

AD-A058 533

DAVID W TAYLOR NAVAL SHIP RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CE--ETC F/G 13/10  
LIFTING LINE CALCULATIONS FOR HYDROFOIL PERFORMANCE AT ARBITRAR--ETC(U)  
JUN 78 M B WILSON


UNCLASSIFIED

DTNSRDC/SPD-0839-01

NL

1 OF 2  
ADA  
068533





NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS  
 MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

LIFTING LINE CALCULATIONS FOR HYDROFOIL PERFORMANCE AT ARBITRARY FROUDE NUMBER AND SUBMERGENCE - PART 1 - FIXED SHAPE ELLIPTICAL CIRCULATION DISTRIBUTION

DTNSRDC/SPD-0839-01

12  
nw

# DAVID W. TAYLOR NAVAL SHIP RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER



Bethesda, Md. 20084

ADA 058533

LIFTING LINE CALCULATIONS FOR HYDROFOIL PERFORMANCE  
AT ARBITRARY FROUDE NUMBER AND SUBMERGENCE  
PART 1  
FIXED SHAPE ELLIPTICAL CIRCULATION DISTRIBUTION

by

Michael B. Wilson

DDC  
SEP 12 1978  
F

AD No. \_\_\_\_\_  
DDC FILE COPY

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED


SHIP PERFORMANCE DEPARTMENT  
DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

78 14 08 031

June 1978

DTNSRDC/SPD-0839-01

MAJOR DTNSRDC ORGANIZATIONAL COMPONENTS





UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER DTNSRDC/SPD-0839-01	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) LIFTING LINE CALCULATIONS FOR HYDROFOIL PERFORMANCE AT ARBITRARY FROUDE NUMBER AND SUBMERGENCE. PART 1. FIXED SHAPE ELLIPTICAL CIRCULATION DISTRIBUTION		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Michael B. Wilson	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) F43421	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS David W. Taylor Naval Ship R&D Center Bethesda, MD 20084	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Task Area ZF43421001 Element 62543N Work Unit 1-1500-100	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Material Command Navy Department Washington, D.C. 20360	12. REPORT DATE June 1978	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 12 99p.	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 95	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 78 14 08 031		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Hydrofoil, Wave Resistance, Froude Number, Finite Aspect Ratio, Lifting Line, Free Surface Effect, Lift Correction		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Hydrofoil drag and lift prediction formulas derived by T.Y. Wu using the lifting line approximation are evaluated numerically using a computer program developed for the purpose. Some results for selected aspect ratios and foil submergences are displayed in several plots of general interest and usefulness, for the case of an elliptic planform hydrofoil supporting an elliptic circulation distribution of fixed shape, but variable strength.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

LB

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

389694

**UNCLASSIFIED**

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Some preliminary comparisons between results obtained numerically and from Wu's asymptotic formulas are discussed. These show that for certain extreme cases, the wave drag and the Froude-independent part of the lift correction are well predicted by asymptotic relations. For intermediate values of both Froude number and submergence ratio, the asymptotic relations give poor results for wave drag. At most all submergences and Froude numbers the existing asymptotic expressions for the Froude-dependent part of lift correction give poor results.

ACCESSION for	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	G. P. Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	
JLS IDENTIFY	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
SPECIAL	
A	

**UNCLASSIFIED**

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
NOTATION.....	vii
ABSTRACT.....	1
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM LIFTING LINE SOLUTION.....	3
GENERAL.....	4
ELLIPTICAL CIRCULATION.....	7
EXAMPLE PLANFORM GEOMETRY.....	7
FROUDE NUMBERS.....	9
FORMULA SUMMARY.....	9
EXAMPLE NUMERICAL RESULTS.....	14
DRAG DUE-TO-LIFT.....	16
Biplane Factor.....	16
Wave Drag.....	16
Transverse and Diverging Wave Contributions.....	18
Total Drag Due-to-Lift.....	20
TOTAL LIFT.....	21
TOTAL LIFT AND DRAG RATIOS.....	22
COMPUTATION TIME.....	25
COMPARISON OF ASYMPTOTIC RESULTS.....	26
DRAG DUE-TO-LIFT.....	27
LIFT.....	29
EXAMPLE DRAG FORCE ESTIMATES.....	32
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	36
APPENDIX A - LISTING OF COMPUTER PROGRAM.....	67
APPENDIX B - THE BIPLANE FACTOR.....	81



	Page
APPENDIX C - NUMERICAL EVALUATION OF WAVE DRAG INTEGRAL.....	83
APPENDIX D - NUMERICAL EVALUATION OF LIFT CORRECTION INTEGRALS..	85
REFERENCES.....	89

#### LIST OF FIGURES

1 - Geometry and Coordinate System of Submerged Hydrofoil.....	38
2 - Elliptic Planform Shape.....	38
3 - The Biplane Factor $\sigma_j(\lambda)$ .....	39
4 - Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil; Contours of Submergence.....	40
5 - Wave Drag Ratio Versus Depth Froude Number for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil.....	41
6 - Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil; Contours of Submergence.....	42
7 - Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratios 4, 6, and 10 at Submergence $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	43
8 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 0.25$ .....	44
9 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	44
10 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 0.25$ .....	45
11 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	45
12 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 10 Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	46
13 - Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil.....	47

	Page
14 - Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil.....	48
15 - Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratios 4, 6, and 10 at Submergence $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	49
16 - Lift Correction Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil; Contours of Submergence.....	50
17 - Lift Correction Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil; Contours of Submergence.....	51
18 - Lift Correction Ratio for Aspect Ratios 4, 6, and 10 at Submergence $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	52
19 - Total Lift Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 at $C_{L_0} = 1.0$ .....	53
20 - Total Lift Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 at $C_{L_0} = 1.0$ .....	53
21 - Comparison of Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratios for Aspect Ratio 6; Contours of Constant $C_{L_0}$ .....	54
22 - Comparison of Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratios for Aspect Ratio 4; Constant Reference Foil Loading.....	55
23 - Comparison Between Large $F_h$ Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence $h/c_a = 0.25$ .....	56
24 - Comparison Between Large $F_h$ Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence $h/c_a = 0.5$ .....	56
25 - Comparison Between Large $F_h$ Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	57
26 - Comparison Between Large $F_h$ Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence $h/c_a = 2.0$ .....	57
27 - Comparison Between Small $F_h$ Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 at Submergence $\lambda = 1.75$ .....	58
28 - Comparison Between Large $F_h$ Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence $h/c_a = 0.25$ .....	59



	Page
29 - Comparison Between Large $F_0$ Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	60
30 - Comparison Between Large $F_0$ Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence $h/c_a = 2.0$ .....	60
31 - Comparison Between Small $F_0$ Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 4 at Submergence $\lambda = 1.75$ .....	61
32 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 4, 20-Foot Chord Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	62
33 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 6, 20-Foot Chord Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	63
34 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 10, 20-Foot Chord Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	64
35 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 10, 12.65-Foot Chord Hydrofoil at $h/c_a = 1.0$ .....	65

#### LIST OF TABLES

1 - Matrix of Calculated Cases.....	15
2 - Computer Program Input Variables.....	67
3 - Main Computer Program Output Variables.....	68
4 - Values of the Biplane Factor $\sigma_i$ .....	82

## NOTATION

		<u>Dimensions*</u>
A	Planform aspect ratio = $(2b)^2/S$	$L^2$
b	Half-span of hydrofoil	L
c(y)	Chord length distribution	L
$c_a$	Average chord length	L
$c_o$	Midspan chord length	L
$C_D$	Total inviscid lift-dependent drag coefficient = $D/\frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S$	-
$C_{D_{i\infty}}$	Unbounded flow induced drag coefficient; corresponds to $D_1/\frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S$	-
$C_{D_{si}}$	Surface induced drag coefficient; corresponds to $(D_2+D_3)/\frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S$	-
$C_{D_{sw}}$	Surface wave part of wave drag coefficient at large Froude number	-
$C_L$	Total lift coefficient = $L/\frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S$	-
$C_{L_o}$	Reference lift coefficient = $2\Gamma_o/Uc_o$	-
$C_W$	Wave drag coefficient, corresponds to $D_4/\frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S$	-
$C_{W(d)}, C_{W(t)}$	Diverging and transverse wave components of $C_W$ ( $C_W = C_{W(d)} + C_{W(t)}$ )	-
D	Total inviscid lift-dependent drag	$ML/T^2$
$D_1, (D_2+D_3), D_4$	Components of total lift-dependent drag (Wu's designations)	$ML/T^2$
$F_b$	Half span Froude number = $U/\sqrt{gb}$	-

\* L = length, T = time, M = mass

		<u>Dimensions</u>
$F_c$	Average chord Froude number = $U/\sqrt{gc_a}$	-
$F_h$	Depth Froude number = $U/\sqrt{gh}$	-
$F_L$	Kernel function in integral of $\Delta C_{L2}$	-
$F_L(o)$	Value of $F_L(u)$ at $u = 0$ , function of $\lambda$ only	-
$g$	Acceleration of gravity	$L/T^2$
$h$	Depth of submergence	$L$
$J_w$	Wave drag integral	-
$k_\lambda$	Modulus appearing in complete elliptic integrals = $1/(1 + \lambda^2)^{1/2}$	-
$L$	Total lift force	$ML/T^2$
$L_o$	Reference lift force	$ML/T^2$
$S$	Planform area of hydrofoil	$L^2$
$U$	Free stream velocity	$L/T$
$x, y, z$	Coordinate variables (see Fig. 1)	$L$
$\beta$	Half-span Froude number squared = $U^2/gb$	-
$\gamma_w$	Wave drag function; related to $C_{D_{sw}}$ term	-
$\Gamma(y)$	Distribution of circulation strength across span	$L^2/T$
$\Gamma_o$	Value of $\Gamma(y)$ at midspan ( $y=0$ ); 'strength' of circulation	$L^2/T$
$\Delta_{LC}$	Lift correction coefficient ratio = $\Delta C_L/C_{L_o}^2$	-



		<u>Dimensions</u>
$\Delta C_L$	Lift correction coefficient = $\Delta L / \frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S$	-
$\Delta C_{L1}, \Delta C_{L2}$	Froude-independent and dependent terms, respectively, of lift correction coefficient	-
$\Delta L$	Lift correction due to u-component induced velocity	$ML/T^2$
$\kappa_0$	Free surface wave number = $g/U^2$	$L^{-1}$
$\lambda$	Depth-to-half span ratio = $h/b$	-
$\sigma_j$	Biplane factor	-
$\phi$	Perturbation velocity potential	$L^2/T$

## ABSTRACT

Hydrofoil drag and lift prediction formulas derived by T.Y. Wu using the lifting line approximation are evaluated numerically using a computer program developed for the purpose. Some results for selected aspect ratios and foil submergences are displayed in several plots of general interest and usefulness, for the case of an elliptic planform hydrofoil supporting an elliptic circulation distribution of fixed shape, but variable strength.

Some preliminary comparisons between results obtained numerically and from Wu's asymptotic formulas are discussed. These show that for certain extreme cases, the wave drag and the Froude-independent part of the lift correction are well predicted by asymptotic relations. For intermediate values of both Froude number and submergence ratio, the asymptotic relations give poor results for wave drag. At most all submergences and Froude numbers the existing asymptotic expressions for the Froude-dependent part of lift correction give poor results.

## ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

This work was authorized by the Naval Material Command (08T), funded under the Ships, Subs and Boats Program, Task Area ZF43-421, and administered by the Ship Performance Department High Performance Vehicles Program (1507).

## INTRODUCTION

Growing interest in very large hydrofoil support systems has focused attention on a low Froude number range of operation (at or near takeoff speeds) generally regarded previously as being below anything of practical utility. This has created a renewed interest in the analytical properties of a hydrofoil moving near the free surface. A recent experiment<sup>1\*</sup> specifically intended to produce data for a hydrofoil operating at low Froude numbers has also pointed out a distinct need for

---

\* A complete list of references is given on page 88



well-founded analytical predictions of foil-alone performance for use in direct comparisons with experimental results, for preliminary design studies, and possibly for refined data analysis of interference effects.

There are available several published lifting line theories for submerged hydrofoils, and though there may be differences as to the form of the final expressions or in the degree of completeness of the calculated results, these theories all share common fundamental assumptions and therefore must ultimately be versions of the same theory. A recent comprehensive summary of published work on the linearized theory of hydrofoils has been presented by T. Nishiyama,<sup>2</sup> whose own extensive work with the hydrofoil lifting line theory appears prominently in the discussion offered in Reference 2. Unfortunately there are only limited examples of hydrofoil aspect ratios and depths of submergence carried out in Nishiyama's papers, and his computer programs are not available. Therefore it was decided to start to build up a computational capability for predicting hydrofoil performance based on the lifting line theory by T.Y. Wu developed in 1953,<sup>3a</sup> and published in 1954.<sup>3b</sup> Hallmarks of this work are the careful formulation and solution of the problem within the framework of the linearized free surface potential theory, and the extensive asymptotic analyses that show the effects of Froude number and submergence depth on drag, lift, and induced velocities. As far as is known, there has never been a systematic attempt made to exploit numerically Wu's derived formulas for the purpose of presenting general information useful for preliminary design or comparison with experiments. It may be noted that in an independent effort, J. Breslin and his associates obtained formulas similar to those

of Wu. Also, Breslin<sup>4</sup> organized what look like part of Wu's asymptotic results for wave drag into an approximate scheme for estimating hydrofoil performance at large Froude number. This scheme has been unverified, however, both as to its accuracy and regions of its application.

The present work has been directed mainly toward the development of numerical procedures and a computer program for evaluating Wu's results for the prediction of hydrofoil total lift-dependent-drag and lift correction.

#### SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM LIFTING LINE SOLUTION

The complete potential flow solution for a submerged flat hydrofoil of span  $2b$ , submergence  $h$ , zero thickness, and arbitrary planform shape of aspect ratio  $A = (2b)^2/S$  moving with steady velocity  $U$  beneath the free surface of an otherwise undisturbed fluid has been presented by Wu.<sup>3</sup> Formulas have been given for the solution of the perturbation velocity potential  $\phi(x, y, z)$  which satisfies the Laplace equation throughout the fluid region and the linearized free surface boundary conditions on the plane  $z = 0$ . Details should be sought in the original reference. Figure 1 shows the geometry and coordinate system for the hydrofoil lifting line problem.

