AEDC-TR-65-234

TEB 21 1966 C. 4 MAY 2 1969



A\_COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND THEORETICALLY PREDICTED PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS AND FORCE AND STABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR A SPHERICALLY BLUNTED CONE AT  $M_{\infty} \sim 18$  and angles of attack

...

Eugene C. Knox and Clark H. Lewis ARO, Inc.

# February 1966

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

VON KÁRMÁN GAS DYNAMICS FACILITY ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND ARNOLD AIR FORCE STATION, TENNESSEE

-----



When U. S. Government drawings specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, or in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

Qualified users may obtain copies of this report from the Defense Documentation Center.

References to named commercial products in this report are not to be considered in any sense as an endorsement of the product by the United States Air Force of the Government.

# A COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND THEORETICALLY PREDICTED PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS AND FORCE AND STABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR A SPHERICALLY BLUNTED CONE AT $M_{\infty} \sim 18$ AND ANGLES OF ATTACK

Eugene C. Knox and Clark H. Lewis ARO, Inc.

.

#### FOREWORD

The work reported herein was sponsored by the Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) under Program Element 62405334, Project 8953, Task 895303.

The results of the research presented were obtained by ARO, Inc. (a subsidiary of Sverdrup and Parcel, Inc.), contract operator of AEDC, AFSC, Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee, under Contract AF 40(600)-1200. The analytical research was conducted under ARO Project No. VW3507, and the manuscript was submitted for publication on October 19, 1965.

Part of the work described herein was presented by the first author as a Master of Science thesis to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia.

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Messrs. Lloyd Johnson and Billy Z. Jenkins, Army Missile Command, Redstone Arsenal, Alabama in developing the General Applied Sciences Laboratory (GASL) three-dimensional characteristics program into an operationally useful machine program and for their cooperation in providing many of the numerical solutions presented herein.

The authors also wish to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. Jack F. Roberts, ARO, Inc., for providing some previously unpublished experimental data and Mr. Marvin R. Reed, ARO, Inc., for developing the pressure interpolation and force coefficient machine programs.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

Larry R. Walter 1/Lt, USAF Gas Dynamics Division DCS/Research Donald R. Eastman, Jr. DCS/Research

# ABSTRACT

Analysis of experimental pressure distributions and force and moment coefficients for a 9-deg half-angle spherically blunted cone at  $M_{\infty} \sim 18$  and  $\alpha = 0$  to 20 deg is presented based on an ideal gas (y = 1.4) three-dimensional characteristics solution developed by General Applied Sciences Laboratory (GASL). Comparisons are also made with predictions based on modified Newtonian theory. Pressure distributions along the windward and leeward streamlines were well predicted by the results from the GASL program at  $\alpha = 10 \deg$ . For  $\alpha < 10 \deg$ , comparison with the experimental data indicated differences attributed to viscous effects. For  $a > 10 \deg$  the numerical results were affected by necessary program modifications on the leeward side. Radial pressure distributions along the body surface from the GASL results showed the development of low pressure "wells" in the leeward region at  $a \ge 10 \deg$ . Similar distributions along a constant entropy surface within the inviscid shock layer indicated substantial delay in the formation of the low pressure "wells".  $C_N$  and  $C_m$  were found to be in good agreement with the experimental data when based on the GASL surface pressure distribution. Predicted values of  $C_{4}$  were about 40 percent below the experimental data over the entire range, a = 0 to 20 deg, in agreement with a previous Newtonian based analysis. The difference is attributed to the viscousinduced drag increment. Computed slopes,  $C_{N_a}$  and  $C_{m_a}$ , were found to be well predicted by the integrated GASL results, whereas the modified Newtonian prediction was in poorer agreement with the trends of the experimental data.

# CONTENTS

		Page
	ABSTRACT	iii
	NOMENCLATURE	vi
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	INVESTIGATION	
	2.1 Theoretical Considerations	2
	2.2 Experimental Studies	4
III.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
	3.1 Zero-Lift Pressure Distributions	5
	3.2 Surface Pressure Distributions at Angles of Attack	6
	3.3 Pressure and Streamline Distributions on a Constant	
	Entropy Surface	11
	3.4 Force and Moment Coefficients	13
IV.	CONCLUDING REMARKS	15
	APPENDIX - Force and Moment Equations	19
	REFERENCES	24

# **ILLUSTRATIONS**

# Figure

Cone Nomenclature and Coordinate Systems
Zero-Lift Pressure Distribution over 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cones
Effects of Changes-of-Frame on Body Pressures at $a = 10 \deg \ldots 29$
Scheduled Changes-of-Frame for Various Angles of Attack
Pressure Distributions along Most Windward and Leeward Streamlines at $M_{\infty}$ ~ 18 and at Angles of Attack
Radial Pressure Distributions over a 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cone at $M_{\infty} \sim 18$ and $\alpha = 5 \deg \ldots 35$
Radial Pressure Distributions over a 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cone at $M_{\infty} \sim 18$ and $\alpha = 10 \deg \dots 36$
Radial Pressure Distributions over a 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cone at $M_{\sim} \sim 18$ and at Angle of Attack

,

#### Page Figure Radial Cross Sections of Shock and Constant Entropy 9. Surfaces at Selected Stations (ZB) versus Radial Angle $(\theta_{\rm B})$ . 40 Streamline Patterns for a 9-deg Half-Angle Cone at 10. $a = 10 \deg$ from the GASL Body-Fixed Axis Solution. . . 41 Pressure Contours for a 9-deg Half-Angle Cone at 11. a = 10 deg from the GASL Body-Fixed Axis Solution. 43 Force and Moment Coefficients for Spherically Blunted 12. 45Cones at M\_ ~ 18..... Variation of Normal-Force and Pitching-Moment 13. Coefficient Slopes with Angle of Attack for a 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cone at $M_{\infty} \sim 18$ . . . . $\mathbf{47}$

# TABLES

1.	Pressure Data from AEDC-VKF Tunnels	49
II.	Test Conditions for AEDC-VKF Pressure Distribution Data	50
III.	Modified Pressure Data from CAL 48-in. Shock Tunnel (Ref. 8)	51
IV.	Test Conditions for CAL Pressure Distribution Data (Ref.8)	52
v.	Experimental Force Coefficients and Free-Stream	53
vı.	Computed Force and Moment Coefficients ( $y = 1.4$ )	54

## NOMENCLATURE\*

A	Surface area/R <sub>n</sub> <sup>2</sup>
Ab	Base area, $\pi (R_b R_n)^2$
C <sub>A</sub>	Axial-force coefficient, axial force/ $q_\infty A_b$
CD	Drag coefficient, $D/q_{\infty}A_b$

\*Unless otherwise noted, all lengths are nondimensionalized with respect to the nose (sphere) radius.

.

CDn	Nose drag coefficient (0.964 for a sphere-cone)
C <sub>F</sub>	General force coefficient representing the total force acting on vehicle, total force/ $q_\infty A_b$
CL	Lift coefficient, $L_{g_{\infty}}A_{b}$
Ċ <sub>M₀</sub>	Resultant-moment coefficient vector obtained by summing moments of all forces about point "O", moment/ $q_{\infty}A_bD_bR_n$
Cm	Pitching-moment coefficient, magnitude of Y-component of resultant-moment coefficient vector
C <sub>ma</sub>	Pitching-moment coefficient slope, $\partial C_m \partial a$ , deg <sup>-1</sup>
C <sub>N</sub>	Normal-force coefficient, normal force $(q_{\infty} \lambda_b)$
CNa	Normal-force coefficient slope, $\partial C_N / \partial \alpha$ , deg <sup>-1</sup>
Cp	Pressure coefficient, $(p - p_{\infty})/q_{\infty}$
C <sub>∞</sub>	Chapman-Rubesin viscosity coefficient, $(\mu_w/\mu_\infty)(T_\infty/T_w)$
D	Drag force along the free-stream velocity vector
$D_{\rm b}$	Vehicle base diameter
d	Vehicle nose (sphere) diameter
Н <sub>о</sub>	Stagnation enthalpy, $ft^2/sec^2$
L	Lift force normal to free-stream velocity vector
Ł	Body length, in.
М	Mach number
Ν	Force normal to body axis of symmetry
→ n	Unit inward normal vector to surface
P	Pressure
₽ <sub>o</sub>	Free-stream stagnation pressure, lbf/in. $^2$
Ρ́Ω	Normal-shock pitot pressure, lbf/in. $^2$
$\mathbf{q}_{\infty}$	Free-stream dynamic pressure, $\gamma_{\infty} \mathtt{p}_{\infty}  \mathtt{M}_{\infty}^2$ (2, 1bf/in. $^2$
R B	Body radius in body-fixed axis system
Rь	Vehicle base radius
Re <sub>∞</sub> ,′in.	Free-stream unit Reynolds number, in. <sup>-1</sup>
Re <sub>∞, í</sub>	Free-stream Reynolds number based on body length
R	Vehicle nose (sphere) radius, ft
r r	Radius vector from point "O" to body point

•

S/R	Entropy, dimensionless
s	Surface distance from the geometric nose of the model
Т	Temperature, °K
$\mathbb{U}_{\infty}$	Free-stream velocity, ft/sec
$\overline{v}_{\infty}$	Viscous parameter, $M_{\infty} \sqrt{C_{\infty}} / \sqrt{Re_{\infty,2}}$
Х	Coordinate axis normal to Z positive downward
Y	Right-hand coordinate axis normal to x-z plane
Z	Coordinate axis along the free-stream velocity vector (wind- fixed axis) or along the axis of symmetry (body-fixed axis)
Zc	Cheng's axial distance parameter, [( $Z_B + 1$ )/2] $\sigma_c^2 / \sqrt{\epsilon C_{D_n}}$
Z <sub>cp</sub>	Center of pressure location
а	Angle of attack, deg
γ	Ratio of specific heats (1.40 used herein)
£	$(\gamma-1)/(\gamma+1)$
η	Angle defined by $\cos \eta = \vec{V} + \vec{n}/ \vec{V} $
θ	Polar angle measured in plane perpendicular to axis of sym- metry from most windward streamline
$\sigma_{c}$	Cone half-angle, deg

# SUBSCRIPTS

1,2,3	Denoted values of parameters at limits of integration for each region, at special values of Z and $\theta$ , or values of force coefficients for each like numbered region
в	Body axes
Ь	Base
i	Initial value in streamline program
n	Nose, or normal direction
0	Stagnation conditions
w	Wind axes, or wall
Xi, Zi	$i$ = B,w , that component of force in region acting in $\lambda i$ or $Z_1$ direction
no	Undisturbed free-stream conditions

# SECTION I

One function of experimental research is to test the applicability and range of validity of theoretical models. In fluid mechanics, as the velocity increases many problems appear such as compressibility, interactions of inviscid and viscous flow fields, and so-called "real gas" effects. On the one hand, the problem is often complicated by the inadequacy of the experimental results to clearly indicate the relative magnitudes of separate but coupled effects. On the other hand, theoretical models usually are only applicable to simple geometric and fluid mechanical models. Even with the aid of large digital computers, "exact" solutions are not possible for many problems of current interest in gas dynamics.

