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**Abstract:**
A numerical model for supersonic, turbulent flow over a projectile rotating band is described. An approximate geometric representation for the separation regions ahead of and behind the band is used to create realistic compression and expansion regions in the projectile boundary layer. The upstream and downstream ramp are found roughly consistent with the expected interaction regions as observed on forward and backward facing steps.

The calculated maximum and minimum pressures agree well with data obtained...
20. ABSTRACT (Continued)
ed on a 6 caliber Secant-Ogive-Cylinder model tested in the Naval Surface Weapons Center supersonic wind tunnel at Mach number of 3. Boundary layer profiles were measured on, and downstream of the rotating band using a Laser Doppler Velocimeter. These profiles were not adequately predicted by the theory suggesting that the turbulence model used did not respond to the rapidly changing flow conditions in a physically realistic way.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The accuracy and range of small arms and artillery have been significantly improved by the use of rifled gun barrels. Rifling causes the projectile to spin rapidly during launch. To insure that slip between the rifling and shell is eliminated, rotating bands were added to projectiles and are now a standard component. These bands are made of soft metal and are slightly larger than the bore. Although the band is desirable in producing spin while the projectile is in the gun tube, it is undesirable after launch because the added cross-sectional area and irregular shape produces added aerodynamic drag. A 5% increase in drag is a nominal estimate for an artillery shell and increases for small caliber bullets because of the relatively large rotating bands required. There is also evidence that the band affects the pitching and magus moments of the shell.

The objective of the present investigation is to incorporate a numerical model of the geometry of a rotating band into existing computer programs designed to predict the aerodynamic characteristics of the projectile. The Ballistic Research Laboratory has had considerable success in using parabolized Navier-Stokes codes in predicting effects of ogive-cylinder-boattail geometries on drag, normal force and moments. Modifications to include effects of surface irregularities would make the numerical simulations more realistic and complete.

This report summarizes the results of some recent investigations aimed at developing a rotating band model for use with the BRL codes. First, a brief review of existing experimental data on rotating band drag sets the work into perspective. The second section is concerned with the development of the rotating band model geometry which has been incorporated into the PNS code. Finally, a comparison is made between the numerical results and the data from a Naval Surface Weapons Center experiment.

II. BACKGROUND

A currently recommended procedure for estimating rotating band drag has been incorporated into the computer code "McDrag" developed by R. McCoy of BRL. The additional band drag coefficient is estimated in that code as shown by the solid line in Figure 1 where $C_d/(d_{RB} - 1)$ is plotted against Mach number. This curve was originally suggested by F. Moore and is based on a

---


series of wind tunnel tests he performed using the basic Naval 5"/38 RAP projectile of about 4 calibers total length. Although there is considerable scatter in the data, the line reasonably well represents the results except perhaps in the low transonic region.

Moore's experiment involved only one basic model size and one size rotating band. He recommended presenting the results in this form presumably because he anticipated the added drag of the band was pressure drag which would vary directly in proportion to the projected frontal area of the protuberance.

There is relatively little corroborating data available. Charters in a 1947 paper discusses "banding" of a 20mm projectile. The results cited are generally consistent with Moore's data but the paper lacks specific dimensions for a more quantitative comparison.

In a later series of experiments, Scott obtained free-flight data on the Army-Navy Spinner Rocket at Mach number 1.8 with several band configurations. Some of Scott's observations agree with Moore's data but they also show that the drag of the band was configuration dependent. Figure 1 shows a number of Scott's data points representing several different configurations. The highest point represents the largest band size (d_{RB} = 1.04) positioned 3.4 calibers from the nose. The lowest data point is a smaller band (d_{RB} = 1.02) in the same position. This latter case represents the rotating band of a 105mm projectile scaled to that of a 20mm model. The intermediate point is a d_{RB} = 1.02 band located 5.4 calibers or 2 calibers farther aft. The variation of drag coefficient with position remains unexplained.

A comprehensive review of aircraft two-dimensional excrescence drag has been published in 1981 by Young and Patterson as AGARDograph 264. This review covers discrete and distributed roughness elements and describes their contribution to aircraft drag. Although a great many research and applied experimental studies were considered, nothing is mentioned regarding the effects of protuberances on projectiles. All the experimental data considered, particularly as regards small rectangular steps, are correlated in terms of C_D /C_f as a function of free-stream Mach number and h^+ = u^+ h/v. When their


recommended drag calculation is performed for the condition of Moore's experiment, the drag coefficient is a factor of 2.5 times higher than that recommended by Moore, although the trend with Mach number is in reasonable agreement.