In accordance with the classical lifting line approach, the spanwise-varying bound vortex distribution  $\Gamma(y)$  has a strength at each  $y$ -value that represents the chordwise-integrated effect of bound

vorticity concentrated at the quarter-chord line---a reasonable approximation for 'large' aspect ratios. In practice, this means for aspect ratios larger than about four.

If we suppose that the circulation distribution  $\Gamma(y)$  is known, either by specification or as part of the solution, Wu's expressions are summarized here for the hydrofoil lift-dependent drag and total lift, given in terms of  $\Gamma(y)$  and the induced velocity field at the location of the lifting line.

#### GENERAL

##### Drag Due-to-Lift

The total drag due-to-lift has been obtained from the expression

$$D = -\rho \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} \right]_{\substack{x=0 \\ z=-h}} dy \quad (1)$$

Of course the perturbation velocity potential  $\phi$  is itself proportional to the circulation strength, and has been determined by Wu as the sum of four parts, with corresponding drag components. Thus

$$D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3 + D_4 \quad (2)$$



where

$$D_1 = \frac{\pi}{4} \rho \int_0^{\infty} \left[ f^2(\mu) + g^2(\mu) \right] \mu d\mu \quad (3)$$

$$(D_2 + D_3) = -\frac{\pi}{4} \rho \int_0^{\infty} e^{-2h\mu} \left[ f^2(\mu) + g^2(\mu) \right] \mu d\mu \quad (4)$$

$$D_4 = \pi \rho \kappa_0^2 \int_0^{\pi/2} e^{-2h\kappa_0 \sec^2 \theta} \left[ f^2(\kappa_0 \sec^2 \theta \sin \theta) + g^2(\kappa_0 \sec^2 \theta \sin \theta) \right] \sec^5 \theta d\theta \quad (5)$$

with

$$f(\mu) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(\eta) \cos \mu \eta d\eta$$

$$g(\mu) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(\eta) \sin \mu \eta d\eta \quad (6)$$

$$\kappa_0 = g/U^2$$

Viscous drag is not included in this potential flow result. The functions  $f(\mu)$  and  $g(\mu)$  are the Fourier coefficients of the circulation distribution.

#### Total Lift

For the hydrofoil, the x-component of total velocity is modified from the free stream  $U$  by the presence of the free surface, so that

total lift is given by

$$L = \rho \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(y) \left( U + \left[ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right]_{\substack{x=0 \\ z=-h}} \right) dy \quad (7)$$

or  $L = L_0 + \Delta L$  (8)

where

$$L_0 = \rho U \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(y) dy \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta L &= \rho \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma(y) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi(0, y, -h) \right) dy \\ \Delta L &= -\frac{1}{2} \rho \int_0^{\infty} e^{-2h\mu} \mu d\mu \int_0^{\pi/2} \left( f^2(\mu \sin \theta) + g^2(\mu \sin \theta) \right) \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{\mu + \kappa_0 \sec^2 \theta}{\mu + \kappa_0 \sec^2 \theta} \right) d\theta \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with  $f(\mu)$  and  $g(\mu)$  given by Equations (6). It may be noted at this stage that in all of Nishiyama's work with the hydrofoil lifting line approach, the lift correction term  $\Delta L$  has been neglected as being of a higher order and therefore not properly included in the results of a linearized theory (see, for example, Reference 2, Equation (195)). There is certainly no question that the numerical computation of  $\Delta L$  is tedious and time consuming. However, it is not at all obvious that  $\Delta L$  is of negligible size from the integral results in their primitive state. Rather, it is fair to state that  $\Delta L$  is of the same order of magnitude as the lift-dependent drag, and that it is one order smaller in magnitude than  $L_0$ .



## ELLIPTICAL CIRCULATION

Because of the inherent simplifications, it is interesting to consider in detail the case of specified elliptical circulation distribution

$$\Gamma(y) = \begin{cases} \Gamma_0 \sqrt{1-y^2/b^2}, & |y| \leq b \\ 0, & |y| > b \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

This is clearly a meaningful choice because the elliptic distribution is the correct linearized solution for an elliptic planform wing in an unbounded stream (no free surface present).

## EXAMPLE PLANFORM GEOMETRY

The planform geometry chosen here is an ellipse, simply to remain consistent with the choice of the elliptical circulation distribution. As indicated in Figure 2, the elliptic planform, with chord distribution

$$c(y) = c_0 \sqrt{1-y^2/b^2} \quad (12)$$

may be characterized by:

$$\text{averaged chord} \quad c_a = \frac{\pi}{4} c_0 \quad (13)$$

$$\text{planform area} \quad S = \frac{\pi}{2} c_0 b = 2bc_a \quad (14)$$

$$\text{aspect ratio} \quad A = \frac{(2b)^2}{S} = \frac{8b}{\pi c_0} = \frac{2b}{c_a} \quad (15)$$

The depth-to-chord ratio and depth-to-half span ratio are, respectively,

$$\frac{h}{c_a} = \frac{4}{\pi} \left( \frac{h}{c_0} \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{h}{b} = \frac{8h}{\pi c_0 A} = \left( \frac{2}{A} \right) \frac{h}{c_a} \quad (17)$$

Then drag and lift coefficient are formed in the usual way, based on planform area

$$C_D = \frac{D}{\frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S} \quad \text{and} \quad C_L = \frac{L}{\frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S} \quad (18)$$

Physically, the results of the present calculations pertain to a special situation where both the form and strength of the circulation distribution are maintained somehow on the specified planform shape; without regard to the angle of attack and changes in the effective angle due to vertical induced velocity. It should be emphasized that for a near-surface hydrofoil of any prescribed geometry, the actual circulation distribution  $\Gamma(y)$  will be fixed in neither shape nor in strength, and in general must be determined as a function of Froude number and depth of submergence. Numerical calculations of the complete free surface hydrofoil problem are deferred to a later reporting of results.

The present calculations are very useful in showing the detailed Froude-dependent behavior and exact relative magnitudes of the various components of both  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$  and  $\Delta C_L/C_{L_0}^2$  for the simplified version of the problem.

#### FROUDE NUMBERS

It is convenient to have several Froude numbers available when discussing hydrofoil performance. The reference length can be either a hydrofoil size parameter or the submergence depth.

chord Froude number	$F_c = U/\sqrt{gc_a}$	
depth Froude number	$F_h = U/\sqrt{gh} = \sqrt{c_a/h} F_c$	(19)
half-span Froude number	$F_b = U/\sqrt{gb} = \sqrt{2/A} F_c$	
	$\beta = U^2/gb = F_b^2$	

Any one Froude number alone will not suffice to characterize the free surface flow geometry of a hydrofoil. There must be a nondimensional speed parameter (Froude number) accompanied by a relative depth of submergence parameter.

#### FORMULA SUMMARY

##### Drag Due-to-Lift

The total inviscid drag due-to-lift, in coefficient form, is hereafter written in components that can be identified in terms of  $C_{D_1}$ ,



$C_{D_2}$ ,  $C_{D_3}$ , and  $C_{D_4}$  (obtained from Wu's  $D_1$ ,  $D_2$ , etc.), but with a notation more suggestive of their physical significance

$$C_D = C_{D_{i\infty}} + C_{D_{si}} + C_W \quad (20)$$

$$= C_{D_1} + (C_{D_2} + C_{D_3}) + C_{D_4} \quad (\text{Wu's notation})$$

where for the elliptic circulation distribution

$$C_{D_{i\infty}} = \frac{C_{L_0}^2}{\pi A} \quad (21)$$

$$C_{D_{si}} = -\frac{\sigma_i}{\pi A} C_{L_0}^2 \quad (22)$$

$$C_W = \frac{8C_{L_0}^2}{\pi A} \int_0^{\pi/2} e^{-2F_h^{-2}\sec^2\theta} J_1^2\left(\frac{1}{\beta} \sec^2\theta \sin\theta\right) \times \frac{\sec\theta}{\sin^2\theta} d\theta \quad (23)$$

where  $J_1$  is the Bessel function of the first kind, of order one. The reference lift coefficient  $C_{L_0}$  is proportional to the circulation strength  $\Gamma_0$ ,

$$C_{L_0} = \frac{2\Gamma_0}{Uc_0} \quad (24)$$

The image induced drag factor  $\sigma_i$  can be identified as the Prandtl 'biplane factor' discussed, for example, by von Kármán and Burgers,<sup>5</sup> pp. 217-219, in connection with the combined drag of biplane arrangements. Wu<sup>3</sup> has obtained a compact formula for the biplane factor, expressed purely as a function of  $\lambda$

$$\sigma_i(\lambda) = 1 - \frac{4}{\pi} \lambda \sqrt{1+\lambda^2} \left[ K(k_\lambda) - E(k_\lambda) \right] \quad (25)$$

where  $\lambda = \text{depth-to-half span ratio} = h/b$

$$k_\lambda = 1/(1 + \lambda^2)^{1/2}$$

and  $K(k)$  and  $E(k)$  are, respectively, the complete elliptic integrals of the first and second kind.

The term  $C_{D_{i\infty}}$  is the familiar unbounded flow induced drag coefficient for an elliptic planform wing with total lift coefficient  $C_{L_0}$ . The negative quantity  $C_{D_{si}}$  represents part of the surface induced drag, independent of Froude number. We note that  $C_{D_{si}}$  depends only on the depth-to-half span ratio  $\lambda$ , as contained in the biplane factor  $\sigma_i(\lambda)$  described above. The 'wave drag' coefficient,  $C_W$ , is the Froude-dependent drag contribution, denoted as such to conform with past notations (e.g. Breslin<sup>4</sup>). However,  $C_W$  embodies more than the usual wavemaking drag coefficient that one would obtain, say, for a submerged non-lifting body. While  $C_W$  has the expected zero-value lower limit (Froude number  $\rightarrow 0$ ), it approaches a non-zero upper limit (as Froude number  $\rightarrow \infty$ ). This upper limit value combines directly with the  $C_{D_{si}}$  term; and in the infinite Froude number limit, changes the sign of the



resulting surface induced drag contribution. Specifically, the wave drag coefficient can be written for the large Froude number regime as

$$C_W = \frac{2\sigma_i}{\pi A} C_{L_0}^2 + C_{D_{sw}} \quad (26)$$

where the new term,  $C_{D_{sw}}$ , is the 'surface wave' part of  $C_W$  that has a zero limit as Froude number grows infinitely large. This form is inappropriate for use at small Froude numbers.

The two limiting values with respect to Froude number of the total drag coefficient due-to-lift are simple modifications to the induced drag, and involve only the biplane factor

$$\lim_{F_c \rightarrow 0} C_D = \frac{C_{L_0}^2}{\pi A} \left[ 1 - \sigma_i(\lambda) \right] \quad (\text{lower limit}) \quad (27)$$

$$\lim_{F_c \rightarrow \infty} C_D = \frac{C_{L_0}^2}{\pi A} \left[ 1 + \sigma_i(\lambda) \right] \quad (\text{upper limit}) \quad (28)$$

#### Total Lift

The total lift coefficient for a hydrofoil having an elliptic circulation distribution of strength  $\Gamma_0$  is given by

$$C_L = C_{L_0} + \Delta C_L \quad (29)$$

where

$$C_{L_0} = \frac{\Gamma_0}{bc_a U} \int_{-b}^b \sqrt{1-y^2/b^2} dy = \frac{\pi\Gamma_0}{2Uc_a} = \frac{2\Gamma_0}{Uc_0} \quad (30)$$

$$\Delta C_L = \Delta C_{L_1} + \Delta C_{L_2} \quad (31)$$

The two parts of the lift correction coefficient,  $\Delta C_L$ , can be written directly from Wu's<sup>3</sup> results as

$$\Delta C_{L_1} = -\frac{8C_{L_0}^2}{\pi^3 \lambda A} \int_0^{k_\lambda} \left( \frac{1 - (k_1/k_\lambda)^2}{1 - k_1^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathfrak{C}(k_1) dk_1 \quad (32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta C_{L_2} = & -\frac{8C_{L_0}^2}{\pi^2 A} \int_0^\infty \frac{du}{u(u-1)} \int_0^{\pi/2} e^{-2uF_h^{-2} \sec^2 \theta} \\ & \times J_1^2 \left( \frac{u}{\beta} \sec^2 \theta \sin \theta \right) \frac{d\theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where  $\mathfrak{C}(k_1)$  is a derived complete elliptic integral that can be written (see Reference 6, p. 321) in terms of the complete elliptic integrals  $K(k_1)$  and  $E(k_1)$  as follows

$$\mathfrak{C}(k_1) = \frac{1}{k_1^4} \left[ (2-k_1^2) K(k_1) - 2E(k_1) \right] \quad (34)$$

with

$$k_\lambda = 1/(1 + \lambda^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

It is clear that the reference lift coefficient  $C_{L_0}$  is the first order lift quantity, and that  $\Delta C_L$  is a second order quantity proportional to  $C_{L_0}^2$  and therefore roughly of the same magnitude as  $C_D$ .

#### EXAMPLE NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section the results of some numerical calculations for hydrofoil drag and lift correction are presented for representative values of planform aspect ratio, depth of submergence, and a range of Froude numbers. Table 1 indicates the matrix of cases considered. To produce these results, numerical evaluations of the integrals appearing in the wave drag coefficient and lift correction coefficient expressions have been carried out with a digital computer program consisting of several subroutines guided by a main program entitled SUBMFL. A complete listing of this computer program is given in Appendix A. No approximate or asymptotic formulas or series solutions are used; only numerical quadrature has been employed. However, rather extensive intermediate and check-out tests of most of Wu's asymptotic results have been performed in the course of debugging the individual subroutines.

Certain details of the manipulations of integration variables and general outlines of the numerical integration procedures are covered in the appendices.