In recent years considerable attention has been given to the comparisons of ideal gas and perfect dissociating and ionizing gas characteristics solutions for sphere-cones at zero angle of attack, but similar comparisons have not been possible at angles of attack because of the lack of adequate theoretical models for analysis of the three-dimensional flow fields. The three-dimensional characteristics theory used in the present study was developed at the General Applied Sciences Laboratory (GASL) by Moretti et al. (Ref. 1). The only known published results from this theory for axisymmetric bodies are calculations done by Jenkins (Ref. 2) for spherically blunted cones at 0- and 5-deg angles of attack over the range of altitudes from 100,000 to 260,000 ft, Mach numbers from 9 to 30, and cone half-angles of 10 and 12 deg.

The present report presents comparisons between an ideal gas, inviscid, three-dimensional characteristic solution and experimental data for surface pressure distributions, forces and moments of a 0.3 nose-to-base radius ratio, 9-deg half-angle spherically blunted cone at  $M_{\infty}$  = 18 over a range of angles of attack from 0 to 20 deg. The experimental data were taken in a Reynolds number range where strong viscous effects on zero-lift drag were previously found by Whitfield and Griffith (Ref. 3). These experimental data at angle of attack will, however, be used to assess the limitations and validity of the characteristics solution.

Since the wind tunnel experimental data were taken in nitrogen, it was necessary to base the calculations on ideal gas (y = 1.4) properties rather than the equilibrium air data available in the machine program. Previously published zero-lift experimental data taken in the AEDC, von Kármán Gas Dynamics Facility (VKF), hotshot tunnels by Whitfield and Griffith (Ref. 3), Griffith and Lewis (Ref. 4), and Lewis and Whitfield (Ref. 5) were found to be in reasonably good agreement with their ideal gas analyses.

Most of the calculations to be presented herein were made using the GASL wind-fixed axis program (Ref. 1). However, during the latter stages of the calculations a new version of the program was published by GASL (Ref. 6) and was used for some of the calculations presented. The new program, denoted herein as the body-fixed axis program, is a modification of the wind-fixed axis program for axisymmetric bodies such that the calculation is done in body-fixed rather than wind-fixed axes. This procedure simplifies the analysis and somewhat improves the accuracy of the calculation. However, a comparison will be shown at one angle of attack which indicates that the differences are small, and thus the large body of calculations at all angles of attack was not recomputed using the new program. Included in the new program is a procedure for tracing the streamline patterns on the surface and within the inviscid shock layer. This program is important for many applications and was used in the present study to determine streamline patterns on the body and on one constant entropy surface within the shock layer.

Calculations were made at  $\alpha = 5$ , 10, and 20 deg for comparisons with experimental data from the AEDC-VKF 50-in, and 100-in, hypervelocity tunnels (Gas Dynamic Wind Tunnels, Hypersonic (H) and (F)) and the 48-in, shock tunnel of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory (CAL). A machine program was developed by the first author and M. R. Reed which transformed the wind-fixed axis solution for the body surface pressure distribution to the corresponding body-fixed axis and interpolated the resulting pressure distribution for comparison with the experimental data. An additional machine program was written to integrate the resulting pressure distribution and compute the normal-force coefficient,  $C_{\rm N}$ , and pitching-moment coefficient,  $C_m$ , for comparison with available experimental data. Also, for comparison with the numerical results based on the GASL program and experimental data, the results of the modified Newtonian theory are presented. In addition to the above comparisons, normal-force and pitching-moment slopes,  $C_{N_{\it a}}$  and  $C_{m_{\it a}}$ , were computed and are compared with numerical differentiation of the experimental data.

# SECTION II

# 2.1 THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The numerical analysis presented herein used the GASL wind-fixed axis program to obtain the body surface pressure distribution for a range

AEDC-TR-65-234

of angles of attack. The wind-fixed axis solution was then transformed to body-fixed axis and interpolated for integration and comparison with the experimental data. A brief discussion of the GASL program is presented below.

The initial supersonic data were obtained from an inverse blunt body solution for a unit sphere at  $M_{\infty} = 18$  in an ideal gas at one atmosphere pressure. The resulting blunt body flow field solution was interpolated along a surface normal to the wind-fixed axis. The GASL program uses the method of characteristics in three dimensions to compute from these initial data the fluid properties in the inviscid supersonic flow field about spherically capped lifting bodies. The technique is such that computations are made in two mutually perpendicular planes using the intersections of the characteristic surfaces in the flow field with these planes as characteristic lines. The intersection of the characteristic lines represents a solution point which is common to both planes. For the present calculations, a cylindrical coordinate system was used with  $Z_w$  measured from the center of the sphere in the wind direction, the radius R, normal to the  $Z_w$  axis, and the polar angle,  $\theta_w$ , measured from the most windward streamline. For the GASL calculations presented, the shock layer was defined by eleven positions between the body and the shock and 10-deg increments in  $\theta_w$ . The calculations were made along the  $Z_w$  axis such that the solutions were obtained for each  $\theta_w$  between 0 and 180 deg in the  $Z_w$  plane, and then a subsequent  $Z_w$  plane was selected and the procedure was repeated.

Inasmuch as the solutions were obtained in  $Z_w$  planes with  $\theta_w$  measured about the  $Z_w$  axis, it was necessary to shift the  $Z_w$  axis periodically as the calculation proceeded along the body. Whenever the  $Z_w$  axis deviated by more than a fixed amount from the axis of symmetry of the body, a "change-of-frame" was made. Figure 1 shows a sketch of the cone nomenclature and coordinate system. The criteria for determining how often a change-of-frame was necessary are arbitrary, and the results of different scheduled changes-of-frame are reported herein.

The transformation of the GASL wind-fixed axis pressure distribution was made using the appropriate equations for a selected body point from which the equivalent  $Z_w$  and  $\theta_w$  were determined. The GASL results were then interpolated by a four-point Lagrangian interpolation formula to obtain the pressure at desired points. The resulting interpolated pressure distribution was integrated by the trapezoidal rule to obtain the forces and moments. Also for comparison, the modified Newtonian theory was used to calculate a pressure distribution and then integrated to obtain the forces and moments. •

A detailed discussion of the pertinent equations and techniques used in the present analysis is given in the Appendix.

The GASL body-fixed axis three-dimensional characteristics solution (Ref. 6) was essentially that described above except that the calculation was done in body-fixed rather than wind-fixed axes. The initial data were, however, obtained by rotating the wind-fixed axis sphere solution to obtain the initial data in a plane perpendicular to the body axis of symmetry.

# 2.2 EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES

The experimental data presented herein were obtained in two AEDC-VKF hotshot tunnels, Tunnels H and F, and the 48-in. reflected shock tunnel of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory (CAL). The AEDC-VKF and CAL tests were conducted in nitrogen and air, respectively. All data were taken on a 0.3 nose-to-base radius ratio 9-deg half-angle spherically blunted cone over an angle-of-attack range of 0 to 20 deg. A comparison of some of the experimental data presented herein from the VKF and CAL facilities was previously presented by Edenfield in Ref. 7, and the reader is referred to that report for a detailed description of the experimental programs. However, tables are presented herein which list all the experimental data used in the present study. Table I gives the pressure distribution data from the VKF tunnels, referenced to the measured test section pitot pressure. Each column gives a gage location on the model, and the coordinates of each orifice are noted. The axial distance is referenced to the nose radius and measured from the center of the spherical cap, whereas the surface distance is measured from the nose of the model. The model radial angle,  $\theta_{\rm B}$ , was measured from the most windward streamline direction, The test conditions associated with the data presented in Table I are given in Table II.

The data for the CAL investigation were obtained from Ref. 8. The pressure data are presented in Table III in a modified form, and the tunnel test conditions are given in Table IV. The data given in Ref. 8 were referenced to a computed  $p'_0$  based on previous tunnel calibrations. These data were modified so that at zero angle of attack the measured stagnation point pressure was used as the reference, and at angles of attack the pressure measured nearest the stagnation point was corrected to the stagnation point by modified Newtonian theory. The latter value is denoted herein as  $p'_0$ \*.

Finally, tabulations of all the force and moment coefficients are presented in Tables V and VI. The experimentally determined coefficients

and the associated tunnel test conditions are given in Table V, and the computed coefficients are given from the GASL and modified Newtonian numerical solutions in Table VI.

# SECTION III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## 3.1 ZERO-LIFT PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS

An obvious test of any three-dimensional flow field solution is comparison with a two-dimensional or axisymmetric solution where both theories are applicable, viz., at zero angle of attack. Such a comparison is shown in Fig. 2 between the GASL solution and the results from an AEDC axisymmetric ideal gas characteristics program developed by ARO, Inc. The comparison is made in terms of  $C_p/2\sigma_c^2$  against  $Z_c = \lfloor (Z_B + 1)/2 \rfloor \sigma_c^2 / \sqrt{\epsilon C_{D_n}}$ . The correlation parameter,  $Z_c$ , was proposed by Cheng (Ref. 9), and Griffith and Lewis (Ref. 4) modified Cheng's correlation parameter,  $p/M_{\infty}^2 P_{\infty} \gamma \sigma_c^2$ , to read  $C_p/2\sigma_c^2$  in order to account for the fact that the condition imposed by Cheng,  $p >> p_{\infty}$ , frequently is not satisfied. An improved correlation with experimental data was obtained in this manner.

Some experimental data from AEDC-VKF and CAL are also shown in Fig. 2. Of primary interest here is the comparison between the AEDC ideal gas axisymmetric solution and the GASL wind-fixed axis solution. The differences are believed to be in the computation techniques used and the numerical accuracy of each solution. As noted earlier, the GASL program obtains a solution at each point represented by the intersection of two characteristic lines in a  $\theta_n$  plane. This point also lies in a  $Z_w$  plane, and the points between the body and the shock in each plane are interpolated at eleven points in the R direction and eighteen points in the  $\theta$  direction. At angles of attack, large variations in the slopes of the characteristics lines occur from the windward to the leeward side of the body, and this implies large deviations in their intersections from a single  $Z_w$  plane. This requires the convergence criteria to be relatively loose at angle of attack, and thus the accuracy of the numerical solution suffers at zero angle of attack. However, when the convergence criteria in the AEDC axisymmetric program are not met, the mesh size is reduced by doubling the number of points along a right running characteristic from the shock to the body. This latter procedure generates a finer network of points, and the solution is inherently more accurate. Therefore, the difference between the AEDC and GASL wind-fixed axis solution at zero angle of attack must be viewed as an indication of the built-in inaccuracy within the GASL method.

