
425 Volker Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64110

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

North American Rockwell Corp
Attn: T. R. Neuburger
4300 East Fifth Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43216

North American Rockwell Corp
Attn: Mr. G. M. Stone, Jr.
International Airport
Los Angeles, California 90009

North American Rockwell Corp
Space & Info. Sys. Division
Meteor Physics
Attn: C. N. Scully
12214 Lakewood Blvd
Downey, California 90241

Northrop Corporation
Northrop Norair
Attn: S. A. Powers
3901 West Broadway
Hawthorne, California 90250

Physics International Co.
2700 Merced Street
San Leandro, California 94577

Southwest Research Institute
Dept of Mech. Sciences
Attn: Dr. H. N. Abramson,
Director
8500 Culebra Road
San Antonio, Texas 78228

The Marquardt Corp.
Gas Dynamics Branch
Attn: J. L. Harp, Mgr
16555 Saticoy Street
Van Nuys, California 91406

The RAND Corp.
Aero-Astronautics
Attn: Dr. Carl Gazley, Jr.
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California 90401

TRW Space Technology Labs.
Attn: Dr. A. G. Hammitt,
Asst. Mgr.
1 Space Park
Redondo Beach, California 90278

United Aircraft Corp.
Research Laboratories
Attn: Dr. Russell Meyerand
400 Main Street
East Hartford, Conn. 06108

Aeronautical Research Labs.
Fluid Dynamics Facility Labs.
Attn: E. G. Johnson
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Army Ballistic Missile Agency
ORDAB
Redstone Arsenal
Huntsville, Alabama 35808

Air Force Missile Test Center
Technical Library, MU-135
Patrick Air Force Base, Florida
32925

Air Force Armament Center
ARDC
Technical Library
Eglin AFB, Florida 32542

Air Force Missile Develop. Center
Technical Library
Holloman Air Force Base,
New Mexico 88330

Air Force Office of Scientific
Research RDTRRE
Washington, D. C. 20330

Air Force Western Develop. Div.
Technical Library
5760 Arbor Vitae Street
Los Angeles, California 90045

Air University
Technical Library
Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112

Ames Research Center
NASA
Thermo and Gas Dynamics Div.
Attn: V. I. Stevens,
Asst Chief
Moffett Field, California 94035

Arnold Eng. Develop. Center
Air Force Systems Command
U. S. Air Force
Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn
37389

Ballistic Research Labs.
U. S. Army
Aberdeen Proving Ground,
Maryland 21005

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

Chief of Ordnance
Dept of the Army
ORDTB-Ballistic Section
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20310

David Taylor Model Basin
Dept of the Navy
Gas Dynamics Division
Aerodynamics Lab.
Attn: Dr. S. de los Santos,
Head
Washington, D. C. 20007

Defense Atomic Support Agency
Technical Library
P. O. Box 2610
Washington, D. C. 20301

Diamond Ordnance Fuze Labs.
Dept of the Army
ORDTL
Washington, D. C. 20310

Flight Research Center
NASA
P. O. Box 273
Edwards, California 93523

George C. Marshall Space Flight
Center NASA
Attn: A. R. Felix, R-AERO-AE
Huntsville, Alabama 35812

Goddard Space Flight Center
NASA
Greenbelt, Maryland 20771

Jet Propulsion Lab.
NASA
Aerodynamics Facilities Section
Attn: E. A. Laumann, Mgr
Pasadena, California 91100

John F. Kennedy Space Center
NASA
Cocoa Beach, Florida 32925

Langley Research Center NASA
Langley Station
Hampton, Virginia 23365

NASA
Manned Spacecraft Center
Houston, Texas 77058

Lewis Research Center
NASA
21000 Brookpark Rd
Cleveland, Ohio 44135

National Bureau of Standards
Fluid Mechanics Section
Dept of Commerce
Washington, D. C. 20234

National Science Foundation
Div. of Mathe., Physi. and
Engineering Sciences
Washington, D. C. 20550

Naval Postgraduate School
Technical Library
Monterey, California 93940

Naval Research Laboratory
Technical Library
Washington, D. C. 20390

Navy Dept.
Bureau of Aeronautics
Technical Library
Washington, D. C. 20360

Navy Dept.
Bureau of Ordnance
Technical Library
Washington, D. C. 20360

Office of Naval Research
Dept of the Navy
Technical Library
Washington, D. C.

U. S. Air Force Academy
Aerodynamics Dept
Attn: Prof. Ralph Marker
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80912

U. S. Military Academy
Library
West Point, New York 10996

U. S. Naval Academy
Library
Attn: Dr. R. B. Mathieu
Annapolis, Maryland 21402

U. S. Naval Missile Center
Technical Library
Point Mugu, California 93041

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station
Aerodynamics Branch
China Lake, Inyokern, Calif. 93527

U. S. Naval Ordnance Lab.
Aerophysics Division
White Oak

Attn: Dr. R. K. Lobb
Silver Spring, Maryland 20900

U. S. Naval Weapons Lab.
Technical Library
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448

White Sands Proving Ground
Technical Library
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88002

Air Force Research Division
ARDC
Aeronautical Research Laboratory
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433

Advisory Group for Aeronautical
Research and Development
NATO
APO 230
New York, New York

Aeronautical Research Labs.
Technical Library
Melbourne, Australia

Aircraft Research Asso., Ltd.
Manton Lane
Attn: E. C. Carrer
Bedford, England

British Aircraft Corp
(Operating) Ltd.
Warton Aerodrome
Attn: K. Emslie
Preston
Lancashire, England

Canadian Armament Research and
Development Establishment
Valcartier
Quebec, Canada

Eidgenössische Technische
Hochschule Inst. for Aerodynamics
Attn: Prof. Ackeret
Zurich, Switzerland

Institut, Franco-Allemand
De Recherches, De Saint-Louis
12 Rue De L'Industrie
Saint-Louis, France

Institute of Space and Aero-
nautical Science
Komaba
Meguro-ku
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Instituto di Aerodinamica
Faculta di Ingegneria Dell
'Universita
Attn: Prof. Luigi Napolitano
Viale C. Augusto, Napoli

Institute of Aerophysics
University of Toronto
Attn: Dr. I. I. Glass
Toronto 5, Canada

Instituto Di Fisica Tecnica
E. Macchine
Sezione Propulsione
Milano, Italy

Laboratoire d' Aerothermique
4C
route des grades (Se & O)
Meudon, France

Laboratoire Meditteraneeen de
Recherches
Thermodynamic
Nice, France

National Aeronautical Establish-
ment
National Research Council of
Canada
Unsteady Aerodynamics Lab.
Attn: K. J. Orlik-Ruckemann,
Head
Montreal Road
Ottawa 7
Ontario, Canada

National Lucht-en Ruimtevaart-
laboratorium
Gas Dynamics Dept
Attn: Dr. S. F. Erdmann, Chief
Sloterweg 145
Amsterdam-W, Nederland

National Physical Laboratory
Aerodynamics Division
Teddington
Middlesex, England

DISTRIBUTION: (cont)

Office National d' Etudes et de
Recherches Aérospatiales
Scientifique de l' Aerodynamique
Attn: P. Carrière, Directeur
29, avenue de la Division Leclerc
Châtillon-sous-bagneux (Seine),
France

Royal Aircraft Establishment
Ministry of Aviation
Aerodynamics Sept
Attn: L. F. Crabtree
Farnborough
Hants, England

Tech. University of Braunschweig
Institute of Fluid Mechanics
Braunschweig, Germany

ONERA
Institut de Mécanique de l
Atmosphère
66 rue Saint Sebastien
Marseille, France

Polytecnica
Dept of Aerodynamics
Castello del Valentino
Turin, Italy

The Royal Aeronautical Society
4 Hamilton Place
London W. 1, England

Tech. University of Stuttgart
Aerodynamic & Gasdynamic Insti.
Stuttgart, Germany

Technion
Dept of Aeronautical Eng.
Attn: Prof. J. Rom
Haifa, Israel

The Aeronautical Research Insti.
of Sweden
Aerodynamics Dept
Attn: K. Fristedt
Bromma 11
Stockholm, Sweden

con Karman Insti. for Fluid
Dynamics
Attn: Prof. Jean Smolderen
Technical Director
72, Chaussee de Waterloo
Rhode-Saint-Genese, Belgium

Weapons Research Establishment
Aerodynamics Division
Salisbury, South Australia

Ecole Polytechnique
Division de Mécanique Appliquée
Attn: Prof. Andre Biron
2500 Marie-Guyard
Montreal
Quebec, Canada

The University of Sydney
Dept of Mech. Eng.
Attn: Prof. B. W. Roberts
Sydney, N.S.W. 2006, Australia

University of Tel Aviv
Attn: Prof. Nima Feggen
Tel Aviv, Israel

University of Waterloo
Dept of Mech. Eng.
Attn: Prof. T. A. Brzustowski
University Avenue
Waterloo
Ontario, Canada

Standard Distribution
Category UC-2
TID-4500(56th Ed.) (208)

D. B. Shuster, 1200
S. J. Buchsbaum, 5000
L. C. Hebel, 5200
J. C. King, 8300
G. W. Anderson, 8330
A. N. Blackwell, 8350
G. A. Fowler, 9000
A. Y. Pope, 9300
R. C. Maydew, 9320
W. H. Curry, 9322
E. C. Rightley, 9323
W. R. Barton, 9324
H. R. Vaughn, 9325
W. N. Caudle, 9327
B. E. Bader, 9328
K. J. Touryan, 9340
J. K. Cole, 9341
J. F. Muir, 9341 (5)
R. A. Hill, 9342
F. G. Blottner, 9343
W. C. Scrivner, 9400
J. L. Tischhauser, 9420
L. A. Hopkins, 9500
A. J. Clark, Jr., 9510
S. McAlees, Jr., 9513
Central Files, 3422-1 (15)
Library Division, 8232 (5)
L. C. Baldwin, 3412
G. C. McDonald, 3416 (3)
Attn: J. G. Wallace