TABLE 1  
MATRIX OF CALCULATED CASES

DEPTH-TO-CHORD RATIO, $h/c_a$	ASPECT RATIO, A		
	4	6	10
0.25	x	x	
0.35	x		
0.5	x	x	
0.75	x		
1.0	x	x	x
1.5	x		
2.0	x	x	
3.5	x		

## DRAG DUE-TO-LIFT

### Biplane Factor

The magnitude of image induced drag effect (see Equations (27) and (28)) is contained in the biplane factor  $\sigma_i(\lambda)$ , given by Equation (25). Owing to the ease of computation of  $K(k)$  and  $E(k)$ , an approximate formula for  $\sigma_i$  is not needed. Appendix B presents brief remarks on the calculation of  $\sigma_i$  and a table of its values. Figure 3 is a plot of  $\sigma_i(\lambda)$  covering a practical range of  $\lambda$ -values.

### Wave Drag

A convenient form for the expression for wave drag coefficient ratio, starting with Equation (23) is shown in Appendix C to be

$$\frac{C_W}{C_{L_0}^2} = \frac{e^{-F_h^{-2}}}{\pi F_c^2} J_W \quad (35)$$

where the wave drag integral is

$$J_W = \int_0^\infty \frac{\exp(-F_h^{-2} \sqrt{1+4\beta^2 t^2}) \left[1 + \sqrt{1+4\beta^2 t^2}\right]^2}{t^2 \sqrt{1+4\beta^2 t^2}} J_1^2(t) dt \quad (36)$$

Numerical results for the wave drag coefficient ratio versus the chord Froude number  $F_c$  are plotted in Figure 4 for an aspect ratio  $A = 4$  hydrofoil, with contours of eight depth-to-chord ratios. Some of the same results are replotted versus depth Froude number  $F_h$  in Figure 5 to show that the peaks in the wave drag ratio  $C_W/C_{L_0}^2$  apparently line up at

a Froude number of  $F_h = 1.4$ , regardless of the depth of submergence. From Figure 4, it is seen that in the chord Froude number plot, the peaks shift to higher  $F_c$ -values as the submergence depth increases. Figure 6 displays wave drag results for aspect ratio  $A = 6$  at four depth-to-chord ratios.

In all three Figures 4, 5, and 6, the upper limit values of wave drag ratio (see Equation (26))

$$\lim_{F_c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_W}{C_{L_0}^2} = \frac{2\sigma_i}{\pi A} \quad (37)$$

are indicated by horizontal lines along the right hand borders of the graphs. Evidently the  $C_W/C_{L_0}^2$  curves approach the limiting values more quickly for the deep submergence cases than for the shallow submergence cases.

For a constant depth-to-chord ratio  $h/c_a = 1.0$ , Figure 7 is a graph of  $C_W/C_{L_0}^2$  versus  $F_c$  for three different aspect ratios  $A = 4, 6, \text{ and } 10$ . This shows that the wave drag peaks become relatively higher for hydrofoils with larger aspect ratios. Although at first glance this may seem contrary to one's intuition, the result is true only for the wavemaking part of the drag due-to-lift at a low Froude number, and can be understood by a separate study of the relative magnitudes of the drag components associated with the transverse and diverging wave systems.



### Transverse and Diverging Wave Contributions

The free surface wave pattern produced by a submerged disturbance is the superposition of two families of waves, the transverse and diverging systems. It is interesting to decompose the total wave drag into corresponding wave system components as was accomplished by Wigley (see Lunde<sup>7</sup>) using the thin ship theory for wave resistance for surface ships, and by Breslin<sup>4</sup> for hydrofoil wave drag. In the  $\theta$ -integral representation of wave drag in Equation (23), the transverse wave system is the integrated effect of the wave-direction-interval  $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_c$ , and the diverging wave system comes from  $\theta_c \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$ . The critical angle dividing the two intervals is

$$\theta_c = \sin^{-1} (\sqrt{1/3})$$

In the  $t$ -integral representation of wave drag, given in Equation (36), the critical  $t$ -value corresponding to  $\theta_c$  is Froude dependent

$$t_c = \frac{1}{\beta} \sec^2 \theta_c \sin \theta_c$$

Computations of the transverse wave drag contribution  $C_{W(t)}$  and diverging wave part  $C_{W(d)}$  correspond, then, to the intervals  $0 \leq t \leq t_c$  and  $t_c \leq t \leq \infty$ , respectively.

Some example results for the wave drag decomposition are shown in Figures 8 and 9 for an aspect ratio 4 hydrofoil at submergence  $h/c_a = 0.25$  and  $1.0$ , respectively. For comparison, values of the wave drag coefficient ratio of a two-dimensional submerged hydrofoil<sup>8</sup>

$$\frac{C_w}{C_l^2} = \frac{e^{-2F_h}}{2F_c^2} \quad (38)$$

are also plotted versus the chord Froude number in Figures 8 and 9. The  $C_w$  and  $C_l$  denote the wave drag and lift coefficients per unit span, respectively. At low Froude numbers, the transverse wave component  $C_w(t)$  dominates the total wave drag, reaches a peak value, then drops off rapidly as the diverging wave component slowly builds up. In Figure 8, there is a striking correspondence between the two-dimensional wave drag ratio and the total finite span wave drag ratio,  $C_w/C_{L_0}^2$ , at the chord Froude numbers below  $F_c \approx 1.2$ . There is a great temptation to suppose that this good correspondence could be used to generate an approximate prediction method for total hydrofoil lift-dependent drag based on the sum of the two-dimensional hydrofoil wave drag expression plus terms accounting for induced and biplane induced drag. In fact, this appears to be just what has been suggested in the well known drag estimation procedure introduced by Wadlin, Shuford, and McGehee.<sup>9</sup> However, the comparison in Figure 9, also for  $A = 4$ , but with  $h/c_a = 1.0$ , shows that any good correspondence observed earlier is fortuitous. Significant differences exist, particularly near the peak of wave drag, or in other words in the low Froude number regime. The wave drag decomposition curves in Figures 10 and 11, for  $h/c_a = 0.75$  and  $1.0$  respectively, show similar trends in the comparison between the two-dimensional wave drag ratio and the finite span values of  $C_w/C_{L_0}^2$ , but for aspect ratio  $A = 6$ . Apparently the good correspondence noted in

Figure 8 improves with decreasing  $\lambda$ -values. Figure 12 is the wave drag decomposition for a aspect ratio 10 hydrofoil at submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$ .

#### Total Drag Due-to- Lift

Summary curves of total inviscid drag ratio due-to-lift (from Equation (20)) plotted versus chord Froude number are given in Figure 13 for aspect ratio  $A = 4$ , and in Figure 14 for aspect ratio  $A = 6$ . The low and high Froude number limits given by Equations (27) and (28) are indicated by horizontal lines at the left and right borders of the graphs, respectively.

Figure 15 is a plot of  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$  versus  $F_c$ , comparing curves for aspect ratio 4, 6, and 10 hydrofoils at the same submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$ . The horizontal broken lines indicate the magnitudes of the unbounded flow induced drag ratio  $C_{D_{i\infty}}/C_{L_0}^2 = 1/\pi A$ . This figure is also a representation of the relative magnitudes of the inviscid drag components, for this typical value of hydrofoil submergence. Now it is seen that the total drag due-to-lift increases for decreasing aspect ratio hydrofoils, but that the relative contribution of wavemaking drag increases with increasing ratio cases at low Froude numbers. As we have seen previously, this is caused by the large transverse wavemaking contribution that approaches the two-dimensional limit as the aspect ratio increases, but the effect is localized with respect to Froude number in the speed range  $F_h \leq 1.4$ .



## TOTAL LIFT

As indicated in Equations (31)-(33), there are two parts to the lift correction ratio  $\Delta C_L / C_{L_0}^2$ . The form for the  $\Delta C_{L_1} / C_{L_0}^2$  term, given in Equation (32), is directly suitable for numerical evaluation by Simpson's Rule.

A convenient form for the second term,  $\Delta C_{L_2} / C_{L_0}^2$ , starting with Equation (33) is shown in Appendix D to be

$$\frac{\Delta C_{L_2}}{C_{L_0}^2} = -\frac{4}{\pi^2 A F_h} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-u/F_h^2}}{\sqrt{u}(u-1)} F_L(u) du \quad (39)$$

where

$$F_L(u) = \int_0^\infty \frac{\exp(-2\sqrt{t_1^2 + u^2/4F_h^4}) \left[ u/2F_h^2 + \sqrt{t_1^2 + u^2/4F_h^4} \right]^{3/2}}{t_1^2 \sqrt{t_1^2 + u^2/4F_h^4}} \times J_1^2\left(\frac{t_1}{\lambda}\right) dt_1 \quad (40)$$

The kernel function  $F_L(u)$  resembles the wave resistance integral  $J_W$ , and has been computed numerically in the same manner. The  $u$ -integral in Equation (39) must be evaluated in terms of its principal value, and some details of its numerical treatment are outlined in Appendix D. Completely numerical evaluation of the double integral for  $\Delta C_{L_2} / C_{L_0}^2$  is very time consuming, much more so than the numerical computation of either the  $C_W / C_{L_0}^2$  or  $\Delta C_{L_1} / C_{L_0}^2$  terms.

Sample numerical results for the total lift correction ratio  $\Delta C_L / C_{L_0}^2$  versus depth Froude number  $F_h$  are plotted in Figure 16 for an aspect ratio 4 hydrofoil, with contours of depth-to-chord ratio. Similar

results for aspect ratio 6 are plotted in Figure 17 versus chord Froude number  $F_c$ . At a constant depth-to-chord ratio  $h/c_a = 1.0$ , Figure 18 shows the variation of  $\Delta C_L / C_{L_0}^2$  versus  $F_c$  for aspect ratios  $A = 4, 6,$  and  $10$ . There is a distinctive effect of the free surface that causes a sharply peaked, positive lift correction at depth Froude numbers smaller than  $F_h = 1.5$  and a broad, persistent, negative lift correction at Froude numbers larger than  $1.5$ . The cross-over point appears to occur at  $F_h \approx 1.5$  regardless of depth of submergence or aspect ratio. Apparently the influence of aspect ratio on the magnitude of  $\Delta C_L / C_{L_0}^2$  is relatively slight, but Figure 18 shows that the peak values of lift correction (both positive and negative) increase somewhat with aspect ratio. It should be reiterated that this Froude-dependent behavior of  $\Delta C_L / C_{L_0}^2$  has been computed with the assumption of fixed circulation distribution shape, and that the full Froude-dependent effects on both the strength and distribution of  $\Gamma(y)$  have not been taken into account in these preliminary calculations.

#### TOTAL LIFT AND DRAG RATIOS

It is interesting to consider the ratio of total lift  $C_L$  to the reference lift coefficient  $C_{L_0}$  and how this affects the expected ratio of total lift-dependent drag to total lift squared. If the lift correction ratio is denoted as

$$\Delta_{LC} = \frac{\Delta C_{L1} + \Delta C_{L2}}{C_{L_0}^2} \quad (41)$$

then

$$\frac{C_L}{C_{L_0}} = 1 + \Delta_{LC} C_{L_0} \quad (42)$$

and so

$$\frac{C_D}{C_L^2} = \left( \frac{C_D}{C_{L_0}^2} \right) \frac{1}{(1 + \Delta_{LC} C_{L_0})^2} \quad (43)$$

This shows that the absolute magnitude of the reference lift coefficient  $C_{L_0}$  is important in determining to what extent the free surface effect will alter both  $C_L/C_{L_0}$  and  $C_D/C_L^2$ .

If the reference lift coefficient is held fixed at  $C_{L_0} = 1.0$  throughout the speed range, then curves of the variation of  $C_L/C_{L_0}$  versus depth Froude number  $F_h$  are shown in Figures 19 and 20, for aspect ratio  $A = 4$  and 6 respectively, with contours of two different submergence ratios  $h/c_a = 0.25$  and 1.0. Some care must be exercised in interpreting these  $C_L/C_{L_0}$  curves with respect to determining the influence of the free surface on the lift produced by a submerged hydrofoil. Because the circulation distribution shape has been assumed to remain elliptical, the only adjustment accommodated by the present computations is the circulation strength  $\Gamma_0$ , or equivalently, the reference coefficient  $C_{L_0}$ . It should be noted that  $C_{L_0}$  is not the same as the unbounded flow lift coefficient denoted as  $C_{L_\infty}$  by Nishiyama.<sup>2</sup>

Effectively, the only free surface influence accounted for here in the calculation of the lift correction,  $\Delta C_L$ , enters through the induced changes in the x-component of the perturbation velocity multiplied by



the circulation distribution and integrated over the span. See Equation 10. This results in the rather modest variations in the ratio  $C_L/C_{L_0}$  versus Froude number shown in Figures 19 and 20. It is reasonable to predict that when a full accounting is made for adjustments of both the strength and shape of the circulation distribution, the variations will be different and possibly more extreme. An important improvement anticipated with complete solution is a detailed description of the induced changes due to both the horizontal and vertical perturbation velocities.

Curves of  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$  versus chord Froude number for an aspect ratio 6 hydrofoil at submergence  $h/c_a = 0.25$  are plotted in Figure 21 for several different constant values of  $C_{L_0} = 0.25, 0.5, \text{ and } 1.0$ . For comparison, the reference total drag ratio,  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$ , is included. The effect of varying the magnitude of  $C_{L_0}$  is to separate the several contours of  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$ , and to shift the peaks of the curves to somewhat higher Froude numbers.

A more realistic display of these results is shown in Figure 22, where a curve of  $C_D/C_L^2$  versus  $F_c$  is plotted for a reference lift coefficient  $C_{L_0}$  that is based on a constant reference foil loading equal to  $(L/S)_0 = \frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 C_{L_0} = 1200 \text{ pounds/foot}^2 \text{ (} 57,456 \text{ N/m}^2 \text{)}$  on an aspect ratio 4 hydrofoil having an average chord length of  $c_a = 20 \text{ feet (} 6.1 \text{ m)}$ , operating at submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$ . In this case the reference  $C_{L_0}$  is speed-dependent

$$C_{L_0} = \frac{1237}{U^2} \quad (44)$$

The curve is terminated for this example at a speed corresponding to  $C_{L_0} = 2.0$ . In the comparison with the  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$  curve in Figure 22, the main effect is to shift the peak of  $C_D/C_L^2$  with respect to Froude number. The changes in magnitude between  $C_D/C_L^2$  and  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$  become rather small for the higher Froude numbers because  $C_{L_0}$  becomes progressively smaller with speed increasing.