The differences between the experimental data and the AEDC axisymmetric characteristics solution shown in Fig. 2 have recently been investigated by Lewis and Whitfield (Ref. 5). The results of that study showed that the difference can be accounted for on the basis of a combined inviscid-viscous interaction solution. They showed that for the range of conditions of interest in the present study, the correlation of  $C_p/2\sigma_c^2$  against  $Z_c$  as given previously by Griffith and Lewis (Ref. 4) was in good agreement with the results of the inviscid-viscous interaction solution. Therefore, at zero angle of attack the differences between the experimental data and the AEDC inviscid characteristics solution are believed to be primarily caused by viscous effects, and the differences between the two inviscid solutions are believed to be numerical.

When considering the angle-of-attack results, one should keep in mind these comments which only strictly apply at zero angle of attack. The effects of numerical accuracy and viscous interaction will remain important at angles of attack and particularly at small angles of attack. Effects of viscous interaction, at least on the windward side, will be reduced with increasing angle of attack.

# 3.2 SURFACE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS AT ANGLES OF ATTACK

## 3.2.1 Effects of Change-of-Frame

In performing the calculations with the GASL wind-fixed axis program at angles of attack, it was necessary to select positions along the body at which changes-of-frame of reference were made. Such changesof-frame were made by specifying the  $Z_w$  at which the change was to occur and the incremental change in  $X_w$ . Since both quantities were arbitrarily chosen, it was of interest to see the effects of these quantities on the solution. To investigate these effects several computer solutions were obtained for the 10-deg angle-of-attack case with a wide variation in the change-of-frame schedules. The results of these comparisons will now be presented.

Three different solutions were obtained at an angle of attack of 10 deg with three change-of-frame schedules. Figure 3 is a sketch of the model showing the changes-of-frame for the three solutions denoted solutions 1, 2, and 3. Solutions 1 and 2 differ only after the fourth change-of-frame, and solution number 3 was selected such that  $\Delta X_w = 0.2$ ; that is, whenever  $\Delta Z_w \tan a = 0.2$  a change-of-frame was made. All three solutions were found to be practically identical to change-of-frame number 5 for solution number 2 and to change-of-frame number 10 for solution number 3. However, solution number 1 departed radically from solutions number 2 and 3 further downstream. Figure 3b shows the radial surface pressure distribution for the three solutions at two  $Z_B$  stations where experimental data were available for comparison. The comparison shows solution number 2 is considerably improved over solution number 1. It is interesting to note, however, that a further increase in the number of changes-of-frame had no significant effect on the distribution as shown by solution number 3. Since the criteria for making a change-of-frame are arbitrary, it does appear that one should investigate the effects by making comparisons of the type shown above.

The solution from the GASL body-fixed axis program is also shown in Fig. 3b. Comparison of the body-fixed axis solution and solution number 3 shows excellent agreement except near the most windward and most leeward streamlines. There are also some small differences in the region of minimum pressure. It is also of interest to note that the experimental pressure distributions along the most windward ( $\theta_B = 0$ ) and most leeward ( $\theta_B = \pi$ ) streamlines are in better agreement with the body-fixed axis solution. Because of this and certain overall improvements in smoothness of the solution, the body-fixed axis solution is preferred. However, as noted above, most of the calculations for this study were completed before the body-fixed axis program became available.

Solutions were obtained for a = 5, 10, and 20 deg with change-of-frame schedules similar to those of solution number 1 shown in Fig. 3a. Only after examination of solution number 1 and the "wells" of low pressure noted were the two other solutions obtained for  $a = 10 \deg$ . The  $a = 5 \deg$ case did not exhibit the formation of any low pressure wells. However, for  $\alpha = 20 \deg$  the problem of low pressure wells became more acute, and the solution failed to converge on the leeward side at a Z<sub>w</sub> station only about one-third of the total length of the body. In order to continue the solution over the remainder of the body, it was necessary to delete  $\theta_w$ planes in the leeward region downstream of the  $Z_w$  plane where the failure occurred. This was accomplished by limiting the maximum value of  $\theta_w$ to less than the value where the failure occurred. Before the a = 20-deg solution was continued an a = 15-deg solution was obtained with a changeof-frame criteria similar to that in solution 3 above, viz.  $\Delta Z_w$  tan  $\alpha = 0.2$ . Difficulties similar to those encountered in the  $\alpha$  = 20-deg solution were observed for the  $\alpha = 15$ -deg case. Except in the latter case, the failure occurred about two-thirds of  $Z_{B_{max}}$ . However, it was necessary again to delete  $\theta_w$  planes to continue the solution. Because of this result, it was felt that increasing the changes-of-frame in the 20-deg case would not improve the solution significantly, since deleting  $\theta_w$  planes in the leeward region is tantamount to removing the leeward boundary condition

from the solution, viz., the requirement that the cross velocity be zero along the most leeward streamline. Little can be said regarding the validity of solutions obtained under conditions where  $\theta_{\rm w}$  planes are deleted. Therefore, only representative radial distributions will be presented to illustrate the character of the solutions upstream and downstream of the Z<sub>w</sub> plane where the solutions failed to converge. Figure 4 shows the change-of-frame schedules for all angles of attack used in the wind-fixed axis solutions.

# 3.2.2 Windward and Leeward Streamline Pressure Distributions

The computed longitudinal pressure distributions on the windward  $(\theta_B = 0)$  and leeward  $(\theta_B = \pi)$  streamlines on the conical portion of the body are compared with experimental data in Figs. 5a, b, and c for a = 5, 10, and 20 deg. Lack of experimental data at a = 15 deg prevented a similar comparison for that case. The experimental data show considerable scatter, but in comparison with the computed distributions, the agreement is reasonably good. The agreement is improved with increasing angle of attack, especially along the most windward streamline, and as noted above, viscous effects are reduced with increasing angle of attack. At a = 10 deg the distributions along the most windward and leeward streamlines from the body-fixed solution are also shown, and the results are seen to be in better agreement than the corresponding wind-fixed axis solutions.

At a = 5 and 10 deg along the leeward streamlines the agreement between the experimental and numerical pressure distributions is not as good as for the windward streamlines. The agreement improves somewhat with angle of attack. However, because of the low pressure region, experimentally there will be a thick laminar boundary layer interacting with the inviscid outer flow. This viscous interaction will induce a pressure increment as noted previously for zero angle of attack. Since the solution along the leeward streamline at 20-deg angle of attack only existed over approximately the first one-third of the body, the comparison shown in Fig. 5c is interesting, but conclusive statements regarding the results are not possible.

It is well known that the nose-dominated region of spherically blunted slender cones extends many nose diameters downstream. That is, for a cone of small half-angle (e.g.  $\sigma_c \leq 9 \deg$ ), the inviscid blunt cone surface pressure distribution will require more than 60 nose radii before approaching the inviscid sharp cone value. As the cone angle increases the nose-dominated region is reduced in extent. The pressure distribution is characterized by a strong overexpansion and recompression to the sharp cone value. It is of interest to note at zero-lift that

AEDC-TR-65-234

the cone under investigation ends at approximately the minimum in the overexpansion and recompression region. It is also of interest to note from Figs. 5a and b that the same effects of the nose-dominated region are observed along the windward streamlines at a = 5 and 10 deg.

Axisymmetric characteristic solutions were obtained for spherically blunted cones with half-angles  $\sigma_c = 9 + a \deg$ . Figure 5d shows a comparison of the axisymmetric solutions for  $\sigma_c = 14$  and  $19 \deg$  and the "corresponding" GASL solutions for a = 5 and  $10 \deg$ . Of primary interest here is the approximately constant difference between the solutions for the range of  $Z_w$  shown and the smaller difference between solutions as  $\sigma_c$ or  $\alpha$  increases. This is in agreement with the results and comments given for a = 0. It is also of interest to note the small effects of cross flow along the most windward streamline as indicated by the good agreement between the axisymmetric and three-dimensional solutions. It thus appears that an axisymmetric characteristics solution adequately predicts the most windward streamline pressure level and the overexpansion and recompression regions for an equivalent angle,  $\sigma_{c_{equiv}} =$  $\sigma_{\rm c}$  + a. Except in the asymptotic limit of large  $Z_{\rm B}$  or large cone angle,  $\sigma_{\rm c}$ , modified Newtonian is unable to predict the correct pressure level and, in any event, is unable to predict the overexpansion and recompression pressure region. The axisymmetric calculations gave  $p/p'_{\alpha} = 0.0594$ , 0.1230, and 0.2440 for  $\alpha = 5, 10$ , and 20 deg, respectively, for the limiting surface pressure ratio, and modified Newtonian theory gave corresponding values of 0.057, 0.105, and 0.236. A comparison with the experimental data of Table I shows good agreement with these values. The limits of applicability of the Newtonian theory will be clearer from comparisons of predicted and experimental radial pressure distributions at angles of attack.

#### 3.2.3 Radial Pressure Distributions

Comparisons of the radial pressure distributions at several positions along the body computed by the GASL wind-fixed axis program and modified Newtonian are presented in Fig. 6 for  $a = 5 \deg$ . The available experimental data are also shown for comparison. Only at  $Z_B = 10.675$  were data available for a range of the viscous hypersonic parameter,  $\bar{v}_{\infty}$ . The trends of the distributions from the GASL wind-fixed axis solution and experiment are in good agreement. As noted before, the experimental data are strongly viscous affected especially at this low angle of attack. It should be noted here that the CAL experimental data are for  $M_{\infty} = 13$ , whereas the calculation was made for  $M_{\infty} = 18$ . It would be surprising indeed if the differences shown were strongly Mach number dependent. Moreover, the Reynolds numbers for the experiments were sufficiently high  $(\bar{v}_{\infty} = 0.034)$  that it would be equally surprising if the

differences between experiment and numerical results were attributable entirely to viscous interaction. Thus, further calculations and experiments at the CAL conditions would be of interest at  $a = 5 \deg$ .

Modified Newtonian theory is also shown in Fig. 6 for comparison with the GASL solution and experimental data. The comparison shows reasonably good agreement over the windward side and far downstream of the nose. It is under these conditions, of course, where the shock wave is nearly parallel to the body that one would expect Newtonian theory to better apply; however, even over the windward side the GASL solution better predicts the trends of the experimental data.