The conclusions to be drawn from this brief review of rotating band measurements are:

1. The added drag of the band is small on the order of 5% of the total drag and is a maximum in the transonic speed range.

2. The correlations of the experimental data are not sufficient to accurately define the drag within a factor of two. This is probably because in wind tunnel and ballistic range experiments it is necessary to take the difference between the relatively large drag with and without the band to find the much smaller band drag.

3. Pressure distribution measurements in the vicinity of the band might be a more sensitive method of extracting the force acting on the band.

4. If the correct perturbation of the viscous and inviscid flow field can be obtained in computer models, they may be expected to predict the effects of the rotating band on downstream skin friction, separation and base pressure effects.

III. COMPUTER MODEL OF ROTATING BAND

Ideally it would be desirable to specify the geometry of the rotating band and apply a full Navier-Stokes solver to the compressible and viscous surrounding flow. However, solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for flows including regions of locally separated flow are not yet routine. It would require a major effort to produce such solutions. As an intermediate step to the development of a rigorous technique, a relatively simple modification to the steady-state, space marching parabolized Navier-Stokes (PNS) code has been constructed. The code is based on the work of Sturek and Schiff.7

A. Assumed Features of the Rotating Band Flow Field

The flow field in the vicinity of the rotating band is assumed as indicated in Figure 2. The band is assumed to be smaller than the local boundary layer thickness and that the effect of the band is to induce embedded regions of separated flow ahead of and behind the protuburance. The turning of the flow by the separated regions produces weak compression waves which propagate into the inviscid flow and may coalesce into shock waves. The flow reattaches on top of the band where it turns approximately parallel to the band. At the trailing edge, the flow again turns to follow the separated flow region and

the main flow reattaches to the projectile some distance downstream. Compression waves produce the gradual turning of the flow so that after reattachment the boundary layer grows in a constant pressure region.

These are the primary elements in the physical flow model. Note that the pressure rise associated with the compression waves actually precedes the separation point of the boundary layer flow. The extent of the upstream pressure rise can be estimated by considering the results of experiments on forward and backward facing steps. Figure 3 shows typical pressure distribution observations for these two situations. This figure is from the work of Chapman, et al\(^8\) as reported by Chang\(^9\). The forward facing step with turbulent boundary layer shows that the pressure begins to rise ahead of the separation point, \(s\), and reaches 2.2 times the ambient value for this particular configuration. On the other hand, the backward step shows a sharp 65% pressure drop from the ambient value just behind the step with a more gradual return downstream. These results confirm in general the physical situation assumed in Figure 2.

Separation length data from a number of sources is summarized in Figure 4 and 5 again taken from Chang\(^9\). Although these figures show some dependency of the separation length on Reynolds number, Mach number and geometry, the magnitude for the high Reynolds number turbulent flow of between 5 and 6 is remarkably the same for both forward and backward facing steps. From these observations it may be concluded that the total interaction length is of the order of 10 step heights before and behind the band.

B. PNS Code Model Rotating Band

After considering the previous data the geometry of the projectile in the vicinity of the band was specified as shown in Figure 6. Given the height of an actual band, the upstream and downstream interaction regions are specified by an interaction length, \(L\), and a functional form for a surface which produces the same pressure rise as the actual flow field. This surface may be considered as roughly a dividing streamline separating the separated flow region from the rest of the boundary layer. This is not literally correct because the function extends beyond the separated region to produce the upstream and downstream pressure effects. It is not a true dividing streamline because the no-slip boundary condition is applied to this surface whereas the dividing streamline does have a slip velocity due to viscous effects.

The functional form was chosen arbitrarily as:

---


\[ r_b = r + h f \left( \frac{x}{L} \right) \]

where \[ f \left( \frac{x}{L} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 - \cos \left( \frac{\pi x}{2L} \right) \\ \left( \frac{x}{L} \right)^n + 1 \end{cases} \]

Note that both functions have their maximum slope at \( x = L \). If small perturbation arguments are used, the maximum pressure on the upstream ramp corresponds to the maximum slope. The maximum pressure rise can be increased by decreasing \( L \). In using the cosine function the minimum \( L \) that can be used is apparently limited by local separation on the ramp. In order to eliminate the separation various functional forms were tried in an attempt to tailor the slope distribution and thereby the adverse pressure gradient so as to prevent separation. The power law shape has a slower rate of increase in slope than the cosine shape followed by a more rapid increase near the band. Higher maximum slopes can be achieved with the power law shapes and thus higher maximum pressures.