#### COMPUTATION TIME

The execution time for computation of a single case (given aspect ratio, submergence, and Froude number) varies widely as a function of both submergence ratio  $\lambda$  and Froude number, with the longest times being required for shallow submergence and small Froude numbers. Also, the execution time is dominated by the calculation of the  $\Delta C_{L_2}$  term. Consider a representative case. With  $\lambda$  around 0.4 ( $h/c_a \approx 1.0$ ), chord Froude number about 0.5, using 100 spaces per loop for the calculation of  $J_W$  and for  $\Delta C_{L_1}$ , using 60 spaces per loop for  $F_L$  and for the non-singular integrals of  $\Delta C_{L_2}$ , and with 61 spaces per half interval for the singular part of  $\Delta C_{L_2}$  the total Central Processor (CP) execution time is around 55 seconds per case on the DTNSRDC CDC 6400 computer. Of this, approximately 0.5 to 0.75 seconds of CP time is devoted to each of the calculations of the wave drag  $C_W$  and lift correction term  $\Delta C_{L_1}$ . The remainder, some 52 seconds, must be spent on the lift correction term  $\Delta C_{L_2}$ .

## COMPARISONS OF ASYMPTOTIC RESULTS

In consideration of how useful asymptotic results can be if they are accurate enough, some preliminary comparisons are included here between asymptotic estimates obtained in Reference 3 and the numerically determined values. This section is not intended as an exhaustive comparative study, but it does illustrate one important application of the present results.

It is crucial to consider asymptotic results only in the variable regimes where they are valid. In the case of the near surface hydrofoil, estimates produced by  $Wu^3$  for large Froude number ( $F_h^2 \gg 1$ ) require simultaneously small submergence ( $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ ). Similarly, formulas for small Froude number ( $F_h^2 \ll 1$ ) must be accompanied by large submergence ( $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ). The present numerical tests of Wu's results were made on the following basis

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Large } F_h, \text{ small } \lambda: & F_h^2 \geq 1.5, \\ & \lambda < 1 \end{array} \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Small } F_h, \text{ large } \lambda: & F_h^2 \leq 1.5, \\ & \lambda > 1 \end{array} \quad (46)$$



## DRAG DUE-TO-LIFT

### Large Froude Number, Small Submergence

The asymptotic relation for wave drag at large Froude number obtained by Wu in Reference 3 (Equation (68)) can be written in coefficient form as

$$\frac{C_W}{C_{L_0}^2} \sim \frac{2\sigma_i}{\pi A} + \frac{1}{\pi F_c^2} \left\{ \frac{4}{3} \left\{ \frac{2}{\pi} (1+\lambda^2)^{3/2} E(k_\lambda) - \frac{3}{2} \lambda \right. \right. \quad (47)$$

$$\left. \left. - \lambda^2 \sqrt{1+\lambda^2} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}; 1; k_\lambda^2\right) \right\} + O\left(\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \beta, \frac{1}{\beta^2}, \frac{1}{F_h^2}\right) \right\}$$

where  $F$  is the hypergeometric function, whose expansion for small  $\lambda$  was determined in Reference 3a, Appendix E, p. 70 to be

$$F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}; 1; k_\lambda^2\right) \sim \frac{2}{\pi} \left( 2 - \ln \frac{4\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}{\lambda} \right) - \frac{3}{2\pi^2} \left( \frac{1}{3} - \ln \frac{4\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}{\lambda} \right) \quad (48)$$

$$\times \left( \frac{\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2} \right) + O(\lambda^2 \ln \lambda)$$

with  $k_\lambda = 1/(1 + \lambda^2)^{1/2}$ .

Now, this result can be used to write an asymptotic formula for the 'surface wave' drag term,  $C_{D_{SW}}$ , introduced in Equation (26). Following a suggestion and notation similar to that of Breslin,<sup>4</sup> the large Froude number, small submergence approximation for the surface wave drag is

$$\frac{C_{D_{SW}}}{C_{L_0}^2} \sim \frac{\gamma_W(\lambda)}{F_c^2} \quad (49)$$

where the wave drag function  $\gamma_W$  is purely a function of the depth-to-half span ratio, and from (47) and (48), is given in its complete asymptotic form by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_W(\lambda) \sim & \frac{4}{3\pi} \left\{ \frac{2}{\pi} (1+\lambda^2)^{3/2} E(k_\lambda) - \frac{3}{2} \lambda - \lambda^2 \sqrt{1+\lambda^2} \left\{ \frac{2}{\pi} \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \times \left( 2 - \ln \frac{4\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}{\lambda} \right) - \frac{3}{2\pi^2} \left( \frac{1}{3} - \ln \frac{4\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}{\lambda} \right) \left( \frac{\lambda^2}{1+\lambda^2} \right) \right\} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

provided  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ .

Breslin<sup>4</sup> proposed an abbreviated form of this function

$$\gamma_{W,Bres} \sim \frac{4}{3\pi} \left\{ \frac{2}{\pi} (1+\lambda^2)^{3/2} E(k_\lambda) - \frac{3}{2} \lambda \right\} \quad (51)$$

Example comparisons between the asymptotic results for  $\gamma_W$  and numerical values are shown in Figures 23 through 26, for an aspect ratio 6 hydrofoil at depth-to-chord ratios  $h/c_a = 0.25, 0.5, 1.0,$  and  $2.0$  with corresponding depth-to-half span ratios of  $\lambda = 0.0833, 0.1667, 0.3333,$  and  $0.6667$  respectively. For the smallest submergence of  $\lambda = 0.08333$ , in Figure 23, good correspondence between the asymptotic and numerical results for  $\gamma_W$  is observed, but not until the Froude number exceeds  $F_h \sim 9$  or  $10$ . The difference between the two expressions for  $\gamma_W$  in this case is negligible.

For larger and larger values of  $\lambda$ , the agreement between asymptotic and numerical values for the wave drag function  $\gamma_W$  becomes poorer. Also the disparity between the values of  $\gamma_W$  calculated using the complete asymptotic expression in Equation (50) and Breslin's version in Equation (51) becomes greater as  $\lambda$  increases, although significant differences occur only for  $\lambda$ -values where the asymptotic formula no longer appears to be valid anyway.

#### Small Froude Number, Large Submergence

For very small values of depth Froude number, and large submergence ratio  $\lambda$ , the asymptotic relation for wave drag from Reference 3, (Equation (66)) can be expressed as

$$\frac{C_W}{C_{L_0}^2} \sim \frac{e^{-2/F_h^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \lambda^2 A F_h^3} \left[ 1 + \frac{3}{8} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{6\lambda^2 F_h^4} \right) F_h^4 + O(F_h^4) \right] \quad (52)$$

for  $F_h^2 \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

Figure 27 is an example comparison between results from the asymptotic estimate and numerical calculations, for an aspect ratio 4 hydrofoil at submergence  $h/c_a = 3.5$ ,  $\lambda = 1.75$ . The curve for the asymptotic result is plotted out to  $F_h^2 = 1.5$ , and the agreement shown is excellent.

#### LIFT

The two parts of the lift correction ratio have somewhat different asymptotic behavior. The term  $\Delta C_{L_1}/C_{L_0}^2$  is independent of Froude number,



and has approximating formulas that depend only on the relative size of the depth-to-half span ratio  $\lambda$ . The term  $\Delta C_{L2}/C_{L0}^2$  requires careful attention to both Froude number and submergence ratio simultaneously, as prescribed earlier for wave drag in Equations (45) and (46).

#### Large Froude Number, Small Submergence

The asymptotic relation for the  $\Delta C_{L1}/C_{L0}^2$  term, given in Equation (78a) of Reference 3, requires small values of submergence ratio, and can be written

(53)

$$\frac{\Delta C_{L1}}{C_{L0}^2} \sim -\frac{8}{3\pi^3 \lambda A} \left\{ 1 - 3\lambda^2 (\ln 2 - \frac{3}{4} + \frac{5}{8} \ln \frac{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}}{\lambda}) \right\} + O(\lambda^4 \ln \lambda)$$

provided  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ .

For the  $\Delta C_{L2}/C_{L0}^2$  term, the asymptotic expression from Equation (80) of Wu<sup>3</sup> can be written as

$$\frac{\Delta C_{L2}}{C_{L0}^2} \sim \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi^2 A} \Gamma(1/4) \left[ 1 - \frac{\Gamma(3/4)}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(1/4)} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} \right] \times \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{F_h} (\gamma + \ln \frac{2}{F_h^2}) \right)$$

(54)

for  $F_h^2 \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ ,

where  $\Gamma$  = the gamma function (c.f. Reference 10, p. 255)

$\gamma$  = Euler's constant = 0.5772156649.

Example direct comparison of values for both  $\Delta C_{L1}/C_{L0}^2$  and  $\Delta C_{L2}/C_{L0}^2$ , obtained both numerically and from the asymptotic expressions are plotted in Figures 28, 29 and 30 for the cases of an aspect ratio 6

hydrofoil at submergences  $h/c_a = 0.25, 1.0, \text{ and } 2.0$ , having corresponding values of  $\lambda = 0.08333, 0.333, 0.667$  respectively. The agreement between the two curves for the  $\Delta C_{L1}/C_{L0}^2$  part is excellent, even at the larger values of  $\lambda$ . However, the discrepancies between the asymptotic estimates and the numerical values for  $\Delta C_{L2}/C_{L0}^2$  are substantial, even at the largest Froude numbers and smallest submergence ratio. Some preliminary checks on the series solution of the inner integral outlined by Wu<sup>3a</sup> in his Appendix IV(H) have shown some inconsistencies which may explain the differences.

The present calculations are undoubtedly more accurate, but at the expense of time-consuming computations, particularly for the  $\Delta C_{L2}/C_{L0}^2$  term.

#### Small Froude Number, Large Submergence

For large submergence ratio  $\lambda$ , the approximate expression for the  $\Delta C_{L1}/C_{L0}^2$  term, given by Wu<sup>3</sup> in his Equation (76), can be expressed as

$$\frac{\Delta C_{L1}}{C_{L0}^2} = \frac{-1}{8\pi\lambda\sqrt{1+\lambda^2}} A \left[ 1 + \frac{0.3125}{(1+\lambda^2)} + \frac{0.70703}{(1+\lambda^2)^2} + \frac{0.0920105}{(1+\lambda^2)^3} + o\left(\frac{1}{(1+\lambda^2)^4}\right) \right] \quad (55)$$

provided  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

For the  $\Delta C_{L2}/C_{L0}^2$  term, the asymptotic relation from Equation (81) of Wu<sup>3</sup> can be written

$$\frac{\Delta C_{L_2}}{C_{L_0}^2} \sim \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3/2} \lambda^2 A F_h} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} F_h^2 + O(F_h^4) \right) \quad (56)$$

for  $F_h^2 \ll 1$ ,  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

Figure 31 is a comparison plot for both  $\Delta C_{L_1}/C_{L_0}^2$  and  $\Delta C_{L_2}/C_{L_0}^2$  versus Froude number for an aspect ratio 4 hydrofoil at submergence ratio  $\lambda = 1.75$ . Here again, the approximate formula for  $\Delta C_{L_1}/C_{L_0}^2$  appears to be remarkably accurate. The same cannot be said for the  $\Delta C_{L_2}/C_{L_0}^2$  term, where the asymptotic result shows a distinct divergence from the numerically obtained curve. There is good reason to suspect the validity of the asymptotic formula, which is the result of nested asymptotic evaluations of the double integral expression for  $\Delta C_{L_2}$ . Although the example data are not provided here, a substantial number of numerical checks have been carried out on the inner integral, or the  $F_L(u)$  function defined in Equation (40). These showed that the intermediate asymptotic formula obtained by Wu<sup>3a\*</sup> gives inaccurate results, except for a limited range of large values for both  $u/F_h^2$  and  $\lambda$ .

#### EXAMPLE DRAG FORCE ESTIMATES

In order to illustrate the relative importance of the major components of total drag experienced by large submerged hydrofoils moving at speeds between takeoff and subcavitating maximum, results of some simple estimates can be made using the computed predictions

---

\* Asymptotic result for Wu's integral  $I_2(u)$ ; his Equation (IV.34) in his Appendix IV



generated in this work. Two groups of comparison examples are included:  
 (a) constant chord length (same chord Froude number range) and (b)  
 constant total foil lift; both with the same foil loading

$$L/S = 1200 \text{ pounds/foot}^2 = 57,456 \text{ N/m}^2$$

and at submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$ .

Consider first a family of three, uncambered, 10 percent thick, elliptic planform hydrofoils all having the same chord length

$$c_a = 20 \text{ feet (6.1 m)}$$

with aspect ratios  $A = 4, 6, \text{ and } 10$ . The total foil-alone drag can be estimated from

$$\begin{aligned} D_T &= D_{\text{visc}} + D \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \rho U^2 S (C_{D_{\text{visc}}} + C_D) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where  $C_{D_{\text{visc}}} \approx 2(1 + f) C_f + K_{\text{sep}} C_L^2$

$$C_D = C_{D_{f\infty}} + C_{D_{si}} + C_W \quad (58)$$

Here the total viscous drag contribution is estimated using

$C_f$  = flat plate friction, 1957 ITTC correlation line,  
 based on wetted surface

$f$  = viscous pressure drag factor from Hoerner;<sup>10</sup>

$f = 0.206$  for 10 percent thick foils

$K_{sep}$  = incremental profile drag factor recommended in Reference 11, Appendix 8-B; assumed constant here as  $K_{sep} = 0.005$ , approximately true for  $R_c = 10^8$ .

The term  $C_D$  is the total drag coefficient due-to-lift, given by Equations (20)-(23).

The lift coefficient in sea water is speed dependent

$$C_L = \frac{1206}{U^2}$$

using  $U$  in feet/second. With the calculated, Froude-dependent values of  $\Delta_{LC}$  defined by Equation (41), or

$$\Delta_{LC} = \frac{C_L - C_{L_0}}{C_{L_0}^2}$$

the reference lift coefficient  $C_{L_0}$  can be determined from

$$C_{L_0} = \frac{1}{2\Delta_{LC}} (\sqrt{1 + 4C_L\Delta_{LC}} - 1) \quad (59)$$

The Froude-dependent  $C_{L_0}$ -values together with the drag coefficient ratios,  $C_D/C_{L_0}^2$ , of Figures 13, 14, and 15 permit the final estimates of drag due-to-lift,  $C_D$ . Again it should be recalled that these lifting line predictions apply to the drag induced by an elliptical circulation distribution of fixed shape, but variable strength.

Figures 32, 33, and 34 are plots of drag force versus velocity for the speed range 20 to 50 knots, corresponding to aspect ratios  $A = 4, 6,$  and 10 respectively. The total foil lift is different for each case,

having corresponding values of  $L = 1,920,000$  pounds ( $8.54 \times 10^6$  N),  $2,880,000$  pounds ( $12.81 \times 10^6$  N), and  $4,800,000$  pounds ( $21.35 \times 10^6$  N). Physically, it would be necessary to increase the foil angle of attack with decreasing speed in order to achieve the contours shown in Figures 32-34 and 35; but for the purposes of this comparison, the determination of the angle of attack schedule is superfluous. In each of these plots, the lower curve is the viscous drag  $D_{visc}$  and the upper curve is the total drag  $D_T$ . The dashed curve represents values of

$$(1 + \sigma_i) D_{i\infty}' \quad (60)$$

where  $D_{i\infty}'$  is the unbounded flow induced drag determined from the coefficient

$$C_{D_{i\infty}'} = \frac{C_L^2}{\pi A} \quad (61)$$

The biplane factors corresponding to these cases are  $\sigma_i = 0.2322$ ,  $0.3409$ , and  $0.4842$  respectively. The difference between the  $D_T$  and  $(1 + \sigma_i) D_{i\infty}'$  curves is the surface wave drag contribution, whose value goes to zero at infinite Froude number. It is clear from these graphs that for increasingly larger aspect ratios and physically larger hydrofoils, the surface wave drag becomes a relatively much more important factor in the speed range shown.

A second comparison is made on the basis of the same total foil lift. Figure 35 shows the drag variation with speed for an aspect ratio 10 hydrofoil having the same planform area,  $S = 1600$  foot<sup>2</sup> ( $148.6$  m<sup>2</sup>),



and the same lift as the aspect ratio 4 hydrofoil example shown in Figure 32. Even with the smaller chord and therefore shifted Froude number range, the relatively greater importance of the surface wave drag contribution to the total drag is evident from looking at both Figures 32 and 35. It may also be noted that despite the increased surface wave drag, the total drag of the aspect ratio 10 hydrofoil is lower in this comparison at  $h/c_a = 1$ .

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A successful computer program has been developed for the numerical calculation of the integrals appearing in the prediction formulas for hydrofoil drag due-to-lift and total lift, for the special case of foil loading due to an elliptic circulation distribution of fixed shape on an elliptical planform.
2. Some results are displayed in a variety of useful graphs for aspect ratios 4, 6, and 10 at several depths of submergence, and for a range of Froude numbers  $0.2 \leq F_c \leq 6.0$  and  $F_h \leq 12.0$ .
3. Although it was not the direct purpose of this work, some preliminary comparisons between numerical results and results from Wu's asymptotic relations have been made. These show mixed results. Excellent predictions are provided by asymptotic formulas for: (a) wave drag,  $C_w/C_{L_0}^2$ , at small Froude number and deep submergence, and (b) lift correction term,  $\Delta C_{L_1}/C_{L_0}^2$ , for both shallow and deep submergence.

A narrow range of good predictions are provided by the asymptotic relations for wave drag at large Froude number and shallow submergence.

Rather poor predictions are available from the asymptotic formulas for the lift correction term  $\Delta C_{L2} / C_{L0}^2$  in both the large and small Froude number regimes.

4. More efficient means should be explored for the evaluation of the  $\Delta C_{L2}$  term to avoid performing both integrals by numerical quadrature. With faster computation of this term, it is recommended to include the  $\Delta C_L$  correction to the drag and lift results of the linearized theoretical prediction of hydrofoil performance.
5. The lifting line results of Wu should be further implemented in a computer program capable of analyzing arbitrary planform shapes (those within the known limitations of the lifting line theory) and should be made available for evaluation for general hydrofoil support systems.
6. Example calculations of hydrofoil drag force illustrate the need to have accurate predictions of the surface wave drag contributions present at the low chord Froude numbers characteristic of very large hydrofoil planforms.




Figure 1 - Geometry and Coordinate System of Submerged Hydrofoil




Figure 2 - Elliptic Planform Shape






Figure 3 - The Biplane Factor  $\sigma_i(\lambda)$




Figure 4 - Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil; Contours of Submergence




Figure 5 - Wave Drag Ratio Versus Depth Froude Number for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil






Figure 6 - Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil; Contours of Submergence




Figure 7 - Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratios 4, 6, and 10 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$




Figure 8 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 0.25$




Figure 9 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 1.0$






Figure 10 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 0.25$




Figure 11 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 1.0$





Figure 12 - Transverse and Diverging Wave Components of Wave Drag for Aspect Ratio 10 Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 1.0$

A = 4



Chord Froude Number,  $F_c$

Figure 13 - Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil






Figure 14 - Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil




Figure 15 - Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratios 4, 6, and 10 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$




Figure 16 - Lift Correction Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 Hydrofoil;  
Contours of Submergence






Figure 17 - Lift Correction Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 Hydrofoil;  
Contours of Submergence




Figure 18 - Lift Correction Ratio for Aspect Ratios 4, 6, and 10 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$




Figure 19 - Total Lift Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 at  $C_{L_0} = 1.0$




Figure 20 - Total Lift Ratio for Aspect Ratio 6 at  $C_{L_0} = 1.0$






Figure 21 - Comparison of Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratios for Aspect Ratio 6; Contours of Constant  $C_{L_0}$




Figure 22 - Comparison of Total Lift-Dependent Drag Ratios for Aspect Ratio 4; Constant Reference Foil Loading




Figure 23 - Comparison Between Large  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 0.25$




Figure 24 - Comparison Between Large  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 0.5$






Figure 25 - Comparison Between Large  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$




Figure 26 - Comparison Between Large  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Function for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 2.0$




Figure 27 - Comparison Between Small  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Wave Drag Ratio for Aspect Ratio 4 at Submergence  $\lambda = 1.75$




Figure 28 - Comparisons Between Large  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 0.25$






Figure 29 - Comparisons Between Large  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 1.0$




Figure 30 - Comparisons Between Large  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 6 at Submergence  $h/c_a = 2.0$




Figure 31 - Comparisons Between Small  $F_h$  Asymptotic and Calculated Lift Correction Terms for Aspect Ratio 4 at Submergence  $\lambda = 1.75$

$c_a = 20 \text{ ft (6.1 m)}$   
 $S = 1600 \text{ ft}^2 (148.6 \text{ m}^2)$   
 $L = 1,920,000 \text{ lbs (871 m.tonnes)}$




Figure 32 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 4, 20-Foot Chord Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 1$



$c_a = 20 \text{ ft (6.1 m)}$   
 $S = 2400 \text{ ft}^2 (223 \text{ m}^2)$   
 $L = 2,880,000 \text{ lbs (1306 m. tonnes)}$




Figure 33 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 6, 20-Foot Chord Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 1$




Figure 34 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 10, 20 Foot Chord Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 1$

$c_a = 12.65 \text{ ft (3.86 m)}$   
 $S = 1600 \text{ ft}^2 (148.6 \text{ m}^2)$   
 $L = 1,920,000 \text{ lbs (871 m.tonnes)}$




Figure 35 - Estimated Drag Force Versus Speed for an Aspect Ratio 10, 12.65-Foot Chord Hydrofoil at  $h/c_a = 1$



APPENDIX A  
LISTING OF COMPUTER PROGRAM

The computer program used to generate all the numerical data of the report is listed here for reference. Definitions of the input variables and the main output quantities are given in Tables 2 and 3.

TABLE 2  
COMPUTER PROGRAM INPUT VARIABLES

Computer Notation	Symbol and/or Meaning
A	A = planform aspect ratio
HOCA	$h/c_a$ = depth-to-chord ratio
TWMAX	Maximum allowable t-value in the $C_w$ -integration (typically 70 to 100)
TLMAX	Maximum allowable t-value in the integration of $F_L(u)$ (typically 70-100)
EPS	Accuracy limit for integration of $C_w$ and $F_L(u)$ (typically 0.000001)
NSPW	Number of spaces for numerical integration of loops in $C_w$ and for $\Delta C_{L_1}$ (typically 100)
NSPL	Number of spaces for numerical integration of non-singular integrals of $\Delta C_{L_2}$ (typically 60)
NINDEX	Counting index for modified Simpsons Rule for Cauchy singular integral (typically 30)
NDATA	Number of input data cases of Froude number
FC	$F_c$ = chord Froude number
CLO	$C_{L_0}$ = reference lift coefficient

TABLE 3  
MAIN COMPUTER PROGRAM OUTPUT VARIABLES

Computer Notation	Symbol and/or Meaning
CDIIR	$C_{D_{i\infty}} / C_{L_0}^2$
CDSIR	$C_{D_{si}} / C_{L_0}^2$
CDSWR	$C_{D_{sw}} / C_{L_0}^2$
CL1R	$\Delta C_{L_1} / C_{L_0}^2$
CL2R	$\Delta C_{L_2} / C_{L_0}^2$
CLRO	$C_L / C_{L_0} = (1 + \Delta_{LC} \cdot C_{L_0})$
CWR	$C_W / C_{L_0}^2$
CWR(T)	$C_{W(t)} / C_{L_0}^2$
CWR(D)	$C_{W(d)} / C_{L_0}^2$
DELW	$\Delta_{LC} = \Delta C_L / C_{L_0}^2$
DELCL	$\Delta C_L = C_{L_0}^2 \cdot \Delta_{LC}$
NLOOPS	Number of loops of integrand required to reach desired accuracy
SIGMAI	$\sigma_i$

THIS PAGE TO BE LEFT BLANK  
END OF DOCUMENT

TABLE 3 (Continued)

TE	End value of t-integration for $C_W$
WS	$\gamma_W$ = Auxillary function for wave drag (see Equation (49))



THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

```
1      C
      C      CENTRAL PROGRAM TO COMPUTE HYDRODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS
      C      OF DRAG AND LIFT FOR A SUBMERGED FLAT HYDROFOIL HAVING AN
      C      ELLIPTICAL PLANFORM WITH SPECIFIED ELLIPTIC CIRCULATION
5      C      DISTRIBUTION, USING THE 1953 LIFTING LINE RESULTS OF
      C      T.Y. WU. COMPLETELY NUMERICAL EVALUATION OF INTEGRALS AT
      C      ARBITRARY DEPTH AND FROUDE NUMBER

10     PROGRAM SUBMFL (INPUT, OUTPUT, TAPE5=INPUT, TAPE6=OUTPUT)
      REAL LAMDA, JW, JMT, JMD, JL1, JL2, KE, LAMDA2
      COMMON/BLCK1/ZJ1(100)
      COMMON FH, FC, A, HOCA, LAMDA, BETA, EPS, PI, NSPW, NSPL
      PI = 3.1415926536
15     PI2 = PI*PI
      PI3 = PI2*PI
      RPI = SQRT(PI)
      CONV = PI/180.0

      C
20     DO 22 N=1,100
22     ZJ1(N) = 0.0

      C      FIRST 20 ZEROS OF BESSEL FUNCTION J1(T) ARE KNOWN.
      C      SEE ABRAMOWITZ AND STEGUN, PAGE 409

25     ZJ1(1) = 3.83171
      ZJ1(2) = 7.01559
      ZJ1(3) = 10.17347
      ZJ1(4) = 13.32369
      ZJ1(5) = 16.47063
30     ZJ1(6) = 19.61586
      ZJ1(7) = 22.76008
      ZJ1(8) = 25.90367
      ZJ1(9) = 29.04683
35     ZJ1(10) = 32.18968
      ZJ1(11) = 35.33231
      ZJ1(12) = 38.47477
      ZJ1(13) = 41.61709
      ZJ1(14) = 44.75932
40     ZJ1(15) = 47.90146
      ZJ1(16) = 51.04354
      ZJ1(17) = 54.18555
      ZJ1(18) = 57.32753
      ZJ1(19) = 60.46946
45     ZJ1(20) = 63.61136

      C
      READ (5,1001) A,HOCA
      READ (5,1001) TWMAX,TLMAX,EPS
      READ (5,1002) NSPW,NSPL,NINDEX
50     1001 FORMAT (A15.7)
      1002 FORMAT (3I10)
      READ (5,1000) NDATA
      1000 FORMAT (I10)
      DO 9999 I0=1,NDATA
55     WRITE (6,9000)
      9000 FORMAT (1M1)
      READ (5,1001) FC,CLO

      C
      FC2 = FC*FC
60     LAMDA = (2.0/A)*HOCA
      LAMDA2 = LAMDA*LAMDA
      FH2 = (1.0/HOCA)*FC2
      FH = SQRT(FH2)
65     FH3 = FH2*FH
      BETA = (2.0/A)*FC2
      FS = (1.0/SQRT(2.0))*SQRT(BETA)

      C
70     THETT = 35.26438968
      THETTR = THETT*CONV
      ST = SIN(THETT)
      SECT = 1.0/COS(THETTR)
      SECT2 = SECT*SECT
      TT = (1.0/BETA)*SECT2*ST
75     CONST = HOCA/FC2

      C
      WRITE (6,2000) A,LAMDA,HOCA,BETA,FC,FH,FS,TT
2000 FORMAT (/1X,8HGEOMETRY,/5X,22HASPECT RATIO, A =F15.7,
120X,7HLAMDA =F15.7,/5X,22HDEPTH-TO-CHORD, HOCA =F15.7,
80     215X,12HFH2 = BETA =F15.7,/5X,22HCHORD FROUDE NO., FC =F15.7,
```

```

35X,22HDEPTH FROUDE NO., FH =F15.7,/
45X,22HSPAN FROUDE NO., FS =F15.7,5X,
522HCritical T-VALUE, TT =F15.7)
85      C
      C      DRAG
      C
      C      WRITE (6,2001) NSPW,TWMAX,EPS
2001    FORMAT (/1X,4HDRAG,5X,6HNSPW =I10,5X,7HTWMAX =F15.7,5X,5HEPS =
90      1E15.7,7X,25HINDUCED DRAG COEFF RATIOS,35X,
      222HWAVE DRAG COEFF RATIOS)
      KE = 0.0
      EE = 0.0
      EMM1 = LAMDA2/(1.0 + LAMDA2)
      EMM = 1.0 - EMM1
95      CALL ELLIP(VALK,VALE,EMM)
      KE = VALK
      EE = VALE
      ELL = 1.0 + LAMDA2
      RELL = SQRT(ELL)
100     SIGMAI = 1.0 - (4.0/PI)*LAMDA*RELL*(KE - EE)
      C
      CALL CALJW(JW,JWT,JWD,TT,TWMAX,NLOOPS,TE)
      C = (1.0/PI)*EXP(-CONST)
105     WS = C*JW - (2.0*SIGMAI*FC2)/(PI*A)
      C
      CDIIR = 1.0/(PI*A)
      CDSIR = -SIGMAI*CDIIR
110     CWR = (C/FC2)*JW
      CWRT = (C/FC2)*JWT
      CWRD = CWR - CWRT
      CDSWR = (1.0/FC2)*WS
115     C
      CDIRUL = (1.0 + SIGMAI)/(PI*A)
      CDIRLL = (1.0 - SIGMAI)/(PI*A)
120     C
      CDR = CDIIR + CDSIR + CWR
      WRITE (6,2002) CDIIR,CWR,CDSIR,CWRT,SIGMAI,CWRD,CDIRLL,CDSWR,
      1CDIRUL,WS,CDR
2002    FORMAT (/10X,7HCDIIR =E15.7,32X,
      125HWAVE DRAG(TOTAL), CWR =E15.7,10X,7HCDIRLL =E15.7,
      273X,32HTRANSVERSE WAVE PART, CWR(T) =E15.7,10X,
      38HSIGMAI =E15.7,40X,32HDIVERGING WAVE PART, CWR(D) =E15.7,
125     4//10X,18HCDI(LOWER LIMIT) =E15.7,21X,
      530HCDSWR = (CWR - 2*SIGMAI/PI*A) =E15.7,10X,
      618HCDI(UPPER LIMIT) =E15.7,21X,
      730HSURFACE WAVE FACTOR, WS =E15.7,7X,
      838HCDI(TOTAL)/CLO2 = (CDIIR + CDSIR + CWR) =E15.7)
130     WRITE (6,2003) NLOOPS,TE
2003    FORMAT (/5X,8HNLOOPS =I10,5X,4HTE =F15.7)
      WRITE (6,2005)
2005    FORMAT (/5X,22HASYMPTOTIC RESULTS ---,6X,3HCWR,17X,5HCDSWR,15X,2HW
135     1S,11X,11HWS(BRESLIN),12X,1HF)
      IF(LAMDA.GE.1.0.AND.FH2.LE.1.5) GO TO 170
      IF(LAMDA.LT.1.0.AND.FH2.GT.1.5) GO TO 171
      GO TO 172
170     FAC1 = SQRT(2.0*PI)
      FAC2 = EXP(-2.0/FH2)
140     FAC3 = LAMDA2*A*FH2*FH
      FAC4 = 6.0*LAMDA2*FH2*FH2
145     C
      CWR --- LAMDA.GE. 1.0, FH2.LE.1.5
      C
      CWR = (FAC2/(FAC1*FAC3))*(1.0 + 0.375*(1.0 - (1.0/FAC4))*FH2)
      WRITE (6,2004) CWR
2004    FORMAT (28X,E15.7,11X,3H---,16X,2H--)
      GO TO 175
171     FAK1 = 2.0/PI
      FAK2 = 1.5/PI2
      FAK3 = 4.0/(3.0*PI)
      ARG1 = 4.0*RELL/LAMDA
      TLOG = ALOG(ARG1)
      F = FAK1*(2.0 - TLOG) - FAK2*((1.0/3.0) - TLOG)*(LAMDA2/ELL)
155     WS = FAK3*(FAK1*RELL*ELL*EE - (1.5*LAMDA) -
      1(LAMDA2*RELL)*F)
      CDSWR = (1.0/FC2)*WS
      CWR = 2.0*SIGMAI/(PI*A) + CDSWR
160     WSBRES = FAK3*((FAK1*ELL*RELL*EE) - (1.5*LAMDA))
      C

```

**THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC**

```

WRITE (6,2006) CWR,COSWR,WS,WSHRES,F
2006 FORMAT (28X,E15.7,5X,E15.7,3X,E15.7,3X,E15.7,3X,E15.7)
GO TO 175
172 WRITE (6,2007)
2007 FORMAT (/28X,27HNO ASYMPTOTIC RESULTS APPLY)
175 NS = 2*NINDEX+1
C
C
C          LIFT CORRECTION
170
WRITE (6,2008) NSPL,NINDEX,NS,TLMAX,EPS
2008 FORMAT (/1X,4HLIFT, /5X,6HNSPL =I10, /5X,8HNINDEX =I10, /5X,4HNS =I1
+0, /5X,7HTLMAX =F15.7, /5X,5HEPS =F15.7,
+//24X,2RHLIFT COEFF CORRECTION RATIOS)
C
CALL CALJL1(JL1)
CL1R = -(8.0/(PI3*LAMDA*A))*JL1
C
CALL CALJL2(JL2,TLMAX,NINDEX)
CL2R = -(4.0/(PI2*A*FH))*JL2
180
DELW = CL1R + CL2R
CL02 = CL0*CL0
DELCL = CL02*DELW
CLR0 = 1.0 + DELCL
185
C
WRITE (6,2009) CL1R,CL2R,DELW
2009 FORMAT (27X,6HCL1R =E15.7, /27X,6HCL2R =E15.7, //27X,6HDELW =E15.7)
WRITE (6,2010) CL0,DELCL,CLR0
2010 FORMAT (/5X,9HFOR CL0 =F15.7, /10X,7HDELCL =E15.7, /10X,6HCLR0 =E15.
+7)
WRITE (6,2011)
2011 FORMAT (/5X,22HASYMPTOTIC RESULTS ---, /7X,6HCL1RAS, /15X,6HCL2RAS)
C
IF (LAMDA.GE.1.0) GO TO 50
195 GO TO 51
50 ELL2 = ELL*ELL
ELL3 = ELL2*ELL
C
C
C CL1RAS --- LAMDA.GE.1.0
200
CL1RAS = -(1.0/(8.0*PI*LAMDA*RELL*A))*(1.0 + (0.3125)/ELL +
1(0.70703)/ELL2 + (0.0920105)/ELL3)
GO TO 60
205 51 EXL = RELL/LAMDA
AL1 = ALOG(EXL)
AL2 = ALOG(2.0)
C
C
C CL1RAS --- LAMDA.LT.1.0
210
CL1RAS = -(8.0/(3.0*PI3*LAMDA*A))*(1.0 - (3.0*LAMDA2)*(AL2 -
10.75 + 0.625*ALL))
60 IF (LAMDA.GE.1.0.AND.FH2.LE.1.5) GO TO 70
IF (LAMDA.LT.1.0.AND.FH2.GT.1.5) GO TO 71
GO TO 72
215 70 FACD = (2.0*PI)*SQRT(2.0*PI)
C
C
C CL2RAS --- LAMDA.GE.1.0, FH2.LE.1.5
220
CL2RAS = (1.0/(FACD*LAMDA2*A*FH))*(1.0 + 0.5*FH2)
GO TO 80
225 71 GAM14 = 3.6256099082
GAM34 = 1.2254167024
GAM = 0.5772156649
C
C
C CL2RAS, LAMDA.LT.1.0, FH2.GT.1.5
230
RTWO = SQRT(2.0)
ARG = 2.0/FH2
CL2RAS = ((RTWO*GAM14)/(PI2*A))*(1.0 - (GAM34*LAMDA)/(RPI*GAM14*RE
1LL))*(1.0 + (RTWO/RPI)*(1.0/FH)*(GAM + ALOG(ARG)))
GO TO 80
235 72 WRITE (6,2020) CL1RAS
2020 FORMAT(30X,E15.7,5X,21HNO RESULTS APPLY HERE)
GO TO 90
240 90 WRITE (6,2012) CL1RAS,CL2RAS
2012 FORMAT (30X,E15.7,5X,E15.7)
CLR02 = CLR0*CLR0
CDCL2 = CD0/CLR02
WRITE (6,2013) CL0,CDCL2
2013 FORMAT (/1X,21HINVISCID DRAG-TO-LIFT, /5X,9HFOR CL0 =F15.7,

```



THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

110X,15HCD(TOTAL)/CL2 =E15.7)  
9999 CONTINUE  
END

```
1      SUBROUTINE CALJW(JW,JWT,JWD,TT,TWMAX,NL,TF)
C
C      CALCULATES THE WAVE RESISTANCE INTEGRAL JW
C      FOR A SUBMERGED HYDROFOIL
5      C
      REAL JW,JWT,JWD,J1,J12,LLOOP,LAMDA
      COMMON/RLCK1/ZJ1(100)
      COMMON FH,FC,A,HOCA,LAMDA,BETA,EPS,PI,NSPW,NSPL
      DIMENSION PS(100)
      CONV = PI/180.0
      SPACEN = FLOAT(NSPW)
      NSP1 = NSPW
      DO 1 N=1,100
10      PS(N) = 0.0
      C
15      FC2 = FC*FC
      CONST = HOCA/FC2
      BETA2 = BETA*BETA
      C
20      C
      ITT = 0
      J1 = 0.0
      N=1
      T=0.0
25      JW = 0.0
      JWT = 0.0
      JWD = 0.0
      LLOOP = ZJ1(1)
      DT = LLOOP/SPACEN
      APS = EXP(-CONST)
      SIM1 = 1.0
      SIM2 = 1.0
      IF (LLOOP.GE.TT) GO TO 200
50      I = 0
35      100 I = I+1
          IF (I.EQ.NSP1) GO TO 150
          T = T+DT
          IF (T.GT.TWMAX) GO TO 800
          T2 = T*T
          FORBT = 4.0*BETA2*T2
          ROOT = SQRT(1.0 + FORBT)
          CALL CALJ1(VALJ1,T)
          J1 = VALJ1
          J12 = J1*J1
45      EFACTR = EXP(-CONST*ROOT)
          FACT2 = (1.0 + ROOT)*(1.0 + ROOT)
          DAPS = (EFACTR*J12*FACT2)/(T2*ROOT)
          SIM = SIM1 + SIM2
          APS = APS + DAPS*SIM
50      SIM2 = -SIM2
          GO TO 100
150     APS = APS*(DT/3.0)
          PS(N) = APS
          JW = JW + PS(N)
          IF (ITT.EQ.0) GO TO 350
          GO TO 351
350     JWT = JW
351     RATIO = ABS(PS(N)/JW)
          IF (RATIO.LE.EPS) GO TO 700
60      151     SIM1 = 3.0
          SIM2 = 1.0
          N = N+1
          IF (N.GT.20) GO TO 500
65      152     T = ZJ1(N-1)
          LLOOP = ZJ1(N) - T
          TUL = (T + LLOOP)
          IF (TUL.GE.TT.AND.ITT.EQ.0) GO TO 200
          DT = LLOOP/SPACEN
          APS = 0.0
70      I=0
```

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

```
160 I = I+1
      IF (I.EQ.NSP1) GO TO 170
      T = T+DT
      IF (T.GT.TWMAX) GO TO 800
75     T2 = T*T
      FOHBT = 4.0*BETA2*T2
      ROOT = SQRT(1.0 + FORBT)
      CALL CALJ1(VALJ1,T)
      J1 = VALJ1
80     J12 = J1*J1
      EFACTR = EXP(-CONST*ROOT)
      FACT2 = (1.0 + ROOT)*(1.0 + ROOT)
      DAPS = (EFACTR*J12*FACT2)/(T2*ROOT)
      SIM = SIM1 + SIM2
85     APS = APS + DAPS*SIM
      SIM2 = -SIM2
      GO TO 160
170   APS = APS*(DT/3.0)
      PS(N) = APS
90     JW = JW + PS(N)
      IF (ITT.EQ.0) GO TO 352
      GO TO 353
352   JWT = JW
95     353   RATIO = ABS(PS(N)/JW)
      IF (RATIO.LE.EPS) GO TO 700
      GO TO 151
200   ITT = 1
      IF (N.EQ.1) GO TO 201
100    DT = (TT - ZJ1(N-1))/SPACEN
      GO TO 202
201   DT = TT/SPACEN
202   I=0
203   I = I+1
105    T = T+DT
      IF (T.GT.TWMAX) GO TO 800
      T2 = T*T
      FOHBT = 4.0*BETA2*T2
      ROOT = SQRT(1.0 + FORBT)
110    CALL CALJ1(VALJ1,T)
      J1 = VALJ1
      J12 = J1*J1
      EFACTR = EXP(-CONST*ROOT)
      FACT2 = (1.0 + ROOT)*(1.0 + ROOT)
115    DAPS = (EFACTR*J12*FACT2)/(T2*ROOT)
      IF (I.EQ.NSP1) GO TO 204
      SIM = SIM1 + SIM2
      APS = APS + DAPS*SIM
      SIM2 = -SIM2
120    GO TO 203
204   APS = APS + DAPS
      APS = APS*(DT/3.0)
      PS(N) = APS
      JW = JW + PS(N)
125    JWT = JW
      RATIO = ABS(PS(N)/JW)
      IF (RATIO.LE.EPS) GO TO 700
      APS = DAPS
C
C     THIS SETS INITIAL VALUE FOR DOING THE AREA UNDER
C     THE REMAINDER OF THE LOOP
C
      DT = (ZJ1(N) - TT)/SPACEN
      SIM1 = 3.0
      SIM2 = 1.0
135    GO TO 50
500   WRITE (6,2003)
2003  FORMAT (/2X,85HINTEGRATION MUST PROCEED BEYOND N=20 LOOPS, T = 63.
161136 --- HEREAFTER ESTIMATE ZEROS)
      ENT = FLOAT(N)
140    THE1 = (2.0*ENT - 1.0)*(PI/2.0)
      ALPHA0 = 2.35619449
      SUM = THE1 + ALPHA0
      SUM2 = SUM*SUM
145    ZJ1(N) = (0.5*SUM)*(1.0 + SQRT(1.0 - (1.49995344)/SUM2))
      GO TO 152
800   WRITE (6,2006) TWMAX
2006  FORMAT (/10X,33HINTEGRATION TERMINATED AT TWMAX =F15.7)
700   JW0 = JW-JWT
      TE = 7J1(N)
150    ROOTE = SQRT(1.0 + 4.0*BETA2*TE*TE)
      ARGE = (1.0/(2.0*BETA*TE))*(-1.0 + ROOTE)
```