Radial distributions for  $a = 10 \deg$  are shown in Fig. 7 for comparison with the considerably larger body of experimental data. It was, in fact. this body of data which influenced the decision to obtain the GASL body-fixed axis solution for this condition. In contrast to the a = 5-deg experimental data, the experimental scatter here appears to be considerably reduced, and the agreement with the numerical surface pressure distribution is quite good to  $\theta_{\rm B} \approx 120 \, \text{deg}$ . The largest body of experimental data exists for this case at  $Z_B = 10.675$ , and as in the a = 5-deg case, there was no consistent trend of the experimental data with Reynolds number. Modified Newtonian theory is seen to be in better agreement with the experimental data in the windward region than in the previous  $a = 5 \deg$  case. This is not surprising since the shock wave lies closer to the body along the windward side and is more nearly parallel with the body. Modified Newtonian theory also again fails in the leeward region, and comparisons of the GASL solution and experimental data also show poor agreement on the leeward side of the body.

The discovery of the inviscid low pressure "wells" on the leeward side of the body at  $a \ge 10 \text{ deg}$  and their apparent strong effects on the solution was one of the more interesting aspects of the present study. These low pressure regions have been observed experimentally on other axisymmetric bodies at low Mach numbers and high Reynolds numbers. However, the experimental data at  $M_{\infty} \sim 18$  did not indicate their existence. A well was first noted in the distributions shown here at  $Z_B = 5.250$ . However, it was found that once the well began to develop the minimum pressure tended to drop rather rapidly with increasing  $Z_B$  and ultimately led to the failure of the solution to converge. The a = 10 deg calculation was continued, and the solution failed to converge at  $Z_b \approx 22$ . The experimental data do not appear to support the development of the low pressure wells. However, viscous effects could mask the effect and almost certainly would strongly affect the pressure distribution in this region.

There appear to be two simple explanations for the development of the inviscid wells. First, consider the flow along a streamline on the body surface. The fluid expands along the streamline from the high pressure windward side. However, as the leeward side of the body is approached it is necessary for the streamlines to be turned back toward the free-stream direction since the streamlines cannot cross. This bunching of streamlines near the most leeward streamline\* will create a ridge of high pressure. The second explanation is related to the alleged loose convergent criterion discussed earlier. At the higher angles of attack the right running characteristics on the leeward side of the body are more nearly parallel with the body so that the distance between the intersections becomes large. Therefore, the possibility of errors affecting the solution is increased. The first explanation appears physically reasonable. However, in any numerical solution as complex as this the effects of numerical inaccuracies can never by entirely neglected. In any event, let it suffice to say that a problem area exists in the simple, straightforward application of the numerical results.

Finally, distributions for a = 15 and 20 deg are shown in Figs. 8a and b, respectively, to further illustrate the development of the low pressure wells and to show the distributions at  $Z_B = 10.675$  obtained downstream of the leeward region cut-off plane. Notice the excellent agreement between the GASL solution and modified Newtonian theory. However, in view of the procedure used to obtain the GASL solution (viz. deleting  $\theta_w$  planes) the results must be viewed with caution.

Beyond the interest in the comparisons with experimental pressure distributions shown here, the results should be useful in conjunction with a three-dimensional boundary-layer analysis. Examination of the surface pressure distributions for  $\alpha = 10 \deg$  leads one to consider the effects of the low pressure wells and strong adverse pressure gradients on a boundary-layer solution. It is well known that laminar boundary layers cannot sustain strong adverse pressure gradients, and the adverse gradient shown for  $\alpha = 10 \deg$  and  $Z_{\rm B} = 12.55$  in Fig. 7 would be sufficient to separate a laminar boundary layer. To further investigate this problem, the following hypothetical case was studied.

# 3.3 PRESSURE AND STREAMLINE DISTRIBUTIONS ON A CONSTANT ENTROPY SURFACE

To investigate the behavior of the pressure distribution within the shock layer, a constant entropy surface (S/R = 15.754) was considered at  $\alpha = 10 \text{ deg}$ . The entropy at the intersection of the initial surface and the bow shock wave at  $\theta_B = 0$  was chosen. The initial surface was a plane

<sup>\*</sup>The authors are indebted to E. A. Sanlorenzo, General Applied Sciences Laboratory, for an interesting discussion of this point.

normal to the body axis at  $Z_B = -0.33787$  and intersected the bow shock wave and  $\theta_B = 0$  at 60.25 deg (acute angle measured at the center of the sphere from  $Z_w$  axis). This value of the entropy is the minimum for the complete three-dimensional characteristics flow field solution and is independent of angle of attack for these initial surface data. It should be emphasized that this constant entropy surface (bounding an "entropy layer") is not the "edge" of the boundary layer but is rather a surface within the inviscid shock layer along which certain data were obtained.

The GASL streamline tracing program was used to interpolate the inviscid shock layer, establish the coordinates of the constant entropy surface, trace the streamlines on that surface, and interpolate for the flow field variables along the streamlines. Figure 9 shows the cross sections of the body, shock wave, and constant entropy surface at selected stations for  $a = 10 \deg$ . Figure 10 shows the streamline distributions on the body and on the constant entropy surface. Note the significantly reduced curvature of the streamlines on the constant entropy surface relative to those on the body surface. More significant comparisons are shown, however, in Fig. 11 where pressure contours on the body surface and the constant entropy surface are shown. The development of the low pressure wells on the body surface is easily seen in Fig. 11a, and a low pressure well is seen to form at  $Z_B \equiv 18$ on the constant entropy surface. Note, however, that the wells begin to form on the constant entropy surface approximately three times further downstream than on the body surface. It should also be mentioned here that the solution failed to converge at  $Z_B \approx 22$  on the body surface. Thus, the formation of the well and the associated adverse pressure gradient on the constant entropy surface would indicate that a much smaller adverse pressure gradient exists within the shock layer than on the body surface. These results, although only qualitative, are believed to be significant for they clearly show that whereas a boundarylayer solution would separate based on the inviscid wall pressure distribution, a similar calculation based on the boundary-layer-edge pressure distribution (simulated here by the constant entropy surface) would be less subject to strong adverse pressure gradients.

Comparisons between the experimental surface pressures and the computed pressures on the constant entropy surface at  $a = 10 \deg$  are shown in Fig. 7. The agreement between experiment and the constant entropy surface data is better than a similar comparison with the pressure distribution along the inviscid wall. Because of the arbitrariness of the constant entropy surface, only the trends should be considered here, and those trends are in good agreement with the experimental data.

## 3.4 FORCE AND MOMENT COEFFICIENTS

The second area of primary interest in the present report is a comparison between calculated and experimentally measured force and moment coefficients. Numerical results will be presented based on surface pressure distributions obtained from the GASL solutions and modified Newtonian theory. In addition, numerical and experimental normal-force and pitching-moment coefficients will be used to calculate the slopes,  $C_{N_a}$  and  $C_{m_a}$ . However, before discussing the results at angle of attack a few comments will be made on previous studies at zero-lift.

# 3.4.1 Zero-Lift Drag Studies

The effects of viscous interaction on wall measurable quantities have received much attention in VKF in recent years. The primary shape considered in those studies was also a 0.3 bluntness 9-deg halfangle cone. The effects of viscous interaction on zero-lift drag were studied by Whitfield and Griffith (Refs. 3 and 10). More recently, Lewis and Whitfield (Ref. 5) re-examined the experimental data and earlier analysis at zero-lift. Two important results from these studies should be noted here: First, for the range of experimental conditions of the present study the total viscous drag was approximately twice the inviscid pressure drag. Secondly, the application of the most exact currently available theories (viz. characteristics and nonsimilar boundary-layer solutions) at zero-lift underestimated the total drag, thus implying significant contributions by other so-called "second-order" boundary-layer effects (especially shock generated external vorticity, cf. Ref. 5).

#### 3.4.2 Angle-of-Attack Results

Figure 12 shows a comparison of experimental and theoretically predicted force and moment coefficients for a 9-deg half-angle spherically blunted cone over a range of angles of attack,  $\alpha = 0$  to 20 deg. The experimental data shown from AEDC-VKF and CAL were all chosen at nominal values of  $\tilde{v}_{\infty} = 0.05$  and wall-to-stagnation temperature ratio  $T_w/T_o = 0.1$ . The present results (in agreement with the previous results of Whitfield and Wolny (Ref. 11)) show that the inviscid normal-force and pitching-moment coefficients,  $C_N$  and  $C_m$ , are in reasonably good agreement with the experimental data over the entire angle-of-attack range. However, in agreement with the zero-lift data, the axial-force coefficient,  $C_A$ , is strongly viscous affected over the angle-of-attack range considered herein. The trends of the numerical and experimental results are, however, in reasonably good agreement. For comparison, Harris' results from the NASA helium tunnel (Ref. 12) and a  $R_n/R_b = 0.255$ 

10-deg half-angle cone at  $M_{\infty} = 19$  and  $\text{Re}_{\infty}/\text{in.} = 200,000$  (corresponding to a  $\overline{v}_{\infty} = 0.016$ ) are also shown. The agreement between the present analysis for  $\gamma = 7/5$  and the experimental data in helium ( $\gamma = 5/3$ ) is excellent for  $\alpha \leq 7.5 \text{ deg.}$ \* At a Reynolds number almost one order of magnitude higher than the AEDC-VKF and CAL experimental data, the viscous-induced drag should, of course, be substantially reduced. The strong effects of viscous interaction on the axial-force coefficient are also shown on Fig. 12d with a plot of lift-to-drag ratio against angle of attack. From this figure it can be seen that the integrated GASL results substantially overpredict the lift-to-drag ratio because of the rather large viscous-induced axial-force increment. Again, it is also interesting to note that the NASA helium tunnel data are in substantial agreement with the integrated GASL results.

Modified Newtonian theory was also used to compute the force and moment coefficients for the range of angles of attack,  $a \leq 20 \text{ deg}$ , Fig. 12. Based on the comparison with the experimental data, the theory is not clearly inferior to the GASL prediction and appears to be a reasonably good approximation for the normal-force and pitching-moment coefficients,  $C_N$  and  $C_m$ . Moreover, only relatively small differences exist between theoretical predictions of  $C_A$  based on modified Newtonian theory and the integrated GASL results. The area of largest difference between the two theories occurs at the lower angles of attack (a < 10 deg). The significant differences between the predicted values of the normal-force coefficient,  $C_N$ , are reflected in the lift-to-drag ratio curve, where again it should be noted that better agreement exists between the integrated GASL results and the experimental data than was found using the modified Newtonian theory.