The ramp characteristic length, \( L \), is assumed to represent the interaction length and based on the previous discussion it is expected to be on the order of 10 band heights. The lengths used were varied in the computations so as to obtain agreement between the calculated pressure distribution and some measurements obtained at the Naval Surface Weapons Center.

IV. COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT

The Ballistic Research Laboratory sponsored a series of wind tunnel tests at the Naval Surface Weapons Center, White Oak Laboratory, on a projectile model with and without a rotating band. Complete details of the experiment will be published as a NSWC Technical Report\textsuperscript{10}. The following brief discussion of the experiment is limited to only those aspects pertinent to the present comparison with the PNS results.

A. BRL-NSWC Experiment

The BRL Secant-Ogive-Cylinder (SOC) model (57.15mm in diameter) was modified by attaching two rotating band configurations for these tests. The general configuration of the model is given in Figure 7 along with the conditions of the test.

The primary measurements included the model pressure distribution and boundary layer characteristics. The NSWC laser velocimeter was used to obtain mean velocity and turbulence profiles through the boundary layer at four

\textsuperscript{10} Yanta, W. and Gorney, J., NSWC/WOL unpublished wind tunnel data, private communication.
stations, one ahead, one on top and two downstream of the band.

The tests were made at a Mach number of 3.02 and with atmospheric supply conditions which results in a Reynolds number based on model diameter of $5.5 \times 10^6$.

Figure 8 is a Schlieren photograph from these tests which shows the compression waves originating from in front of and behind the rotating band. Waves are also generated by the trip mechanism located near the nose. The transition trip insured a fully turbulent boundary layer over the rotating band.

B. Comparison Between PNS Code and Experiment

Figure 9 shows the comparison between the pressure distribution predicted by the PNS code and the NSWC measurements. The center of the band is located at 4.39 calibers from the nose and the band is 2mm high ($h/D = .0356$) and 12.7mm wide. The measured pressures are given in Table 1 which also defines the location of the pressure taps.

| TABLE 1. PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION DATA ROTATING BAND SOC MODEL |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| $h/D = 0.0 (1)$ | $0.0178$ | $0.0356$ |
| $X/D$ | $p_w/p_{\infty}$ | $p_w/p_{\infty}$ | $p_w/p_{\infty}$ |
| 0.889 | 1.200 | 1.245 | 1.238 |
| 1.556 | 1.044 | 1.074 | 1.061 |
| 2.222 | 0.918 | 0.927 | 0.932 |
| 2.791 | 0.819 | (2) | (2) |
| 3.129 | 0.577 | 0.586 | 0.592 |
| 3.222 | 0.559 | 0.571 | 0.572 |
| 3.556 | 0.582 | 0.571 | 0.579 |
| 4.222 | 0.618 | 1.144 | 1.559 |
| 4.556 | 0.330 | 0.224 |
| 4.889 | 0.636 | 0.602 | 0.582 |
| 5.333 | 0.640 | 0.632 | 0.656 |
| 5.611 | 0.652 | 0.650 | 0.680 |
| 5.778 | 0.645 | 0.656 |
| BASE | 1.368 | 0.758 |

$P_0 = 1.238$ atm.  
$T_0 = 322$ K  
$M_\infty = 3.02$

NOTE:  
(1) Reklis and Sturek, Ref. 11.  
(2) Bad Data point.

Excellent agreement is obtained between the PNS computation and the measured pressures in all regions unaffected by the band which generally confirms the quality of the method. Only two points are substantially affected by the presence of the protuberance; these taps are located 3mm ahead of and behind the band. The predicted pressures in this area agree relatively well with these two measurements. Between the maximum and minimum values the pressure drops very rapidly, undershoots and then tries to stabilize near the undisturbed level. It is not clear whether this rather large oscillation is related to the numerical procedure when subject to such a rapid change in conditions or whether the flow actually over expands when reattaching on the model. More detailed pressure measurements are required in that region to answer this question. The shape of the band in these computations was the power law equation with $n = 1$, and with $L = 7.5h$. The relaxation of the pressure to the undisturbed level behind the band is also well predicted by the PNS code.

Similar results were obtained for the smaller band case ($h = 1\text{mm}$) as shown in Figure 10. The cosine function was used in this case but the interaction length was $L = 10h$. The high and low peaks may be under predicted here because the pressure taps are still located ±3mm from the band which is now ±3 step heights. Thus, the measured pressures may be somewhat less than the actual peak pressures.

C. Boundary Layer Profiles

As has already been pointed out, boundary layer velocity profiles were obtained at four stations as part of the experiment. The measurements were made using a two-component laser doppler velocimeter. This equipment permitted the measurement of mean $u$ velocity parallel to the model axis and the mean $v$ component normal to the surface. Turbulent fluctuating quantities such as $\sqrt{u'^2}$, $\sqrt{v'^2}$ and the Reynolds stress $u'v'$ were also obtained. Prediction of the turbulence characteristics based on the PNS algebraic turbulence model are being developed but will not be considered here.

The mean $u$ component of the velocities are shown in Figure 11 for the 2mm band and in Figure 12 for the 1mm band. In both sets the first Figures 11a and 12a represent the boundary layer approaching the band. This station is 0.28 calibers ahead of the band or 7.8 step heights for the large band and 15.8 step heights for the smaller band case. These upstream profiles are well predicted by the PNS code which is consistent with the quality of the codes results for all smooth projectile configurations. The profiles on top of the band (Figure 11b and 12b) are significantly different from the prediction, both in shape and magnitude. Near the outer edge of the calculated profile is a local low speed region which corresponds to the compression waves generated by the upstream ramp. No sign of this is observed in the experimental data, but the range of the data in distance normal to the wall is rather limited. Close to the wall the velocity is considerably less than the prediction. Some possible reasons for the discrepancies are:

1. Numerical: i.e., the change in conditions is too rapid for the grid distribution used.
2. Geometrical: i.e., the band geometry is arbitrary chosen and may be incorrect.

3. The turbulence model employed is unable to respond correctly to the rapid expansion at the top of the band.

4. Experimental: i.e., the laser velocimeter results depend on tracer particles in the flow following the fluid motion; with rapidly changing conditions the particles may not respond fast enough.

Downstream of the band the profiles slowly relax toward the undisturbed boundary layer. Figures 11c,d and 12c,d show this development. The small band produces a smaller perturbation and its effects die out faster. The X/D = 4.70 and 5.75 stations are 0.20 and 0.75 model diameters, respectively, behind the rotating band which means that they are 5.6 and 21 step height downstream. Using the upstream station to evaluate the boundary layer thickness, these stations are approximately 3 and 11 boundary layer thicknesses downstream. Based on these results it appears that on the order of 15-20 boundary layer thicknesses would be required for the boundary layer to return to the undisturbed state. The numerical theory relaxes in a much shorter distance.

D. Skin Friction Coefficient

Figures 13 and 14 show the calculated skin friction coefficient distribution and its rather major fluctuation in the vicinity of the rotating band. These calculations show that the more severe adverse pressure gradient upstream of the large rotating band brings the flow to the verge of separation, i.e., \( c_f = 0 \). It is this condition that limits the maximum pressure rise which can be developed with the model band. Because the model band does not correctly represent the separated flow ahead of and behind the band, it is not correct to integrate this friction distribution to determine the skin friction contribution to the rotating band drag. Nevertheless, it may be anticipated that the \( c_f \) contribution to band drag will be small because of: (a) the small areas affected by the perturbations and (b) the rough balance between the regions of decreased friction (adverse pressure gradient regions) and the increased friction on the top of the band.

E. Pressure Drag Coefficient

Normally, integration of the axial component of the model band pressure distribution over the area of the band could be used to give the drag acting on the model band. It is not clear that such a procedure would correctly estimate the actual band drag because it is the local pressure acting on the forward and rearward face of the band which contributes to the physical band drag. With this assumption it is possible to use the measured pressure data or the maximum and minimum theoretical pressures to estimate the rotating band \( C_D \). The relationship between the pressures and \( C_D \) is

\[
\frac{C_D}{d_{RB} - 1} = \frac{P_{\text{max}} - P_{\text{min}}}{\gamma P_\infty - \gamma P_\infty M_\infty^2}, \quad (2)
\]
The small band drag agrees with the Moore correlation whereas the large band is in better agreement with Young and Patterson as can be seen by referring to Figure 1. This indicates that the drag coefficient is a function of the size of the band as well as the Mach number.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

It has been the objective of this report to describe a numerical model for the flow over a rotating band and to compare the results of this model with experimental data obtained at the NSWC on the BRL Secant-Ogive-Cylinder Model.

The results of this investigation shows that the maximum and minimum pressure can be predicted using a parabolized Navier-Stokes computational technique employing an approximate, but realistic, geometric model of the flow in the vicinity of the band. The separation regions ahead of and behind the band are approximated by compression ramps with expansion corners at the forward and rear edges of the rotating band. By suitable choices of the form of the ramps the boundary layer flow is decelerated without producing local separation. The upstream and downstream extent of the ramp is roughly consistent with the interaction distance measured on forward and backward facing steps.

The details of the velocity boundary layer near the band are not correctly predicted by this theory. Further investigation of the turbulence model employed and additional experimental data are required to help explain this discrepancy. Calculations of parasitic projectile drag based on maximum and minimum pressures associated with the rotating band are dependent on size of the band and not just Mach number as suggested by the methods currently in use. Skin friction drag is found to contribute very little to the overall drag although no estimate of the effect of the perturbation in the boundary layer on the base drag has been or can be made using the present PNS code. The numerical results indicate that the disturbance caused by the band dies out in a few boundary layer thicknesses (much faster than observed experimentally) and therefore little downstream influence is predicted.
Figure 1. Rotating Band Drag Coefficient
Figure 2. Rotating Band Flow Field
Figure 3. Typical Pressure Distributions for Forward and Backward Facing Steps
Figure 4. Reattachment and Pressure Interaction Length for Backward Facing Step
\[ f_n(X/L) = \begin{cases} (X/L)^2 & \text{for } X/L \leq 1 \\ 1 - \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \frac{X}{L}\right) & \text{for } X/L > 1 \end{cases} \]

Negelects slip boundary condition on dividing streamline

Figure 6. PNS Rotating Band Model
TEST CONDITIONS

\[ M = 3 \]
\[ \alpha = 0^\circ, 2^\circ \]
\[ \text{Re} = 5.5 \times 10^6 \]

ROTATING BAND HEIGHT

\[ h = 0.0178 \text{ AND } 0.0356 \text{ cal} \]

MEASUREMENTS

LDV STATIONS

- A 4.00 cal
- B 4.39 cal
- C 4.70 cal
- D 5.25 cal

WALL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION

SPARK SHADOWGRAPHS

Figure 7. BRL-NSWC/WOL Experimental SOC Model
Figure 8. Shadowgraph of SOC Model with Rotating Band in NSWC/WOL Wind Tunnel, $M_\infty = 3.0$

Figure 9. Pressure Distribution - Large Rotating Band
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$h/D = 0.0356$
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Figure 10. Pressure Distribution - Small Rotating Band
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Figure 11. Velocity Profiles, \( h/D = 0.0356 \), \( M_\infty = 3.0 \)

a. \( X/D = 4.0 \)
Figure 11. Continued

b. $X/D = 4.39$
Figure 11. Continued

c. $X/D = 4.70$
Figure 11. Continued

d. $X/D = 5.25$

$M_\infty = 3.0$
$h/D = 0.0356$
$X/D = 5.25$
Figure 12. Velocity Profiles, \( h/D = 0.0178, M_\infty = 3.0 \)

a. \( X/D = 4.0 \)
Figure 12. Continued

b. \( X/D = 4.39 \)
Figure 12. Continued

c. $X/D = 4.70$

\[ M_\infty = 3.0 \]
\[ h/D = 0.0178 \]
\[ X/D = 4.70 \]
Figure 12. Continued
d. $X/D = 5.25$

$M_\infty = 3.0$
$h/D = 0.0178$
$X/D = 5.25$
Figure 13. Skin Friction Coefficient Distribution, \( h/D = 0.0356 \), \( M_\infty = 3.0 \)
Figure 14. Skin Friction Coefficient Distribution, $h/D = 0.0178$, $M_\infty = 3.0$
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{DRB}$</td>
<td>drag coefficient based on projectile cross-sectional area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_D$</td>
<td>drag coefficient based on frontal area of rotating band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_f$</td>
<td>skin friction coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_{RB}$</td>
<td>rotating band diameter in calibers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>projectile diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>rotating band height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h^+$</td>
<td>nondimensional rotating band height $= u_\tau h/v$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>interaction length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_\infty$</td>
<td>free-stream Mach number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_\infty$</td>
<td>free-stream static pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_0$</td>
<td>free-stream total pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_w$</td>
<td>surface pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>projectile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_b$</td>
<td>rotating band radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_0$</td>
<td>free-stream total temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_\tau$</td>
<td>shear velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>axial distance from projectile nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y$</td>
<td>ratio of specific heats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>kinematic viscosity</td>
</tr>
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