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

```
155      THETER = ASIN(ARGE)
        THETED = THETER/CONV
        NL = N
        RETURN
        END
```

```
1      SUBROUTINE CALJL1(VJL1)
        C
        C      CALCULATES THE NESTED INTEGRAL JL1 FOR LIFT
        C      CORRECTION
5      C
        REAL LAMDA,KX,KX2,KX4,KLAM,KE,LAMDA2
        COMMON FH,FC,A,HOCA,LAMDA,BETA,EPS,PI,NSPW,NSPL
        LAMDA2 = LAMDA*LAMDA
        SPACEN = FLOAT(NSPW)
10     NSP1 = NSPW
        KLAM = 1.0/(SQRT(1.0 + LAMDA2))
        DKX = KLAM/SPACEN
            SIM1 = 3.0
            SIM2 = 1.0
15     KX = 0.0
        VJL1 = PI/16.0
        C
            I=0
100    I=I+1
20     IF (I.EQ.NSP1) GO TO 200
        KX = KX + DKX
        KX2 = KX*KX
        KX4 = KX2*KX2
        EMM = KX2
25     CALL ELLIP(VALK,VALE,EMM)
        KE = VALK
        EE = VALE
        CE = (1.0/KX4)*((2.0 - KX2)*KE - 2.0*EE)
        RKKL = KX/KLAM
30     RKKL2 = RKKL*RKKL
        FAC = SQRT((1.0 - RKKL2)/(1.0 - KX2))
        C
        DVJL1 = FAC*CE
            SS = SIM1 + SIM2
35     VJL1 = VJL1 + DVJL1*SS
            SIM2 = -SIM2
        GO TO 100
200    VJL1 = VJL1*(DKX/3.0)
        RETURN
        END
40
```

```
1      SUBROUTINE CALJL2(VJL2,TLMAX,NINDEX)
        C
        C      CALCULATES THE INTEGRAL JL2 FOR LIFT CORRECTION
5      C
        NSPL = NUMBER OF SPACES FOR ORDINARY
        C      (NONSINGULAR) INTEGRATIONS
        C      NINDEX = COUNTING INDEX FOR CAUCHY SINGULAR
        C      INTEGRAL TREATED WITH SIMPSONS RULE
10     C
        H = SPACING FOR SINGULAR PART
        C      = 1.0/(2*NINDEX + 1)
        C
        NS = NUMBER OF SPACES ON EACH SIDE OF ZERO
        C      = 2*NINDEX + 1
15     C
        C      NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS FOR INTEGRALS I1,IN, AND IS
        C
20     REAL LAMDA,IS,IN,I1
        COMMON/HLCK1/ZJ1(100)
        COMMON FH,FC,A,HOCA,LAMDA,BETA,EPS,PI,NSPW,NSPL
        RPI = SQRT(PI)
```



THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

```
25 RTWO = SQRT(2.0)
    SPACEN = FLOAT(NSPL)
    NSP1 = NSPL
    FM2 = FH*FH
    NS = 2*NINDEX+1
    H = 1.0/FLOAT(NS)
    CALL CALFLO(FLO,TLMAX)
30 UARG = 1.0/(2.0*FM2)
    CALL CALFL(FL,UARG,TLMAX)
    FL1 = FL
C
    UARG = 1.0/FM2
    CALL CALFL(FL,UARG,TLMAX)
35 FL2 = FL
C
C
C          NONSINGULAR INTEGRALS I1 AND IN
C
40     SIM1 = 3.0
        SIM2 = 1.0
        T = 0.0
        DT = 1.0/SPACEN
        FAEF = EXP(-1.0/FM2)
        I1 = 2.0*FAEF*(FL1 - FLO)
45     IN = RTWO*FL2*FAEF
        I=0
100    I=I+1
        IF (I.EQ.NSP1) GO TO 110
        T=T+DT
50     EFTU = 1.0/(T*FM2)
        IF (EFTU.GT.500.0) GO TO 10
        GO TO 11
10     E2 = 0.0
        GO TO 12
55     11 E2 = EXP(-EFTU)
        12 F1 = EXP(-T/FM2)
        T12 = SQRT(T)
        T32 = T*T12
C
60     ROOTT = SQRT((1.0 + T)/T)
        UARG1 = T/(2.0*FM2)
        CALL CALFL(FLT,UARG1,TLMAX)
        UARG2 = 1.0/(T*2.0*FM2)
        CALL CALFL(FLOT,UARG2,TLMAX)
65     UARG3 = (1.0 + T)/(T*2.0*FM2)
        CALL CALFL(FLPOOT,UARG3,TLMAX)
C
70     D11 = (E1/T12)*(FLT - FLO) + (E2/T32)*(FLOT - FLO)
        DIN = FLPOOT*ROOTT*(E2/T)
C
        SIM = SIM1 + SIM2
        I1 = I1 + D11*SIM
        IN = IN + DIN*SIM
        SIM2 = -SIM2
75     GO TO 100
110    DT03 = DT/3.0
        I1 = I1+DT03
        IN = IN+DT03
C
C
C          SINGULAR INTEGRAL IS
C
80     SIM1 = 3.0
        SIM2 = 1.0
        T = -1.0
        TM = 1.0
85     EHPLUS = EXP(H/FM2)
        EHNEG = EXP(-H/FM2)
        HARGP = (1.0 + H)/(2.0*FM2)
        CALL CALFL(FLHP,HARGP,TLMAX)
        HARGN = (1.0 - H)/(2.0*FM2)
        CALL CALFL(FLHN,HARGN,TLMAX)
90     RHP = SQRT(1.0 + H)
        RHN = SQRT(1.0 - H)
C
95     IS = RTWO*FAEF + (4.0/H)*(FLHP*RHP*EHNEG - FLHN*RHN*EHPLUS)
C
200    I=1
        I=I+1
        T = T+H
        TM = TM - H
100    IF (I.EQ.NS) GO TO 210
```

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

```

105      E1H = EXP(-TM/FH2)
          F1L = EXP(-T/FH2)
          ROOTR = SQRT(1.0 + TM)
          ROOTL = SQRT(1.0 + T)
C
          HARGR = (1.0 + TM)/(2.0*FH2)
          HARGL = (1.0 + T)/(2.0*FH2)
110      CALL CALFL(FL,HARGR,TLMAX)
          FLR = FL
          CALL CALFL(FL,HARGL,TLMAX)
          FLL = FL
C
          DISR = (FLR*ROOTR*E1R - FL1*FAEF)/TM
          DISL = (FLL*ROOTL*E1L - FL1*FAEF)/T
          SIM = SIM1 + SIM2
          IS = IS + (DISL + DISR)*SIM
          SIM2 = -SIM2
120      GO TO 200
210      IS = IS*(H/3.0)
          VJL2 = -RPI*FH*FLO - I1 + FAEF*(IS + IN)
          RETURN
          END

```

```

1      SUBROUTINE CALFL(FL,UARG,TLMAX)
C
C      CALCULATES THE FUNCTION FL DEFINED IN KERNEL OF
C      THE FROUDE-DEPENDENT LIFT CORRECTION INTEGRAL JL2
5      C
          REAL LAMDA,LAMDA2,J1,J12
          DIMENSION PSL(100)
          COMMON/HLCK1/ZJ1(100)
          COMMON FH,FC,A,HOCA,LAMDA,BETA,EPS,PI,NSPW,NSPL
10      C
          CONV = PI/180.0
          SPACEN = FLOAT(NSPL)
          NSP1 = NSPL
          XVAR = 2.0*UARG
15      UARG2 = UARG*UARG
          FL = 0.0
          J1 = 0.0
          IF (XVAR.GT.500.0) GO TO 3000
          DO 1 N=1,100
20      PSL(N) = 0.0
          LAMDA2 = LAMDA*LAMDA
C
          N=0
25      100      SIM1 = 3.0
          SIM2 = 1.0
          N=N+1
          IF (N.GT.20) GO TO 500
          IF (N.EQ.1) GO TO 101
152      T = LAMDA*ZJ1(N-1)
          DT = (LAMDA*ZJ1(N) - T)/SPACEN
          APSL = 0.0
          GO TO 102
101      T = 0.0
          DT = LAMDA*ZJ1(1)/SPACEN
35      APSL = (0.5/LAMDA2)*(SQRT(XVAR))*(EXP(-XVAR))
          102      I=0
110      I=I+1
          IF (I.EQ.NSP1) GO TO 170
          T = T+DT
          IF (T.GT.TLMAX) GO TO 800
          T2 = T*T
          ROOT = SQRT(T2 + UARG2)
          TOL = T/LAMDA
          CALL CALJ1(VALJ1,TOL)
45      J1 = VALJ1
          J12 = J1*J1
          EFACTR = EXP(-2.0*ROOT)
          FACT32 = (UARG + ROOT)*(SQRT(UARG+ROOT))
C
50      DAPSL = (EFACTR*J12*FACT32)/(T2*ROOT)
          SIM = SIM1 + SIM2

```

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

```
APSL = APSL + DAPSL*SIM
SIM2 = -SIM2
GO TO 110
55 170 APSL = APSL*(DT/3.0)
PSL(N) = APSL
FL = FL + PSL(N)
RATIO = ABS(PSL(N)/FL)
IF (RATIO.LE.FPS) GO TO 700
60 GO TO 100
500 ENT = FLOAT(N)
THET1 = (2.0*ENT - 1.0)*(PI/2.0)
SUM = THET1 + 2.35619449
SUM2 = SUM*SUM
65 ZJ1(N) = (0.5*SUM)*(1.0 + SQRT(1.0 - (1.4995344)/SUM2))
GO TO 152
800 WRITE (6,2006) TLMAX
2006 FORMAT (//10X,33HINTEGRATION TERMINATED AT TLMAX =F15.7)
700 TE = LAMDA*ZJ1(N)
70 3000 CONTINUE
RETURN
END
```

```
1 SUBROUTINE CALFLO(FLO,TLMAX)
C
C CALCULATES THE FUNCTION FLO CONTAINED IN THE
C KERNEL OF THE LIFT CORRECTION INTEGRAL JL2
5 C
REAL LAMDA,J1,J12
DIMENSION P0(100)
COMMON/RLCK1/ZJ1(100)
COMMON FH,FC,A,MOCA,LAMDA,BETA,EPS,PI,NSPW,NSPL
10 C
CONV = PI/180.0
C
SPACEN = FLOAT(NSPL)
NSP1 = NSPL
15 DO I N=1,100
1 P0(N) = 0.0
FL0 = 0.0
J1 = 0.0
N=0
20 100 SIM1 = 3.0
SIM2 = 1.0
N=N+1
IF (N.GT.20) GO TO 500
IF (N.EQ.1) GO TO 101
25 152 T = LAMDA*ZJ1(N-1)
DT = (LAMDA*ZJ1(N) - T)/SPACEN
GO TO 102
101 T = 0.0
DT = LAMDA*ZJ1(1)/SPACEN
30 102 APS0 = 0.0
I = 0
110 I=I+1
IF (I.EQ.NSP1) GO TO 170
T=T+DT
IF (T.GT.TLMAX) GO TO 800
35 T32 = (SQRT(T))*T
TOL = T/LAMDA
CALL CALJ1(VALJ1,TOL)
J1 = VALJ1
J12 = J1*J1
EFACTR = EXP(-2.0*T)
C
DAPSO = (EFACTR*J12)/T32
SIM = SIM1 + SIM2
45 APS0 = APS0 + DAPSO*SIM
SIM2 = -SIM2
GO TO 110
170 APS0 = APS0*(DT/3.0)
P0(N) = APS0
50 FLO = FLO + P0(N)
RATIO = ABS(P0(N)/FLO)
IF (RATIO.LE.EPS) GO TO 700
GO TO 100
```



THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE  
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC

```
55 500 ENT = FLOAT(N)
      THET1 = (2.0*ENT - 1.0)*(PI/2.0)
      SUM = THET1 + 2.35619449
      SUM2 = SUM*SUM
      ZJ1(N) = (0.5*SUM)*(1.0 + SQRT(1.0 - (1.49953441/SUM2)))
      GO TO 152
60 800 WRITE (6,2006) TLMAX
      2006 FORMAT (//10X,33HINTEGRATION TERMINATED) AT TLMAX =E15.7)
      700 TE = LAMDA*ZJ1(N)
      RETURN
      END
```

```
1 SUBROUTINE CALJ1(VJ1,TJ)
  IF (TJ.GE. 3.0) GO TO 300
  XT1 = TJ/3.0
  XT2 = XT1*XT1
  5 XT4 = XT2*XT2
  XT6 = XT4*XT2
  XT8 = XT4*XT2
  XT10 = XT8*XT2
  XT12 = XT10*XT2
  10 VJ1 = TJ*( 0.5 - 0.56249985*XT2 + 0.21093573*XT4
    1-0.03954289*XT6 + 0.00443319*XT8 - 0.00031761*XT10
    2+0.00001109*XT12)
  GO TO 301
  300 XT1 = 3.0/TJ
  15 XT2 = XT1*XT1
  XT3 = XT2*XT1
  XT4 = XT3*XT1
  XT5 = XT4*XT1
  XT6 = XT5*XT1
  20 C THETA1 = TJ - 2.35619449 + 0.12499612*XT1 + 0.00005650*XT2
    1-0.00637879*XT3 + 0.00074348*XT4 + 0.00070824*XT5
    2-0.00029166*XT6
  C F1 = 0.79788456 + 0.00000156*XT1 + 0.01650667*XT2
  25 1+0.00017105*XT3 - 0.00249511*XT4 + 0.00113653*XT5
    2-0.00020033*XT6
  CS1 = COS(THETA1)
  VJ1 = (F1*CS1)/(SQRT(TJ))
  30 301 RETURN
  END
```

```
1 SUBROUTINE ELLIP(VK,VE,EM)
  C
  C COMPUTES COMPLETE ELLIPTIC INTEGRALS OF THE FIRST AND
  C SECOND KIND --- K AND E , RESPECTIVELY
  5 C EM = PARAMETER (= K**2)
  C EM1 = 1.0 - EM = COMPLEMENTARY PARAMETER
  C
  C SEE ABRAMOWITZ AND STEGUN, PAGES 590,591,592 FOR
  C POLYNOMIAL APPROXIMATIONS
  10 C EM1 = 1.0 - EM
  C ALN = ALOG(1.0/EM1)
  C EM12 = EM1*EM1
  15 C EM13 = EM12*EM1
  C EM14 = EM13*EM1
  C
  C VK = 1.38629436112 + (0.09666344259)*EM1 + (0.03590092383)*EM12
  20 1 + (0.03742563713)*EM13 + (0.01451196212)*EM14
  C 2 + ( 0.50 + (0.12498593597)*EM1 + (0.06880248576)*EM12
  C 3+ (0.03328355346)*EM13 + (0.00441787012)*EM14)*ALN
  C
  C VE = 1.0 + (0.44325141463)*EM1 + (0.0626060122)*EM12
  25 1 + (0.04757383546)*EM13 + (0.01736506451)*EM14
  C 2 + ((0.2499836831)*EM1 + (0.09200180037)*EM12
  C 3+ (0.04069697526)*EM13 + (0.00526449639)*EM14)*ALN
  RETURN
  END
```

APPENDIX B  
THE BIPLANE FACTOR

Routine and accurate calculation of the biplane factor  $\sigma_i$  for elliptic circulation distribution has been made easy by the existence of Wu's<sup>3</sup> formula, quoted in Equation (25), where the complete elliptic integrals are

$$K(k_\lambda) = \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{d\phi}{\sqrt{1 - k_\lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi}}$$
$$E(k_\lambda) = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sqrt{1 - k_\lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi} \, d\phi \tag{B.1}$$

and  $k_\lambda = 1/(1 + \lambda^2)^{1/2}$ .

Polynomial approximations of great accuracy are available in Reference 12 (Chapter 17, pages 591 and 592) for the simple computation of  $K(k)$  and  $E(k)$ . These are fourth order polynomials in the "complementary parameter"

$$m_1 = \frac{\lambda^2}{1 + \lambda^2} \tag{B.2}$$

where  $\lambda$  = depth-to-half span ratio.

A convenient collection of values for  $\sigma_i$  for a wide range of  $\lambda$ -values has been calculated using these formulas and is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4  
VALUES OF THE BIPLANE FACTOR  $\sigma_f$

$\lambda$	$\sigma_f(\lambda)$	$\lambda$	$\sigma_f(\lambda)$
0.0	1.0	0.65	0.17095
0.01	0.9364	0.70	0.1555
0.02	0.8905	0.75	0.1418
0.03	0.8513	0.80	0.1298
0.04	0.8163	0.85	0.1191
0.05	0.7845	0.90	0.1096
0.06	0.7553	0.95	0.1011
0.08	0.7027	1.0	0.09351
0.10	0.6565	1.2	0.06999
0.15	0.5604	1.4	0.05406
0.20	0.4842	1.6	0.04285
0.25	0.4221	1.8	0.03472
0.30	0.3705	2.0	0.02865
0.35	0.3273	2.5	0.01889
0.40	0.2905	3.0	0.01334
0.45	0.2592	3.5	0.009904
0.50	0.2322	4.0	0.007635
0.55	0.2089	4.5	0.006061
0.60	0.1886	5.0	0.004927



## APPENDIX C

### NUMERICAL EVALUATION OF WAVE DRAG INTEGRAL

For the calculation of the integral in the wave drag formula of Equation (23), it is convenient to place the integrand in a form where the zero points of the oscillating factor (in this case the  $J_1$ -function) are most easily specified. To accomplish this, the transformation

$$t = \frac{1}{\beta} \sec^2 \theta \sin \theta \quad (C.1)$$

is applied to the integration variable to reduce the argument of the  $J_1$ -function to the linear variable  $t$ . This leads to the formula

$$\frac{C_W}{C_L^2} = \frac{e^{-1/F_h^2}}{\pi F_c^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{\exp(-F_h^{-2} \sqrt{1+4\beta^2 t^2}) (1 + \sqrt{1+4\beta^2 t^2})^2}{t^2 \sqrt{1+4\beta^2 t^2}} \times J_1^2(t) dt \quad (C.2)$$

The entire  $t$ -integral is the wave drag integral, denoted by  $J_W$ . The technique of numerical integration proceeds in a sequence of steps, with each step being taken over an entire loop, whose value is then added to the cumulative sum. The current loop sum is then compared to the cumulative sum and when this ratio is found to be smaller than a specified accuracy, the approximate integration is complete.

Integration time is governed by the rate of decay of the integrand, and in general is slowest for shallow submergence ( $\lambda$  small) and for small Froude numbers.

APPENDIX D

NUMERICAL EVALUATION OF LIFT CORRECTION INTEGRALS

TERM  $\Delta C_{L_1}$

The numerical evaluation of the integral for  $\Delta C_{L_1}$  given in Equation (32) involves a straight forward application of Simpsons Rule over the finite interval  $(0, k_\lambda)$ . As noted in Equation (34), the  $\mathcal{C}(k_1)$  function appearing in the integrand is known in terms of the complete elliptic integrals  $K(k_1)$  and  $E(k_1)$  whose values can be computed using the polynomial approximations given in Reference 12, pages 591 and 592.

TERM  $\Delta C_{L_2}$

For the calculation of the double integral in the  $\Delta C_{L_2}$  term in Equation (33), the  $\theta$ -integral is treated first. The transformation

$$t_1 = \frac{\lambda u}{\beta} \sec^2 \theta \sin \theta \quad (D.1)$$

leads to the final form

$$\frac{\Delta C_{L_2}}{C_{L_0}^2} = - \frac{4}{\pi^2 A F_h} J_{L_2} \quad (D.2)$$

where

$$J_{L_2} = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-u/F_h^2} F_L(u)}{\sqrt{u} (u-1)} du \quad (D.3)$$

with

$$F_L(u) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\exp(-2\sqrt{t_1^2 + u^2/4F_h^4}) \left( \frac{u}{2F_h^2} + \sqrt{t_1^2 + u^2/4F_h^4} \right)^{3/2}}{t_1^2 \sqrt{t_1^2 + u^2/4F_h^4}} \times J_1^2\left(\frac{t_1}{\lambda}\right) dt_1 \quad (D.4)$$

The inner integral function  $F_L(u)$  is dealt with numerically at any value  $u$  using the same procedure employed for the  $J_W$  integral in Appendix C.

The lift correction integral  $J_{L2}$  has a Cauchy singular integrand and must be computed in terms of its principal value. By rewriting the integrand fraction  $1/(u - 1)$  and by adding and subtracting the function  $F_L(o)$  in the numerator, the singular part of  $J_{L2}$  can be separated out, with  $J_{L2}$  rewritten as

$$J_{L2} = - \int_0^{\infty} e^{-u/F_h^2} F_L(o) \frac{du}{\sqrt{u}} - \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-u/F_h^2} [F_L(u) - F_L(o)]}{\sqrt{u}} du + \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-u/F_h^2} F_L(u) \sqrt{u} du}{(u-1)} \quad (D.5)$$

where  $F_L(o) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-2t} J_1^2(t/\lambda)}{t^{3/2}} dt \quad (D.6)$

The first term of (D.5) involves a known definite integral

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{-u/F_h^2} \frac{du}{\sqrt{u}} = \sqrt{\pi} F_h \quad (D.7)$$

The second term of (D.5) is not singular and can be handled easily by splitting the interval into  $0 \leq u \leq 1$  plus  $1 \leq u \leq \infty$ ; and then further transforming the second part by the substitution  $u_1 = 1/u$  and integrating on  $u_1$  from 1 to 0.



The third term of (D.5) contains the Cauchy singularity which is further isolated, first by substitution of  $\xi = u - 1$ , and then splitting the resulting interval  $-1 \leq \xi \leq \infty$  into  $-1 \leq \xi \leq 1$  plus  $1 \leq \xi \leq \infty$ .

Ultimately the lift correction integral  $J_{L_2}$  can be written

$$J_{L_2} = -\sqrt{\pi} F_L(0) - I_1 + e^{-1/F_h^2} (I_N + I_S) \quad (D.8)$$

where

$$I_1 = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-u/F_h^2} \left[ F_L(u) - F_L(0) \right] \frac{du}{\sqrt{u}} \quad (D.9)$$

$$I_N = \int_0^1 \frac{f\left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right)}{\xi} d\xi \quad (D.10)$$

$$I_S = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{f(\xi)}{\xi} d\xi \quad (D.11)$$

with

$$f(\xi) = F_L(\xi + 1) \sqrt{\xi + 1} e^{-\xi/F_h^2} \quad (D.12)$$

Numerical evaluation of integrals  $I_1$  and  $I_N$  is accomplished by normal application of Simpsons Rule. The singular part,  $I_S$ , can be evaluated by a modified Simpsons Rule for a Cauchy singularity, which uses slightly modified Simpsons multipliers with a zero weight value on the integrand function at the singular point  $\xi = 0$ .

## REFERENCES

1. Wilson, M.B. and J.R. Kelley, "Low Froude Number Hydrodynamic Performance of a Flat Plate Hydrofoil," DTNSRDC Departmental Report SPD-743-01, Dec 1976.
2. Nishiyama, T., "Linearized Steady Theory of Fully Wetted Hydrofoils," Advances in Hydrosience, Vol. 3, Edited by Ven Te Chow, Academic Press, 1966, pp. 237-342.
3. Wu, Y.T., "A Theory for Hydrofoils of Finite Span," (a) California Institute of Technology Hydrodynamics Lab Report No. 26-8, May 1953; (b) published in condensed form in Journal of Mathematics and Physics, Vol. 33, 1954/44, pp. 207-248.
4. Breslin, J.P., "Applications of Ship-Wave Theory to the Hydrofoil of Finite Span," Journal of Ship Research, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1957, p. 27.
5. von Kármán, T. and J.M. Burgers, "General Aerodynamic Theory - Perfect Fluids," Division E, Vol. II of Aerodynamic Theory, Edited by W.F. Durand, Julius Springer, 1935.
6. Bateman Manuscript Project, Higher Transcendental Functions, Vol. 2, Edited by A. Erdélyi, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953.
7. Lunde, J.K., "On the Linearized Theory of Wave Resistance for Displacement Ships in Steady and Accelerated Motion," Trans. SNAME, Vol. 59, 1951.
8. Kotchin, N.E., "On the Wave-Making Resistance and Lift of Bodies Submerged in Water," Translation from Russian, SNAME Technical and Research Bulletin No. 1-8, Aug 1951.
9. Wadlin, K.L., C.L. Shuford, and J.R. McGehee, "A Theoretical and Experimental Investigation of the Lift and Drag Characteristics of Hydrofoils at Subcritical and Supercritical Speeds," NACA Report 1232, 1955.
10. Hoerner, S.F., Fluid-Dynamic Drag, Published by the Author, 1965.
11. Burroughs, J.D., et al, "Hydrofoil Analysis and Design Program (HANDE), Theory Manual," Vol. II, The Boeing Co. Report No. D321-51312-2, Jul 1976.
12. National Bureau of Standards, Handbook of Mathematical Functions, Edited by M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1964.

AD-A058 533

DAVID W TAYLOR NAVAL SHIP RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CE--ETC F/G 13/10  
LIFTING LINE CALCULATIONS FOR HYDROFOIL PERFORMANCE AT ARBITRAR--ETC(U)  
JUN 78 M B WILSON

UNCLASSIFIED

DTNSRDC/SPD-0839-01


NL

2 OF 2  
ADA  
058533



END  
DATE  
FILMED  
11-78  
DDC





**DTNSRDC ISSUES THREE TYPES OF REPORTS**

**1. DTNSRDC REPORTS, A FORMAL SERIES, CONTAIN INFORMATION OF PERMANENT TECHNICAL VALUE. THEY CARRY A CONSECUTIVE NUMERICAL IDENTIFICATION REGARDLESS OF THEIR CLASSIFICATION OR THE ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT.**

**2. DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS, A SEMIFORMAL SERIES, CONTAIN INFORMATION OF A PRELIMINARY, TEMPORARY, OR PROPRIETARY NATURE OR OF LIMITED INTEREST OR SIGNIFICANCE. THEY CARRY A DEPARTMENTAL ALPHANUMERICAL IDENTIFICATION.**

**3. TECHNICAL MEMORANDA, AN INFORMAL SERIES, CONTAIN TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION OF LIMITED USE AND INTEREST. THEY ARE PRIMARILY WORKING PAPERS INTENDED FOR INTERNAL USE. THEY CARRY AN IDENTIFYING NUMBER WHICH INDICATES THEIR TYPE AND THE NUMERICAL CODE OF THE ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT. ANY DISTRIBUTION OUTSIDE DTNSRDC MUST BE APPROVED BY THE HEAD OF THE ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.**