# 3.4.3 Stability Derivatives

Stability analyses make use of normal-force and pitching-moment coefficient slopes,  $C_{N_{\alpha}}$  and  $C_{m_{\alpha}}$ . It was, therefore, of interest to examine the integrated GASL and modified Newtonian results for predictions of those slopes. The coefficients  $C_N$  and  $C_m$  are again shown in Fig. 13 based on the two theoretical models. In addition, the variation of  $C_{N_{\alpha}}$  and  $C_{m_{\alpha}}$  with angle of attack is also shown. An experimental uncertainty of ±10 percent was associated with the experimental AEDC-VKF and CAL data and is also shown. The minimum and maximum of the experimental

<sup>\*</sup>The differences in cone geometry, Mach number, and  $\gamma$  make a quantitative comparison between the numerical results at  $\gamma = 1.4$  and the helium tunnel experimental data impossible; the trends of the experimental data are as expected.

data, treated as two separate curves, were interpolated at 2.5-deg intervals with a four-point Lagrangian interpolation formula over the range a = 0 to 15 deg. The results were differentiated numerically with a cubic spline, and the resulting slopes are shown as shaded areas in the figure. Of most importance here is the trend of the results rather than the absolute values of the normal-force and pitching-moment slopes. Absolute differences between experiment and theory are difficult to determine because of the uncertainty in the experimental data and the errors induced by numerical differentiation. It is clear from the results shown that the integrated GASL results over the range a = 0 to 10 deg give trends that are in good agreement with the experimental data, whereas the modified Newtonian theory results are in poor agreement with the experimental trends.

# SECTION IY CONCLUDING REMARKS

Comparisons have been made between an ideal gas ( $\gamma = 1.4$ ) threedimensional characteristics solution (GASL), the modified Newtonian theory and available experimental data for pressure distributions, force and moment coefficients, and stability derivatives for a 9-deg spherically blunted cone over the angle-of-attack range from 0 to 20 deg. The results were as follows:

- 1. The effects of arbitrarily prescribed change-of-frame criteria in the wind-fixed axis solution were investigated. The criteria  $\Delta Z_w \tan \alpha = 0.2$  gave good results over the range of angles of attack and axial distance considered in the present study. Some improvement was found by using the body-fixed axis solution and is to be preferred in further studies of axisymmetric bodies at angles of attack. However, the differences found in surface pressure distributions were small, and the wind-fixed axis results given in the present report were only slightly affected.
- 2. A comparison between the GASL results and an axisymmetric characteristic solution at zero angle of attack indicated differences in the pressure distribution along the body of about 10 percent. The GASL result was found to be uniformly below an AEDC ideal gas axisymmetric solution. Previous studies have shown that differences between inviscid solutions and experimental data of the order of 10 percent can be explained as the viscous-induced pressure increment. Therefore, caution should be exerted when using the GASL wind-fixed solution to predict pressure distribution at zero angle of attack.

- 3. Predictions of windward streamline pressure distributions from the GASL results were found to be in better agreement with the experimental data with increasing angle of attack, and at 10-deg angle of attack the comparison was quite good. Because of the necessity of dropping  $\theta_w$  planes at  $\alpha = 15$  and 20 deg, the comparison of windward streamline pressure distribution at  $\alpha = 20$  deg was interesting, but conclusive statements regarding the comparison were not possible.
- 4. Comparison of experimental and theoretically predicted radial pressure distributions based on the GASL and modified Newtonian theories showed the GASL results to be uniformly superior in predicting the trends of the experimental data. At low angles of attack the differences between the GASL results and the experimental data are believed to be primarily caused by viscous effects. Since  $\theta_w$  planes were deleted for  $a \ge 10 \deg$ , comparison of leeward side pressure distributions was not possible over much of the body at  $a = 20 \deg$ . Low pressure "wells" were found to develop along the surface at  $a \ge 10 \deg$ . The experimental data did not indicate such formations; however, further experimental data are needed along the leeward side at angles of attack.
- 5. The possible effects of the low pressure "wells" were investigated along a constant entropy surface within the inviscid shock layer. The curvature of the streamlines and the depth of the low pressure wells were substantially less along the constant entropy surface than along the body surface. The agreement between the experimental wall and the computed, constant entropy surface pressures was better than with the computed inviscid wall pressures.
- 6. Force and moment coefficients were approximated reasonably well by both the integrated GASL wind-fixed axis solution and those based on modified Newtonian theory. The normal-force and pitching-moment coefficients,  $C_N$  and  $C_m$ , were found to be in good agreement with the experimental data when computed from the GASL results. In agreement with previous studies of viscous effects on zero-lift drag, the predicted inviscid axial-force coefficient,  $C_A$ , was found to be about 40 percent below the experimental data at  $M_{\infty} \sim 18$  over the entire angle-of-attack range. Strong viscous effects were reflected in the lift-to-drag ratio comparison where all theoretical results considerably overpredicted the lift-to-drag ratio.
- 7. Normal-force and pitching-moment coefficients,  $C_N$  and  $C_m$ , were numerically differentiated with respect to angle of attack, *a*.

r.

Comparisons showed results based on the integrated GASL data were in better agreement with the trends of the experimental data than were the results based on modified Newtonian theory.

The results of the present study indicate the GASL characteristic solution should be a valuable tool when coupled with a three-dimensional boundary-layer theory for studying hypersonic viscous effects at angles of attack. Certain limitations and deficiencies were noted which deserve further study (such as the comparison of pressure distributions at zero angle of attack).

# APPENDIX FORCE AND MOMENT EQUATIONS

For comparison with the experimental (body-fixed) pressure distributions, it was convenient to machine interpolate the GASL wind-fixed axis solution. The resulting surface pressure distribution was integrated to obtain the force and moment coefficients for comparison with the experimental data. The transformation, derivation of the force and moment equations, and the details regarding the use of the modified Newtonian theory will be given below.

## **TRANSFORMATIONS**

It can be seen from Fig. 1 that the two axes systems of interest are related by a rotation transformation, which in matrix form is as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_{w} \\ Y_{w} \\ Z_{w} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & 0 & \sin \alpha \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin \alpha & 0 & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_{B} \\ Y_{B} \\ Z_{B} \end{pmatrix}$$
(1)

In the body-axis system, the X and Y coordinates were replaced by the polar coordinates  $R_B$  and  $\theta_B$ , so that

$$X_B = R_B \cos \theta_B$$
,  $Y_B = R_B \sin \theta_B$  (2)

where  $X_B$ ,  $Y_B$ , and  $R_B$  are nondimensionalized with respect to the nose radius. Using the results in Eq. (2) in the scalar form of Eq. (1) the result was obtained:

$$X_{w} = R_{B} \cos \theta_{B} \cos \alpha + Z_{B} \sin \alpha$$

$$Y_{w} = Y_{B} = R_{B} \sin \theta_{B}$$

$$Z_{w} = Z_{B} \cos \alpha - R_{B} \cos \theta_{B} \sin \alpha$$
(3)

The geometry was such that

$$\theta_{\rm B} = \tan^{-1} (Y_{\rm B}/X_{\rm B}), \ \theta_{\rm w} = \tan^{-1} (Y_{\rm w}/X_{\rm w})$$

Thus,

$$\theta_{w} = \tan^{-1} \left[ R_{B} \sin \theta_{B} / (R_{B} \cos \theta_{B} \cos \alpha + Z_{B} \sin \alpha) \right]$$
(4)

so that Eqs. (3) and (4) are the transformation equations from bodyfixed to wind-fixed axes.

Inasmuch as the reference axis for  $\theta_w$  within each change-of-frame was the shifted  $Z_w$ , there was a correction on  $X_w$  in computing tan  $\theta_w$ .

This correction was to decrease  $X_w$  by the sum of the  $\Delta X_w$ 's for all changes-of-frame up to the point considered. The result is

$$\theta_{\rm w} = \tan^{-1} \left[ {\rm R}_{\rm B} \sin \theta_{\rm B} / ({\rm R}_{\rm B} \cos \theta_{\rm B} \cos \alpha + {\rm Z}_{\rm B} \sin \alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Delta X_{w_i}) \right]$$
(5)

where m is the number of changes-of-frame to  $Z_w$ . For a given  $Z_B$  and  $\theta_B$ , Eq. (5) and the last of Eq. (3) were used to determine  $Z_w$  and  $\theta_w$ . The pressure was computed by the four-point Lagrangian formula,

$$Y_{1} = F_{1}(x) Y_{1} + F_{2}(x) Y_{2} + F_{3}(x) Y_{3} + F_{4}(x) Y_{4}$$

where

$$F_{1}(x) = \frac{(x - x_{2})(x - x_{3})(x - x_{4})}{(x_{1} - x_{2})(x_{1} - x_{3})(x_{1} - x_{4})}, \qquad F_{2}(x) = \frac{(x - x_{1})(x - x_{3})(x - x_{4})}{(x_{2} - x_{1})(x_{2} - x_{3})(x_{2} - x_{4})}$$

$$F_{3}(x) = \frac{(x - x_{1})(x - x_{2})(x - x_{4})}{(x_{3} - x_{1})(x_{3} - x_{2})(x_{3} - x_{4})}, \qquad F_{4}(x) = \frac{(x - x_{1})(x - x_{2})(x - x_{3})}{(x_{4} - x_{1})(x_{4} - x_{2})(x_{4} - x_{3})}$$

and the subscript numbers represent the known values to be interpolated in both  $Z_w$  and  $\theta_w$ . More specifically, for a given  $Z_B$  and  $\theta_B$  the corresponding  $Z_w$  and  $\theta_w$  were computed. The computer searched the GASL results for four sets of pressures which bracketed both  $Z_w$  and  $\theta_w$ , preferably two on each side; however, as the end of the body or a changeof-frame was approached, a three and one or an end point interpolation was used. In all, five interpolations were necessary to define the pressure at a point--four were required to determine the pressure at each of the four known  $\theta_w$ 's in the desired  $Z_w$  plane, and a final interpolation on  $\theta_w$ gave the desired result. In the present analysis, these calculations were performed at 0.2 intervals in  $Z_B$  from -1 to 14.644 with additional special  $Z_B$  values for comparison purposes. In each  $Z_B$  plane, pressures were computed in 10-deg increments in  $\theta_B$ . The resultant pressures were printed out and stored for later use in the force equations.

## FORCE COEFFICIENTS

A general expression for the resultant force coefficient attributable to the surface pressure is

$$C_{F_{\overrightarrow{n}}} = \int_{A} \int C_{p} \vec{n} \, dA / \pi R_{b}^{2}$$
(6)

where  $\pi Rb^2$  is the reference base area,  $C_p$  the local pressure coefficient, and  $\vec{n}$  the local inward unit normal vector for an element of surface area, dA. As can be readily seen, the normal vector and the elemental area are functions of the local geometry, so that for the present case Eq. (6) was evaluated for two regions--the spherical cap

and the conical afterbody. However, for ease of computing, three regions were chosen, as shown in the following sketch.



In regions 1 and 2, the integration was performed in the wind-fixed axis system because these regions represented a sphere at zero angle of attack. So that for a given  $Z_w$ ,  $C_p$  was constant, i. e.,  $C_p \neq f(\theta_w)$ . Immediately, in region 1

$$(C_{F_{Z_{w}}})_{t} = -(2/R_{b}^{2}) - \int_{-1}^{Z_{w_{1}}} C_{p} Z_{w} dZ_{w}$$
 (7)

In region 1, the net effect of the forces acting in the  $X_w$  or  $Y_w$  direction was zero.

The resulting equations for region 2 are different only because of the lower limit of integration formed by the plane  $Z_{B_i}$ ; that is, the range of integration over  $\theta_w$  was  $+ \theta_{w_i}$  to  $-\theta_{w_i}$ . For given  $Z_w$  and  $Z_{B_i}$ , one obtains

$$\theta_{B_i} = \cos^{-1} \left[ (Z_w - Z_{B_i} \cos \alpha) / - R_{B_i} \sin \alpha \right]$$

where

$$R_{B_i} = \sqrt{1 - Z_{B_i}^2}$$

 $\operatorname{and}$ 

 $\theta_{W_1} = \tan^{-1} \left[ R_{B_1} \sin \theta_{B_1} / (R_{B_1} \cos \theta_{B_1} \cos \alpha + Z_{B_1} \sin \alpha) \right]$ 

Because of symmetry, the following equations result in region 2:

In region 1, the values of  $C_p$  were taken from the blunt body (inverse) solution, which was used to compute the initial data for the GASL supersonic solution (region 3). In region 2, the solution obtained from the GASL program was used. In region 3,  $C_p = C_p(\theta_w, Z_w) = C_p(\theta_B, Z_B)$ , and from a geometrical view the equations are more tractable in the body-fixed axis system. The expression for the inward unit normal vector in the body-fixed axis system at any point on the cone was substituted into Eq. (6), and the integration performed with the result that

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_{F_{Z_B}} \end{pmatrix}_{s} = (2 \tan \sigma_{c} / \pi R_{b}^{2}) \int_{Z_{B_{1}}}^{Z_{B_{max}}} R_{B}(Z_{B}) \int_{c}^{\theta_{B_{max}}} C_{p}(\theta_{B}, Z_{B}) d\theta_{B} dZ_{B}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_{F_{X_B}} \end{pmatrix}_{s} = -(2 / \pi R_{b}^{2}) \int_{Z_{B_{1}}}^{Z_{B_{max}}} R_{B}(Z_{B}) \int_{c}^{\theta_{B_{max}}} C_{p}(\theta_{B}, Z_{B}) \cos \theta_{B} d\theta_{B} dZ_{B}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} (9) \\ (2 - \pi R_{b}^{2}) \\ Z_{B_{1}} \end{pmatrix}_{s} = -(2 / \pi R_{b}^{2}) \int_{Z_{B_{1}}}^{Z_{B_{max}}} R_{B}(Z_{B}) \int_{c}^{\theta_{B_{max}}} C_{p}(\theta_{B}, Z_{B}) \cos \theta_{B} d\theta_{B} dZ_{B}$$

In this region, the GASL results were interpolated for a selected  $Z_B$ , the integrals over  $\theta_B$  evaluated by the trapezoidal rule, and the results were then integrated over  $Z_B$  by the trapezoidal rule. Because of the large number of  $Z_B$  planes (150), this technique was considered to be sufficiently accurate. Because of symmetry, in all three regions the side forces integrate to zero.

#### MOMENT COEFFICIENT

The general equation for the three moments about a point  $^{\prime\prime}O^{\prime\prime}$  may be expressed as

$$\left(\vec{C}_{M}\right)_{o} = \int_{A} \int \vec{r} \times C_{p} \vec{n} \, dA / \pi R_{b}^{2} D_{b}$$
(10)

where  $\vec{r}$  is the radius vector from point "O". In regions 1 and 2, the point "O" was chosen as the nose of the sphere ( $Z_w = -1$ ), so that

The latter result was obtained because the resultant moment arm of the forces in region 2 was unity. In region 3, the point "O" was taken as the intersection of  $Z_B$  with the sphere, so that

$$(C_m)_{\sigma,s} = -(2/\pi R_b^2 D_b) \int_{Z_{B_1}}^{Z_{B_{max}}} R_B [R_B \tan \sigma_c + Z_B + 1] \times$$

$$\int_{\sigma}^{\theta_{B_{max}}} C_p (\theta_B, Z_B) \cos \theta_B d\theta_B dZ_B$$

$$(12)$$

To add all the contributions of the various regions, the coefficients in regions 1 and 2 were transformed to region 3 through the angle of attack, so that the following expressions were obtained for the axial-force, normal-force, and pitching-moment coefficients and center of pressure location from the nose:

$$C_{A} = \left[ \left( C_{F_{Z_{W}}} \right)_{1}^{} + \left( C_{F_{Z_{W}}} \right)_{2}^{} \right] \cos a + \left( C_{F_{X_{W}}} \right)_{2}^{} \sin a + \left( C_{F_{Z_{B}}} \right)_{3}^{} \right]$$

$$C_{N} = \left[ \left( C_{F_{Z_{W}}} \right)_{1}^{} + \left( C_{F_{Z_{W}}} \right)_{2}^{} \right] \sin a - \left( C_{F_{X_{W}}} \right)_{2}^{} \cos a - \left( C_{F_{X_{B}}} \right)_{3}^{} \right]$$

$$C_{n_{1nose}} = \left( C_{m} \right)_{0,3}^{} + \left[ \left( C_{F_{X_{W}}} \right)_{2}^{} \cos a - \left( C_{F_{Z_{W}}} \right)_{2}^{} \sin a \right] / D_{b}$$

$$Z_{cp}/D_{b} = C_{m}/C_{N}$$

$$(13)$$

Also

$$C_{L} = C_{N} \cos \alpha - C_{A} \sin \alpha$$

$$C_{D} = C_{A} \cos \alpha + C_{N} \sin \alpha$$
(14)

and

$$L/D = C_L/C_D \tag{15}$$

These final equations with the results from the GASL program were used to compute the force and moment coefficients for comparison with the experimental data.

#### NEWTONIAN THEORY

The pressure coefficient from modified Newtonian theory is

$$C_{p} = C_{p} \cos^{2} \eta \tag{16}$$

where  $C_{p_o}$  is the pressure coefficient at the forward stagnation point on a blunt body. A value of 1.841 was used for  $C_{p_o}$  in these computations which corresponds to the normal-shock pressure for M = 18. The angle  $\eta$  is the acute angle between the free-stream velocity vector and the local unit normal vector, i. e.

 $\cos \eta = \vec{V} + \vec{n} / |\vec{V}|$   $C_{p} = 1.841 (\vec{V} + \vec{n} / |\vec{V}|)^{2}$ (17)

was used to predict the surface pressure distribution. The value of  $C_p$  was substituted into the force equations, and the Newtonian force coefficients were computed. One precept of the modified Newtonian theory is that the pressure is zero in a "shadowed" region. Thus, on integrating the pressure distribution, the limit was set at  $\cos \eta = 0$ , or  $\eta = \pi/2$ .

Thus

## REFERENCES

- Moretti, G., Sanlorenzo, E. A., Magnus, E. E., and Weilerstein, G. "Supersonic Flow about General Three-Dimensional Bodies: Flow Field Analysis of Reentry Configurations by a General Three-Dimensional Method of Characteristics, Vol. III." ASD-TDR-61-727, October 1962.
- Jenkins, B. Z. "Real Gas Flow Field Properties around Blunt Cones, Vol. I." U. S. Army Missile Command Rept. No. RF-TR-63-18, August 1963.
- Whitfield, Jack D. and Griffith, B. J. "Viscous Effects on Zero-Lift Drag of Slender Blunt Cones." AEDC-TDR-63-35, March 1963. See also AIAA Journal, Vol. 2, No. 10, October 1964, pp. 1714-1722.
- Griffith, B. J. and Lewis, C. H. "Laminar Heat Transfer to Spherically Blunted Cones at Hypersonic Conditions." <u>AIAA Journal</u>, Vol. 2, No. 3, March 1964, p. 438.
- Lewis, Clark H. and Whitfield, J. D. "Theoretical and Experimental Studies of Hypersonic Viscous Effects." Paper presented at the AGARD Specialists' Meeting, Naples, Italy, May 1965, AGARDograph 97, Part III, also AEDC-TR-65-100 (AD 462717), May 1965.
- 6. Sanlorenzo, E. and Petri, F. "Programs for the Analyses of Flow Fields around Spherically Capped Three-Dimensional Bodies at Angles of Attack." GASL-TR-462, September 1964.
- Edenfield, E. E. "Comparison of Hotshot Tunnel Force, Pressure, Heat Transfer and Shock Shape Data with Shock Tunnel Data," AEDC-TDR-64-1 (AD 428916), January 1964.
- 8. Wilkinson, David B. and Harrington, Shelby A. "Hypersonic Force, Pressure, and Heat Transfer Investigations of Sharp and Blunt Slender Cones." AEDC-TDR-63-177 (AD 414616), August 1963.
- Cheng, H. K. "Hypersonic Flow with Combined Leading-Edge Bluntness and Boundary-Layer Displacement Effect." Cornell Aeronautical Lab Report AF-1285-A-4 (AD 243140), August 1960.
- Whitfield, Jack D. and Griffith, B. J. "Viscous Drag Effects on Slender Cones in Low-Density Hypersonic Flow." Submitted for Publication in AIAA Journal.

- Whitfield, Jack D. and Wolny, W. "Hypersonic Static Stability of Blunt Slender Cones." AEDC-TDR-62-166 (AD 282897), August 1962.
- Harris, Julius E. "Force-Coefficient and Moment-Coefficient Correlations and Air-Helium Simulation for Spherically Blunted Cones." NASA-TN-D-2184, November 1964.



a. Cone Nomenclature



b. Cone Coordinate Systems

Fig. 1 Cone Nomenclature and Coordinate Systems



Fig. 2 Zero-Lift Pressure Distribution over 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cones







# b. Radial Pressure Distributions for Three Change-of-Frame Schedules

Fig. 3 Concluded

ī.



Fig. 4 Scheduled Changes-of-Frame for Various Angles of Attack



b.  $a = 10 \deg$ 

Fig. 5 Pressure Distributions along Most Windward and Leeward Streamlines at  $M_\infty\sim$  – 18 and at Angles of Attack



Experimental Data

Fig. 5 Continued











35



Fig. 7 Radial Pressure Distributions over a 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cone at  $M_{\infty}$  - 18 and  $\alpha = 10$  deg



Fig. 7 Concluded



.

a.  $a = 15 \deg$ 

Fig. 8 Radial Pressure Distributions over a 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cone at M<sub>50</sub> ~ 18 and at Angle of Attack

Experimental Data

e



Fig. 8 Concluded

.



Fig. 9 Radial Cross Sections of Shock and Constant Entropy Surfaces at Selected Stations (ZB) versus Radial Angle ( $\theta_B$ )





Fig. 10 Streamline Patterns for a 9-deg Half-Angle Cone at  $\alpha = 10$  deg from the GASL Body-Fixed Axis Solution

41



b. Constant Entropy Surface (S/R = 15.754)

Fig. 10 Concluded



a. Body Surface Isobars

Fig. 11 Pressure Contours for a 9-deg Holf-Angle Cone at  $\alpha = 10$  deg from the GASL Body-Fixed Axis Solution

**4** ω



,

b. Constant Entropy Surface Isobars

Fig. 11 Concluded

AEDC-TR-65-234

# Numerical Results

Ideal Gas ( $\gamma$  = 1, 4),  $M_{co}$  = 18

Pressure Distribution from

---Modified Newtonian

------

I

٠

# Experimental Data

Sym	Source	Mω	Re <sub>m</sub> /in.	$\sigma_{c}$ , deg	R <sub>n</sub> /R <sub>b</sub>	$\overline{v}_{\infty}$	T <sub>W</sub> /T <sub>O</sub>
•	CAL 48-in. Shock Tunnel	14.7	14,000	9	0.3	~0.05	~0.1
	AEDC-VKF 50-in. (H)	18, 45	13,000	9	0.3	~0.05	~01
<u>د</u>	AEDU-VKF 100-IR. (F) NASA Helium Tunnel	10.2-20 19	9,000-41,000 200_000	10	U. 3 0. 255	~0.05	~0.1
			200, 000		0.05	0.02	1.0
	0.8						
	0.6			Å			
	CN			1			
			-8				
	0.4		11				
			6				
	0.2	14					
		0					
	a starter and						
	0	5	10 15	20			
		Angle of A	ttack, ¤, deg				
	1.0	۵.	$C_N$ with $\alpha$				
	-1.0			Î			
	S. R.						
	-0.8						
	с <sub>т</sub>		8	¥			
	-0.6		1				
	15.8-13.		11				
	2.0		1				
	-0.4-	1	/				
		14					
	-0.2	6/					
	19			1			
		1	1 1				
	0	5	10 15	20			
		Angle of A	ttack, α, deg				
		Ь.	C <sub>m</sub> with a				

Fig. 12 Force and Moment Coefficients for Spherically Blunted Cones at  $M_\infty~\sim~18$ 

# Numerical Results

# Ideal Gas (y = 1, 4), M<sub>co</sub> = 18

Pressure Distribution from

—— GASL Wind-Fixed Axis Solution

-- Modified Newtonian

## **Experimental Data**

Sym	Source	<u>M</u> @	Re <sub>o</sub> /in.	$\sigma_c$ , deg	R <sub>n</sub> /R <sub>b</sub>	$\overline{v}_{\underline{\omega}}$	T <sub>W</sub> /T <sub>o</sub>
•	CAL 48-in. Shock Tunnel	14, 7	14,000	9	0.3	~0.05	~0.1
Э	AEDC-VKF 50-in. (H)	18. 45	13,000	9	0, 3	~0.05	~0.1
$\diamond$	AEDC-VKF 100-in. (F)	16.5-20	9,000-41,000	9	0, 3	~0.05	~0.1
	NASA Helium Tunnel	19	200, 000	10	0.255	~0.02	~1.0



d. Lift-to-Drag Ratio with a

Fig. 12 Concluded



. .....

Fig. 13 Variation of Normal-Force and Pitching-Mament Coefficient Slopes with Angle of Attack for a 9-deg Half-Angle Spherically Blunted Cone at  $M_{\infty} \sim 18$ 

		TABLE I	
PRESSURE	DATA	FROM AEDC-VKF	TUNNELS

Surface Distance, s Axial Distance, Z <sub>B</sub> Model Radial Angle, 6 <sub>B</sub> , deg			2.70 1.125 0	4.19 2.61 180	10.35 8.675 0	12, 35 10, 675 157, 5	12.35 10.675 112.5	12.35 10.675 67.5	12,35 10.675 22.5	14.28 12.55 180	15,28 13,54 0	10.35 8.675 180	
Tunnel Run No. Tunnel Tunnel Angle of Attack Roll Angle					P/Po								
- <u>-</u> 50-1n. (H)	1362*	0	0	0,0456	0.0360	0.0263	0,0212	0, 0223	0.0249	0.0232	0.0227	0.0239	
1	1363	0	0	0.0459	0.0345	0.0238	0,0195	0.0200	0.0221	0.0180	0.0200	0.0183	
	1364*	0	0	0.0521	0.0352	0,0249	0,0240	0.0220	0.0240	0.0229	0,0215	0. 0232	
	1365*	5	0	0.0769	0.0212	0,0564	0,0142	0.0184	0.0340	0.0513	0.0143	0.0632	
ļ	1366	5	0	0.0563	0.0220	0,0459	0.0113	0.0160	0.0312	0.0435	0.0140	0.0542	
1	1367*	10	0	0.0965	0.0213	0.1110	0.0112	0.0147	0.0515	0.1087	0,0110	0.1200	
	1368	10	0	0.0978	0.0184	0.1100	0.0102	0,0131	0.0542	0.1016	0.0100	0.1180	
ļ	1369	5	0		0.0240		0,0106	0.0148	0.0320		0.0137		
1	1370*	U	0	0.0527	0.0362	0.0236	0.0216	0.0222	0.0238	0,0221	0,0216	0.0224	
1	1372*	10	180	0.0278	0.0840	0.0113	0.1030	0,0393	0.0140	0.0122	0.1220	0.0110	
	1373*	20	0	0.2100	0.0150	0.2300	0,0067	0.0140		0.2200	0.0060	0.2400	
	1374	20	0	0.2150	0.0168	0,2540	0.0076	0,0130		0.2310	0.0063	0,2460	
	1379	10	30	0.0982	0.0252	0.1070	0.0128	0.0328	0.1060	0,1300	0.0112	0.1160	
1	1380	10	60	0.0673	0.0269	0.0520	0.0218	0.0710	0.1230	0.0900	0,0129	0.0540	
	1381*	10	90	0.0493	0.0407	0.0270	0,0520	0, 1080	0.1080	0.0485	0.0300	0,0260	
+	1386*	20	180	•••	0.2230	0.0085	0,1950				0.2340		
100-in.(F)	585	0	0	0.0473	0,0367	0,0234	1				0.0219	0,0216	0,0235
	590	0	0	0,0516	0.0401						0.0233	0.0230	0.0244
	592	0	0	0.0494	0.0389	0,0235				•	0.0222	0.0220	0.0224
ł	593	0	0	0.0493		0.0236					0.0219	0.0215	0.0220

-

\*These data presented in Ref. 7 also.

.

# TABLE II TEST CONDITIONS FOR AEDC-VKF PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION DATA (TEST GAS: NITROGEN)

Tunnel Run No.	Angle of Attack, deg	P <sub>o</sub> , psia	Т₀,°К	M <sub>~</sub>	Re <sub>∞</sub> ∕ın.	P <sub>∞ ×</sub> 10³, psia	Т <sub>∞</sub> ,°К	q <sub>∞</sub> ,psia	U <sub>∞</sub> , fps	Po's psia
50-in (H)										
1362	0	7 282	3830	18, 42	9, 035	1 53	66 74	0 363	10 066	0.678
1363	ů ů	6 2 2 9	3498	20.97	6.538	0.57	46.82	0.176	9, 597	0 328
1364	ů ů	7 356	3247	18.84	12.464	1.47	53.37	0.366	9,206	0.682
1365	5	6 497	3243	18.79	11, 183	1.33	53,59	0.330	9, 198	0.614
1366	5	5,803	3460	21,76	5,701	0.43	43.31	0.141	9,577	0,264
1367	10	6,989	3897	18.45	8,313	1.44	67.80	0.342	10, 162	0,640
1368	10	6,937	4164	21.57	4,526	0.47	53.82	0,154	10, 582	0.289
1369	5	6,609	4561	21.25	3,658	0.47	61.00	0.148	11,098	0.279
1370	0	6.807	2862	19.41	14, 274	1.23	44.05	0.324	8,614	0,602
1372	10	8.519	3345	18.97	13, 140	1.59	54.44	0.400	9,363	0,746
1373	20	7,263	3376	18.67	11,542	1.51	56.65	0.367	9,400	0,685
1374	20	7,437	3865	18.38	9,082	1.57	67.71	0.372	10,116	0.695
1379	10	6.543	3473	18.99	9,320	1.19	56.47	0.300	9,547	0.560
1380	10	6,519	2890	19.37	13,433	1.18	44.64	0.310	8,655	0.577
1381	10	6,878	3315	18.89	11,046	1.34	54.30	0.334	9,309	0.622
1386	20	7,523	3232	18.94	12,680	1.46	52.58	0.366	9,185	0.682
100-in (4)										
585	0	19 200	2240	19 40	71 200	4 00	33 62	1 099	7 682	2 044
590	0	22 100	2100	20 10	87 700	4.00	29.81	1.164	7,451	2 164
592	l õ	22 300	2450	19.30	68,500	4.50	37.27	1.233	8,082	2 295
593	o o	21 700	2480	19.20	66,600	4,59	38.22	1, 235	8,112	2.300
	Ŭ Š			10,20				1	-,	2.000

 TABLE III

 MODIFIED \* PRESSURE DATA FROM CAL 48-IN. SHOCK TUNNEL (REF. 8)

Surface Distance, s Axial Distance, $Z_B$ Model Radial Augle, $\theta_R$ , deg			0 -1.00 	1.045 -0.50 180	3.510 1,940 180	4.625 3.025 0	4, 625 3, 025 90	6 890 5.250 180	9,140 7,500 0	9,140 7,500 90	11.390 9720 180	13,630 11,925 0	13,630 11,925 90	$     15.890 \\     14.130 \\     180     $		
Tunnel Run No.	Tunnel Angle of Attack, deg	Tunnel Rott Angle, deg							ρ'ρ <sub>0</sub> , ,							
30	υ	0	ι 000	0, 2398	0,0437	0.0373	0.0255	1 0.0343	0 0330	0.0430	0,0272	0 0316	0 0260			
31	0	L	1.000	0.2518	0,0396	0.0278	0.0411		0,0331	0 0275	0.0192	0, 0312	0,0261	0.0194		
32	0	0	1,000	0.3300	0.0294	0 0295		0.0311	0.0312	0.0254	0.0246	0 0204	0.0258			
33	0	0	1.000	0 3410	0.0414	0 0295	0 0392	0.0323	0,0325	0.0257	0,0258	0,0293	0.0257	0 0279		
12	0	0	1.000	0.2400	0.0450	0.0430	0.0435	0 0352	0,0316	0.0297	0.0276	0.0333	0.0281	0.0307		
13	5	0	0 9920	0.1787	0.0321	0.0590	0,0408	0.0731	0,0013	0 0292	0.0163	0 0755	0 0279	0.0160		
14	10	0	0.9700	0.1370	0.0246	0,0898	0,0398	0.0185	0.1281	0,0290	0.0130	0.1526	0,0297	0.0124		
15	70	0	0 8830	0,0798	0.0183	0,2740	0 0469	0.0154	0.3120	0.0398	0.0100	0 3170	0.0447	0 0083		
17	5	180	0.9920	0 2800	0.0591	0,0325	0.0410	0.0540	0.0215	0.0284	0.0562	0.0206	0.0265	0 0732		
18	20	180	0,8830	0, 1610	0 1890	0.0189	0.0391	0,2395	0.0143	0.0327	0,2297	0.0108	0,0367	0,2410		
19	10	180	0.9700	0.3350	0 0750	0.0246	0 0374	0,0936	0.0186	0 0263	0.1118	0.0163	0.0273	0.1345		
21	10	90	0 0700	0,2760	0.0540	0.0499		0,0540	0.0419	! }	0.0368	0 0386		0.0384		
22	20	90	0,8810	0 2490	0.0549	0,0519		0,0602	0,0185		0 0476	0,0501		0 0481		
24	30	180	0.8830	0,5920	0.2430	0.0221		0.4010	0.0155		0.2860	0 0106	] 	0, 2930   		

\*See Section 2.2.

•

Tunnel Run No.	Angle of Attack, deg	p <sub>os</sub> psia	H <sub>0</sub> x 10 <sup>-5</sup> , ft <sup>2</sup> /sec <sup>2</sup>	١J <sub>∞</sub>	Re <sub>w</sub> /m.	р <sub>ос</sub> х 10 <sup>3</sup> , ръта	'J <sub>∞</sub> , "K	մ <sub>թ,</sub> , րեւս	և <sub>տ</sub> , քրչ	9 <sub>0</sub> ', psia	₽ <sub>0</sub> '*, psia
30	υ	2510	36.1	11.65	11, 583	2.84	136.9	0.4264	8401	0.7965	0,7434
31	0	1170	36.0	14.35	5,667	1.50	142.0	0.2155	8381	0,4026	0.3474
$^{32}$	0	623	36.2	14.00	3,083	0.92	150,1	0,1256	8407	0,2346	0,2180
33	0	1177	35,9	11.37	5,667	1.49	141.1	0.2159	8366	0.4033	0.3645
12	0	3903	37.5	13.18	19,250	7.54	167.0	0.9587	8538	1.7917	1.5201
13	5	3923	37.6	13.17	19,250	7.59	167.9	0,9641	8553	1,8019	1.6090
14	10	3905	37,7	13, 46	19,083	7.57	168.7	0.9601	8569	1.7945	1,6830
15	20	3973	37.9	13,45	19, 250	7.72	169.6	0,9770	8584	1,8262	1.6350
17	5 .	4005	38, 1	13.43	19, 167	7,81	171.3	0,9863	8614	1.8437	1.6510
18	20	4073	38.0	13.44	19,667	7,93	170.4	1.0032	8599	1.8751	1.7400
19	10	3737	37.5	13,48	18,500	7.23	167.0	0.9191	8538	1,7176	1.6170
21	10	40.30	38,6	13.42	18,917	7.83	173.4	0.9867	8661	1,8447	1,2950
22	20	3975	38, 7	13, 41	18,500	7.74	174.3	0.9737	8676	1.8205	1,3850
24	20	3890	38.1	13,45	18, 583	7,52	170.8	0.9518	8615	1.7792	1.3730

TABLE IVTEST CONDITIONS FOR CAL PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION DATA (REF. 8)(TEST GAS : AIR)

Source <sup>†</sup>	Tunnel Run No.	Angle oi Aitack, deg	( 4	C N	C.n	p <sub>o</sub> , psia	ľ₀,°k	<u>Ч</u> ",	Ri ∞/10.	р <sub>∞</sub> х 10°,ръты	Т <sub>х</sub> , «К	9 <sub>~1</sub>  151a	U <sub>ra</sub> , psri	p <sub>a</sub> ', psia
CAL	74	- 0	0, 175			3492	36.9*	11, 75	13,666	3,69	138.1	0.563	8495	1,051
100-in. (F)	79	Ő	0.160			7744	3650	19.1	9,250	1.19	57	0.311	9800	0.580
50~m, (II)	1229	ō	0.195	0.110	-0.180	6969	3189	18, 15	13, 118	1.64	55	0.390	9115	0,727
CAL	68	5	0.190	0.114	-0.175	3683	37.2×	14.73	14,250	3,91	139.5	0.594	8526	1.110
CAL	70	10	0.214	0,272	-0,422	3806	37.6*	14,71	14, 417	4.04	141.4	0.612	8572	1.143
100 m. (F)	80	10	0.215	0.271	-0.130	7137	3450	19.7	9,350	1,00	52	0.273	9500	0.510
100-in, (F)	82	15	0.261	0.448	-0.684	7943	3700	19,1	9,000	1.24	60	0.323	9900	0.603
100-1n, (F)	443	15	0,243	0.465	-0,665	9747	2566	16,5	11, 292	5.63	51	1.071	8082	2,000
CAL	71	20	0.283	0.645	-0.961	3592	36.7*	14.77	14,250	3, 79	136.7	0.578	8464	1,080
100-m. (F)	89	20	0.304	0.661	-0,976	7474	3350	20.0	10,450	1.08	50	0,284	9400	0.530

TABLE V EXPERIMENTAL FORCE COEFFICIENTS AND FREE-STREAM CONDITIONS

\* La was not given,  $B_0 \propto 10^{-6}$  in  $h^2/sco^2$  was listed.

<sup>1</sup>See also Ref. 7 for AEDC-VKF 100-10, Tunnel F and 50 10, Tunnel H and Ref. 8 for CAL data.

Source of Surface Pressure Distri- bution	Angle of Attack, deg	C <sub>A</sub>	C <sub>N</sub>	Cm	L/D	C <sub>Na</sub> /deg	C <sub>ma</sub> /deg
GASL	0 5 10 15 20	0.1120 0.1182 0.1399 0.1614 0.1976	0 0.0905 0.2452 0.4284 0.6161	0 -0.1337 -0.3761 -0.6294 -0.9075	0 0.635 1.204 1.360 1.290	0.01620 0.02404 0.03465 	-0.02359 -0.03731 -0.05073 
Modified Newtonian	0 5 10 15 20	0.1259 0.1308 0.1453 0.1663 0.1901	0 0.1515 0.2982 0.4520 0.6236	0 -0.2159 -0.4255 -0.6473 -0.8980	$0 \\ 0.972 \\ 1.377 \\ 1.418 \\ 1.329$	0.03042 0.02970 0.02970 	-0.03969 -0.04128 -0.04199 

TABLE VI COMPUTED FORCE AND MOMENT COEFFICIENTS ( $\gamma = 1.4$ )

UNCLASSIFIED								
Security Classification								
DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D (Security classification of little, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)								
1 ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)		28 REPOR	T SECURITY CLASSIFICATION					
ARO, Inc., Operating Contractor.	· <b>_</b> ,	UNC LASSI						
Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee		N/A						
3 REPORT TITLE A COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL	AND THEORE?	TICALI	LY PREDICTED					
A SPHERICALLY BLUNTED CONE AT	$M_{\infty} \sim 18$ AND	ANGLI	ES OF ATTACK					
4 DESCR(PT)VE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)								
IN / A. 5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)								
Knox, Eugene C., and Lewis, Clark H	,, ARO, Inc.							
6. REPORT DATE	74. TOTAL NO. OF PA	GES	75. NO OF REFS					
February 1966	61		12					
88 CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. AF40(600)-1200	90. DRIGINATOR'S RE	PORT NUM	BER(S)					
6. PROJECT NO. 8953	AEDC-TR-	65-234						
c. Program Element 62405334	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(5) (Any other numbers that may be easigned this report)							
a. Task 895303	N/A							
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES								
Qualified requesters may obtain copies Distribution of this document is	of this report unlimited.	from E	DDC.					
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILIT	ARY ACT						
N/A	Arnold Engine	ering . stome (	Development Center,					
- ,	Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee							
13 ABSTRACT Analysis of experimental	ressure distril	butions	and force and					
moment coefficients for a 9-deg half-ai and $\alpha = 0$ to 20 deg is presented based characteristics solution developed by C (GASL). Comparisons are also made v Newtonian theory. Pressure distributi streamlines were well predicted by the deg. For $\alpha < 10$ deg, comparison with attributed to viscous effects. For $\alpha >$ by necessary program modifications or butions along the body surface from the low pressure "wells" in the leeward re along a constant entropy surface within tial delay in the formation of the low pr be in good agreement with the experime pressure distribution. Predicted value experimental data over the entire range previous Newtonian based analysis. The induced drag increment. Computed slop predicted by the integrated GASL result diction was in poorer agreement with the	ngle spherically on an ideal gas General Applied with predictions ions along the w results from t the experimen 10 deg the num in the leeward si GASL results gion at $\alpha \ge 10$ c the inviscid sh ressure "wells" ental data when es of CA were a e, $\alpha = 0$ to 20 d he difference is opes, CN <sub>a</sub> and C ts, whereas the he trends of the	y blunts ( $\gamma = 1$ . Science based vindwar he GAS tal data erical ide. R showed deg. S hock lay based bout 40 eg, in s attrib $Cm_{\alpha}$ , v e modifiered	ed cone at $M_{\infty} \sim 18$ 4) three-dimensional ces Laboratory on modified ed and leeward 5L program at $\alpha \approx 10$ a indicated differences results were affected adial pressure distri- 1 the development of imilar distributions yer indicated substan- and $C_m$ were found to on the GASL surface 0 percent below the agreement with a uted to the viscous- vere found to be well fied Newtonian pre- imental data.					

DD 1 JAN 64 1473

#### UNCLASSIFIED

#### Security Classification

	LINK A		LIN	КВ	LINKC	
KEY WORDS	ROLE	ΨT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	ΨT
blunted cones						
pressure distributions		Í				}
force coefficients	İ					
stability coefficients						
hypersonic flow	1					
3D characteristics solutions						ļ
angles of attack						
inviscid flow fields						

#### INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manuel. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S)' Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal withor is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE. Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7.3. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract of grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(5) Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been ass good any other report numbers (either b) the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES. Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign ennouncement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

13 ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it .nay also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U)

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional