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FOREWORD

The present report is one of a series of six reports, published simultaneously, which describe analyses and computational procedures for: 1) prediction of the in-depth response of charring ablation materials, based on one-dimensional thermal streamtubes of arbitrary cross-section and considering general surface chemical and energy balances, and 2) nonsimilar solution of chemically reacting laminar boundary layers, with an approximate formulation for unequal diffusion and thermal diffusion coefficients for all species and with a general approach to the thermochemical solution of mixed equilibrium-nonequilibrium, homogeneous or heterogeneous systems. Part I serves as a summary report and describes a procedure for coupling the charring ablator and boundary layer routines. The charring ablator procedure is described in Part II, whereas the fluid-mechanical aspects of the boundary layer and the boundary-layer solution procedure are treated in Part III. The approximations for multicomponent transport properties and the chemical state models are described in Parts IV and V, respectively. Finally, in Part VI an analysis is presented for the in-depth response of charring materials taking into account char-density buildup near the surface due to coking reactions in depth.

The titles in the series are:


Part VI An Approach for Characterizing Charring Ablator Response with In-depth Coking Reactions, by R. A. Rindal.

This effort was conducted for the Structures and Mechanics Division of the Manned Spacecraft Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration under Contract No. NAS9-4599 to Vidya Division of Itek Corporation with Mr. Donald M. Curry and Mr. George Strouhal as the NASA Technical Monitors. The work was initiated by the present authors while at Vidya and was completed by Aerotherm Corporation under subcontract to Vidya (P.O. 8471 V9002) after Aerotherm purchased the physical assets of the Vidya Thermodynamics Department. Dr. Robert M. Kendall of Aerotherm was the Program Manager and Principal Investigator.
ABSTRACT

A laminar nonsimilar boundary-layer procedure is described which yields accurate solutions for a broad range of problems. In its current formulation, solutions can be obtained for any equilibrium chemical environment with specified rate-controlled reactions at the surface. It has been used to treat a variety of ablating and nonablating surface boundary conditions including coupled energy and mass balances. The formulation considers unequal diffusion and thermal diffusion coefficients for all species in a particularly convenient manner through a bifurcation approximation for binary diffusion coefficients. The multicomponent viscosity and thermal conductivity of the mixture are determined by use of Sutherland-Wassiljewa type approximations. The procedure is readily applicable to inclusion of one-dimensional radiation emission and absorption and a general nonequilibrium chemical model.

The procedure combines features of the general integral relations approach with those of matrix solution techniques. Following the former, smooth functions (in particular, cubic spline functions) are chosen to relate the principal dependent variables to their derivatives. This enables the attainment of an accurate solution with relatively few entries into the conservation equations (3 to 4 place accuracy with 7 to 11 spline points). From the latter, the concept of treating the entire solution as a set of simultaneous, nonlinear algebraic equations is adopted. This technique results in linearized coupling between all relations required to characterize the boundary layer, and thus assures a general, rapid, and stable iterative convergence. As a consequence, the damping of corrections has seldom been required. Computational speed appears to be an attractive feature based on the few comparisons with other techniques which have been possible to date.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[\Delta{VL_K}]$</td>
<td>corrections for the &quot;linear&quot; primary variables $K'_k, K''_k, \ldots, K'_k, K''_k, \ldots, K''_k$ for $k^{th}$ elemental species in Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas (defined by Fig. 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF SYMBOLS (Concluded)

\[ \Delta V_{L_p} \] corresponds to any of the \[ \Delta V_{L_F}, \Delta V_{L_H}, \ldots \] defined in Fig. 3

\[ \Delta V_{NL_j} \]
correction for the \( j \)th "nonlinear" primary variable in Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas (defined by Eq. (150))

\[ \Delta V_{NL_a} \]
corrections for the "nonlinear" primary variables \( \alpha_H, f_n, f_w', f_w'', \ldots, f_n', H_w', H_w'', \ldots, H_T'^{n-l} \) and the \( \bar{K}_w, \bar{K}_{w_2}, \ldots, \bar{K}_w^{n-l} \) in the Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas

\[ \Delta V_{NL_b} \]
corrections to the reduced set of "nonlinear" primary variables \( f_w, H_w \), and the \( \bar{K}_w^{n-l} \) in Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas

\[ \Delta V_{NL_p} \]
corrections for the "nonlinear" primary variables \( \alpha_H, f_w, f_w', f_w'', f_w''', \ldots, f_w'''' \) in the Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas (defined by Fig. 3)

\[ \Delta V_{NL_H} \]
corrections for the "nonlinear" primary variables \( H_w', H_w'', H_w''', \ldots, H_T'^{n-l} \) in Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas (defined by Fig. 3)

\[ \Delta V_{NL_K} \]
corrections for the "nonlinear" primary variables \( K_w', K_w'', K_w''', \ldots, K_w^{n-l} \) for \( k \)th elemental species in Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas (defined by Fig. 3)

\[ \Delta V_{NL_p} \]
corresponds to any of the \[ \Delta V_{NL_F}, \Delta V_{NL_H}, \ldots \] defined in Fig. 3
AN INTEGRAL-MATRIX METHOD FOR NONSIMILAR
SOLUTION OF THE MULTICOMPONENT LAMINAR BOUNDARY LAYER

SECTION 1
INTRODUCTION

A computational procedure is described which is suitable for obtaining accurate numerical solutions of the nonsimilar multicomponent laminar boundary layer with arbitrary equilibrium or nonequilibrium chemical systems, unequal diffusion and thermal diffusion coefficients for all species, radiation absorption and emission, and a variety of surface boundary conditions including intimate coupling with transient charring-ablation energy and mass balances. A Fortran IV computer program has been developed in accordance with this analysis with the exceptions that 1) the chemical system is presently limited to equilibrium, with or without selected rate-controlled surface reactions or surface catalyzed reactions, and 2) radiation absorption and emission is not currently permitted. This computer program, designated BLIMP, for Boundary Layer Integral Matrix Procedure, is described in Ref. 1.

The computational procedure has been developed while attempting to take advantage of the most attractive features of other boundary-layer procedures. In light of the application of the procedure to be adopted, certain specific requirements seemed appropriate. In particular, minimization of the number of "nodal points" required to obtain a solution was judged to be of prime importance as a consequence of the relatively large times associated with state calculations for a general chemical environment and, in the streamwise direction, because of the desire to couple the boundary layer procedure to a transient internal conduction or ablation solution.

For a given accuracy, the number of necessary "nodal points" in the surface normal direction is controlled primarily by the nature of the functions which relate the dependent variables (and their derivatives) to the independent variable. Thus the continuous functions typically used in integral relations approaches require fewer "nodal points"* than the discontinuous functions implied by most finite difference approximations. In order to permit relatively flexible profiles, sets of connected cubics were selected to represent enthalpy, velocity, and elemental concentrations. The first and second derivatives of these cubics were made continuous at the connecting points. The advantages of such a "spline fit" are considered, for example, in Ref. 2.

*The term "nodal point" is meant to encompass the integral strips of Pallone and the matching points used by Dorodnitsyn.
If the general integral relations approach is followed, weighting functions must be selected. In the present study this selection was based primarily on the complexity of the resultant algebra. Studies were made using Dirac delta weighting functions (i.e., a differential approach*) and step weighting functions similar to those used by Pallone which indicated,** when other aspects of the procedure were unchanged, no definite superiority in terms of accuracy or stability. Because all of the complexities introduced by the generalization of the thermodynamic and transport properties of the system occur within a divergence term, step weighting functions produce markedly simpler algebra and, consequently, were adopted for the present procedure.

In the past when relatively large spacing in the streamwise direction has been desired, iterative procedures have generally been used to assure accuracy and stability. In many instances these procedures have treated the solution in a manner resembling those used for similar solutions but with the addition of finite difference representations for the nonsimilar terms, a procedure which eliminates the necessity of special starting techniques. Using this basic approach, the specific treatment adopted in the current study follows most closely the matrix procedure used by Leigh wherein the iteration is a consequence of the solution of a set of linear and nonlinear algebraic relations. Whereas a special successive approximation procedure was used by Leigh, the general Newton-Raphson technique was used in the present procedure. This technique results in linearized coupling between all relations required to characterize the boundary layer, and thus assures a more general, rapid and stable iterative convergence.

The present document concentrates on the fluid mechanical aspects of the problem and describes the basic numerical solution procedure. The procedures employed for calculating the equilibrium state of the gas and suggested for including rate-controlled reactions are described elsewhere since they are conveniently treated as subroutines to the basic boundary layer computational procedure. However, the terms which are directly involved in the boundary layer equations such as the "elemental source term" which arises from kinetic considerations are included in the present development. Similarly, radiation absorption and emission enters directly into the conservation equations only as a net radiation flux term in the energy equation. The calculation of this term could also be conveniently accomplished by a subroutine. A one-dimensional model for net radiation flux which represents an extension of the work of Cess to allow an angular-dependent incident radiation flux at the boundary-layer edge is presented in Appendix E.

*This correspondence is pointed out by Dorodnitsyn.
**The results of these studies are discussed in an appendix to this report.
Multicomponent transport properties are based on a newly developed approximation described in Ref. 9. Modification of the conservation equations as a consequence of this approximation is described herein. Finally, the procedures employed for coupling to a transient charring ablation program are described in Ref. 10.

The governing differential equations for laminar or turbulent flow are presented in Section 2. The laminar form of the equations are normalized by a modified Levy-Lees transformation in Section 3. The modification consists of a coordinate stretching parameter which permits the establishment of an efficient universal boundary layer nodal network. In Section 4, the transformed conservation equations are integrated and the connected-cubic functional relationships are introduced through truncated Taylor series expansions. The procedure utilized to solve these equations is described in Section 5. First, the Newton-Raphson linear recurrence formulas are developed. A matrix reduction procedure is then described which takes full advantage of the linear Taylor series expansions and simplifies the generalization of surface boundary conditions.

In Section 6, comparisons to other numerical solutions are shown for several uncoupled nonreacting boundary layer problems. Generally, 3-to 4-place accuracy is obtained for 7-point boundary-layer solutions, and the solution usually converges in 3 or 4 iterations. Solutions for chemically reacting boundary layers are presented in Section 7.

SECTION 2

BOUNDARY LAYER CONSERVATION EQUATIONS

In this section are presented the differential equations which govern laminar or turbulent flow in a planar or axisymmetric compressible boundary layer with mass addition, equilibrium or nonequilibrium chemical reactions, multicomponent diffusion, thermal diffusion, and radiation. Unequal diffusion and thermal diffusion coefficients for all diffusing pairs are in accordance with the unified approximation presented in Ref. 9. The equations derived are essentially an extension of those derived in Ref. 11 to include radiation, thermal diffusion, and unequal binary-diffusion coefficients. The diffusion introduced by pressure gradients and body forces are neglected.

The standard definitions of time-averaged turbulent quantities and relative order of magnitude are employed (Refs. 11 and 12). The turbulent transport terms are expressed in the Boussinesq form, that is, eddy viscosity, eddy diffusion, and eddy conductivity. Hence, all the terms in the equations
are time-averaged quantities and no need exists for using a superscript bar.*

In the order-of-magnitude arguments, terms of the following types have been eliminated: 1) triple correlations, 2) derivatives of turbulent correlations parallel to the wall, and 3) correlations involving turbulent components of molecular transport mechanisms.

A mass balance of an individual species in a unit volume results in the relationship

$$\frac{1}{r_0^\kappa} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left( \rho u K_i r_o^\kappa \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \rho v K_i \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \rho \varepsilon_{D_i} \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y} - j_i \right) + \psi_i $$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where s and y are the streamwise and normal coordinates, respectively, u and v are the velocity components in the s and y directions, respectively, $K_i$ is the mass fraction of species $i$, $r_o$ is the radius of the body in a meridian plane for an axisymmetric shape, $\kappa$ is zero for a flat plate and unity for a body of revolution, $\rho$ is the density, $\psi_i$ represents the rate of mass generation of species $i$ per unit volume due to chemical reaction, $\rho \varepsilon_{D_i}$ is defined in terms of the correlation of the fluctuating components of concentration and normal velocity, that is,

$$\rho \varepsilon_{D_i} = - \frac{(\rho v)' K_i}{\partial K_i/\partial y} $$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

and $j_i$ is the mass-diffusion rate of species $i$ due to molecular processes.

When Eq. (1) is summed over all the species in the system, utilizing

$$\sum_{i} \rho \varepsilon_{D_i} \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y} = \sum_{i} j_i = 0$$

which results from the definition of mass diffusion, and utilizing

$$\sum_{i} \psi_i = 0$$

*Accordingly, $\rho v$ represents $\bar{\rho} \bar{v}$, not $\bar{\rho} \bar{v}$. 
which results from conservation of mass, there results
\[
\frac{1}{r_0} \frac{\partial \rho u r_0^K}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \rho v}{\partial y} = 0
\]  
(3)

which is the familiar global continuity equation.

When Eq. (3) is considered together with Eq. (1), the more conventional species conservation equation is obtained:
\[
\rho u \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \rho \varepsilon_i \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y} - j_i \right) + j_i
\]
(4)

The streamwise momentum equation can be written as
\[
\rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \rho (\nu + \varepsilon_M) \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right] - \frac{\partial p}{\partial s}
\]
(5)

where \( p \) is the pressure and the eddy viscosity is defined in terms of the Reynolds stresses of turbulent flow by
\[
\rho \varepsilon_M = -\frac{(\nu u') u'}{\partial u/\partial y}
\]
(6)

The momentum equation for forces and fluxes normal to the surface is given by
\[
\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} = \frac{\rho u^2}{r_c}
\]
(7)

where \( r_c \) is the radius of curvature of a surface streamline.

The energy equation for this general system is
\[
\rho u \frac{\partial H_T}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial H_T}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \rho (\varepsilon_M + \nu) \frac{3(u^2/2)}{\partial y} + \left( \lambda + \rho c \overline{\rho} \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right]
\]
(equation continued on next page)
(equation continued from previous page)

\[ + \sum_i \left( \rho \frac{\partial D_i}{\partial y} - j_i \right) h_i - \frac{RT}{\rho} \sum_i \sum_j \frac{x_i D_i T}{m_i D_{ij}} \left( \frac{j_i}{K_i} - \frac{j_j}{K_j} \right) + q_x \] (8)

where \( H_T \) is the total enthalpy (static plus kinetic)

\[ H_T = h + \frac{u^2}{2} \] (9)

\( h \) is the static enthalpy including chemical as well as sensible contributions

\[ h = \sum_i K_i h_i \] (10)

\( h_i \) is the static enthalpy of species \( i \)

\[ h_i = \int_0^T C_{pi} dT + h_i^0 \] (11)

\( T \) is the temperature, \( h_i^0 \) is the heat of formation of species \( i \), \( C_{pi} \) is the specific heat of species \( i \), \( \bar{C}_p \) is the frozen specific heat of the gaseous mixture

\[ \bar{C}_p = \sum_i K_i C_{pi} \] (12)

\( \lambda \) is the thermal conductivity, \( R \) is the gas constant, \( x_j \) is the mole fraction of species \( j \), \( m_i \) is the molecular weight of species \( i \), \( D_{ij} \) is the binary diffusion coefficient of species \( i \) into \( j \), \( D_i T \) is the multicomponent thermal diffusion coefficient of species \( i \), the turbulent enthalpy-transport coefficient is defined by

\[ \rho c_H = \frac{\sum_i K_i (\partial v/\partial y) h_i}{\sum_i K_i (\partial h_i/\partial y)} \] (13)
and \( q_r \) is the net one-dimensional energy flux towards the surface due to radiation absorption and emission.\(^\ast\) In Eq. (8) the turbulent contribution to the DuFour effect (the double summation term) has been neglected since significant diffusion thermo occurs only in the laminar region where temperature gradients are severe.

When the assumption of equal diffusion coefficients is made, a substantial simplification of the problem results if the species conservation Equations (4) are multiplied by \( a_{ki} \), defined as the mass fraction of element \( k \) in species \( i \), and the resulting terms are summed over all species (known as the Shvab-Zeldovich transformation). When this is done, there is a reduction in the number of conservational equations from the number of species (typically 20 to 50) to the number of elements (usually 2 to 6). In addition, the resulting equations are simplified since the source terms are eliminated. Furthermore, elements vary more smoothly across the boundary layer than do the molecular species, and hence are better represented numerically. To illustrate, when all binary-diffusion coefficients are assumed equal and in the absence of thermal diffusion, the \( j_i \) can be expressed by Fick's law

\[
j_i = - \rho \delta_{12} \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y}
\]

Substituting this into Eq. (4) and performing the Shvab-Zeldovich transformation results in the following elemental conservation equations for the laminar or turbulent boundary layer:

\[
\rho u \frac{\partial \bar{R}_k}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial \bar{R}_k}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \rho (\bar{e}_D + \delta_{12}) \frac{\partial \bar{R}_k}{\partial y} \right]
\]

where \( \bar{R}_k \) is the mass fraction of element \( k \) in the system defined by

\[
\bar{R}_k = \sum_i a_{ki} K_i
\]

It has also been assumed that all \( \bar{e}_{D_i} = \bar{e}_D \). When diffusion coefficients are not equal, Fick's law does not apply. The diffusional fluxes, \( j_i \), must then be expressed in terms of multicomponent diffusion coefficients, \( \nu_{ij} \).

\(^\ast\)A model for \( q_r \) which allows an angular-dependent incident radiation flux at the boundary-layer edge is developed in Appendix E.
\[ j_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \sum_{j \neq i} m_j D_{ij} \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y} - D_i T \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial y} \]  

(17)

or via the Stefan-Maxwell relations\(^1^3\)

\[ \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y} = \sum_j x_j x_j \left[ \frac{j_j + D_i T \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial y}}{K_j} - \frac{j_i + D_i T \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial y}}{K_i} \right] \]  

(18)

Utilization of the Stefan-Maxwell equations in conjunction with the species conservation equations is awkward even in the absence of thermal diffusion effects, since the diffusional flux, \( j_i \), is expressed implicitly in terms of mole fractions and their gradients. Hence, use is often made of Eq. (17) together with the multicomponent diffusion coefficients, for example, in Refs. 14 through 16. However, each of the \((I^2-I)\) multicomponent diffusion coefficients depends upon local concentrations and upon \((I^2-I)/2\) symmetric binary diffusion coefficients, \( b_{ij} \), where \( I \) is the total number of species being considered.

A bifurcation approximation to binary diffusion coefficients introduced by Bird\(^1^7\) and utilized herein permits explicit solution of the Stefan-Maxwell relations for \( j_i \) in terms of gradients and properties of species \( i \) and of the system as a whole. The approximation can be expressed in the form:

\[ b_{ij} \approx \frac{D}{F_i F_j} \]  

(19)

with \( D(T,P) \) a property of the given multicomponent mixture and \( F_i(T) \) a property of the \( i^{th} \) species in the mixture.* It is apparent when considering more than 3 species** that Eq. (19) is indeed approximate, since \((I^2-I)/2\) diffusion coefficients, \( b_{ij} \), are replaced by \( I \) diffusion factors, \( F_i \). Equation (19) should thus be viewed as a correlation equation for actual binary diffusion coefficient data. The \( F_i \) are determined for a given chemical system by a least-squares fit of actual diffusion data.

*The effect of pressure can be absorbed entirely into the \( D \) since \( b_{ij} \) is inversely proportional to pressure. It will be shown that the dominant temperature effect can also be absorbed into the \( D \) so that the \( F_i \) are nearly constants for a given molecular set.

**Eq. (19) is exact for a ternary system.
The accuracy of the correlation was investigated by Bird\textsuperscript{17} for a five component mixture containing hydrogen and shown to be surprisingly good, the maximum error in any $J_{ij}$ being 4 percent. In order to establish more generally the adequacy of the approximation, correlations were performed for several chemical systems including a 16-component (120 $J_{ij}$) C-H-O-N system.\textsuperscript{9} These studies have demonstrated that Eq. (10) has general applicability, and represents the $J_{ij}$ for nearly all diffusing pairs within 5 percent. The largest single error in $J_{ij}$ obtained in these correlations has never exceeded 15 percent or so.

Introducing this approximation into the Stefan-Maxwell relations, it is shown in Ref. 9 that the $j_1$ can be expressed explicitly as

\begin{equation}
\frac{\mu_1 \mu_2}{\mu_1 \mu_2} \left\{ \alpha \frac{Z_i}{\delta y} + \left( \frac{Z_i - K_i}{\delta y} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right] \right\}
\end{equation}

where $Z_i$ is a quantity which for unequal diffusion lies between a mass and a mole fraction and is defined by

\begin{equation}
Z_i = \frac{\mu_1 x_i}{F_i \mu_2}
\end{equation}

and $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are system quantities defined by

\begin{equation}
\mu_1 = \sum_j x_j F_j \quad \mu_2 = \sum_j \frac{\mu_l x_i}{F_j}
\end{equation}

It can be seen from Eqs. (21) and (22) that $\sum Z_i = 1$. When diffusion coefficients are assumed equal, setting $F_i = 1$ yields $Z_i = K_i$, $\mu_1 = 1$, and $\mu_2 = \mu_l$.

In Ref. 9 it was observed that the $F_i$ are weak functions of temperature. Thus Eq. (20) can often be simplified to

9
\[ j_i = - \left\{ \frac{\rho D_i}{\mu_i m} \left[ \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial y} + (Z_i - K_i) \frac{\partial \ln \mu_i}{\partial y} \right] + D_i T \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial y} \right\} \]  

(23)

Substituting Eq. (23) into the boundary-layer species conservation equation (Eq. (4)) and performing the Shvab-Zeldovich transformation yields the following conservation equations for chemical elements in a multicomponent, laminar or turbulent boundary layer with unequal diffusion coefficients:

\[
\rho u \frac{\partial \tilde{Z}_k}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial \tilde{Z}_k}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left\{ \rho c_D \frac{\partial \tilde{Z}_k}{\partial y} + \frac{\rho D_i}{\mu_i m} \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{Z}_k}{\partial y} + (Z_k - K_k) \frac{\partial \ln \mu_i}{\partial y} \right] \right\} 
+ \sum_i a_{ki} D_i T \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial y} + \phi_k
\]  

(24)

where \( \tilde{Z}_k \) is defined by Eq. (16) and

\[ \tilde{Z}_k = \sum_i a_{ki} z_i \]  

(25a)

\[ \phi_k = \sum_i a_{ki} \psi_i \]  

(25b)

The term \( \phi_k \) requires some discussion. Introduction of the Shvab-Zeldovich transformation eliminates the chemical production terms \( \psi_i \) when the boundary layer is everywhere in local equilibrium since \( \psi_k \) is then equal to zero. With the introduction of nonequilibrium, the approach of Ref. 7 generalizes the term "element" and results in an expanded (in terms of "elements", \( k \)) \( a_{ki} \) array, taking advantage of all equilibrium aspects of the system. As a consequence, the \( \psi_k \) may no longer equal zero and thus cannot, in general, be omitted from Eq. (24). This general mixed equilibrium, nonequilibrium approach results in more equations of the form of Eq. (24) than in the purely equilibrium system. Except in the limit of all reactions being kinetically controlled, the number of equations of the form of Eq. (24) is, however, less than the number of molecular...
conservation equations (Eq. (4)). The local state of the gas for this nonequlibrium system is defined in terms of the expanded set of "elements". The production or destruction rates, \( \phi_k \), of these "elements" becomes a state property and can be evaluated along with other local system properties.

It should be noted that the Shvab-Zeldovich transformation is still possible without the approximation for \( \beta_{ij} \) embodied in Eq. (19), but solution then depends upon \((\mathbf{I}^2 - \mathbf{I})\) multicomponent diffusion coefficients, each of which depends upon \((\mathbf{I}^2 - \mathbf{I})/2\) symmetric binary diffusion coefficients and upon concentrations of all species. Therefore, use of the approximation for \( \beta_{ij} \) embodied in Eq. (19) should be looked upon as a computational convenience.

At this point the multicomponent thermal diffusion coefficients, \( D_{i T} \), still appear in the conservation relations. Theoretical equations for \( D_{i T} \) are quite complicated\(^1\) and these have to be solved at every boundary-layer point since they are strongly concentration dependent. Therefore, a correlation of binary thermal diffusion data was conducted\(^9\) which yielded, upon generalization to multicomponent systems, the following simple relation:

\[
D_{i T} \approx \frac{c_t \rho D_{i i}}{\mu_1} \left( Z_i - K_i \right)
\]

with the empirical constant \( c_t \) about \(-0.5\). This approximation for \( D_{i T} \) satisfies the requirement that they sum to zero,\(^1\) the observation that they are independent of fluxes, and the assumption that thermal diffusion of species \( i \) should behave nearly as though it were in a system of species \( i \) and a species representative of the mixture as a whole. The approximation represents binary thermal diffusion data reasonably well (within 10 percent or so, considering a wide range of molecular weights and variation of mass fractions from zero to 100 percent). An accuracy study of multicomponent \( D_{T} \) has not yet been accomplished. However, the generalizations which were employed appear to be in basic accord with the approximate model for multicomponent thermal diffusion coefficients developed by Laranjeira.\(^18\)

Inserting this approximation into Eqs. (24) and (8) and performing all summations yields the following relations for diffusive mass flux of species \( i, j_i \), diffusive mass flux of element \( k, j_k \), and diffusive heat flux, \( q_a \), respectively
\[
  j_i = -\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_i}{\partial y} + (\tilde{Z}_i - \tilde{K}_i) \frac{\partial \mu_4}{\partial y} \right] \tag{27a}
\]

\[
  j_k = -\frac{\partial \bar{u}_k}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_k}{\partial y} + (\tilde{Z}_k - \tilde{K}_k) \frac{\partial \mu_4}{\partial y} \right] \tag{27b}
\]

\[
  q_a = -\left\{ \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_p}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_p}{\partial y} \right] \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial y} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_p}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_p}{\partial y} \right\} \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial y} \right] + \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial y} \right] \right\} \right\} \tag{27c}
\]

where

\[
  \tilde{c}_p = \sum_i Z_i c_{p_i} \quad \tilde{h} = \sum_i Z_i h_i \quad \mu_3 = \sum_i Z_i \mu_{3_i} \quad \mu_4 = \ln(\mu_2 c_t) \tag{28}
\]

The elemental species conservation equation thus becomes

\[
  \rho \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_k}{\partial z} + \rho \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_k}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \rho \frac{\partial \tilde{c}_k}{\partial y} - j_k \right] + q_k \tag{29}
\]

while the energy equation can be expressed as

\[
  \rho \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial z} + \rho \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ -q_a + q_r \right] \tag{30}
\]

Equations (27a) through (27c) are derived in Appendix A. For assumed equal diffusion coefficients, \( \mu_3 = 1/\gamma \), \( \tilde{c}_p = \tilde{c}_p \), and \( \tilde{h} = h \). When thermal diffusion is to be neglected \( c_t = 0 \) and \( \mu_4 = \ln \mu_2 \).

Equations (3), (5), (7), (29), and (30) comprise the boundary-layer conservation equations incorporating the approximations for unequal thermal and multicomponent diffusion coefficients embodied in Eqs. (19) and (26). It
should be emphasized that the numerical solution procedure described in a later section is not dependent upon the use of these convenient approximations.

Any consistent set of boundary conditions can be applied which yield, in effect, \( u/u_e, H_T, \) and the \( \tilde{F}_k \) and their first derivatives at the edge of the boundary layer, and wall values of \( u/u_e \), mass flux, \( H_T \) (or its gradient), and the \( \tilde{F}_k \) (or their gradients). Specific boundary conditions will be introduced in Section 3.

The mathematical specification of the boundary-layer problem is completed by introduction of the remaining multicomponent transport properties, the equation of state for a gaseous mixture, the equilibrium relations, and the kinetic relations. These are described in Refs. 7 and 9.

SECTION 3
THE TRANSFORMED NONSIMILAR LAMINAR BOUNDARY-LAYER EQUATIONS

From the original formulations of Blasius, a continuing effort has been expended in the search for more general means of reducing the partial-differential equations of the boundary layer to total-differential equations. Basically, this involves the search for a new coordinate system \((\eta, \xi)\) related to the original system \((y, s)\) and certain of the dependent variables, in which the \( \xi \)-wise variations of functions of the dependent variable either vanish or become of second order. A successful similarity transformation, as this is called, results in \( \xi \)-derivatives vanishing, but this occurs only under certain conditions which are generally quite restrictive. Currently, the most popular transformation represents a combination of the Levy and Mangler and the Howarth-Dorodnitsyn transformations. This particular form was suggested by Lees (Ref. 19) among others, and is known by a variety of names including Lees-Dorodnitsyn, Levy-Lees, Mangler-Dorodnitsyn, and Dorodnitsyn-Stepanov. This transformation is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\xi &= \int_0^S u_e e^{u} e^{a_x} ds \\
\eta &= \frac{r_o^{x} u_e}{\sqrt{2\xi}} \int_0^Y p \, dy
\end{align*}
\]  

where, in this and subsequent equations, the subscripts \( w \) and \( e \) refer, respectively, to the wall and to a reference condition which can be taken as the boundary-layer edge in the absence of an entropy layer (to be discussed).
In this section, a slightly modified form of this transformation is applied to the laminar form of the boundary-layer conservational equations presented in Section 2. Although the boundary-layer equations remain partial-differential equations when the nonsimilar terms are retained, the Levy-Lees transformation is still quite advantageous, since it aids in the specification of the boundary conditions, it eliminates the global conservation equation from the set of relations to be solved, and it normalizes the boundary-layer thickness. In addition, the nonsimilar terms are often small; hence, they can be investigated individually and eliminated for certain classes of problems.

If the conventional Levy-Lees transformation embodied in Eqs. (31) and (32) is utilized, the transformed boundary-layer thickness is uniform for a similar boundary layer. However, when the boundary layer is highly nonsimilar (e.g., as a result of large blowing or suction, severe pressure gradients, or surface discontinuities) the transformed boundary-layer thickness can vary by a factor of two or more. Therefore, it is useful to normalize the boundary layer further by stretching the $\eta$ coordinate:

$$\bar{\xi} = \xi, \quad \bar{\eta} = \eta \frac{a_H}{\alpha_H}$$

(33)

where $a_H$ is a function of $\bar{\xi}$ only and is determined implicitly during the numerical solution. This makes possible the efficient use of a universally applicable nodal network which can be chosen a priori once and for all. The use of such a universal nodal network is highly desirable as the linearity of a large body of equations (Taylor series expansions of primary variables) during the numerical solution procedure is retained. In addition, it reduces the variation of boundary-layer parameters along a grid line from one streamwise station to the next.

Since a new variable $a_H(\bar{\xi})$ is introduced, an additional relation is required. This is conveniently supplied by constraining an internal nodal point near the boundary-layer edge, $\bar{\eta}_c$, to have a specified streamwise velocity, $c$, near (but something less than) the edge value:

$$f'\left|_{\bar{\eta}_c} = cf'\left|_{\bar{\eta}_e} \right. \right.$$  

(34)
where $f$ is the stream function defined as

$$f - f_w = \int_0^\eta \frac{u}{u_e} d\eta = \alpha_H \int_0^\eta \frac{u}{u_e} d\eta$$

(35)

and the prime denotes partial differentiation with respect to $\eta$, so that

$$f' = \alpha_H \frac{u}{u_e}$$

(36)

To illustrate, selection of $\eta_e = 4.0$, $\eta_c = 2.4$, and $c = 0.90$ yields $\alpha_H \approx 1.0$ for the Blasius problem (incompressible flow along a flat plate at zero incidence with no mass addition). The $f'|\eta_e$ is utilized in Eq. (34) in anticipation that the $u/u_e$ may not be unity at the edge of the boundary layer for superorbital reentry problems involving an entropy layer or nonadiabatic flow field.

In order to illustrate further the procedure, two extreme velocity distributions are compared in Figure 1 to the Blasius solution. The profiles shown are those for a boundary layer near separation and one near blowoff. These were calculated using the integral matrix method for numerical solution of the boundary layer (described later). It can be seen that by the use of the transformation (Eq. (33)) together with the arbitrarily chosen constraint (Eq. (34)) that the boundary-layer edge occurs at about the same value of $\eta$ for the three problems. It should be noted that this is accomplished with little mathematical complexity; only two terms involving derivatives of $\alpha_H$ appear (both in the momentum equation).

Variation of $\alpha_H$ with Reynolds number (proportional to $\xi$) is shown in Figure 2 for a nonsimilar boundary layer with constant blowing and one with constant suction. These results were also obtained using the integral matrix technique. The behavior of $\alpha_H$ is indicative of the increase (and decrease) of the $\eta$ at the edge of the boundary layer. The desirability of the stretching transformation is made apparent by this example. Without the use of the transformation to $\eta$, the choice of an $\eta_{max}$ sufficiently large to characterize accurately the boundary layer at large distances from the leading edge would be inefficient near the leading edge. Furthermore, it would be required to make an estimate for $\eta_{max}$ as it is not known a priori.
Figure 1. Several Velocity Profiles in Terms of $\eta$ with the Velocity Ratio Constrained to be 0.90 at $\eta = 2.4$.

- Incompressible similar boundary layer with blowing (near blowoff, $f_w = -0.707$, blowoff at $-0.87$), $a_H = 1.98$
- Incompressible similar boundary layer with adverse pressure gradient (near separation, $\beta = -0.18$, separation at $-0.199$), $a_H = 1.34$
- Incompressible boundary layer on a flat plate, $a_H = 1.00$
- Solutions obtained with 7 point integral matrix procedure.
Figure 2. Variation of $\alpha_H$ with Reynolds number for Incompressible Boundary Layers with Constant Blowing and Suction, $\rho_w v_w / \rho_e u_e = 1 \times 10^{-3}$
Transformation of the independent variables \( s \) and \( y \) into the Levy-Lees variables \( \xi \) and \( \eta \) is conveniently accomplished through the use of the operator

\[
p_{u} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} + p_{v} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = \rho \rho^* \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} + \rho \rho^* \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} - \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right] \tag{37} \]

In addition, the partial derivatives are given by

\[
\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \right)_y = \rho \rho^* \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \right)_y \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right)_y \tag{38} \]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y} = \frac{u}{(2 \xi)^{1/2}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right)_y \tag{39} \]

where

\[
\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \right)_\eta = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \right)_\eta - \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right)_\eta \tag{40} \]

\[
\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right)_\xi = \frac{1}{\alpha H} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \right)_\xi \tag{41} \]

Equations (37) through (41) are derived in Appendix B.

Utilization of Eqs. (37) through (41) results in the following transformed equations for diffusive fluxes and conservation of momentum, elemental species, and energy in a laminar compressible nonsimilar boundary layer with mass addition, chemical reactions, and unequal diffusion and thermal diffusion coefficients (using the approximations embodied in Eqs. (19) and (26)). These equations are derived in Appendix B. Throughout the remainder of this document the bar is dropped from \( \overline{\xi} \), \( \overline{\eta} \) and the prime refers to partial differentiation with respect to \( \overline{\eta} \) except when noted otherwise:

**Diffusive flux of \( i^{th} \) species**

\[
j_i = \alpha j_i^* \tag{42} \]

where \( j_i^* \) is a normalized diffusive flux of species \( i \)

\[
j_i^* = - \frac{C}{\alpha H} \left[ Z_i^* \left( Z_i - K_i \right) \mu_i^4 \right] \tag{43} \]
\( \alpha^* \) is the normalizing parameter defined by
\[
\alpha^* = \frac{\rho e^u \mu e^r \rho e^{\mu r}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} \tag{44}
\]

\( C \) is defined by
\[
C = \frac{\rho \mu}{\rho e^{\mu r}} \tag{45}
\]
and \( \overline{Sc} \) is a system property defined by
\[
\overline{Sc} = \frac{\mu_1 \mu_2}{\rho \mu \rho_e} \tag{46}
\]
The \( \overline{Sc} \) is a Schmidt number based on the self diffusion coefficient for a fictitious species representative of the system as a whole.

**Diffusive flux of \( k \)th elemental species**
\[
j_k = \alpha j_k^* \tag{47}
\]
where \( j_k^* \) is a normalized diffusive flux of element \( k \)
\[
j_k^* = -\frac{C}{a_H \overline{Sc}} \left[ \frac{2}{a} + (\frac{2}{a} - \overline{K}_k) \mu_4' \right] \tag{48}
\]

**Diffusive heat flux**
\[
q_a = \alpha q_a^* \tag{49}
\]
where \( q_a^* \) is a normalized diffusive heat flux
\[
q_a^* = -\frac{C}{a_H} \left( \frac{f'''' u_e^2}{a_H^2} + \frac{c_P T'}{Pr} \right) \sum_j j_j^* \left( h_j + \frac{c_t RT}{m_j} \left( 1 - \frac{F_1}{\mu_1} \right) \right)
= -\frac{C}{a_H} \left[ \frac{f'''' u_e^2}{a_H^2} + \frac{c_P T'}{Pr} + \frac{1}{\overline{Sc}} \left[ \bar{h} - \left( \frac{c_P + c_t^2 R}{\mu_1 \mu_2} \right) T' + c_t R T \mu_3' + (\bar{h} - h + c_t R T \mu_3) \mu_4' \right] \right] \tag{50}
\]
and \( Pr \) is the Prandtl number based on the frozen specific heat

\[
Pr = \frac{C_p L}{\lambda}
\]  

\( \text{Streamwise momentum equation} \)

\[
\frac{d}{d\xi} \left[ \frac{Cf''}{a_H} \right]'' + \beta \left( \frac{2\alpha^2_H}{u_e} \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial e} - \frac{\eta}{\alpha_H} \frac{d\alpha_H}{d\xi} \right) \right) + P' \alpha_H \left[ \frac{3}{3\xi} \left( \frac{r_o}{\alpha_H} \right)^{1/2} \int_0^Y \rho \, dy \right] \right) \right) - \beta f''
\]

\[
= 2 \left( f' \frac{\delta f}{\delta \ln \xi} - f'' \frac{\delta f}{\delta \ln \xi} \right) - f''^2 \frac{d \ln \alpha_H}{d \ln \xi}
\]  

where \( \beta \) is the streamwise pressure-gradient parameter

\[
\beta = 2 \frac{d \ln u_e}{d \ln \xi}
\]  

\( \text{Normal momentum equation} \)

\[
P' - \frac{u_e (2\xi)^{1/2} (f')^2}{\alpha_H c r_o x} = 0
\]  

In the present study it will be assumed that the pressure is constant across the boundary layer. Equation (54) is therefore replaced by that statement, and the partial derivatives of pressure in Eq. (52) can be changed to a total derivative. Also, from the compressible Bernoulli equation, Eq. (52) becomes

\( \text{Streamwise momentum equation (} P = P(\xi) \text{ only)} \)

\[
\frac{d}{d\xi} \left[ \frac{Cf''}{a_H} \right]'' + \beta \left( \frac{2\alpha^2_H}{u_e} \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial e} - \frac{\eta}{\alpha_H} \frac{d\alpha_H}{d\xi} \right) \right) \right) + P' \alpha_H \left[ \frac{3}{3\xi} \left( \frac{r_o}{\alpha_H} \right)^{1/2} \int_0^Y \rho \, dy \right] \right) \right) - \beta f''
\]

\[
= 2 \left( f' \frac{\delta f}{\delta \ln \xi} - f'' \frac{\delta f}{\delta \ln \xi} \right) - f''^2 \frac{d \ln \alpha_H}{d \ln \xi}
\]  
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Energy equation

\[ fH_T' + \left[ -q_a* + q_r* \right]' = 2 \left( f' \frac{\partial H_T}{\partial \ln \xi} - H_T' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} \right) \]  

where \( q_a* \) is the normalized diffusive heat flux away from the surface given by Eq. (50) and \( q_r* \) is the normalized radiant heat flux toward the surface

\[ q_r* = \frac{q_r}{\alpha*} \]  

where \( \alpha* \) is given by Eq. (44).

Elemental species equations

\[ fK_k' + \left[ -j_k* \right]' + a_H\phi_k = 2 \left( f' \frac{\partial K_k}{\partial \ln \xi} - K_k' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} \right) \]  

where \( j_k* \) is given by Eq. (48). The transformation also yields the following relations between \( f_w \) and \( \rho_wv_w \) (see Appendix B):

\[ \rho_wv_w = -\alpha* \left( f_w + 2\xi \frac{df_w}{\partial \xi} \right) \]  

where \( \alpha* \) is the normalizing parameter defined by Eq. (44) or, equivalently

\[ f_w = -\left(2\xi\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^\xi \frac{\rho_wv_w df}{\rho e^\mu e\xi^o} \]  

When certain groupings of parameters are constant so that the similarity assumption is valid, the terms on the right-hand side of the conservation equations (Eqs. (52) or (55), (56) and (58)) vanish, in which case the conservation equations become ordinary differential equations. It should be emphasized that the equations as presented herein are equivalent to the corresponding boundary-layer equations presented in Section 2. That is, no similarity assumptions have been made in their development.

Equations (44), (53), and (60) for \( \alpha* \), \( \beta \), and \( f_w \), respectively, are indeterminate at the stagnation point of a blunt body. Special forms for these equations valid at the stagnation point are shown in Appendix C to be given by

\[ \alpha_o* = \left( \rho e^\mu e \frac{du}{ds} \right)_o^{1/2} \]  

\[ f_{w_o} = -\left( \rho_wv_w/\alpha* \right)_o \]
where for Newtonian flow

\[ \beta_0 = \frac{1}{(\kappa + 1)} \]  

and

\[ \left. \frac{du_e}{ds} \right|_o = \frac{(2P/\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R_{\text{eff}}} \]

with \( R_{\text{eff}} \) an effective nose radius taking into account the shock shape. Alternatively, \( \beta_0 \) and \( \left(\frac{du_e}{ds}\right)_o \) can be computed from curve fits of the inviscid pressure distribution.

In addition, in order to improve the accuracy of numerical integration procedures in the nose region, \( \xi \) and \( f_w \) can be computed by the following relations

\[ \xi = \frac{1}{2(\kappa + 1)} \int_0^{s_{2^{k+2}}} \left[ \rho_e \left( \frac{u_e}{s} \right) \left( \frac{r_o}{s} \right)^{2\kappa} \right] d(s^{k+2}) \]  

\[ f_w = -\frac{(2\xi)^{\frac{1}{k}}}{(\kappa + 1)} \int_0^{s_{k+1}} \left[ \rho_w v_w \left( \frac{r_o}{s} \right)^{\kappa} \right] d(s^{k+1}) \]

which take advantage of the fact that \( u_e/s \) and \( r_o/s \) vary more nearly linearly in the stagnation region than do \( u_e \) and \( r_o \). Equations (31a) and (60b) are also derived in Appendix C. Of course, the original Equations (31) and (60) are more applicable on the afterbody.

The surface boundary conditions can assume numerous forms. The simplest of these are the requirement of zero slip at the surface which yields

\[ f_w' = 0 \]  

and assignment* of numerical values for \( \rho_w v_w \) (or \( f_w \)), \( h_w \) (or \( T_w \)), and \( K_{kw} \). In the event that \( \rho_w v_w \) is assigned, the \( f_w \) can be calculated by use of Eq. (60). Alternatively, Eq. (61) can be utilized together with the assignment of wall mass diffusive fluxes, \( j_{kw} \), and \( h_w \) (or \( T_w \)) or with the assignment

*It is physically unrealistic in most cases to assign \( K_{kw} \), when diffusion coefficients are unequal since the contribution to \( K_{kw} \) by preferential diffusion of the various elements to the surface is not known a priori.
of wall mass diffusive fluxes and the requirement that the surface material either be in equilibrium with the gas adjacent to the surface or satisfy surface reaction kinetic relations. (Surface chemistry considerations are discussed in Ref. 7.)

Additional wall boundary conditions of interest admit the addition of chemically active species arising from the pyrolysis of an internally decomposing material, surface combustion or phase change, and liquid-layer removal. In this case $\rho_w v_w$ (and thus $f_w$ by means of Eq. (60)), $f_w^t$, $H_{T_w}$ and $K_{k_w}$ are supplied through surface chemistry considerations, the zero slip condition (Eq. (61)), an energy balance, and elemental mass balances.

The surface energy and elemental mass balances are supplied by transient internal conduction solutions such as those described in Ref. 20. The procedure for accomplishing this is discussed in Ref. 10. The resultant equation for the surface energy balance is given by

$$m^* h_g + m^* h_c - \sum_l m^* h_{l_k} - (\rho_w v_w)^* h_w - q_{a_w}^* + q_{r_w}^* - q_{cond}^* = 0 \quad (62)$$

where $m_g^*$ is the mass flow rate per unit area and $h_g$ the enthalpy of gas which enters the boundary layer without phase change at the surface (e.g., pyrolysis gases), $m^*_g$ is a normalized $m_g$ given by $m^*_g = m_g/\alpha^*$ (typical), $m^*_c$ is the mass removal rate per unit area and $h_c$ the enthalpy of surface material (e.g., char) removed by chemical reactions or phase change. $m_{r_w}^*$ is the mass removal rate per unit area and $h_g$ the enthalpy of that material which is removed in the condensed phase (e.g., by melting with subsequent liquid run-off or by mechanical spallation). $h_w$ is the enthalpy of the gas phase at the wall, $q_{a_w}^*$ is the normalized diffusive heat flux away from the wall (Eq. (50) evaluated at the wall), $q_{r_w}^*$ is the net radiative flux to the wall (including reradiation from the surface), and $q_{cond}^* = \lambda_w (\partial T/\partial y)_w$ is conduction into the surface material (with $\lambda_w$ the thermal conductivity of the surface material). The elemental mass balances are given by

$$m^* R^*_k + m^* R^ c_k - \sum_l m^* R^ l_k - (\rho_w v_w)^* R^ k_w - j^*_{k_w} = 0 \quad (63)$$

where the subscripts $g, c, r$ and $w$ and the asterisk have the same meaning and $j^*_{k_w}$ is the normalized diffusive net mass flux of elemental species $k$ away from the wall, given by Eq. (48) evaluated at the wall.

To illustrate a simplified special case for this surface boundary condition, consider the case of steady-state ablation of a homogeneous material
such as carbon, neglecting mechanical spallation and radiation absorption and emission with the exception of reradiation from the surface. In this case \( \dot{m}_g = 0, \dot{m}_r = 0, \dot{m}_c = \rho_w V_w, q_r = -\sigma c_w T_w^4, K_{KC} \) is unity for carbon and zero for nitrogen, and \( q_{\text{cond}} = \dot{m}_c (h_c - h_w) \) where \( h_w = 0 \) if the carbon is initially at the base state of 298°K. Therefore Eqs. (62) and (63) become

\[
(\rho_w V_w) h_w + q_{r*} + \sigma c_w T_w^4 / \alpha^* = 0
\]

(64)

for the energy balance and

\[
\begin{align*}
(\rho_w V_w) (K_{Cw} - 1) + j_{Cw}^* &= 0 \\
(\rho_w V_w) K_{Nw} + j_{Nw}^* &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

(65)

for elemental species balances for carbon and nitrogen, respectively.* In the absence of mechanical removal, equilibrium of the gas phase at the surface can be satisfied by considering any one of the equilibrium relations, for example

\[
(1/3) \ln P_{C_3} - K_{P_{\text{eq}}}(T_w) = 0
\]

(66)

where \( P_{C_3} \) is the partial pressure of \( C_3 \) at the wall and \( K_{P_{\text{eq}}}(T_w) \) is the equilibrium constant for the reaction

\[
C(s) \rightarrow (1/3) C_3
\]

(67)

Eqs. (64) through (66) together with Eq. (61) comprise the complete set of surface boundary conditions for this specific example of steady-state carbon ablation.

*It is necessary to consider individual elemental species balances for only one less than the number of elements (see footnote at bottom of page 27).
Returning to the general problem, edge conditions of interest admit the possibility of an entropy layer:

\[
\begin{align*}
  f'_{\text{edge}} &= \alpha H \left[ \frac{u}{u_e} (f, \xi) \right]_{\text{edge}} \\
  f''_{\text{edge}} &= \alpha H \left\{ \frac{d}{df} \left[ \frac{u}{u_e} (f, \xi) \right] \right\}_{\text{edge}} \\
  H_T_{\text{edge}} &= H_T_{\text{edge}} \big|_{\text{actual}} \\
  H_T'_{\text{edge}} &= 0 \\
  \tilde{K}_{k_{\text{edge}}} &= \tilde{K}_{k_{\text{edge}}} \big|_{\text{actual}} \\
  \tilde{K}_k'_{\text{edge}} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]  

(68)  

(69)  

(70)

where the subscript "e" refers to a reference condition, conveniently taken as the \( f = 0 \) streamline (see Appendix D) and the subscript "edge" refers to \( \eta_{\text{edge}} \) chosen to be outside of the boundary layer but possibly in the entropy layer. When there is no entropy layer, the reference condition \( e \) can be considered as the edge condition, \( e = \text{edge} \). In this case, Eqs. (68) simplify to:

\[
\begin{align*}
  f'_{\text{edge}} &= f'_e = \alpha H \\
  f''_{\text{edge}} &= f''_e = 0
\end{align*}
\]  

(71)

In the next section, the boundary-layer equations and boundary conditions presented in this section are cast into a form suitable for numerical solution by an integral matrix method.
The solution of the transformed boundary layer equations presented in Section 3 utilizes an integral matrix method which has been developed specifically for the solution of chemically reacting, nonsimilar, coupled boundary layers. In this procedure, the primary dependent variables \( f, H_T, \) and \( \overline{K}_k \) and their derivatives with respect to \( \eta \) are related by Taylor series expansions such that \( f', H_T, \) and \( \overline{K}_k \) are represented by connected cubics with continuous first and second derivatives at the junction points (commonly called a spline fit). Primarily for convenience, the conservation equations are integrated using a weighting function which is unity between adjacent nodal points and zero elsewhere. The linear Taylor series expansions together with linear boundary conditions form a very sparse matrix which has to be inverted only once for a given problem. The nonlinear boundary-layer equations and the nonlinear boundary conditions are then linearized, the errors being driven to zero using Newton-Raphson iteration.

In this section, the Taylor series expansions are presented. The boundary-layer equations are integrated, and the integrals which appear are also expanded in Taylor series. The resulting equations are precisely those which have been programmed for solution on high-speed digital computers to represent a coupled chemically reacting boundary layer such as surrounds an ablating heat shield during superorbital reentry. Special cases corresponding to a nonreacting (homogeneous) boundary layer and to an incompressible boundary layer are also discussed. The procedure utilized for solving the sets of linear and nonlinear algebraic equations developed in this section are presented in Section 5.

Consider the boundary layer in the region of a given station \( s \) as being divided into \( N-1 \) strips connected by \( N \) nodal points. These nodal points are designated by \( \eta_i \) where \( i = 1 \) at the wall and \( i = N \) at the edge of the boundary layer.

Consider a function \( p(x) \) which with all its derivatives is continuous in the neighborhood of the point \( x = a \). Then, for any value of \( x \) in this neighborhood, \( p(x) \) may be expressed in a Taylor series expansion as

\[
p(x) = p(a) + \frac{p'(a)}{1!} (x - a) + \frac{p''(a)}{2!} (x - a)^2 + \frac{p'''(a)}{3!} (x - a)^3 + \frac{p''''(a)}{4!} (x - a)^4 + ... \quad (72)
\]
Considering the point \( a \) as \( \eta_i \) and the \( x \) as \( \eta_{i+1} \)

\[
P_{i+1} = P_i + p'_i \delta \eta + p''_i \frac{\delta \eta^2}{2} + p'''_i \frac{\delta \eta^3}{6} + p''''_i \frac{\delta \eta^4}{24} + \ldots
\]  

(73)

where

\[
\delta \eta = \eta_{i+1} - \eta_i
\]  

(74)

The \( P_i \) can be considered to be any of \( f_i, f'_i, f''_i, f'''_i, H'_{Ti}, H''_Ti, \cdots \). To illustrate:

\[
f'_{i+1} = f'_i + f''_i \delta \eta + f'''_i \frac{\delta \eta^2}{2} + f''''_i \frac{\delta \eta^3}{6} + \ldots
\]  

(75)

Since the highest derivatives of the dependent variables which appear in the boundary-layer equations are \( f''''_i, H''_Ti \) and \( \tilde{K}'_{ki} \), it is reasonable to truncate the series at the next highest derivative and to consider that derivative as being constant between \( \eta_i \) and \( \eta_{i+1} \), that is:

\[
\begin{align*}
f'''_{i+1} &= \frac{f'''_{i+1} - f'''_i}{\delta \eta} \\
H'''_{Ti+1} &= \frac{H'''_{Ti+1} - H'''_Ti}{\delta \eta} \\
\tilde{K}'''_{ki+1} &= \frac{\tilde{K}'''_{ki+1} - \tilde{K}'''_{ki}}{\delta \eta}
\end{align*}
\]  

(76)

The following set of \([3 + 2(1 + K)](N - 1)\) linear equations are thus obtained where \( K \) is the number of elemental species minus one* and \( N \) is the number of nodal points across the boundary layer:

\[
-f_{i+1} + f_i + f'_i \delta \eta + f''_i \frac{\delta \eta^2}{2} + f'''_i \frac{\delta \eta^3}{8} + f''''_i \frac{\delta \eta^4}{24} = 0
\]  

(77)

*For example, if 4 elements C, H, O, N are under consideration, \( K = 3 \). Conservation of the remaining element is supplied through overall mass balance.
where in Eqs. (78) and (79) the $p_i$ represents $f_i'$, represents $H_{T_i}$, and represents each of the $K_k$.

Thus, between each $i$ and $i+1$ the $f$ is represented as a quartic; the $f'$, $H_T$ and $K_k$ are represented as cubics; and the $f''$, $H_{T'}$ and $K''_k$ are represented as quadratics; whereas the $f'''$, $H_{T''}$ and $K''_k$ are considered to vary linearly and the $f''''$, $H_{T'''}$ and $K''''_k$ are considered to be constants between each pair of $\eta$-stations. Of course, all of these functions with the exception of $f''''$, $H_{T'''}$ and $K''''_k$ join continuously at the nodal points. Herein lies one of the major distinguishing features of integral methods in general and of the integral matrix method in particular. Conventional finite difference methods are generally based on a representation which is not too unlike the first term in a Taylor series expansion and thus yield discontinuous functions. Integral methods generally use smoother functions and hence can be made to yield comparable accuracy with far fewer nodal points. This is extremely important for a chemically reacting boundary layer since the state of the gas (the computation of which is not trivial) must be determined at each nodal point during each iteration. In the past (e.g., Ref. 3) integral methods have employed high-order polynomials from the wall to the boundary-layer edge to obtain smooth profiles for $f'$, $H_T$ and $K_k$. The cubic spline functions employed herein are believed preferable as they are usually better behaved.

The momentum, energy, and elemental species equations are integrated at constant $\xi$ between $\eta_{i-1}$ and $\eta_i$ to yield:

**Momentum equation:**

\[
\int_{i-1}^{i} f f'' \, d\eta + \left[ \frac{C_f'}{a_H} \right]_{i-1}^{i} \beta a_1^2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \frac{\rho e}{\rho} \, d\eta - \beta \int_{i-1}^{i} f' e \, d\eta \\
= 2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \left[ \frac{f'}{\frac{d}{d \ln \xi}} - f'' \frac{\frac{d}{d \ln \xi}}{\frac{d}{d \ln \xi}} \right] \, d\eta - 2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \frac{f'^2}{\frac{d}{d \ln \xi}} \, d\eta
\]  (80)
Energy equation:

\[ \int_{i-1}^{i} fH_T \, d\eta + \left[ q_a^i + q_r^i \right] = 2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \left( \frac{\partial H_T}{\partial \ln \xi} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} \right) d\eta \]  

(81)

Elemental species equations:

\[ \int_{i-1}^{i} f'k' \, d\eta - \left[ j_k^i \right] = \alpha_H \int_{i-1}^{i} \phi_k \, d\eta = 2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \left( \frac{\partial k}{\partial \ln \xi} - k \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} \right) d\eta \]  

(82)

This, in effect, is a square-wave weighting factor of unity between \( i-1 \) and \( i \) and zero elsewhere. This is equivalent to the step-function weighting factor used by Pallone.\(^3\) As discussed in Appendix F, the primary advantage of this type of integration is algebraic simplicity, the complex terms in the energy and elemental species equations (the \( q_a^i \), \( q_r^i \), and \( j_k^i \)) being divergence terms. The use of smoother species equations (the \( q_a^i \), \( q_r^i \), and \( j_k^i \)) being divergence terms. The use of smoother weighting functions, such as those utilized by Dorodnitsyn,\(^4\) would add considerable algebraic complexity and do not appear warranted on the basis of studies described in Appendix F which indicated that square-wave weighting functions and Dirac delta functions (i.e., a differential approach) yield comparable results as long as equivalent smooth functions are used to relate the primary variables to their derivatives.

The integral of \( fp' \), where \( p \) is \( f' \), \( H_T \), or \( k_k' \), can be expressed as

\[ \int_{i-1}^{i} fp' \, d\eta = \left[ fp \right]_{i-1}^{i} - \int_{i-1}^{i} f'p \, d\eta \]  

(83)

The integral of \( f'p \) can then be expressed by expanding in a Taylor series about \( i \).
\[
\int_{i-1}^{i} f' p \, d\eta = f'_1 p'_1 \frac{\delta \eta}{1!} - (f'_1 p'_1 + f''_1 p''_1) \frac{\delta \eta^2}{2!}
\]
\[
+ (f'_1 p''_1 + 2f''_1 p''_1 + f'''_1 p''_1) \frac{\delta \eta^3}{3!}
\]
\[
- (f'_1 p'''_1 + 3f''_1 p'''_1 + 3f'''_1 p'''_1 + f''''_1 p''''_1) \frac{\delta \eta^4}{4!}
\]
\[
+ (4f''_1 p''''_1 + 6f'''_1 p''''_1 + 4f''''_1 p''''_1) \frac{\delta \eta^5}{5!}
\]
\[
- (10f'''_1 p''''_1 + 10f''''_1 p''''_1) \frac{\delta \eta^6}{6!} + 20f''''_1 p''''_1 \frac{\delta \eta^7}{7!} + \ldots
\]

(84)

where, consistent with the truncation of the Taylor series employed earlier, all derivatives greater than \( f''''_1 \) and \( p''''_1 \) have been dropped. Utilizing again Eqs. (76) to eliminate \( p''_1 \), Eq. (84) becomes

\[
\int_{i-1}^{i} f' p \, d\eta = f'_1 X_1 + f''_1 X_2 + f'''_1 X_3 + f''''_1 X_4
\]

(85)

where

\[
X_1 = \frac{\delta n}{p_1 - p'_1 \frac{\delta n}{2} + p''_1 \frac{\delta n^2}{8} + p'''_1 \frac{\delta n^3}{24}}
\]

\[
X_2 = -\frac{\delta n^2}{p'_1 - p''_1 \frac{\delta n}{3} + p'''_1 \frac{11\delta n^2}{120} + p'''_1 \frac{\delta n^3}{30}}
\]

\[
X_3 = \frac{\delta n^3}{p''_1 \frac{\delta n}{8} - p'''_1 \frac{11\delta n}{120} + p''''_1 \frac{11\delta n^2}{420} + p'''_1 \frac{5\delta n^3}{504}}
\]

\[
X_4 = \frac{\delta n^4}{p''''_1 \frac{\delta n}{24} - p'''_1 \frac{\delta n}{30} + p''''_1 \frac{5\delta n^2}{504} + p'''_1 \frac{5\delta n^3}{252}}
\]

(86)

For the axial derivatives, logarithmic two- and three-point difference relations are utilized, namely
\[
2 \left[ \frac{d(\cdot)}{d \ln \xi} \right]_L = d_0(\cdot)_L + d_1(\cdot)_{L-1} + d_2(\cdot)_{L-2}
\]  

(87)

where \((\cdot)_{L-1}\) refers to the previous streamwise station, and

\[
d_0 = \frac{2}{k^\Delta_{L-1}} \quad d_1 = \frac{2}{k^\Delta_{L-1}} \quad d_2 = 0
\]

(88)

for two-point difference and

\[
d_0 = 2 \frac{k^\Delta_{L-1} + k^\Delta_{L-2}}{k^\Delta_{L-1} k^\Delta_{L-2}} \quad d_1 = -2 \frac{k^\Delta_{L-2}}{k^\Delta_{L-1} k^\Delta_{L-2}}
\]

\[
d_2 = 2 \frac{k^\Delta_{L-1}}{k^\Delta_{L-2} k^\Delta_{L-2}}
\]

(89)

for three-point difference where typically

\[
k^\Delta_{L-1} = \ln \xi_L - \ln \xi_{L-1} = \ln (\xi_L/\xi_{L-1})
\]

(90)

The three-point difference relation is utilized unless a similar solution is desired (in which case \(d_0 = d_1 = d_2 = 0\)) or unless the point in question is the first point after either (1) a similar solution or 2) a discontinuity (e.g., where the body changes shape abruptly, or where mass injection is suddenly terminated).

Similar approaches have been utilized previously in finite difference procedures, for example, by Smith et al.\(^5\) and by Leigh.\(^6\) Integral methods, on the other hand, have generally integrated the boundary-layer equations in the streamwise direction (e.g., Pallone\(^3\)). The present approach is considered preferable since the streamwise derivative terms are generally small, and hence are conveniently treated as forcing functions. This avoids the difficulty sometimes experienced during integration when the streamwise step size is too small (see Ref. 6).

Applying Eq. (87) to the streamwise derivative terms
\[ 2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \left( f' \frac{\partial p}{\partial \ln \xi} - p' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} \right) d\eta \]

\[ = \int_{i-1}^{i} f' \left( d_0 p + d_1 f_{L-1} + d_2 f_{L-2} \right) d\eta \]

\[ - \int_{i-1}^{i} p' \left( d_0 f + d_1 f_{L-1} + d_2 f_{L-2} \right) d\eta \quad (91) \]

where again this relation applies for the three cases where \( p \) is equal to \( f', h_T \) and \( \tilde{h}_k \). Utilizing Eq. (83) yields

\[ 2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \left( f' \frac{\partial p}{\partial \ln \xi} - p' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} \right) d\eta = 2d_0 \int_{i-1}^{i} f' p d\eta \]

\[ + d_1 \int_{i-1}^{i} f' p_{L-1} d\eta + d_1 \int_{i-1}^{i} f'_{L-1} p d\eta \]

\[ + d_2 \int_{i-1}^{i} f' p_{L-2} d\eta + d_2 \int_{i-1}^{i} f'_{L-2} p d\eta \]

\[ - \left[ d_0 f p + d_1 f_{L-1} p + d_2 f_{L-2} p \right]_{i-1}^{i} \quad (92) \]

Noting that each of the five integrals in Eq. (92) is of the same form as the integral expanded in Eq. (84) by means of Taylor series

\[ 2 \int_{i-1}^{i} \left( f' \frac{\partial p}{\partial \ln \xi} - p' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} \right) d\eta = - \left[ d_0 f p + d_1 f_{L-1} p + d_2 f_{L-2} p \right]_{i-1}^{i} \]

(equation continued on next page)
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\[ + 2d_0 \left( f_i' X_P_1 + f_i'' X_P_2 + f_i''' X_P_3 + f_i'''' X_P_4 \right) \]

\[ + \left( f_i' Z_P_1 + f_i'' Z_P_2 + f_i''' Z_P_3 + f_i'''' Z_P_4 \right) \]

\[ + \left( P_i Z_M_1 + P_i' Z_M_2 + P_i'' Z_M_3 + P_i''' Z_M_4 \right) \]

where

\[ Z_P_1 = \delta \eta \left( Y_P_1 - Y_P_2 \frac{\delta \eta}{2} + Y_P_3 \frac{\delta \eta^2}{8} + Y_P_4 \frac{\delta \eta^3}{24} \right) \]

\[ Z_P_2 = -\delta \eta^3 \left( \frac{Y_P_1}{2} - Y_P_2 \frac{\delta \eta}{3} + Y_P_3 \frac{11 \delta \eta^2}{120} + Y_P_4 \frac{\delta \eta^3}{30} \right) \]

\[ Z_P_3 = \delta \eta^3 \left( \frac{Y_P_1}{8} - Y_P_2 \frac{11 \delta \eta}{120} + Y_P_3 \frac{11 \delta \eta^2}{420} + Y_P_4 \frac{5 \delta \eta^3}{504} \right) \]

\[ Z_P_4 = \delta \eta^3 \left( \frac{Y_P_1}{24} - Y_P_2 \frac{\delta \eta}{30} + Y_P_3 \frac{5 \delta \eta^2}{504} + Y_P_4 \frac{\delta \eta^3}{252} \right) \]

with

\[ Y_P_1 = d_1 P_\ell-1,i + d_2 P_{\ell-2,i} \]

\[ Y_P_2 = d_1 P_{\ell-1,i} + d_2 P_{\ell-2,i} \]

\[ Y_P_3 = d_1 P_{\ell-1,i} + d_2 P_{\ell-2,i} \]

\[ Y_P_4 = d_1 P_{\ell-1,i-1} + d_2 P_{\ell-2,i-1} \]

and ZM_1, ZM_2, ZM_3, and ZM_4 are equal to ZP_1, ZP_2, ZP_3, and ZP_4, respectively, for the special case that \( p = f' \).
Following the same procedure

\[
\begin{align*}
2 \int_{i-1}^{i} f'^{2} \frac{d \ln \alpha_{H}}{d \ln \xi} &= \left( d_{0} + \frac{d_{1} \alpha_{H_{l-1}} + d_{2} \alpha_{H_{l-2}}}{\alpha_{H}} \right) \left[ f'_{i} \chi P_{1} + f'^{1}_{i} \chi P_{2} + f'^{2}_{i} \chi P_{3} + f'^{3}_{i-1} \chi P_{4} \right] \\
p_{i} &= f'_{i}
\end{align*}
\]  

(96)

where use has been made of the fact that the coordinate stretching parameter \(\alpha_{H}\) is a function of \(\xi\) only.

Finally, it is necessary to evaluate the integral of the density ratio which appears in the momentum equation and the integral of the elemental source term which appears in the elemental conservation equation. Approximat- ing \(\rho_{e}/\rho\) as a cubic between \(i\) and \(i-1\), an exact integration of the result-
ing approximate integral yields

\[
\int_{i-1}^{i} \frac{\rho_{e}}{\rho} \, d\eta = \left( \frac{\rho_{e}}{\rho_{i}} + \frac{\rho_{e}}{\rho_{i-1}} \right) \frac{\delta \eta}{2} + \left( \frac{\rho_{e} \rho_{i}^{2}}{\rho_{i}^{2}} - \frac{\rho_{e} \rho_{i-1}^{3}}{\rho_{i-1}^{3}} \right) \frac{\delta \eta^{2}}{12}
\]

(97)

Similarly for the integral of \(\phi_{k}\)

\[
\int_{i-1}^{i} \phi_{k} \, d\eta = \left( \phi_{k_{i}} + \phi_{k_{i-1}} \right) \frac{\delta \eta}{2} - \left( \phi'_{k_{i}} - \phi'_{k_{i-1}} \right) \frac{\delta \eta^{2}}{12}
\]

(98)

These approximations are not quite as good as the approximations for \(f', H_{T}\) and \(\bar{K}_{k}\) since continuity of derivatives is not guaranteed at the nodal points.

Utilizing Eqs. (83) through (98) the boundary-layer equations (Eqs. (80) through (82)) become

**Momentum:**

\[
\left[ C \frac{f''}{\alpha_{H}} + f' \left( 1 + d_{0} \right) f + d_{1} f_{l-1} + d_{2} f_{l-2} \right]_{i-1}^{i}
\]

(equation continued on next page)
(equation continued from previous page)

\[ + \beta \frac{a_H^2}{\rho} \left[ \left( \frac{\rho + \rho_{i-1}}{\rho_i} \right)^2 \frac{\Delta n}{2} + \left( \frac{\rho e_i - \rho e_{i-1}}{\rho_i} \right)^2 \frac{\Delta n^2}{4} \right] \]

\[ - \left( 1 + \beta + d_0 - \frac{d_1 a_{H_{i-1}} + d_2 a_{H_{i-2}}}{\alpha_H} \right) \left[ f_{i-1}^{\prime} \text{XP}_1 + f_{i-1}^{\prime\prime} \text{XP}_2 + f_{i-1}^{\prime\prime\prime} \text{XP}_3 + f_{i-1}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime} \text{XP}_4 \right] \]

\[ + f_{i-1}^{\prime\prime\prime\prime} \text{XP}_4 \]

\[ p_i = f_i^{\prime} \]

Energy:

\[ - q_a^* + q_r^* + H_t \left[ (1 + d_0) f + d_1 f_{i-1} + d_2 f_{i-2} \right] \]

\[ - (1 + 2d_0) \left[ f_{i}^{\prime} \text{XP}_1 + f_{i}^{\prime\prime} \text{XP}_2 + f_{i}^{\prime\prime\prime} \text{XP}_3 + f_{i-1}^{\prime\prime\prime} \text{XP}_4 \right] p_i = H_{T_i} \]

\[ - \left[ f_{i}^{\prime} \text{ZP}_1 + f_{i}^{\prime\prime} \text{ZP}_2 + f_{i}^{\prime\prime\prime} \text{ZP}_3 + f_{i-1}^{\prime\prime\prime} \text{ZP}_4 \right] p_i = H_{T_i} \]

\[ - \left[ H_{T_i} \text{ZP}_1 + H_{T_i}^i \text{ZP}_2 + H_{T_i}^{\prime\prime} \text{ZP}_3 + H_{T_i-1}^{\prime\prime\prime} \text{ZP}_4 \right] p_i = f_i^{\prime} \]

where \( q_a^* \) and \( q_r^* \) are given by Eqs. (50) and (57), respectively.
Elemental species:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left[ -j_k^i + \bar{K}_k \left( (1 + d_0) f + d_1 f_{i-1} + d_2 f_{i-2} \right) \right]_{i-1}^i \\
&+ a_H \left[ \left( \phi_{k_i} + \phi_{k_{i-1}} \right) \frac{\delta n}{2} - \left( \phi_{k_i} - \phi_{k_{i-1}} \right) \frac{\delta n^2}{12} \right] \\
&- (1 + 2d_0) \left[ f_{i_1} XP_1 + f_{i_1} XP_2 + f_{i_1} XP_3 + f_{i_1} XP_4 \right] p_i = \bar{K}_k \\
&- \left[ f_{i_1} ZP_1 + f_{i_1} ZP_2 + f_{i_1} ZP_3 + f_{i_1} ZP_4 \right] p_i = \bar{K}_k \\
&- \left[ \bar{K}_k ZP_1 + \bar{K}_k ZP_2 + \bar{K}_k ZP_3 + \bar{K}_k ZP_4 \right] p_i = f_{i_1} = 0 \quad (101)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( j_k^i \) is given by Eq. (48).

The boundary-layer equations (Eqs. (99) through (101)) are applicable to the problem of the nonsimilar chemically-reacting boundary layer with unequal diffusion coefficients, thermal diffusion, entropy layer, radiation absorption and emission, and rate-controlled reactions, coupled point by point with a charring ablator solution. In the absence of thermal diffusion \( c_t \) is set equal to zero. When the diffusion coefficients are equal, \( \bar{K}_k = \bar{K}_k, \mu_1 = 1, \mu_2 = 1/\mu_3 = \eta, \bar{h} = h, \) and \( \bar{C}_p = C_p \). When the boundary layer does not react chemically, the elemental species equation is inconsequential. Finally, if the boundary layer is incompressible or if Crocco relations are utilized only the momentum equation is needed.

Before discussing the procedure for solving the equations developed in this section, it is appropriate to discuss briefly the thermodynamic and transport properties employed in the solution procedure. These subjects are treated in considerably more detail in Refs. 7 and 9, respectively.

The state at each node is determined with a general purpose chemical equilibrium subprogram of much the same form as those described in Refs. 21 and 22. State derivatives are determined by the same routine. Enthalpy and specific heat values are obtained through accurate curve fits of JANAF or other reliable thermochemical data.

In the present formulation, transport properties are determined as follows. The \( T_{ij} \) and \( D_i^T \) are calculated using the approximate Eqs. (19) and (26), respectively. The \( D \) is given by
\[ D = 2.628 \times 10^{-3} \frac{T(T/\text{ref})^{1/2}}{P_\text{ref}^2 \sigma_n^1(i,i)^{1/2}} \quad \text{(cm}^2/\text{sec)} \]  

with \( T \) in K, \( P \) in atmospheres, and \( \sigma \) in Å. The subscript "ref" refers to a reference species (often \( \text{O}_2 \), but conceivably fictional). \( D \) is thus the self-diffusion coefficient of that species. The \( F_i \) are determined by a least-squares correlation of \( \beta_{ij} \).

The viscosity of the mixture is obtained from an approximate relation of the Sutherland-Wassiljewa type:\(^{13}\)

\[ \mu = \sum_i \mu_i \]  

where \( \mu_i \) is the viscosity of species \( i \) given by

\[ \mu_i = \frac{5}{6A_{ii}^*} \rho \bar{\beta}_{ii} \]  

and

\[ \frac{1}{\mu_i^{-1}} = 1 + 1.385 \frac{RT_i}{\mu_i x_i} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{x_j}{\beta_{ij}} \]  

with the 1.385 an empirical constant suggested by Buddenberg and Wilke.\(^ {23}\)

The mixture thermal conductivity, \( \lambda \), is obtained as the sum of a monatomic thermal conductivity and a contribution from internal degrees of freedom:

\[ \lambda = \lambda^{\text{mono}} + \lambda^{\text{int}} \]  

The \( \lambda^{\text{mono}} \) is determined by a relation similar to that for \( \mu \)

\[ \lambda^{\text{mono}} = \sum_i \lambda^{\text{mono}}_i \rho_i \]  

where \( \lambda^{\text{mono}}_i \) is the monatomic thermal conductivity of species \( i \)

\[ \lambda^{\text{mono}}_i = \frac{15}{4} \frac{R}{M_i} \mu_i \]  
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with the 1.065 being suggested by Mason and Saxena. The \( \lambda^{\text{int}} \) is computed using

\[
\lambda^{\text{int}} = \sum_{i} x_i (\lambda_i - \lambda^{\text{mono}}_i) \sum_{j} x_j \beta_{ij}
\]

where

\[
\lambda_i - \lambda^{\text{mono}}_i = \rho_i \beta_{ii} \frac{m_i}{m} \left( \frac{C_{pi}}{2} - \frac{5}{2} \frac{R}{m_i} \right)
\]

SECTION 5

SOLUTION OF THE BOUNDARY-LAYER EQUATIONS IN INTEGRAL MATRIX FORM

The solution of the boundary-layer equations presented in Section 4 together with the boundary conditions such as those presented in Section 3 is accomplished by Newton-Raphson iteration. In this section these equations are put into a form suitable for solution by this procedure. The resulting equations are then written in matrix form, and a method is presented for their solution suitable for coupling with an internal conduction solution. The procedure attempts to minimize computational time and computer storage requirements.

In order to illustrate the Newton-Raphson method consider two simultaneous nonlinear algebraic equations

\[
F(x,y) = 0 \quad G(x,y) = 0
\]

the solution for which is given by \( x = \bar{x}, \ y = \bar{y} \). Define \( x_m \) and \( y_m \) as the values of \( x \) and \( y \) for the \( m^{\text{th}} \) iteration. The desired solution \( f(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \) can be expressed in a Taylor series expansion
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= F(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = F(x_m, y_m) + (\bar{x} - x_m) \frac{\partial F(x_m, y_m)}{\partial x} \\
&\quad + (\bar{y} - y_m) \frac{\partial F(x_m, y_m)}{\partial y} + \ldots \tag{113}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= G(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = G(x_m, y_m) + (\bar{x} - x_m) \frac{\partial G(x_m, y_m)}{\partial x} \\
&\quad + (\bar{y} - y_m) \frac{\partial G(x_m, y_m)}{\partial y} + \ldots \tag{113}
\end{align*}
\]

The Newton-Raphson method consists of replacing \((\bar{x}, \bar{y})\) by \((x_{m+1}, y_{m+1})\) on the right-hand-side of these expressions, neglecting nonlinear terms in \(x_{m+1} - x_m\) and \(y_{m+1} - y_m\). This yields the set of recurrence formulas

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta x_m \frac{\partial F(x_m, y_m)}{\partial x} + \Delta y_m \frac{\partial F(x_m, y_m)}{\partial y} &= -F(x_m, y_m) \\
\Delta x_m \frac{\partial G(x_m, y_m)}{\partial x} + \Delta y_m \frac{\partial G(x_m, y_m)}{\partial y} &= -G(x_m, y_m) \tag{114}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\Delta x_m = x_{m+1} - x_m, \quad \Delta y_m = y_{m+1} - y_m \tag{115}
\]

The \(\Delta x_m\) and \(\Delta y_m\) are the corrections to be added to \(x_m\) and \(y_m\), respectively, to yield the values of the dependent variables for the \(m+1\)th iteration. Here \(F(x_m, y_m)\) and \(G(x_m, y_m)\) are the values of the original functions \(F(x, y)\) and \(G(x, y)\) evaluated for \(x = x_m\) and \(y = y_m\). As the corrections approach zero, the \(F(x_m, y_m)\) and \(G(x_m, y_m)\) thus approach zero. Hence, it is appropriate to look upon these as errors associated with the original Equations (112). It is apparent that this procedure can be extended to an arbitrary number of functions and a corresponding number of primary variables.

For the purpose of the present problem, it has been found to be most convenient to consider the primary variables as the \(f_i, f'_i, f''_i, f'''_i, H_{T_i}, H_{T_i}'\), \(H_{T_i}''\), \(K_{K_i, K_i}, K_{K_i, K_i}''\) at each nodal station \(i\), plus the \(\alpha_H\). This amounts to a total of \((7 + 3K)N + 1\) unknowns where \(N\) is the number of nodal points across the boundary layer and \(K\) is one less than the number of elements present in the boundary layer. The corresponding number of equations is provided as follows.
Taylor series expansions
Equation numbers: (77)-(79)
Number of equations: (5 + 2K)(N - 1)

Boundary layer equations
Equation numbers: (99)-(101)
Number of equations: (2 + K)(N - 1)

Boundary conditions
Equation numbers: (61)-(63) and (68)-(70) or equiv.
Number of equations: (7 + 3K)

The $a_H$ constraint
Equation numbers: (34)
Number of equations: 1

Total
Equation numbers: (7 + 3K) N + 1

It is thus necessary to specify the corrections of the other variables (such as density, temperature, etc.) in terms of corrections of the primary variables. The procedure for accomplishing this will be described later.

The Taylor series expansions are linear with respect to the primary variables as are several of the boundary conditions. The boundary layer equations and the remainder of the boundary conditions are nonlinear. The $a_H$ constraint is linear but it must be considered together with the nonlinear equations in order to avoid a singular matrix. The recurrence formulas representing the linear equations will be presented first, after which recurrence formulas appropriate to the nonlinear equations will be developed.

Partial differentiation of the Taylor series expansions with respect to the primary dependent variables in accordance with Equations (114) yields for the $m^{th}$ iteration

$$(-1)\Delta f_{i+1} + (1)\Delta f_i + (\delta \eta)\Delta f'_i + (\frac{\delta n^2}{2})\Delta f''_i$$

$$+ (\frac{\delta n^3}{6})\Delta f'''_i + (\frac{\delta n^4}{24})\Delta f''''_i = - \text{ERROR}$$

$$(116)$$

$$(-1)\Delta p_{i+1} + (1)\Delta p_i + (\delta \eta)\Delta p'_i + (\frac{\delta n^2}{3})\Delta p''_i + (\frac{\delta n^3}{6})\Delta p'''_i + (\frac{\delta n^4}{24})\Delta p''''_i = - \text{ERROR}$$

$$(117)$$

$$(-1)\Delta p'_{i+1} + (1)\Delta p'_i + (\delta \eta)\Delta p''_i + (\frac{\delta n}{2})\Delta p'''_i + (\frac{\delta n}{2})\Delta p''''_i = - \text{ERROR}$$

$$(118)$$

where as before $p_i$ represents $f'_i$, $H'_i$, and $k'_i$. Here $\Delta f_{i+1}$, $\Delta f_i$, $\Delta f'_i$, and so on represent the respective corrections for $f_{i+1}$, $f_i$, $f'_i$, and so on, the numbers in parentheses represent the partial derivatives of the Taylor series expressions (Equations (77) through (79)) with respect to the primary variables; and the ERRORS are obtained by evaluating the left-hand-sides of the appropriate Equations (77) through (79) for the values of the variables obtained during the $m^{th}$ iteration.

Similarly, the recurrence formulas for the linear boundary conditions (Eqs. (61), (69), and (70)) are given by
\[ \Delta f'_{\text{w}} = - \text{ERROR} = -(f')_m \] (119)

\[ \Delta H_{\text{edge}} = - \text{ERROR} = - \left[ H_{\text{edge}} - H_{\text{edge}} \right]_{\text{actual}} \] (120)

\[ \Delta H_{\text{edge}}' = - \text{ERROR} = -(H')_{\text{edge}}_m \] (121)

\[ \Delta \bar{K}_{\text{edge}} = - \text{ERROR} = - \left[ \bar{K}_{\text{edge}} - \bar{K}_{\text{edge}} \right]_{\text{actual}} \] (122)

\[ \Delta \bar{K}_{\text{edge}}' = - \text{ERROR} = -(\bar{K}')_{\text{edge}}_m \] (123)

The recurrence formulas for the nonlinear boundary-layer equations are given by:

Momentum:

\[
\left[ \frac{C f''}{\alpha_H} \left( \frac{\Delta f''}{f''} + \frac{\Delta C}{C} - \frac{\Delta \alpha_H}{\alpha_H} \right) \right]_i \left[ (1 + d_0) f + d_1 f_{i-1} + d_2 f_{i-2} \right] \Delta f' + f' (1 + d_0) \Delta f
\]

\[
\left[ \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{i-1}} \right]_i \left[ \left( \frac{(1 - \alpha_H \rho_i)}{\rho_{i-1}} \Delta \rho_{i-1} + \frac{\alpha_H \rho_i}{6} \Delta \rho_{i-1} \right) \right]_i \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_H \rho_i}{3} \right) \Delta \rho_{i-1} \right]_i + \left( \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_{i-1}} \right)_i \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha_H \rho_i}{3} \right) \Delta \rho_{i-1} + \frac{\alpha_H \rho_i}{6} \Delta \rho_{i-1} \right]_i
\]

\[
\left[ \left( \frac{(1 - \alpha_H \rho_i)}{\rho_{i-1}} \Delta \rho_{i-1} + \frac{\alpha_H \rho_i}{6} \Delta \rho_{i-1} \right) \right]_i \Delta \alpha_H + \left[ (1 + \beta + d_0 - \left( \frac{\alpha_H \rho_i}{\alpha_H} + d_2 \alpha_H \rho_i \right) \right]_i \Delta f + f' \left( \frac{\alpha_H \rho_i}{\alpha_H} + \alpha_H \rho_i \right) \Delta f
\]

\[
\times \left[ f'_i \Delta P_1 + f''_i \Delta P_2 + f'''_i \Delta P_3 + f''''_i \Delta P_4 + \frac{d_1 \alpha_H \rho_i}{\alpha_H} - \frac{d_2 \alpha_H \rho_i}{\alpha_H} \right]_i \Delta f + f' \Delta P_1
\]

\[
\left[ f'_i \Delta P_1 + f''_i \Delta P_2 + f'''_i \Delta P_3 + f''''_i \Delta P_4 + \frac{d_1 \alpha_H \rho_i}{\alpha_H} - \frac{d_2 \alpha_H \rho_i}{\alpha_H} \right]_i \Delta f + f' \Delta P_1
\]

\[
\text{(equation continued on next page)}
\]
(equation continued from previous page)

\[ + f'_i \Delta x_p + f''_i \Delta x_p + f'''_i \Delta x_p + f'_i \Delta x_p + f''_i \Delta x_p + f'''_i \Delta x_p \]

\[ \Delta a_H - 2 \left[ ZP_1 \Delta f'_i + ZP_2 \Delta f''_i \right] \]

\[ p_i = f'_i \]

\[ + ZP_3 \Delta f''_i'' + ZP_4 \Delta f'''_i''''' \]

\[ p_i = f'_i = - \text{ERROR} \quad (124) \]

where the \text{ERROR} is given by the left-hand-side of Eq. (99) evaluated for the \( m \)th iteration.

**Energy:**

\[
\left[ - \Delta q^*_a + \frac{1}{a_w \Delta q_x} \left[ (1 + d_0) f + d_1 f_{i-1} + d_2 f_{i-2} \right] \Delta H_T + H_T (1 + d_0) \Delta f \right]^{i-1}
\]

\[ - (1 + 2d_0) \left[ f'_i \Delta x_p + f''_i \Delta x_p + f'''_i \Delta x_p + f''''_i \Delta x_p + f'_i \Delta x_p + f''_i \Delta x_p + f'''_i \Delta x_p + f''''_i \Delta x_p \right]
\]

\[ + \Delta H_T + H_T (1 + d_0) \Delta f \]

\[ = - \text{ERROR} \quad (125) \]

where the \text{ERROR} is given by the left-hand-side of Eq. (100) evaluated for the \( m \)th iteration and \( \Delta q^*_a \) is given by

\[
\Delta q^*_a = - \left( \frac{C f'' f''' u^2}{a_H^3} \right) + \frac{\Delta C}{C} + \frac{\Delta f'}{f'} + \frac{\Delta f''}{f''} - 3 \left( \frac{\Delta a_H}{a_H} \right) + \frac{C T^*}{a_H Pr} \left( \frac{\Delta C}{C} + \frac{\Delta P}{P} + \frac{\Delta T^*}{T^*} \right)
\]

\[
- \frac{\Delta a_H}{a_H} - \frac{\Delta P}{Pr} \right] + \frac{C}{a_H S_c} \left[ \Delta T^* - \left( \frac{\rho}{p} + \frac{c_p R}{u_1 u_2} \right) \right] + c_T R T u_j + \left( \bar{h}' - h \right)
\]

(equation continued on next page)
Elemental species:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left( - \Delta j^*_k + \left[ (1 + d_0) f + d_1 f_{\Delta f-1} + d_2 f_{\Delta f-2} \right] \Delta \bar{\phi}^*_k + \Delta \bar{\phi}^*_k (1 + d_0) \Delta f \right)_{i-1} \\
&+ \frac{\Delta n}{2} \left[ \Delta \phi^*_{k_1} + \Delta \phi^*_{k_1-1} + \frac{\Delta n}{6} \left( \Delta \phi^*_{k_1} - \Delta \phi^*_{k_1-1} \right) \right] + \frac{\Delta n}{2} \left[ \phi^*_{k_i} + \phi^*_{k_{i-1}} \right] \\
&- \left( \phi^*_{k_i} - \phi^*_{k_{i-1}} \right) \Delta \phi^*_{k_i} - (1 + 2d_0) \left[ f_{i-1} \Delta X_{P_1} + f_i \Delta X_{P_2} + f_{i+1} \Delta X_{P_3} \\
&+ f_{i-1} \Delta X_{P_4} + XP_1 \Delta f_{i} + XP_2 \Delta f_{i+1} + XP_3 \Delta f_{i+2} + XP_4 \Delta f_{i+3} \right] p_i = \bar{\Delta} K_{k_i} \\
&- \left[ ZP_1 \Delta f_{i} + ZP_2 \Delta f_{i+1} + ZP_3 \Delta f_{i+2} + ZP_4 \Delta f_{i+3} \right] p_i = \Delta \bar{K}_{k_i} \\
&+ ZP_2 \Delta \bar{K}_{k_i} + ZP_3 \Delta \bar{K}_{k_{i-1}} + ZP_4 \Delta \bar{K}_{k_{i-1}} \right) p_i = - \text{ERROR}
\end{align*}
\]
Equations (124), (125), and (127) are reduced to linear equations in terms of the corrections on the primary variables ($\Delta f_i$, $\Delta f'_i$, and so on) by noting that the variables $C$, $\rho$, $C_p$, $T$, $Pr$, $\delta c_s$, $\theta$, $C_p'$, $\mu_2$, $\mu_3$, $\mu_4$, $q_r$, $Z_k$, and $\phi_k$ evaluated at any point in the boundary layer can be considered as functions of static enthalpy, static pressure, and elemental composition. With the pressure assumed constant across the boundary layer, it follows that all of the corrections on unprimed variables with the exception of $\Delta q_r$ can be expressed as

$$\Delta f_i = \sum_{kk} \frac{\delta f_i}{\delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta \tilde{K}_{kk} + \frac{\delta f_i}{\delta h_i} \Delta h_i$$

(129)

where from Eqs. (9) and (36)

$$h_i = H_{T_i} - \frac{u_e^* f_i^*}{\alpha_H^*}$$

(130)

so that

$$\Delta h_i = \Delta H_{T_i} - \frac{u_e^* f_i^*}{\alpha_H^*} \left( \frac{\Delta f_i}{f_i} - \frac{\Delta H}{H} \right)$$

(131)

The $\Delta q_r$ is more complicated in that it depends upon the $\Delta \tilde{K}_{kk}$ and $\Delta h_j$ at all nodal points $j$.

The $\eta$-derivatives of these variables (i.e., the primed quantities) can likewise be expressed in terms of corrections on the primary variables as follows

$$\Delta f_i' = \sum_{kk} \tilde{K}_{kk} \left( \sum_{kk} \frac{\delta^2 f_i}{\delta \tilde{K}_{kk} \delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta \tilde{K}_{kk} + \frac{\delta^2 f_i}{\delta h_i \delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta h_i \right)$$

$$+ h_i' \left( \sum_{kk} \frac{\delta^2 f_i}{\delta h_i \delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta \tilde{K}_{kk} + \frac{\delta^2 f_i}{\delta h_i^2} \Delta h_i \right)$$

$$+ \sum_{kk} \frac{\delta f_i}{\delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta \tilde{K}_{kk} + \frac{\delta f_i}{\delta h_i} \Delta h_i'$$

(132)

$$\Delta q_r' = \sum_{kk} \frac{\delta^2 q_r}{\delta \tilde{K}_{kk} \delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta \tilde{K}_{kk} + \frac{\delta^2 q_r}{\delta h_i \delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta h_i \right)$$

$$+ h_i' \left( \sum_{kk} \frac{\delta^2 q_r}{\delta h_i \delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta \tilde{K}_{kk} + \frac{\delta^2 q_r}{\delta h_i^2} \Delta h_i \right)$$

$$+ \sum_{kk} \frac{\delta q_r}{\delta \tilde{K}_{kk}} \Delta \tilde{K}_{kk} + \frac{\delta q_r}{\delta h_i} \Delta h_i'$$

(133)
where

\[ h'_i = H'_i - \frac{u'f'_i f''_i}{\alpha_H^2} \]  

so that

\[ \Delta h'_i = \Delta H'_i - \frac{u'f'_i f''_i}{\alpha_H^2} \left( \frac{\Delta f'_i + \Delta f''_i}{f'_i} - 2 \frac{\Delta \alpha_H}{\alpha_H} \right) \]  

(134)

Use is also made of the following which are obtained by differentiating Equations (86):

- \( \Delta X_{P_1} = \delta \eta \left( \Delta p'_i - \frac{\delta \eta}{2} \Delta p'_i + \frac{\delta \eta^2}{8} \Delta p''_i + \frac{\delta \eta^3}{24} \Delta p'''_{i-1} \right) \)
- \( \Delta X_{P_2} = -\delta \eta \left( \frac{\Delta p'_i}{2} - \frac{\delta \eta}{3} \Delta p'_i + \frac{11 \delta \eta^2}{120} \Delta p''_i + \frac{\delta \eta^3}{30} \Delta p'''_{i-1} \right) \)
- \( \Delta X_{P_3} = \delta \eta \left( \frac{\Delta p'_i}{8} - \frac{11 \delta \eta}{120} \Delta p'_i + \frac{11 \delta \eta^2}{420} \Delta p''_i + \frac{\delta \eta^3}{504} \Delta p'''_{i-1} \right) \)
- \( \Delta X_{P_4} = \delta \eta \left( \frac{\Delta p'_i}{24} - \frac{\delta \eta}{30} \Delta p'_i + \frac{5 \delta \eta^2}{480} \Delta p''_i + \frac{\delta \eta^3}{252} \Delta p'''_{i-1} \right) \)

(133)

The \( \Delta Z_{P_1} = \Delta Z_{P_2} = \Delta Z_{P_3} = \Delta Z_{P_4} = 0 \) since \( Z_{P_1}, Z_{P_2}, Z_{P_3}, \) and \( Z_{P_4} \) can be computed before the iteration commences.

Substituting Eqs. (126), (128), (129), (131), (132), (134), and (135) into Eqs. (124), (125), and (127), and collecting terms yields, neglecting the off-diagonal terms arising from the \( \Delta q_x \), the following recurrence formulas for the momentum, energy, and \( K \)th elemental species equations between nodal points \( i \) and \( i-1 \):

\[ c_1 \Delta f'_i + c_2 \Delta f'_{i-1} + c_3 \Delta f''_i + c_4 \Delta f''_{i-1} \]

\[ + c_5 \Delta f'''_i + c_6 \Delta f'''_{i-1} + c_7 \Delta f''''_i + c_8 \Delta f''''_{i-1} \]

\[ + c_9 \Delta H'_{T_i} + c_{10} \Delta H'_{T_{i-1}} + c_{11} \Delta H''_{T_i} + c_{12} \Delta H''_{T_{i-1}} \]

(equation continued on following page)

*As mentioned previously, \( \Delta q_x \) and \( \Delta q_{x-1} \) produce corrections \( \Delta K_{k_j}, \Delta H_{T_j}, \Delta f'_j \) and \( \Delta H_j \) at all boundary-layer nodal points \( j \).
where the coefficients for the corrections \(c_1, c_2, \ldots\) differ in form for the momentum, the energy, and the \(K^{th}\) elemental species equations and in general yield different numerical results for each elemental species \(kk\) and for each nodal position in the boundary layer \(i\). The coefficients for the corrections are listed in Tables I through III for the momentum equation, the energy equation, and the \(K^{th}\) elemental species equation, respectively.

In order to complete the set of equations, it is necessary to develop the recurrence formulas for the \(a_H\) constraint and for the nonlinear boundary conditions. The \(a_H\) constraint (Eq. (34)) yields

\[
\Delta f'\eta_c - c \Delta f'\eta_e = - \text{ERROR} = - (f'\eta_c - cf'\eta_e)_m \tag{137}
\]

The boundary conditions at the boundary-layer edge are nonlinear when an entropy layer is taken into account. In this case, Eqs. (68) are applicable, resulting in the following recurrence formulas:

\[
- \Delta f'_{\text{edge}} + \left[ \frac{u}{u_e} (f, \xi) \right]_{\text{edge}} \Delta a_H
\]

\[
+ a_H \left[ \frac{d}{df} \frac{u}{u_e} (f, \xi) \right]_{\text{edge}} \Delta f'_{\text{edge}} = - \text{ERROR}
\]

\[
= - \left[ - f'_{\text{edge}} + a_H \left[ \frac{u}{u_e} (f, \xi) \right]_{\text{edge}} \right]_m \tag{138}
\]
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### TABLE I
CORRECTION COEFFICIENTS FOR MOMENTUM EQUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Δf'_i</th>
<th>[(1 + d_0)f'_i]</th>
<th>Δf'_{i-1}</th>
<th>[-(1 + d_0)f'_{i-1}]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δf''_i</td>
<td>[\frac{C}{\alpha_H} + B_2]</td>
<td>Δf''_{i-1}</td>
<td>[-\frac{C}{\alpha_H} + C_2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δf''''_i</td>
<td>B_3</td>
<td>Δf'''''_{i-1}</td>
<td>C_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔH_{Ti}</td>
<td>[\frac{f'''}{\alpha_H} \frac{\partial C}{\partial H} ] + (D_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h}</td>
<td>ΔH_{Ti-1}</td>
<td>[-\frac{f'''}{\alpha_H} \frac{\partial C}{\partial H} ] + (D_4) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔH_{Ti}</td>
<td>D_3 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \right)</td>
<td>ΔH_{Ti-1}</td>
<td>D_5 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \right)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δα_{H_i}</td>
<td>[A_4] + B_4</td>
<td>Δα_{H_i-1}</td>
<td>[-A_4] + C_4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[A_1 = -\frac{u^g}{\alpha_H^2} f'' f' + \frac{\partial C}{\partial h} + (1 + d_0) f + d_1 f_{i-1} + d_2 f_{i-2}\]

\[A_4 = \frac{f'''}{\alpha_H^2} \left( \frac{u^g}{\alpha_H^2} f' f'' \frac{\partial C}{\partial h} - C \right)\]

\[B_1 = -2 \left[ D_1 X P_1 + Z P_1 \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial h} p_i = f'_i - \frac{u^g}{\alpha_H} \left[ f'' f D_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \right] i + f' (D_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial h} p_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial h}\]
TABLE I (continued)

\[ B_2 = -2 \left[ D_1 X P_2 + Z P_2 \right] p_i \neq \frac{u^a}{\alpha H} D_3 \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial h} \right) \]

\[ B_3 = -2 \left[ D_1 X P_3 + Z P_3 \right] p_i = f'_i \]

\[ B_4 = -\left( \frac{d_1^a H_{l-1} + d_2^a H_{l-2}}{\alpha H} \right) \left[ f'_i X P_1 + f'_i X P_2 + f''_i X P_3 + f'''_i X P_4 \right] p_i = f'_i \]

\[ + \frac{u^a}{\alpha H} f'_i \left[ 2 f''_i X P_3 \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial h} \right) + f''_i X P_2 \left( D_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial P} \right) = \frac{3}{\delta h} \right] \]

\[ + \beta \left( \frac{\alpha H}{\pi} \frac{\rho}{\rho_i} \left[ 1 + \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_i-1} \frac{\delta h}{6} \left( \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_i-1} - \rho_i \right) \right] \right] \]

\[ C_1 = -\frac{u^a}{\alpha H} \left[ f''_i-1 D_5 \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial h} \right) i-1 + f''_i-1 \left( D_4 \frac{\partial}{\partial P} \right) = \frac{3}{\delta h} \right] \]

\[ C_2 = -\frac{u^a}{\alpha H} f'_i-1 D_5 \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial h} \right) i-1 \]

\[ C_3 = -2 \left[ D_1 X P_4 + Z P_4 \right] p_i = f'_i \]

\[ C_4 = \frac{u^a}{\alpha H} f'_{i-1} \left[ 2 f''_{i-1} D_5 \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial h} \right) i-1 + f''_{i-1} \left( D_4 \frac{\partial}{\partial P} \right) = \frac{3}{\delta h} \right] \]

\[ D_1 = 1 + \beta + d_0 - \frac{d_1^a H_{l-1} + d_2^a H_{l-2}}{\alpha H} \]
TABLE I (concluded)

\[
D_2 = - \beta \, a_H \, \frac{\delta n}{2} \, \frac{\rho e}{\rho_i} \left\{ \left( 1 + \frac{\delta n}{3} \, \frac{\rho'_{i-1}}{\rho_{i-1}} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial p} \right) \right\} - \frac{\delta n}{6} \left[ \sum_{kkk} K'_{kkk} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial \rho \partial \rho} \right) + h' \left( \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial \rho \partial h} \right) \right]_{i-1}
\]

\[
D_3 = \beta \, a_H \, \frac{\delta n^2}{2} \, \frac{\rho e}{\rho_i^2}
\]

\[
D_4 = - \beta \, a_H \, \frac{\delta n}{2} \, \frac{\rho e}{\rho_{i-1}^2} \left\{ \left( 1 - \frac{\delta n}{3} \, \frac{\rho'_{i-1}}{\rho_{i-1}} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial p} \right) \right\} + \frac{\delta n}{6} \left[ \sum_{kkk} K'_{kkk} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial \rho \partial \rho} \right) \right]_{i-1}
\]

\[
D_5 = - \beta \, a_H \, \frac{\delta n^2}{2} \, \frac{\rho e}{\rho_{i-1}^2}
\]
\[ \Delta f_i : \left[ (1 + d_0)H_T \right]_i \quad \Delta f_{i-1} : -\left[ (1 + d_0)H_T \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta f'_i : \left[ A_{15} \right]_i + B_{15} \quad \Delta f'_{i-1} : -\left[ A_{15} \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta f''_i : \left[ A_{16} \right]_i + B_{16} \quad \Delta f''_{i-1} : -\left[ A_{16} \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta f'''_i : B_{17} \quad \Delta f'''_{i-1} : C_{17} \]

\[ \Delta \Delta H_{T_i} : \left[ A_{18} \right]_i + B_{18} \quad \Delta \Delta H_{T_{i-1}} : -\left[ A_{18} \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta H_{T_i} : \left[ \frac{\partial (D_{14})}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}} \right]_i + B_{19} \quad \Delta H_{T_{i-1}} : -\left[ \frac{\partial (D_{14})}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}} \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta H'_{T_i} : B_{20} \quad \Delta H'_{T_{i-1}} : C_{20} \]

\[ \Delta \tilde{\kappa}_{kk_i} : \left[ \frac{\partial (D_{13})}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}} \right]_i \quad \Delta \tilde{\kappa}_{kk_{i-1}} : -\left[ \frac{\partial (D_{13})}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}} \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}'_i : \left[ \frac{\partial (D_{14})}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}} \right]_i \quad \Delta \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}'_{i-1} : -\left[ \frac{\partial (D_{14})}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}} \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}''_i : 0 \quad \Delta \tilde{\kappa}_{kk}''_{i-1} : 0 \]

\[ \Delta \alpha_{H_{i}} : \left[ A_{21} \right]_i \quad \Delta \alpha_{H_{i-1}} : -\left[ A_{21} \right]_{i-1} \]
TABLE II (continued)

\[
A_{15} = - \frac{u^2}{a_H^2} \left[ f' \left[ \frac{D_{13}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial p}} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial h} + f'' \left( \left[ \frac{D_{14}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial p}} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial h} - \frac{C}{a_H} \right) \right]
\]

\[
A_{16} = - \frac{u^2}{a_H^2} f' \left( \left[ \frac{D_{14}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial p}} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial h} - \frac{C}{a_H} \right)
\]

\[
A_{18} = \left[ \frac{D_{13}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial p}} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial h} + \frac{1}{a_H} \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \left( 1 + d_0 \right) f + d_1 f_{L-1} + d_2 f_{L-2}
\]

\[
A_{21} = - \frac{u^2}{a_H^2} f' \left[ f' \left[ \frac{D_{13}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial p}} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial h} + 2f'' \left( \left[ \frac{D_{14}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial p}} \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial h} - \frac{C}{a_H} \right) \right] - \frac{1}{a_T} \left( D_{12} - a_T^* \right)
\]

\[
B_{15} = \left[ \left( 1 + 2d_0 \right) \left[ ZP_1 \right] \right] P_i = H_{T_1} + \left[ ZP_1 \right] P_i = H_{T_1}
\]

\[
B_{16} = \left[ \left( 1 + 2d_0 \right) \left[ ZP_2 \right] \right] P_i = H_{T_1} + \left[ ZP_2 \right] P_i = H_{T_1}
\]

\[
B_{17} = \left[ \left( 1 + 2d_0 \right) \left[ ZP_3 \right] \right] P_i = H_{T_1} + \left[ ZP_3 \right] P_i = H_{T_1}
\]

\[
B_{18} = \left[ \left( 1 + 2d_0 \right) \left[ ZP_4 \right] \right] P_i = f_i' + \left[ ZP_4 \right] P_i = f_i'
\]

\[
B_{19} = \left[ \left( 1 + 2d_0 \right) \left[ ZP_5 \right] \right] P_i = f_i' + \left[ ZP_5 \right] P_i = f_i'
\]

\[
B_{20} = \left[ \left( 1 + 2d_0 \right) \left[ ZP_6 \right] \right] P_i = f_i' + \left[ ZP_6 \right] P_i = f_i'
\]
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\[ c_{17} = - \left[ (1 + 2d_0) \left[ XP_4 \right] \right] \frac{H T}{p_1} + \left[ ZP_4 \right] \frac{H T}{p_1} \]

\[ c_{20} = - \left[ (1 + 2d_0) \left[ XP_4 \right] \right] \frac{ZP_4}{p_1} + \left[ ZP_4 \right] \frac{ZP_4}{p_1} \]

\[ D_{11} = \left( \frac{\bar{c}_p + \frac{c_{tR}}{\mu_1 \mu_2}}{\alpha_H} \right) T' + c_{tR} T \mu_3' + (\bar{h} - h + c_{tR} T \mu_3) \mu_4' \]

\[ D_{12} = \frac{C}{\alpha_H^2} \left[ f' f'' \left( \frac{u^2 c}{\alpha_H^2} + \frac{c_{tR} T'}{p' \alpha_H^2} - \frac{D_{11}}{\alpha_H^2} \right) + \gamma_T \right] \]

\[ D_{13} = (D_{12} - \gamma_T) \frac{1}{C} \left( \frac{\partial c}{\partial p} + \frac{\partial c_{tR}}{\partial p} \right) + \frac{C}{\alpha_H} \left( \frac{\partial T'}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial T}{\partial p} \frac{\partial T'}{\partial p} \right) \]

\[ = \frac{D_{11}}{\alpha_H^2} \frac{\partial c}{\partial p} + \frac{c_{tR} T'}{\alpha_H^2} \frac{\partial (\mu_1 \mu_2)}{\partial p} - \left[ \frac{C}{\alpha_H} \frac{\partial c_{tR}}{\partial p} \right] \frac{\partial c}{\partial p} \]

\[ + \frac{C}{\alpha_H} \frac{\partial c_{tR}}{\partial p} \left( \frac{\partial c_{tR}}{\partial p} \right) \left[ \sum_{\text{k}} \tilde{k}'_{kkk} \left( \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial p \partial \tilde{k}_{kkk}} \right) + h' \left( \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial \tilde{k}_{kkk}} \right) \right] \]

\[ + \frac{C}{\alpha_H} \left( \frac{\partial c_{tR}}{\partial p} \right) \left[ \sum_{\text{k}} \tilde{k}'_{kkk} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mu_3}{\partial p \partial \tilde{k}_{kkk}} \right) + h' \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mu_3}{\partial \tilde{k}_{kkk}} \right) \right] \]

\[ + \frac{C}{\alpha_H} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{h} - h + c_{tR} T \mu_3}{\partial p} \right) \left[ \sum_{\text{k}} \tilde{k}'_{kkk} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mu_4}{\partial p \partial \tilde{k}_{kkk}} \right) + h' \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mu_4}{\partial \tilde{k}_{kkk}} \right) \right] \]
\[ D_{14} = \frac{C}{\alpha_{HF}} \frac{\partial \bar{c}}{\partial p} \frac{\partial T}{\partial p} + \frac{C}{\alpha H} \left[ \frac{c_{R} T}{\delta p} \frac{\partial \mu_{3}}{\delta p} + (\bar{h} - h + c_{R} T \mu_{3}) \frac{\partial \mu_{4}}{\delta p} \right] \]

\[ - \left( \frac{C}{\alpha H} \frac{\partial \mu_{1}}{\partial \mu_{2}} \right) \frac{\partial T}{\delta p} + \left[ \frac{C}{\alpha H} \frac{\partial \mu_{3}}{\delta p} \right] \frac{\partial \mu_{4}}{\delta p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \text{ only} \]
TABLE III
CORRECTION COEFFICIENTS FOR Kth ELEMENTAL SPECIES EQUATION

\[ \Delta f_i : \left[ (1 + d_0 \tilde{R}_K) \right]_i \]
\[ \Delta f_{i-1} : - \left[ (1 + d_0 \tilde{R}_K) \right]_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta f'_i : \left[ A_7 \right]_i + B_7 \]
\[ \Delta f'_{i-1} : - \left[ A_7 \right]_{i-1} + C_7 \]

\[ \Delta f''_i : \left[ - \frac{u_0}{a_h} f'(D_6) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \right]_i + B_8 \Delta f'_{i-1} : - \left[ - \frac{u_0}{a_h} f'(D_6) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \right]_{i-1} + C_8 \]

\[ \Delta f'''_i : B_9 \]
\[ \Delta f'''_{i-1} : C_9 \]

\[ \Delta H_{T_i} : \left[ D_7 \right]_i, \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} + B_{10} \]
\[ \Delta H_{T_{i-1}} : - \left[ D_7 \right]_{i-1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} + C_{10} \]

\[ \Delta H'_{T_i} : \left[ D_6 \right]_i, \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} - a_h \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)_i \]
\[ \Delta H'_{T_{i-1}} : - \left[ D_6 \right]_{i-1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} + a_h \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)_{i-1} \]

\[ \Delta H''_{T_i} : 0 \]
\[ \Delta H''_{T_{i-1}} : 0 \]

\[ \tilde{\Delta R}_{kk_i} : \left[ A_{11} \right]_i + B_{11} \]
\[ \tilde{\Delta R}_{kk_{i-1}} : - \left[ A_{11} \right]_{i-1} + C_{11} \]

\[ \tilde{\Delta R}'_{kk_i} : \left[ A_{12} \right]_i + B_{12} \]
\[ \tilde{\Delta R}'_{kk_{i-1}} : - \left[ A_{12} \right]_{i-1} + a_h \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{R}_{kk}}{\partial h} \right)_{i-1} \]

\[ \tilde{\Delta R}''_{kk_i} : B_{13} \]
\[ \tilde{\Delta R}''_{kk_{i-1}} : C_{13} \]

\[ \tilde{\Delta a}_{H_i} : \left[ A_{14} \right]_i + B_{14} \]
\[ \tilde{\Delta a}_{H_{i-1}} : - \left[ A_{14} \right]_{i-1} + C_{14} \]
TABLE III (continued)

\[ A_7 = -\frac{u^2 e}{a_H^2} \left(f'^{\prime}D_6 + f'^{\prime}D_7\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} = \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \]

\[ A_{11} = \left[D^7\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} (1 + d_0) f + d_1 f_{l-1} + d_2 f_{l-2} - \frac{c}{a_H \delta c} \mu_4' \]

\[ k = kk \text{ only} \]

\[ A_{12} = \left[D^6\right] \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k} \]

\[ A_{14} = \frac{u^2 e}{a_H^2} \left(2f''D_6 + f'D_7\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \frac{1}{a_H} \left[\tilde{Z}'_k + (Z_k - \tilde{K}_k) u_4'\right] \]

\[ B_7 = -\left[ZP_1 + (1 + 2d_0) XP_1\right] p_i = \tilde{K}_{k_i} \]

\[-a_\delta \frac{u^2 e}{a_H^2} \frac{\delta n}{2} \left(\frac{f'_i}{\delta n} \right) \left(\frac{3f_i}{\delta n} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \times \left(\delta \phi_k \right) \left(D_8 \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial n}\]

\[ B_8 = -\left[ZP_2 + (1 + 2d_0) XP_2\right] p_i = \tilde{K}_{k_i} + a_\delta \frac{u^2 e \delta n^2}{12} \left(\frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial n} \right) \left(D_8 \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} \]

\[ B_9 = -\left[ZP_3 + (1 + 2d_0) XP_3\right] p_i = \tilde{K}_{k_i} \]

\[ B_{10} = a_\delta \frac{\delta n}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial n} \right) \left(D_8 \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial n}\right] \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( B_{11} = - \left[ z p_1 + (1 + 2d_0) x p_1 \right] p_i = f_i^i, k = k k \text{ only} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ + \frac{\alpha_H \delta_n}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right]<em>i - \frac{\delta_n}{6} (D</em>{g})_i, \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_{12} = - \left[ z p_2 + (1 + 2d_0) x p_2 \right] p_i = f_i^i, k = k k \text{ only} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ - \alpha_H \frac{\delta_n^2}{12} \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)_i ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_{13} = - \left[ z p_3 + (1 + 2d_0) x p_3 \right] p_i = f_i^i, k = k k \text{ only} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_{14} = \frac{u_e^2}{\alpha_H^2} \frac{\delta_n}{2} f^i_i \left[ \left( f^i_{i-1} + \frac{\delta_n}{6} f^i_{i+1} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)<em>{i-1} + \frac{\delta_n}{6} / f^i</em>{i-1} (D_{g})_{i-1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ + \frac{\delta_n}{2} \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)<em>{i-1} \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)</em>{i-1} - \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)<em>{i-1} - \frac{\delta_n}{6} (D</em>{g})_{i-1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_7 = - \alpha_H \frac{u_e^2}{\alpha_H^2} \frac{\delta_n}{2} \left[ \left( f^i_{i-1} + \frac{\delta_n}{6} f^i_{i+1} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)<em>{i-1} + \frac{\delta_n}{6} / f^i</em>{i-1} (D_{g})_{i-1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_8 = - \alpha_H \frac{u_e^2}{\alpha_H^2} \frac{\delta_n^2}{12} f^i_{i-1} \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)_{i-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_9 = - \left[ z p_4 + (1 + 2d_0) x p_4 \right] p_i = \kappa_k )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{10} = \alpha_H \frac{\delta_n}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)<em>{i-1} + \frac{\delta_n}{6} (D</em>{g})_{i-1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{11} = \alpha_H \frac{\delta_n}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right)<em>{i-1} + \frac{\delta_n}{6} (D</em>{g})_{i-1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III (concluded)

\[ C_{13} = - \left[ ZP_4 + (1 + 2d_0) XP_4 \right] P_1 = f_{i_1}^{'} , \ k = kk \text{ only} \]

\[ C_{14} = \frac{\mu e}{\alpha_H^2} \frac{\delta n}{2} f_{i-1}^{i-1} \left[ \left( f_{i-1}^{i-1} + \frac{\delta n}{3} f_{i-1}^{i''} \right) \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right] i-1 + \frac{\delta n}{6} f_{i-1}^{i-1} \left( D_{i-1}^{i-i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \right) \]

\[ D_6 = \frac{C}{\alpha_H SC} \left[ \frac{\partial Z_k}{\partial p} + (Z_k - \bar{Z}_k) \frac{\partial u_4}{\partial p} \right] \]

\[ D_7 = \frac{C}{\alpha_H SC} \left\{ \frac{\mu_4}{\alpha_H} \left[ \frac{\partial Z_k}{\partial h} \right] + \left[ \sum_{kkk} \bar{Z}_{kkk}^{'} \left( \frac{\partial u_4}{\partial h} \right) + h' \left( \frac{\partial u_4}{\partial h} \right) \right] \right\} \]

\[ D_8 = \sum_{kkk} \bar{Z}_{kkk}^{'} \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right) + h' \left( \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial h} \right) \]
In the absence of an entropy layer, Eqs. (71) yield the following recurrence formulas:

\[
\Delta f'_e - \Delta a_H = - \text{ERROR} = -(f'_e - a_H)_m \tag{140}
\]

\[
\Delta f''_e = - \text{ERROR} = - f''_e \tag{141}
\]

Although Eqs. (140) and (141) are linear, these boundary conditions are included in the nonlinear set because of the possibility of an entropy layer.

As pointed out in Section 3, the wall boundary conditions can assume a variety of forms. When the boundary layer is coupled to a transient charring ablation solution, there are a total of \(K + 2\) nonlinear wall boundary conditions supplying, in effect, \(\rho_w v_w\) and thus \(f_w\) by means of Eq. (60)), \(H_{Tw}\) and \(K_{Kw}\). Therefore, although some of these boundary conditions become linear for simpler problems, they also must be considered as nonlinear for the general solution procedure. Solution for the wall boundary conditions for the fully coupled problem are discussed in Ref. 10. The wall conditions for two simpler problems are described herein.

In the case that the surface conditions are assigned a priori, these boundary conditions become particularly simple. For example, if \(\rho_w v_w\), \(H_{Tw}\) and \(K_{Kw}\) are assigned, the following recurrence formulas result:
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial (\rho_w v_w)^*}{\partial f_w} \Delta f_w &= - \text{ERROR} = - \left[ (\rho_w v_w)^* - (\rho_w v_w)^* \right]_{\text{actual}} m 
\Delta H_{T_w} &= - \text{ERROR} = - \left[ H_{T_w} - H_{T_w} \right]_{\text{actual}} m 
\Delta K_{N_w} &= - \text{ERROR} = - \left[ K_{N_w} - K_{N_w} \right]_{\text{actual}} m
\end{align*}

where from Eqs. (59) and (87) it follows that

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial (\rho_w v_w)^*}{\partial f_w} = -(1 + d_0)
\end{equation}

To illustrate a more complicated situation, consider the case of steady-state ablation of carbon. The appropriate wall boundary conditions (given by Eqs. (64) through (66)) yield the following recurrence formulas:

\begin{align*}
(p_w v_w)^* \Delta H_{T_w} + H_{T_w} \frac{\partial (\rho_w v_w)^*}{\partial f_w} \Delta f_w + \Delta q_{a_w}^* + \frac{4\sigma \epsilon_{w} T_w^3}{\alpha} \Delta T_w &= - \text{ERROR} \\
(p_w v_w)^* \Delta K_{C_w} + (K_{C_w} - 1) \frac{\partial (\rho_w v_w)^*}{\partial f_w} \Delta f_w + \Delta j_{C_w}^* &= - \text{ERROR} \\
(p_w v_w)^* \Delta K_{N_w} + K_{N_w} \frac{\partial (\rho_w v_w)^*}{\partial f_w} \Delta f_w + \Delta j_{N_w}^* &= - \text{ERROR} \\
\frac{1}{3} \Delta (ln P_{C_3}^w) - \frac{\partial K_{p_{eq}} (T_w)}{\partial T_w} \Delta T_w &= - \text{ERROR}
\end{align*}

where the ERRORS are given by the left-hand-sides of Eqs. (64) through (66), respectively, evaluated for the mth iteration, the \(\frac{\partial (\rho_w v_w)^*}{\partial f_w}\) is given by Eq. (145), the \(\Delta q_{a_w}^*\) and \(\Delta j_{C_w}^*\) are given by Eqs. (126) and (128), respectively, evaluated at the wall, and the \(\Delta T_w\) and \(\Delta (ln P_{C_3}^w)\) are reduced to the primary variables by use of Eq. (129).

In many problems it has not been necessary to consider all of the terms in all of the coefficients in the recurrence formulas. The retention of the
major terms has been seen generally to improve convergence and thereby reduce the number of iterations. However, overall computational time and storage requirements can be improved by dropping the lesser important terms. At present, the terms involving second derivatives and some of the lesser important terms involving first derivatives are excluded. Of course, the dismissal of terms from the recurrence formulas does not affect the accuracy of the final result as long as the ERRORS are evaluated precisely; rather, the errors are driven to zero along different paths.

The coefficients for the recurrence formulas for the Taylor series expansions (Eqs. (116) through (118)), the linear boundary conditions (Eqs. (119) through (123)), the $a_H$ constraint (Eq. (137)), the nonlinear edge boundary conditions (Eqs. (138) and (139)), and the boundary-layer equations (Eqs. (136)) evaluated for the $m$th iteration form a non-square matrix $[A]$ with $I = (7 + 3K)(N - 1) + 6 + 2K$ rows (the number of equations, excluding the nonlinear surface boundary conditions) and $J = (7 + 3K)N + 1$ columns (the number of correction variables). This matrix equation is given by

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
A
\end{bmatrix}_{I \times J}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta V
\end{bmatrix}_J
= -
\begin{bmatrix}
E
\end{bmatrix}_I
$$

(149)

where $\Delta V_j$ represents the correction on the $j$th primary variable ($\Delta f_1$, $\Delta f_2$, ..., $\Delta f_i$, etc.) and $E_i$ represents the error associated with the $i$th equation.

This matrix can be reduced such that all corrections are expressible in terms of $\Delta f_w$, $\Delta f_w'$, $\Delta H_T$, and $\Delta K_{kw}$. This approach makes it convenient to treat varied and complex surface boundary conditions. Any consistent set of surface boundary conditions can be added as an option with a minimum of program modification. The primary reason for this approach, however, was to improve the numerical stability if the boundary layer were to be iteratively coupled to a transient charring ablation solution procedure, by relegating the highly nonlinear surface boundary conditions to a subsidiary iteration with the charring ablation solution. The influence of the boundary layer would be contained in the reduced coefficients of the $\Delta f_w$, $\Delta H_T$, and $\Delta K_{kw}$ somewhat analogous to convective transfer coefficients.

The matrix $[A]$ is quite sparse (i.e., it contains many zeros) in an orderly way. Substantial savings in computation time and storage allocations can be realized if full advantage is taken of this ordered sparseness. This is extremely important since the solution of a boundary layer with several
The first step in the matrix solution procedure is to divide the equations into linear (symbol L) and nonlinear (symbol NL) sets, namely

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_L & \Delta V_{NL} \\ \Delta L & B_L \\ \Delta N_L & B_{NL} \end{bmatrix}_{i \times J} = - \begin{bmatrix} \Delta E_L \\ \Delta E_{NL} \end{bmatrix}_J \quad (150)$$

where for convenience the variables are also classified as "linear" and "nonlinear". The distribution into linear and nonlinear variables is somewhat arbitrary, but care must be taken that the square matrix $[AL]$ not be singular.

It has been found convenient to select the following linear corrections and to arrange them in the order as listed: $\Delta V_L (\Delta f_2, \Delta f_3, \ldots, \Delta f_n, \Delta f'_2, \ldots, \Delta f'_{n-1})$; $\Delta V_{NL} (\Delta H_{T2}, \Delta H_{T3}, \ldots, \Delta H_{Tn}, \Delta H_{w}, \Delta H_{H2}, \ldots, \Delta H_{Hn})$; and $K$ sets of $\Delta V_N (\Delta X_{H2}, \Delta X_{K2}, \Delta X_{K3}, \ldots, \Delta X_{Kn}, \Delta X_{Kw}, \Delta X_{K2}, \ldots, \Delta X_{Kn})$. The nonlinear corrections are conveniently arranged as follows: $\Delta V_{NL} (\Delta f'_{n}, \Delta f''_{w}, \Delta f''_{2}, \ldots, \Delta f''_{n})$; $\Delta V_{NL} (\Delta H_{T2}, \Delta H_{T3}, \ldots, \Delta H_{Tn}, \Delta H_{w}, \Delta H_{H2}, \ldots, \Delta H_{Hn})$; and $K$ sets of $\Delta V_{NL} (\Delta X_{H2}, \Delta X_{K2}, \Delta X_{K3}, \ldots, \Delta X_{Kn}, \Delta X_{Kw}, \Delta X_{K2}, \ldots, \Delta X_{Kn})$. Here the nodal stations are sequenced from 1 at the wall (subscript $w$) to $n$ at the outer edge of the boundary layer. The linear equations are conveniently sequenced as follows:

$\text{L}_F$ (linear boundary conditions and Taylor series expansions for $f$ and its first and second derivatives); $\text{L}_H$ (linear boundary conditions and Taylor series expansions for $H_T$ and $H_H$); and $K$ sets of $\text{L}_K$ (linear boundary conditions and Taylor series expansions for $X_H$ and $X_K$). The nonlinear equations are sequenced as follows: $\text{NL}_F$ (the momentum equation evaluated between each neighboring pair of nodal stations together with the two nonlinear boundary conditions and $a_H$ constraint); $\text{NL}_H$ (the energy equation evaluated between each neighboring pair of nodal stations); and $K$ sets of $\text{NL}_K$ (each of the elemental species equations evaluated between each neighboring pair of nodal stations). The form of the resulting matrix equation is shown in Figure 3. Here, for example, $[ANL_{PH}]$ and $[BNL_{PH}]$ are matrices representing the coefficients of the corrections $[\Delta V_L]$ and $[\Delta V_{NL}]$, respectively, arising from the nonlinear set of equations $\text{NL}_F$ with the corresponding errors given by the single column matrix $[ENL_F]$.

The first step in the matrix solution procedure is to invert the submatrices $[AL_{pp}]$ and to form the matrix products $[AL_{pp}]^{-1} [BL_{pp}]$ and $[AL_{pp}]^{-1} [EL_{p}]$ for $p = F, H$ and $K$. The former products have to be done only for $p = F$ and $H$ since the linear equations relating the $k$th elemental species would otherwise be very costly. For this reason, the matrix solution procedure will be discussed in some detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( A_{l_{FF}} )</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>( B_{l_{FF}} )</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>( V_{l_{P}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>( A_{l_{HH}} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( B_{l_{HH}} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{H}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K1}K1} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K1}K1} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{K1}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K2}K2} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K2}K2} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{K2}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K3}K3} )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K3}K3} )</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{K3}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( A_{l_{FF}} )</th>
<th>( A_{l_{PH}} )</th>
<th>( A_{l_{FK1}} )</th>
<th>( A_{l_{FK2}} )</th>
<th>( A_{l_{FK3}} )</th>
<th>( B_{l_{FF}} )</th>
<th>( B_{l_{PH}} )</th>
<th>( B_{l_{FK1}} )</th>
<th>( B_{l_{FK2}} )</th>
<th>( B_{l_{FK3}} )</th>
<th>( \Delta V_{l_{N1}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A_{l_{HH}} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{HK1}} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{HK2}} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{HK3}} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{HH}} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{HK1}} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{HK2}} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{HK3}} )</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{N1}} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_{l_{K1}K1} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K1}K1} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K1}K2} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K1}K3} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K1}K1} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K1}K2} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K1}K3} )</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{N1}} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_{l_{K2}K2} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K2}K1} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K2}K2} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K2}K3} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K2}K1} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K2}K2} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K2}K3} )</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{N1}} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_{l_{K3}K3} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K3}K1} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K3}K2} )</td>
<td>( A_{l_{K3}K3} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K3}K1} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K3}K2} )</td>
<td>( B_{l_{K3}K3} )</td>
<td>( \Delta V_{l_{N1}} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Schematic of Matrix Equation Relating the Newton-Raphson Corrections on the Primary Variables to the Errors for the \( m^{th} \) Iteration.
to its derivatives ($L_K$) have the same form as the linear equations relating total enthalpy and its derivatives ($L_H$). Furthermore, this has to be done only once for a given problem as the matrices $[AL_{pp}]$ and $[BL_{pp}]$ depend only upon the boundary layer $\eta$-spacing which can remain fixed as a consequence of the stretching parameter $\alpha_H$.

The linear corrections $[\Delta VL_p]$ can then be expressed in terms of the nonlinear corrections $[\Delta VNL_p]$ and the linear errors $[EL_p]$ as follows:

$$
[\Delta VL_p]_I = - [AL_{pp}]_{IxI}^{-1} [BL_{pp}]_{IxJ} [\Delta VNL_p]_J
+ [AL_{pp}]_{IxI}^{-1} [-EL_p]_I
$$

where $I = 3N - 2$ and $J = N + 3$ for $p = F$ and $I = 2N$ and $J = N$ for $p = H$ or $K$ with $N$ the number of nodal points in the boundary layer. These can be introduced into the nonlinear equations to yield the reduced problem:

$$
[\Delta VNL]_I = [ENL]_I
$$

where $I = (K + 2)(N - 1) + 3$, $J = (K + 2)N + 3$, and the coefficients in the matrix $[\Delta VNL]$ are given by

$$
BNL_{ij} = BNL_{ij} - \sum_{l=1}^{m} ANL_{i,l+r} \left\{ [AL_{pp}]_{l,s}^{-1} [BL_{pp}]_{l,s} \right\}_{l,s}
$$

where $p = F$, $m = 3N - 2$ and $r = s = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq (N + 3)$; $p = H$, $m = 2N$, $r = 3N - 2$ and $s = N + 3$ for $(N + 4) \leq j \leq (2N + 3)$; and $p = K$, $m = 2N$, $r = 3N - 2 + 2N$ and $s = 3 + N(K + 1)$ for $(K + 1)N + 4 \leq j \leq (K + 2)N + 3$ for the choice of linear and nonlinear corrections listed earlier. The coefficients in the $[ENL]$ matrix are given by

$$
ENL_{i} = - ENL_{i} - \sum_{p} \sum_{l=1}^{m} ANL_{i,l+r} \left\{ [AL_{pp}]_{l,s}^{-1} [-EL_{pp}]_{l,s} \right\}_{l,s}
$$

for $p = F$, $H$ and $K$ with the $m$ and $r$ having the same values as in Eq. (153) for each $p$. 
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Each time a coefficient in one of the original nonlinear equations (i.e., an $B_{Li}$ or a $BN_{Lij}$) is formed, its contribution to $\left[ B_{NL} \right]$ and $\left[ E_{NL} \right]$ can be computed. Thus, the rather large matrix $\left[ ANL \right]$ never has to be stored. In fact, it is highly significant that the only major blocks of coefficients which must be stored for the representation of all of the linear and nonlinear equations and for their solution are $\left[ B_{LF} \right]$ which is $3N - 2$ by $N + 3$, $\left[ BL_{HL} \right]$ which is $2N$ by $N$, and $\left[ BN_{L} \right]$ which is $\left( (K + 2)(N - 1) + 3 \right)$ by $\left( (K + 2)N + 3 \right)$ where $N$ is the number of nodal points and $K$ is one less than the number of elemental species. This should be contrasted with the size of the matrix of the complete set of linear and nonlinear equations which is $\left( (7 + 3K)N + 1 \right)$ square.

The matrix Eq. (142) is substantially reduced further as follows. First, the columns are rearranged so that the nonlinear corrections can be divided into two sets: $\Delta V_{NL_{a}}(\Delta T_{n}, \Delta f^{*}, \Delta f^{**}, \Delta f^{***}, \cdots, \Delta f^{***'}, \Delta H_{w}', \Delta H_{w}^{*'}, \cdots, \Delta H_{w}^{*''}, \Delta T_{w}^{*'}, \Delta T_{n-1}, \Delta T_{w}^{*}, \Delta f_{w}', \Delta H_{w}', \cdots, \Delta H_{k_{w}}^{*'})$ and $\Delta V_{NL_{b}}(\Delta f_{w}', \Delta H_{w}', \Delta T_{w})$. Eq. (152) can then be expressed as

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_{NL_{a}} & B_{NL_{b}} \end{bmatrix}_{I \times J} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_{NL_{a}} \\ \Delta V_{NL_{b}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{NL} \end{bmatrix}_{I}$$

where $\begin{bmatrix} B_{NL_{a}} \end{bmatrix}$ is a square matrix, being the coefficients of the $I$ corrections $\begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_{NL_{a}} \end{bmatrix}$, with $I = (K + 2)(N - 1) + 3$ and $J = (K + 2)N + 3$. Utilizing the same matrix reduction procedure employed previously (in going from Eq. (150) to Eq. (152)), the $\begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_{NL_{a}} \end{bmatrix}$ can be expressed in terms of the reduced set of corrections $\begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_{NL_{b}} \end{bmatrix}$ as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_{NL_{a}} \end{bmatrix}_{I} = -\begin{bmatrix} B_{NL_{a}} \end{bmatrix}_{I \times I}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_{NL_{b}} \end{bmatrix}_{I \times J} \begin{bmatrix} B_{NL_{b}} \end{bmatrix}_{I \times J}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} E_{NL} \end{bmatrix}_{I}$$

where $I = (K + 2)(N - 1) + 3$ and $J = K + 2$.

The reduced set of nonlinear corrections $\begin{bmatrix} \Delta V_{NL_{b}} \end{bmatrix} (\Delta f_{w}', \Delta H_{w}', \Delta T_{w})$ are obtained from a consideration of the nonlinear wall boundary conditions.
Once these are determined, the remaining nonlinear corrections \([\Delta VNL_a]\) are obtained directly by use of Eq. (156). The linear corrections \([\Delta VL_p]\) are then calculated using Eq. (151). These linear and nonlinear corrections are then added to the corresponding primary variables in accordance with Eq. (115), thus completing the \(m\)th iteration. The magnitude of the errors are checked and the procedure advances into the \(m+1\)th iteration if the absolute errors exceed prescribed upper limits. If not, the iteration is completed for the current value of the streamwise position \(\xi\) and time \(t\).

Recurrence formulas for nonlinear wall boundary conditions are given by Eqs. (142) through (144) for assigned \(P_w V_w, H_{Tw}\) and \(K_{kw}\), by Eqs. (146) through (148) for steady-state carbon ablation, or can be obtained from any other consistent wall boundary condition. It is apparent that these equations must be expressed in terms of the \([\Delta VNL_b]\). When \(P_w V_w\) (or \(f_w\)), \(H_{Tw}\) (or \(T_w\)), and the \(K_{kw}\) are assigned, the \([\Delta VNL_b]\) are given directly (e.g., Eqs. (142) through (144)). However, when fluxes are assigned or mass and/or energy balances are required, the \(\Delta k_w\) and/or \(\Delta q_w\) (given by Eqs. (128) and (126), respectively, evaluated at the wall) are functions of \([\Delta VL]\) and \([\Delta VNL_a]\) as well as \([\Delta VNL_b]\). That is

\[
\Delta FLUX_i = \sum_j \frac{\partial FLUX_i}{\partial VL_j} \Delta VL_j + \sum_j \frac{\partial FLUX_i}{\partial VNL_{a_j}} \Delta VNL_{a_j} + \sum_j \frac{\partial FLUX_i}{\partial VNL_{b_j}} \Delta VNL_{b_j}
\]

(157)

where \(FLUX_i\) can be \(j_{kw}\) and/or \(q_{aw}\) and the summations are performed over linear and nonlinear variables with nonzero coefficients. The \([\Delta VL]\) and \([\Delta VNL_a]\) can be eliminated from these relations by making use of Eqs. (151) and (156). For this purpose it is convenient to look upon Eqs. (157) as additional nonlinear equations in the matrix Eq. (150):

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta FLUX_i \\
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
AF & BF
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta VL \\
\Delta VNL_j
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(157a)

where \(I\) is the number of flux equations of concern, \(J = (7 + 3K)N + 1\), \(AF_{ij} = \frac{\partial FLUX_i}{\partial VL_j}\) and \(BF_{ij} = \frac{\partial FLUX_i}{\partial VNL_j}\). First, Eq. (151) is utilized to eliminate the \([\Delta VL]\) from Eq. (157), yielding the result

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta FLUX_i \\
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
BF
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Delta VNL_j
\end{bmatrix}
- \begin{bmatrix}
EF
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(158)
where $I$ is the number of flux equations, $J = (K + 2)N + 3$ (the number of nonlinear variables), and the coefficients are given by

\[
BF_{ij} = BF_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{m} AF_{i,k+r} \left( AL_{pp}^{-1} BL_{pp} \right)_{k,j-s} \tag{159}
\]

\[
EF_{i} = -\sum_{p} \sum_{k=1}^{m} AF_{i,k+r} \left( AL_{pp}^{-1} - BL_{pp} \right)_{k} \tag{160}
\]

where the subscripts are the same as those defined after Eqs. (153) and (154). Next, Eq. (158) is rearranged as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\DeltaFLUX \\
\end{bmatrix}_{I} = \begin{bmatrix}
BF_{a} & BF_{b}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\DeltaVNL_{a} \\
\DeltaVNL_{b}
\end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix}
EF_{a} \\
EF_{b}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{161}
\]

Equation (156) is then used to eliminate the $\DeltaVNL_{a}$ from Eq. (161), yielding

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\DeltaFLUX \\
\end{bmatrix}_{I} = \begin{bmatrix}
BF_{b}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\DeltaVNL_{b}
\end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix}
EF_{b}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{162}
\]

where $I$ is the number of flux equations, $J = K + 2$, and the coefficients are given by

\[
BF_{bij} = BF_{bij} - \sum_{k=1}^{m} BF_{a_{kil}} \left( BNL_{a}^{-1} BNL_{b} \right)_{k} \tag{163}
\]

\[
EF_{i} = EF_{i} - \sum_{k=1}^{m} BF_{a_{kil}} \left( BNL_{a}^{-1} ENL \right)_{k} \tag{164}
\]

with $m = (K + 2)(N - 1) + 3$. For clarity, it can be seen that the matrix Eq. (162) is equivalent to
where the coefficients are constants during the \( m \)th iteration. Thus, corrections in the wall fluxes have been reduced to linear functions of corrections in wall state and total mass flux into the boundary layer (utilizing Eq. (145) and noting that \( H_{T_w} = H_w \)).

Equations (162) can be substituted into the recurrence formulas for the energy and mass balances (e.g., Eqs. (146) and (147)) for steady-state carbon ablation. The resulting equations together with the additional recurrence formula(s) for the nonlinear wall boundary conditions yield the following matrix equation:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
C \\
I 	imes I
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\DeltaVN_L \\
I
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
D \\
I
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(165)

where \( I = K + 2 \). The \( \DeltaVN_L \) are then determined by matrix inversion

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\DeltaVN_L \\
I
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
C \\
I 	imes I
\end{bmatrix}^{-1}
\begin{bmatrix}
D \\
I
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(166)

It should be noted that the time required to invert this matrix is trivial. The time-consuming inversion is that of \( \begin{bmatrix} BNL_a \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \), required for Eqs. (156), (163) and (164), which has the dimension \( (K + 2)(N - 1) + 3 \).

In this section the Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas for the linear and nonlinear equations have been developed. An efficient method for solving these equations has been outlined. The analysis is completed for the case of a boundary layer coupled to steady-state mass and energy balances. The procedure utilized for coupling to a transient solution for internal conduction is described in Ref. 10.
The equations presented in Section 3 have been programmed in Fortran IV utilizing the numerical procedure described in Sections 4 and 5. Solutions have been compared to available results for several incompressible and compressible single-component boundary-layer problems as tests of the accuracy and convergence of the procedure. It has been seen that reasonably accurate results can be obtained with as few as five nodal points (the wall, three internal points, and the boundary-layer edge) and that three to four place accuracy can generally be obtained with seven points, although about 11 points have been required for some severe tests to obtain this level of accuracy. Convergence has been consistently satisfactory, four or five iterations being required for a starting solution and three iterations generally being adequate for subsequent (downstream) solutions. Some typical convergence and accuracy checks are presented in this section.

Typical convergence of a velocity profile in an incompressible similar boundary layer with adverse pressure gradient is shown in Fig. 4 in terms of the conventional* Levy-Lees transverse coordinate. Starting with an assumed linear profile, the first iteration established the basic shape of the profile, the second iteration brought the solution within two to three percent, and the third iteration yielded results which were converged to three significant figures and compared favorably with the tabulated results of Loitsianskii.26

Validity checks for the nonsimilar incompressible boundary-layer problems of uniform blowing and uniform suction on a flat plate are presented in Fig.5. The wall shear function, \( f'_w \), for these two cases is shown in Fig. 5(a) in terms of the stream function at the wall, \( f_w \).** The solution of Lew and Fanucci27 is shown for comparison. Convergence required about three iterations at each streamwise station. Profiles of velocity ratio, \( f' \), and shear function, \( f'' \), are presented in Figs. 5(b) and 5(c). It is of interest that both blowing and

---

*The normalizing parameter \( \alpha_H \) has been removed from \( \eta \) subsequent to the calculations in the accuracy checks presented in this section.

**It should be noted that \( f'_w \) is zero at the leading edge of the plate, increasing with streamwise dimension for the case of suction and decreasing with streamwise dimension for the case of blowing.
Figure 4. Iteration History for a Similar Incompressible Boundary-Layer Solution Near Separation ($\beta = -0.19$, Separation at -0.1988)
Figure 5. Solutions for Incompressible Uniform Blowing and Uniform Suction on a Flat Plate.
(b) Velocity Profiles

Figure 5. Continued
\( f'' = 5.217 \) at \( \eta = 0 \)

DATA POINTS FROM 7 POINT INTEGRAL MATRIX SOLUTIONS

UNIFORM BLOWING \( f_w \)
- \( \bigcirc -0.4142 \)
- \( \square -0.2929 \)

UNIFORM SUCTION
- \( \bigtriangleup 2.62 \)
- \( \bigtriangledown 0.3587 \)

BLASIUS SOLUTION
- \( \bigtriangleup 0.0 \)

(c) Shear Function Profiles

Figure 5. Concluded
suction results were efficiently obtained with the same spacings, in spite of a ten-fold variation in boundary-layer thickness, by the use of the coordinate stretching parameter, $\alpha_H$, introduced in Section 3.

The wall shear function for uniform blowing into an incompressible boundary layer is presented in Fig. 6 as a function of streamwise distance for a pressure of 1 atmosphere, temperature of $2000^\circ R$, and mass injection rate of $0.005$ lb/sec ft$^2$. Results are also shown for the case where blowing is terminated at a streamwise position of 2 feet. It may be of interest to note that the nonsimilar effect of upstream transpiration decays quite rapidly, but that some influence persists for an appreciable distance downstream.

Velocity profiles, shear function profiles, and maps of enthalpy ratio versus velocity ratio are presented in Fig. 7 for incompressible and compressible similar boundary layers with Prandtl number of unity and various positive and negative pressure gradients and wall-to-edge enthalpy ratios. The results compare favorably with those of Hartree$^{28}$ and Cohen and Reshotko$^{29}$. These results were obtained with a 7-point nodal network. Two to five (generally three) iterations were required for each problem, where the previous result was in each case employed as a first guess.

Calculations were made for several single-component compressible boundary layers with variable properties corresponding to that of air at moderate temperatures ($\lambda = T^{0.85}$, $C_p = T^{0.19}$, $\mu = T^{0.70}$ and $Pr = 0.7$) for various values of $\beta$, $H_T/H_w$, and $u_e^2/2H_T$. As an example, profiles of velocity ratio, shear function, and temperature are presented in Fig. 8 for $P = 1$ atm, $T_w = 1200^\circ R$, $H_T/H_w = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0$ for several values of $u_e^2/2H_T$. Convergence was similar to that obtained in the Cohen and Reshotko comparisons.

As an example of a nonsimilar compressible boundary-layer solution, results are compared in Fig. 9 to results obtained at the NASA Ames Research Laboratory with the Smith and Clutter finite-difference procedure$^5$ for the problem of Mach 10.4 flow over a $7\frac{1}{2}$ degree cone with uniform injection downstream of the 0.1574 foot station. The wall shear is compared in Fig. 9(a) whereas representative velocity profiles are compared in Fig. 9(b). The results agree to nearly four significant figures for the similar no-blowing solution and the first few stations downstream of the point where mass injection is initiated. Further downstream, the results are still in reasonably good agreement, considering the $\xi$-derivatives and possibly the $f_w$ and $\xi$ are computed somewhat differently by the two methods. The present results were invariant with streamwise spacing. The effect of nodal distribution across the boundary layer was not investigated. The effect of streamwise step size on Smith and Clutter results was not available. The first solution required 4 iterations, whereas the downstream stations, including those near the
Figure 6. Effect on Wall Shear of Upstream Air-to-Air Injection on a Flat Plate

Air injection rate = 0.305 lb/sec ft²
Pressure = 1 atm
Temperature = 2000°F (constant)
Edge velocity ≈ 0

Air injection terminated at 2.0 ft
Air injection continued
Figure 7. Solutions for Similar Compressible Boundary Layers with Prandtl Number of Unity for Several Values of $\beta$ and Wall-to-Edge Enthalpy Ratios.
SHEAR PROFILES FOR SEVERAL SIMILAR COMPRESSIBLE BOUNDARY LAYERS

EXACT SOLUTIONS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>S_w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Shear Function Profiles

Figure 7. Continued
Fig. 7(c) Enthalpy Profiles

(c) Enthalpy Profiles

Figure 7. Concluded
Figure 8. Profiles of Velocity Ratio, Shear Function and Temperature for Variable-Property Air Boundary Layers for Various Values of Edge Kinetic Energy
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Figure 9. Air-to-Air Transpiration into a Compressible Boundary Layer over a 7.5° Cone with an Impermeable Sharp Nose Tip
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Figure 9. Concluded
the zero wall-shear condition, required three iterations each. The entire solution was generated in 45 seconds on the IBM 7094 computer, an order of magnitude less than the results obtained with the Smith and Clutter procedure. The stability of the present procedure is indicated by the fact that no difficulty was incurred in obtaining solutions down to the zero-shear condition.

In order to gain some confidence in the ability of the solution procedure to compute physical boundary-layer thickness, results were correlated with experimental data reported by Watson et al.\textsuperscript{30} for laminar shock interaction over a flat surface. A velocity profile is presented in Fig. 10. The correlation is good with the exception of values near the wall where it is reasonable to expect some experimental error due to probe-shock interaction.

Results were obtained for a boundary layer in a fictitious gas with rapidly varying properties (e.g., Prandtl number variation from 0.6 to 10 across the boundary layer) in order to study convergence in an extreme situation. A converged solution was obtained in 7 iterations, starting with the usual, uninspired, built-in first guesses.

The problem shown in Fig. 8 (where Mach number effects were investigated) with moderately varying properties and the problem of rapidly varying properties were repeated with various partial derivatives which are used in the iteration process but do not appear in the boundary-layer equations (such as \( \partial \text{Pr}/\partial h \) and \( \partial C/\partial h \)) set equal to zero. In the former case, the total number of iterations was increased by two for the entire set of five solutions. In the more severe case, 11 iterations were required (whereas 7 were required previously). The final results, of course, were unaffected.

SECTION 7
SOME RESULTS FOR MULTICOMPONENT BOUNDARY LAYERS

To date no accuracy studies have been performed for multicomponent chemically-reacting boundary-layer problems. However, convergence has consistently been satisfactory. To illustrate, an iteration history is given in Table IV for graphite ablation in air. In this problem, the ablation rate was assigned and surface temperature was determined by a coupled mass balance at the surface together with heterogeneous equilibrium. Considering that the initial guesses for velocity ratio, total enthalpy, and elemental mass fractions are built-in, linear profiles with respect to \( \eta \), and that there are no constraints on the size of the corrections, convergence such as that shown in Table IV is highly encouraging. Furthermore, it is significant that
Figure 10. Laminar Interaction on a Flat Surface: $M_x = 10.5$ $T_w = 535^\circ R$
this convergence has been obtained while ignoring all second derivatives and some first derivatives in the iteration process.

TABLE IV
CONVERGENCE FOR A TYPICAL GRAPHITE-IN-AIR ABLATION PROBLEM
(Assigned Ablation Rate, Surface Conditions Determined by Coupled Mass Balance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Normalized Wall Enthalpy, Btu/Lb</th>
<th>Wall Temperature, °R</th>
<th>Momentum Equation</th>
<th>Energy Equation</th>
<th>Elemental Species Equations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3135</td>
<td>-223.0</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1727</td>
<td>-804.0</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1628</td>
<td>-795.2</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1670</td>
<td>-794.2</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1670</td>
<td>-794.3</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>6.9 x 10^-4</td>
<td>1.9 x 10^-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A relative error of 1 x 10^-3 corresponds to nominal 4-place accuracy

Boundary-layer profiles of velocity ratio, temperature, and elemental mass fractions are presented in Table V for an air boundary layer over a flat plate with unequal diffusion coefficients for all species, with and without thermal diffusion. Mole fractions are presented graphically in Fig. 11. For assumed equal diffusion coefficients and in the absence of thermal diffusion, the elemental mass fractions remain constant across the boundary layer at the assigned edge values of 0.23 and 0.77 for oxygen and nitrogen, respectively. Consideration of unequal diffusion coefficients for all species is thus seen to have a substantial effect on elemental mass fractions. With unequal diffusion, the elemental mass fraction of oxygen first decreases slightly and then rises to a maximum value of 0.2723 at the wall. When thermal diffusion is also taken into consideration, the elemental mass fraction at the wall is decreased slightly to a wall value of 0.2709. These wall values of elemental mass fractions necessary to maintain zero mass flux at the wall are analogous to the adiabatic wall temperature for zero heat flux at the wall.
Figure 11. Multicomponent Air Boundary Layer Over a Flat Plate:
\( P = 1 \text{ atm}, H_{Te} = 5000 \text{ Btu/lb}, T_w = 5000^\circ \text{R}, s = 1 \text{ foot} \)
TABLE V
AIR BOUNDARY LAYER OVER A FLAT PLATE
WITH UNEQUAL DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS:
\( P = 1 \text{ atm}, H_e = 5000 \text{ Btu/ib}, T_w = 5000^\circ R, s = 1 \text{ foot} \)

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
\eta & y, \text{ft} & u/u_e & R_0 & R_N & T,^\circ R \\
\hline
0 & 0 & 0 & 0.2723 & 0.7277 & 4000 \\
0.584 & 0.0075 & 0.1889 & 0.2626 & 0.7374 & 5355 \\
1.168 & 0.0171 & 0.4044 & 0.2475 & 0.7525 & 6165 \\
1.752 & 0.0284 & 0.6148 & 0.2308 & 0.7692 & 6861 \\
2.336 & 0.0418 & 0.8000 & 0.2239 & 0.7761 & 7722 \\
3.504 & 0.0735 & 0.9699 & 0.2269 & 0.7731 & 8892 \\
5.840 & 0.1427 & 1.0000 & 0.2300 & 0.7700 & 9204 \\
\end{array} \]

Thermal diffusion neglected

This effect could be significant in ablation problems since substantially more oxygen is available at the wall for reaction. Therefore, it is pertinent to investigate the cause of the observed behavior. As a consequence of the lower dissociation temperature of \( O_2 \) relative to \( N_2 \), the oxygen is almost completely dissociated into the relatively more mobile atomic oxygen at the edge of the boundary layer, whereas the nitrogen is only slightly dissociated (see Fig. 11). Moving from the boundary-layer edge toward the wall, the nitrogen recombines more readily than the oxygen. As a consequence, the gradient in the atomic nitrogen concentration, although small, is greater than that for atomic oxygen until an \( \eta \) of 2.5 or so is reached. Thus there is a small net flux of nitrogen inward from the boundary-layer edge with a consequential small decrease in oxygen elemental composition. Closer to the wall, substantial recombination of the oxygen occurs, producing a large gradient in atomic oxygen concentration and thus a flux of oxygen toward the wall.
Thermal diffusion produces a small effect in the present problem since temperature gradients are relatively small. Calculations performed at high edge enthalpies have shown large thermal diffusion effects, as a consequence of the larger temperature gradients, resulting in wall oxygen concentrations below edge values.

Profiles of velocity ratio, temperature, shear function, and mole fractions across a boundary layer into which a large quantity of Apollo heat-shield material is being injected are presented in Fig. 12. These results were obtained for an assigned surface temperature and assigned component fluxes \( \dot{m}_g \) and \( \dot{m}_c \) and utilized a 30-component chemical model. A converged solution was obtained in 7 iterations, starting with an air boundary-layer solution with the same wall temperature and same edge conditions but with no mass injection. The convergence histories of the wall shear function and maximum relative errors are presented in Table VI. In this calculation, the corrections in the elemental species equations were not allowed to exceed 0.30.

### Table VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Normalized Wall Shear</th>
<th>Maximum Relative Errors* In:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Momentum Equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy Equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elemental Species Equations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Guess</td>
<td>.2007</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0883</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1343</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1016</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0995</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.0987</td>
<td>1.4 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.0987</td>
<td>4.8 x 10^{-5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0987</td>
<td>2.6 x 10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maximum relative errors refer to agreement with assigned surface temperature and component fluxes.

The nonsimilar boundary layer around a sphere-cone reentry body with water injection was studied to determine the injection rates required around the body to maintain a uniform wall temperature of 5000°R. A 16-component chemical model was employed in these calculations. The distribution of water
Figure 12. Boundary-Layer Profiles Over the Apollo Heat-Shield Material: Assigned Wall Temperature and Component Mass Fluxes ($\dot{m}_g$ and $\dot{m}_c$)

(a) Velocity Ratio, Temperature, and Shear Function
Solution obtained with 7-point integral matrix procedure

Additional species taken into consideration:
O₂, H₂O, NO, OH, HCO, CH₃, CH₄, C₂N₂, C₃, SiH, SiO₂, Si₂, CN, CO₂, SiO₂(s), SiC(s), C(s)

(b) Mole Fractions

Figure 12. Concluded
injection rates and the distribution of velocity profiles around the body are presented in Figs. 13(a) and (b), respectively. These solutions, which included evaluation of edge conditions, a similar solution at the stagnation point, and nonsimilar solutions at ten additional stations, were obtained in approximately 2.5 minutes on an IBM 7094 computer. Approximately 60 percent of this time was spent in the equilibrium chemistry subroutines. It is thus pertinent to mention that the total computational time could be substantially reduced by the use of a specialized chemical procedure for the particular system of interest. Also, substantial time was spent in tape operation introduced by the use of overlays.
Figure 13. Nonsimilar Boundary Layer Around a Sphere-Cone Reentry Body With Water Injection to Maintain a Wall Temperature of 5000°F
(b) Velocity Profiles

Figure 13. Concluded
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APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION OF THE APPROXIMATION FOR MULTICOMPONENT THERMAL DIFFUSION COEFFICIENTS INTO DIFFUSIVE FLUX RELATIONS

In this appendix the approximation for multicomponent thermal diffusion coefficients is introduced into the expression for diffusive mass flux of species \( i \), diffusive mass flux of element \( k \), and diffusive heat flux.

The diffusive flux of species \( i \) in a multicomponent gas incorporating the bifurcation approximation for binary diffusion coefficients can be expressed as Eq. (23):

\[
j_i = - \left\{ \frac{\rho D_{ii}^T}{\mu_1} \left[ \frac{\partial Z_i}{\partial y} + (Z_i - K_i) \frac{\partial \ln \mu_2}{\partial y} \right] + D_i \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial y} \right\}
\]

(A-1)

when the diffusion factors, \( F_i \), are considered to be invariant with temperature. Introducing the approximation for multicomponent thermal diffusion coefficients (Eq. (26))

\[
D_i \approx \frac{C_T \rho D_{ii}^T}{\mu_1} (Z_i - K_i)
\]

(A-2)

into Eq. (A-1) yields

\[
j_i = - \frac{\rho D_{ii}^T}{\mu_1} \left[ \frac{\partial Z_i}{\partial y} + (Z_i - K_i) \frac{\partial \ln \mu_2}{\partial y} + C_T \frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial y} \right]
\]

(A-3)

or, equivalently,

\[
j_i = - \frac{\rho D_{ii}^T}{\mu_1} \left[ \frac{\partial Z_i}{\partial y} + (Z_i - K_i) \frac{\partial \ln (\mu_2 C_T)}{\partial y} \right]
\]

(A-4)

which is the desired form for the diffusive flux of species \( i \) including the approximation for unequal diffusion coefficients embodied in Eq. (26).
Likewise, the diffusive mass flux of element $k$ is given by

$$j_k = -\left\{ \frac{\rho \overline{D}_{12}}{\mu_1 \mu_2} \left[ \frac{\partial Z_k}{\partial y} + (Z_k - \overline{Z}_k) \frac{\partial \ln \mu_2}{\partial y} \right] + \overline{D}_k \; ^T \; \frac{\partial \ln \; ^T}{\partial y} \right\} \quad (A-5)$$

where

$$\overline{D}_k \; ^T = \sum_{i} a_{ki} D_{i1} \quad (A-6)$$

Substituting Eq. (A-2) into Eq. (A-6) produces

$$\overline{D}_k \; ^T = \frac{c_t \rho \overline{D}_{12}}{\mu_1 \mu_2} \sum_{i} a_{ki} (Z_i - K_i) \quad (A-7)$$

or by the definitions of Eqs. (16) and (25a)

$$\overline{D}_k \; ^T = \frac{c_t \rho \overline{D}_{12}}{\mu_1 \mu_2} (Z_k - \overline{Z}_k) \quad (A-8)$$

The elemental diffusive flux can thus be expressed as

$$j_k = -\frac{\rho \overline{D}_{12}}{\mu_1 \mu_2} \left[ \frac{\partial Z_k}{\partial y} + (Z_k - \overline{Z}_k) \frac{\partial \ln \mu_2}{\partial y} \right] \quad (A-9)$$
The diffusive heat flux can be written as

\[ q_a = - \left\{ \rho (c_M + \nu) \frac{\partial \left( u_+ / 2 \right)}{\partial y} \right\} \]

\[ + (\lambda + \rho e H e_C) \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} + \sum_i \left( \rho e D_i \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y} - j_i \right) h_i - S \]  \(\text{(A-10)}\)

where

\[ S = \frac{RT}{\rho} \sum_i \sum_j x_i D_i \frac{T}{m_i} \beta_{ij} \left( j_i - j_j \right) \left( \frac{K_i}{K_j} \right) \]  \(\text{(A-11)}\)

Substituting for \( D_i T \) and \( \beta_{ij} \), the term \( S \) becomes

\[ S = \frac{c_t R T u_2}{\mu_1 m} \sum_i \sum_j \frac{F_i x_i}{m_i} \left( z_i - K_i \right) \left( \frac{K_i}{K_j} \right) \]  \(\text{(A-12)}\)

Replacing the mole fraction \( x_j \) by \( \frac{m K_j}{m_j} \) and utilizing the definition \( z_i = \frac{m K_i}{F_i \mu_2} \), \( S \) becomes

\[ S = \frac{c_t R T u_2}{\mu_1 m} \sum_i \sum_j \frac{K_i F_i}{m_j} \frac{F_i}{m_i} \left( \frac{m}{\mu_2 F_i} \right) \left( j_i - \frac{K_i}{K_j} j_j \right) \]  \(\text{(A-13)}\)

Expanding

\[ S = \frac{c_t R T u_2}{\mu_1} \left[ \frac{m}{\mu_2} \sum_i \sum_j \frac{K_i F_i}{m_j} \frac{j_i}{m_i} - \sum_i \sum_j \frac{K_i F_i}{m_j} \frac{F_i j_i}{m_i} \right. \]

\[ - \frac{m}{\mu_2} \sum_i \sum_j \frac{K_i F_i}{m_j} \frac{j_i}{m_i} + \sum_i \sum_j \frac{K_i F_i}{m_j} \frac{F_i j_i}{m_i} \]  \(\text{(A-14)}\)
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The second and fourth terms are identical upon interchange of subscripts but of opposite sign and hence cancel each other. Utilizing $1/m = \sum K_i/m_i$ and the definition of $\mu_1 = \sum x_i F_i$, $S$ becomes

$$S = \frac{c_TRT}{\mu_1} \left[ \frac{\mu_1}{m} \sum_i \frac{j_i}{m_i} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \frac{j_i F_i}{m_i} \right] \quad (A-15)$$

Rearranging

$$S = c_TRT \sum_i \frac{j_i}{m_i} \left( 1 - \frac{F_i}{\mu_1} \right) \quad (A-16)$$

Substituting Eqs. (A-4) and (A-16) into Eq. (A-10), the expression for diffusive heat flux becomes

$$q_a = -\left\{ \rho (c_M + \nu) \frac{\partial (u^2/2)}{\partial y} + (\lambda + \rho c_H \theta_p) \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right. + \rho c_D \sum_i h_i \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y} + \frac{\rho D_{12}}{\mu_1 m} \sum_i \left[ \frac{\partial Z_i}{\partial y} + (Z_i - K_i) \frac{\partial \ln (\mu_2 c_T)}{\partial y} \right] \times$$

$$\left. \times \left[ h_i + \frac{c_TRT}{\mu_1 m_i} (\mu_1 - F_i) \right] \right\} \quad (A-17)$$

Now

$$\sum_i h_i \frac{\partial K_i}{\partial y} = \sum_i \frac{\partial (K_i h_i)}{\partial y} - \sum_i K_i \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial y} \quad (A-18)$$

$$= \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \sum_i K_i h_i \right) - \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \sum_i K_i C_{pi}$$

$$= \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} - \bar{c} \rho_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \quad (A-18)$$
Utilizing this and eliminating all summations in favor of defined system quantities yields the following result for \( q_a \)

\[
q_a = - \left\{ \rho (c_M + v) \frac{\partial (u^2/2)}{\partial y} + (\lambda + \rho c_{\infty} C_p) \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} + \rho c_D \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right) + \frac{\rho E}{\mu_1^2 m} \left[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} - \left( \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} + \frac{c_t^2 R}{\mu_1^2} \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} + c_t RT \frac{\partial \mu_3}{\partial y} \right] \right\} + \left( \bar{h} - h + c_t R \mu_3 \right) \frac{\partial \ln \left( \mu_2^2 \frac{c_t}{c_p} \right)}{\partial y}
\]

(A-19)

where \( \mu_2 = \sum \frac{m_i x_i}{F_i} \), \( \mu_3 = \sum \frac{z_i}{m_i} \), \( \bar{h} = \sum z_i h_i \), and \( \bar{c}_p = \sum z_i c_{p_i} \).
APPENDIX B
DERIVATION OF THE TRANSFORMED NONSIMILAR LAMINAR BOUNDARY-LAYER EQUATIONS

In this appendix, transformation relationships for the Levy-Lees transformation, modified by the use of a stretching parameter, are developed and applied to the expressions for diffusive fluxes and to the boundary-layer conservation equations.

The desired independent variables \( \xi \) and \( \eta \) are defined by Eq. (33)

\[
\xi = \xi \quad \eta = \eta \quad = \frac{a_H}{a_H} \quad (B-1)
\]

where \( a_H \) is a function of \( \xi \) only, and

\[
\xi = \int_{-\infty}^{s} u e^{e_{-\infty}^{2k}} ds \quad (B-2)
\]

\[
\eta = \frac{r_{0} u e_{-\infty}^{2k}}{(2\xi)^{2}\int_{-\infty}^{u e_{-\infty}^{2k}} \rho dy} \quad (B-3)
\]

In addition, \( f \) is defined as Eq. (35)

\[
f - f_{w} = \int_{-\infty}^{u e_{-\infty}^{2k}} d\eta \quad (B-4)
\]

from which it follows that \( f' = u/u_{e} \) where the prime refers to partial differentiation with respect to \( \eta \).

The old partial derivatives can be expressed in terms of the new partials by

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \big|_{Y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \big|_{\eta} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \big|_{\xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \big|_{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \big|_{\eta} \quad (B-5)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \big|_{s} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \big|_{\eta} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \big|_{\xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \big|_{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \big|_{\eta} \quad (B-6)
\]

where

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \big|_{s} = 0 \quad (B-7)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \big|_{Y} = \rho_{e} u_{e} e_{-\infty}^{2k} \quad (B-8)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \big|_{s} = \frac{u_{e} e_{-\infty}^{2k} \rho}{(2\xi)^{2}} \quad (B-9)
\]
Furthermore

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} |_{\eta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} |_{\eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} |_{\eta} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} |_{\xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} |_{\eta} \tag{B-10}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} |_{\eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} |_{\eta} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} |_{\xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} |_{\eta} \tag{B-11}
\]

where

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} |_{\eta} = 1 \tag{B-12}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial ^2 \eta}{\partial \xi^2} |_{\eta} = -\frac{1}{a_H} \frac{d a_H}{d \xi} \tag{B-13}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} |_{\xi} = 0 \tag{B-14}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} = \frac{1}{a_H} \tag{B-15}
\]

such that

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} |_{\eta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} |_{\eta} - \left( \frac{1}{a_H} \frac{d a_H}{d \xi} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} \tag{B-16}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} |_{\xi} = \frac{1}{a_H} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} |_{\xi} \tag{B-17}
\]

It is necessary to evaluate the operator \( D(\ ) \) given by

\[
D(\ ) = \rho u \frac{\partial (\ )}{\partial s} + \sigma v \frac{\partial (\ )}{\partial y} \tag{B-18}
\]
The global mass conservation equation (Eq. (3)) can be integrated to yield

\[ \rho v - \rho_w v_w = -\frac{1}{r_o^\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left[ r_o^\xi \rho u dy \right] \]  

(B-19)

Differentiating \( \eta \) for constant \( \xi \), introducing \( f' \), solving for \( (2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} f' d\eta \), and integrating yields the result:

\[ (2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\eta}^{\eta} f' d\eta = r_o^\xi \int_{\eta}^{Y} \rho u dy \]  

(B-20)

Utilizing this and the definition of \( f \), Equation (B-19) can be written as

\[ \rho v = \rho_w v_w - \frac{1}{r_o^\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left[ (2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} (f - f_w) \right] \]  

(B-21)

With Eqs. (B-5) and (B-8), Eq. (21) becomes

\[ \rho v = \rho_w v_w - \rho e u e r_o^\xi \left[ (2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} (f - f_w) \right] - \frac{f^'}{r_o^\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left|_Y^\eta \right| \]  

(B-22)

Performing the differentiation

\[ \rho v = \rho_w v_w - \rho e u e r_o^\xi \left[ \frac{(f - f_w)}{(2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + (2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \frac{\partial f_w}{\partial \xi} - \frac{df_w}{d\xi} \right| \right] - \frac{f^'}{r_o^\xi} (2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left|_Y^\eta \right| \]  

(B-23)

For convenience, define

\[ \rho_w v_w = -\frac{\rho e u e r_o^\xi}{(2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left[ f_w + 2\xi \frac{df_w}{d\xi} \right] \]  

(B-24)

Then

\[ \rho v = -\frac{\rho e u e r_o^\xi}{(2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left[ f + (2\xi) \frac{\partial f_w}{\partial s} \right] - \frac{f^'}{r_o^\xi} (2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left|_Y^\eta \right| \]  

(B-25)
Utilizing this, plus Equations (B-5) through (B-9)

\[ \rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left[ \mu \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) \right] - \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} \quad (B-31) \]

which is the desired form for the operator.

In accordance with Equation (B-24), the use of this operator requires that \( f_w \) be defined as

\[ f_w = - (2\xi)^{-1} \int_{0}^{\xi} \frac{\rho_{w} V_{w} d\xi}{\rho e u_{e} e_{o}^{2k}} \quad (B-27) \]

The diffusive flux of species \( i \) is given by Eq. (27)

\[ j_i = - \frac{\bar{D}}{\mu_2} \left[ \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial y} + (z_i - K_i) \frac{\partial \ln \left( \frac{\mu_2 T^c}{\kappa} \right)}{\partial y} \right] \quad (B-28) \]

Applying the transformation of Eq. (B-6) with the aid of Eqs. (B-7) and (B-9) yields

\[ j_i = \frac{\rho e u_{e} e_{o}^{2k}}{\sqrt{2\xi}} \left( \frac{C}{\beta} \left[ z_i' + (z_i - K_i) \left[ \frac{\partial \ln \left( \frac{\mu_2 T^c}{\kappa} \right)}{\partial y} \right] \right] \right) \quad (B-29) \]

where \( \beta \) is defined as \( \mu_2^{1/2} / \rho_{w} \bar{D}_{w} \) and the prime refers to differentiation with respect to \( \eta \). Utilizing Eq. (B-17):

\[ j_i = \frac{\rho e u_{e} e_{o}^{2k}}{\sqrt{2\xi}} \left( \frac{C}{\alpha H \beta} \left[ z_i' + (z_i - K_i) \left[ \frac{\partial \ln \left( \frac{\mu_2 T^c}{\kappa} \right)}{\partial y} \right] \right] \right) \quad (B-30) \]

where the prime now refers to differentiation with respect to \( \eta \).

The laminar form of the streamwise momentum equation is given by Eq. (5)

\[ \rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left[ \mu \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right) \right] - \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} \]
Applying Eqs. (B-26), (B-5), and (B-6) yields by direct substitution:

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho e u_e^2 \mu e^{-2} e_0^2 & \left[ f' \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} - \left( \frac{f}{2\xi} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} \right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} \right] = \frac{u_e^{\infty} \rho}{(2\xi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left[ \mu e^{-\infty} \rho \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} \right] \\
&- \rho e u_e^2 \mu e^{-2} e_0^2 \frac{\partial p}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \eta} \tag{B-32}
\end{align*}
\]

Now \( u = f'u_e \) where \( u_e \) is a function of \( \xi \) only *

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} &= u_e \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \eta} = u_e f'' \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} &= f' \frac{\partial u_e}{\partial \xi} + u_e \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \xi} \tag{B-33}
\end{align*}
\]

So that

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho e u_e^2 \mu e^{-2} e_0^2 & \left[ f' \left( f' \frac{\partial u_e}{\partial \xi} + u_e \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \xi} \right) - \left( \frac{f}{2\xi} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} \right) u_e f'' \right] \\
&= \frac{u_e^{\infty} \rho}{(2\xi)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \left[ \mu e^{-\infty} \rho u_e f'' \right] - \rho e u_e^2 \mu e^{-2} e_0^2 \frac{\partial p}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \eta} \tag{B-35}
\end{align*}
\]

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \( \eta \). Multiplying by

\[
(2\xi)/\rho e u_e^3 \mu e^{-2} e_0^2 \tag{B-36}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{(2\xi) f_1^2}{u_e} \frac{\partial u_e}{\partial \xi} + (2\xi) f' \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \xi} - f f' - (2\xi) f'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} \\
= \left( \frac{\partial f}{\rho e u_e} \right)' - \frac{(2\xi) \frac{\partial p}{\partial \xi} - (2\xi) \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \eta}}{\rho e u_e^3 \mu e^{-2} e_0^2} \tag{B-36}
\end{align*}
\]

*Note that all properties evaluated at "e" are functions of \( \xi \) only.*
Defining \( C \equiv \rho u / \rho e \) and \( \beta = 2 \frac{u}{e} \frac{du}{dc} \) yields

\[
(Cf')' + ff'' - \beta f' = \frac{(2\xi)}{\rho u e} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\gamma} + (2\xi) \left[ \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \xi} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} f'' \right]
\]

(B-37)

The final term on the left-hand side of this equation involves \( \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi} \), which can be expressed with the aid of Eq. (B-8) as

\[
\frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} = \rho e u e r_o \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\gamma}
\]

(B-38)

Therefore

\[
(Cf')' + ff'' - \beta f' = \frac{(2\xi)}{\rho u e} \left[ \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \right]_{\gamma}
\]

(B-39)

Introducing the additional transformation of Eqs. (B-16) and (B-17)

\[
\frac{1}{\alpha_H} \left[ C \frac{\alpha_H}{\alpha_H} f'' \right] + f \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_H} f'' \right) - \beta \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_H} f' \right)
\]

\[
- \frac{2\xi}{\rho u e} \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi} - \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \right) + \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\gamma}
\]

\[
= 2\xi \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha_H} f' \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_H} f' \right) - \left( \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial n}{\partial \xi} \right)_{\gamma} \right] \right]
\]

(B-40)

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \( \eta \) and use has been made of the relation
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\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_y = a_H \frac{\partial \tilde{y}}{\partial \xi} = a_H \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{x_o u_e}{a_H (2\xi)^{1/2}} \int_0^Y \rho \, dy \right) \right]_y
\] (B-41)

Multiplying by \(a_H^2\) and rearranging terms yields (noting that \(a_H = a_H(\xi)\) only):

\[
f f'' + \frac{c f''}{a_H} - \frac{2\xi}{\rho u_e^2} \left\{ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \xi} - p' - \frac{1}{a_H} \frac{\partial a_H}{\partial \xi} + p' a_H \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{x_o u_e}{a_H (2\xi)^{1/2}} \int_0^Y \rho \, dy \right) \right]_y \right\} - \beta f'^2
\]

\[= 2\xi \left[ f' \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \xi} - f'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} - \frac{f'^2}{a_H} \frac{\partial a_H}{\partial \xi} \right]
\] (B-42)

which is Eq. (52) of this report.

The normal momentum equation is given by Eq. (7)

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial y} - \frac{\rho u_e^2}{r_c} = 0
\] (B-43)

Applying Eq. (B-6) with the aid of Eqs. (B-7) and (B-9) yields directly

\[
\frac{u_e}{x_o} \frac{\rho}{(2\xi)^{1/2}} p' - \frac{\rho u_e^2}{r_c} = 0
\] (B-44)

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \(\eta\). Utilizing Eq. (17) and \(f' = a_H u' / u_e\)

\[
p' = \frac{u_e}{x_o} \frac{f'^2 (2\xi)^{1/2}}{a_H r_c x_o} = 0
\] (B-45)

where the prime refers to differentiation with respect to \(\eta\). This is Eq. (54) of this report.

In the event that normal pressure gradient can be neglected, Eq. (B-45) is replaced by \(p' = 0\) and the compressible Bernoulli equation yields

\[
\frac{d P_e}{d \xi} = -\rho_e u_e \frac{d u_e}{d \xi}
\] (B-46)
Applying this to Eq. (B-42), the streamwise momentum equation becomes

\[ f'' + \left[ \frac{Cf''}{\alpha_H} \right]' + 3 \left( \frac{\alpha}{\alpha_H} \frac{f}{\rho} - f' \right) \]

\[ = 2 \xi \left[ f' \frac{\delta f}{\delta \xi} - f'' \frac{\delta f}{\delta \xi} - \frac{f'}{\alpha_H} \frac{d\alpha}{d\xi} \right] \]  

(B-47)

which is Eq. (55) of this report.

The laminar form of the energy equation is given by Eq. (30)

\[ \rho u \frac{\partial H}{\partial s} + \rho v \frac{\partial H}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left\{ \mu \frac{\partial (u^2/2)}{\partial y} + \lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right\} 

+ \frac{\rho Du_2}{u_1 \mu_2} \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{h}}{\partial y} + \left( \frac{\tilde{c}_p + \frac{c_T^2 R}{\mu_1 \mu_2}}{\mu_1 \mu_2} \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} + c_T R T \frac{\partial \mu_3}{\partial y} \right] 

+ (\tilde{h} - h + c_T R T \mu_3) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \ln \left( \mu_2 T \right) \right] + q_T \right\} \]  

(B-48)

Applying Eqs. (B-6) and (B-26)

\[ \rho u e^2 e_0^2 \left[ f' \frac{\partial H}{\partial \xi} - \left( \frac{f}{2 \xi} + \frac{\delta f}{\delta \xi} \right) H_T \right] \]

\[ = \frac{u e_0^2 \rho}{(2 \xi) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi}} \left[ \frac{u e_0^2 \rho}{(2 \xi)} \left[ \mu u e f f'' + \lambda T' \right] \right] \]

\[ + \frac{\rho Du_2}{u_1 \mu_2} \left( \tilde{h}' - \left( \frac{\tilde{c}_p + \frac{c_T^2 R}{\mu_1 \mu_2}}{\mu_1 \mu_2} \right) T' + c_T R T \frac{\partial \mu_3}{\partial \xi} \right] 

+ (\tilde{h} - h + c_T R T \mu_3) \left[ \ln \left( \mu_2 T \right) \right] \]  

(B-49)

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \( \eta \). Multiplying by \( 2 \xi/\rho u e \mu_1 e_0^2 \) and rearranging

106
\[ fH'_{T} + \left\{ \frac{C}{\rho_1} \frac{u_1}{\rho_1} f' f'' + \frac{C}{\rho_1} \frac{u_2}{\rho_1} T' + \frac{k}{\rho_1} \left( \frac{c_p + c_{5}R}{\mu_1} \right) T' + c_{T}RT_{3}' \right\} \]

\[ + \left( \phi - h + c_{T}RT_{3}' \right) \left[ \ln \left( \mu_2 T_{c} \right) \right]' \left( \frac{q_{T} \left( 2f \right) \beta}{\rho_{e} u_{e} e_{e} r_{e}} \right) \]

\[ = 2f' \left( \frac{\partial H_{T}}{\partial \xi} - H_{T}' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} \right) \]

where \( Pr = \frac{C_{P}}{\beta} \mu_{1}/\beta \) and \( SC = \mu_{1} / \rho_{1} \beta \mu_{1} \). Applying Eqs. (B-16) and (B-17) and multiplying by \( \alpha_{H} \) yields

\[ fH'_{T} + \left\{ \frac{C}{\alpha_{H}} \frac{u_1}{\rho_1} f'' + \frac{C}{\rho_1} \frac{u_2}{\rho_1} T' + \frac{1}{\rho_1} \left( \frac{c_p + c_{5}R}{\mu_1} \right) T' + c_{T}RT_{3}' \right\} \]

\[ + \left( \phi - h + c_{T}RT_{3}' \right) \left[ \ln \left( \mu_2 T_{c} \right) \right]' \left( \frac{q_{T} \left( 2f \right) \beta}{\rho_{e} u_{e} e_{e} r_{e}} \right) \]

\[ = 2f' \left( \frac{\partial H_{T}}{\partial \xi} - f' \left( \frac{\frac{\rho_{1}}{\rho_{e}} \frac{d\alpha_{H}}{d\xi}}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi}} \right) H_{T}' - H_{T}' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} + H_{T}' \left( \frac{\frac{\rho_{1}}{\rho_{e}} \frac{d\alpha_{H}}{d\xi}}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi}} \right) f' \right) \]

\[ = 2f' \left( \frac{\partial H_{T}}{\partial \xi} - H_{T}' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi} \right) \]

(B-51)

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \( \eta \). This is Eq. (56) of this report.

The laminar form of the elemental species equation is given by Eq. (29)

\[ \rho \frac{\partial \tilde{\omega}_K}{\partial s} + \rho \frac{\partial \tilde{\omega}_K}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial \tilde{\omega}_K}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{\omega}_K}{\partial \xi} + \left( \tilde{\omega}_K - \tilde{\omega}_K \right) \frac{\partial \ln \left( \mu_2 T_{c} \right)}{\partial \xi} \right) + \phi_{K} \]

(B-52)
Applying Eqs. (B-6) and (B-26)

\[ \rho \rho_e \rho_e \rho_e r_o^2 \frac{dK}{dx} - \left( \frac{f}{2} \frac{d}{dx} + \frac{\alpha_H}{\alpha_H} \right) \tilde{K}_k \]

\[ = \frac{u_e r_o^2}{2(2\pi)^2} \frac{d}{dx} \left[ \left( \frac{\psi}{\xi} \right) \right] \left[ \frac{d}{dx} \left( \tilde{z}_k - \tilde{K}_k \right) \right] + \left( \frac{\xi}{\alpha_H} \right) + \phi_k \]  

(B-53)

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \( \eta \). Multiplying by \( 2\xi/\rho e \rho e r_o^2 \) and rearranging yields

\[ \tilde{K}_k' + \left( \frac{\xi}{\alpha_H} \right) \left[ \tilde{z}_k' + \left( \tilde{z}_k - \tilde{K}_k \right) \right] + \phi_k \]

\[ = 2\xi \left[ \frac{dK}{dx} \right] \]  

(B-54)

Applying Eqs. (B-16) and (B-17) and multiplying by \( \alpha_H \) yields

\[ \tilde{K}_k' + \left( \frac{\xi}{\alpha_H} \right) \left[ \tilde{z}_k' + \left( \tilde{z}_k - \tilde{K}_k \right) \right] + \phi_k \]

\[ = 2\xi \left[ \frac{dK}{dx} \right] \]  

(B-55)

where the prime denotes differentiation with respect to \( \eta \). This is Eq. (58) of this report.
In this appendix equations are developed which are applicable at the stagnation point of blunt bodies for the calculation of the flux normalizing parameter, $\alpha^*$, the streamwise pressure-gradient parameter, $\beta$, and the wall stream function, $f_w$.

The flux normalizing parameter, $\alpha^*$, is defined by Eq. (44) as

$$\alpha^* = \frac{\rho \mu e u e r_0^x}{(2\xi)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (C-1)$$

In order to compute the value of $\alpha^*$ at the stagnation point, consider the streamwise pressure-gradient parameter, $\beta$, defined by Eq. (53)

$$\beta = 2 \frac{\xi}{u e} \frac{du e}{d\xi} \quad (C-2)$$

The transformed streamwise parameter, $\xi$, is defined by Eq. (31)

$$\xi = \int_0^s \rho \mu e u e e r_0^{2\xi} ds \quad (C-3)$$

Differentiating Eq. (C-3) and introducing the result into Eq. (C-2) yields

$$\beta = 2 \frac{\xi}{u e} \frac{du e}{ds} \frac{1}{\rho \mu e u e r_0^{2\xi}} \quad (C-4)$$

Utilizing Eq. (C-1)

$$\beta = \frac{\rho \mu e u e}{\alpha^*} \frac{du e}{ds} \quad (C-5)$$

Solving for $\alpha^*$ yields the result

$$\alpha^* = \left(\frac{\rho \mu e}{ds} / \beta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (C-6)$$
The $\frac{du_e}{ds}\big|_o$ needed for evaluation of $\alpha^*$ if Eq. (C-6) is to be employed can be obtained as follows if Newtonian flow is assumed in the vicinity of the stagnation point. In the case of Newtonian flow,

$$P_e = P_e o \cos^2 \theta$$  \hspace{1cm} (C-7)

Near the stagnation point $\sin \theta = s/R_{eff}$ where $R_{eff}$ is an effective nose radius of the body. Hence

$$P_e = P_o \left(1 - \frac{s^2}{R_{eff}^2} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (C-8)

Utilizing the Bernoulli equation

$$P_o = P_e + \rho_e \frac{u_e^2}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (C-9)

Equation (C-8) becomes

$$\frac{\rho_e u_e^2}{2} = P_o \frac{s^2}{R_{eff}^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (C-10)

or

$$u_e = \frac{s}{R_{eff} \left(\frac{2P_o}{\rho_e} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (C-11)

The density is nearly constant in the vicinity of the stagnation point. Hence

$$\frac{du_e}{ds}\big|_o \approx \frac{1}{R_{eff} \left(\frac{2P_o}{\rho_o} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (C-12)

In order to compute the stagnation-point $\beta$, consider the definition of $\xi$ (Eq. (C-3)) in the form
\[ \varphi = \int_{o}^{s} \rho_{e} \left( \frac{u_{e}}{s} \right) \mu_{e} \left( \frac{r_{o}}{s} \right)^{2k} s^{2k+1} ds \]

\[ = \int_{o}^{s} \left[ \frac{1}{2k + 2} \rho_{e} \left( \frac{u_{e}}{s} \right) \mu_{e} \left( \frac{r_{o}}{s} \right)^{2k} \right] ds^{2k+2} \]

For Newtonian flow, comparison of Eqs. (C-11) and (C-12) show that \( \frac{u_{e}}{s} \rightarrow \frac{du_{e}}{ds} \) in the vicinity of the stagnation point. In addition, \( \frac{r_{o}}{s} \rightarrow 1 \) and \( \rho_{e} \mu_{e} \) is a constant. Hence

\[ \varphi_{s \rightarrow o} = \frac{1}{2k + 2} \rho_{e} \mu_{e} \frac{du_{e}}{ds} s^{2k+2} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-14)

Substituting into Eq. (C-4) yields

\[ \beta_{o} = \frac{1}{x + 1} \left( \frac{s}{u_{e}} \frac{du_{e}}{ds} \right)^{2} \left( \frac{s}{r_{o}} \right)^{2k} = \frac{1}{x + 1} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-15)

Hence, \( \beta_{o} \) is unity for planar blunt bodies and \( 1/2 \) for axisymmetric blunt bodies for assumed Newtonian flow.

The wall stream function, \( f_{w} \), is defined by Eq. (60) as

\[ f_{w} = - (2s)^{-k} \int_{o}^{s} \frac{\rho_{w} V_{w} \frac{d\varphi}{ds}}{\rho_{e} \mu_{e} - r_{o}^{k}} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-16)

Differentiating Eq. (C-3) and introducing the result into Eq. (C-16) yields

\[ f_{w} = - (2s)^{-k} \int_{o}^{s} \rho_{w} V_{w} r_{o}^{k} ds \] \hspace{1cm} (C-17)

This can be written as

\[ f_{w} = - (2s)^{-k} \int_{o}^{s} \rho_{w} V_{w} \left( \frac{r_{o}}{s} \right)^{k} ds \]

\[ = - (2s)^{-k} \int_{o}^{s} \left[ \frac{1}{x + 1} \rho_{w} V_{w} \left( \frac{r_{o}}{s} \right)^{k} \right] ds^{k+1} \] \hspace{1cm} (C-18)
where again \( r_o/s \approx 1 \) in the stagnation region. The integrand in Eq. (C-18) is well-behaved, starting with a finite value at \( s = 0 \). However, at the stagnation point, the value of the integral is zero and \( f_w \) is indeterminant since \( \xi = 0 \). Thus, it is necessary to develop a special relation for \( f_w \). Applying l'Hospital's rule to Eq. (C-17),

\[
\left. f_w \right|_o = - \frac{\rho_w v_w \chi (2\xi)^{1/2}}{(\frac{ds}{ds})}
\]

(C-19)

Differentiating Eq. (C-3) and introducing the result into Eq. (C-19)

\[
\left. f_w \right|_o = - \left( \frac{2\xi}{\rho \varepsilon \varepsilon_0} \right) \rho_w v_w
\]

Introducing Eq. (C-1),

\[
\left. f_w \right|_o = - (\rho_w v_w/a*)_o
\]

(C-20)

In summary, Eqs. (C-6), (C-12), (C-13) and (C-20) can be used to calculate, respectively, the \( a* \), \( du_o/ds \), \( \beta \) and \( f_w \) at the stagnation point of a blunt body, and Eqs. (C-13) and (C-18) are useful for evaluating the integrals \( \xi \) and \( f_w \) in the vicinity of the nose region.
APPENDIX D

ALTERATION OF THE BOUNDARY-LAYER EQUATIONS TO ENABLE
CONSIDERATION OF GENERALIZED BOUNDARY-LAYER-EDGE CONDITIONS

In the conventional treatment of the hypersonic boundary layer, the boundary-layer-edge conditions are obtained from an inviscid solution as those conditions which exist on the "stagnation streamline" (i.e., that streamline which crosses the shock wave such as to become the stagnation point and wall streamline). This same procedure can still be utilized to include boundary-layer-displacement effects if a new body shape is considered according to the effective displacement of the flow due to the presence of the boundary layer. However, when entropy layer or nonadiabatic flow-field effects occur, this conventional approach is no longer adequate since the edge boundary conditions become functions of the local stream function as well as the streamwise coordinate. Hence, in these cases it is necessary to normalize the dependent parameters of the boundary layer in such a fashion that asymptotic solutions are achieved at the boundary-layer edge. A procedure for accomplishing this task is presented in this appendix.

The procedure used herein consists of normalizing the boundary-layer equations with respect to the \( f = 0 \) streamline when performing the Levy-Lees transformation described in Section 3 of this report. The equations then remain unchanged except that in all equations the subscript "e" is considered as this reference conditions, and "edge" as the actual edge condition. For example, the definition of \( f' \) becomes

\[
f' = \frac{u}{u_e} = \frac{\frac{u}{u_e}}{u_{edge}} \quad \text{edge}
\]

where \( u_e \) is the reference condition and \( u_{edge} \) is now the boundary-layer-edge condition at some arbitrarily chosen \( f_{edge} \). Conversely, the new edge conditions are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
  u_{edge} &= \left( \frac{u}{u_e} \right)_{edge} u_e, \\
  \rho_{edge} &= \left( \frac{\rho}{\rho_e} \right)_{edge} \rho_e
\end{align*}
\]

and so on, where \( u_e, \rho_e, \), etc., are supplied by the inviscid solution for the \( f = 0 \) streamline, and \( (u/u_e)_{edge} \) and \( (\rho/\rho_e)_{edge} \) are also supplied by the inviscid solution, but as functions of \( \xi \) and \( f \). That is
In order to illustrate this procedure, consider the following sketches which represent typical profiles of \( \frac{u}{u_e} \) \(_{\text{edge}} \), \( u/u_e \) and \( f' \) at a given \( \xi \) for two selected values of \( \overline{\eta}_{\text{edge}} \) in the presence of an entropy layer:

In this example, the viscous effects are considered to be confined to an \( \overline{\eta} \) less than 3 so that both \( \overline{\eta}_{\text{edge}} \) considered are out of the boundary layer but in the entropy layer. In Sketch (a), the \( \frac{u}{u_e} \) \(_{\text{edge}} \) is shown to increase with distance from the surface, as would be expected. Since \( u_e \) has different values depending on the choice of \( \overline{\eta}_{\text{edge}} \), \( u/u_e \) \(_{\text{edge}} \) profiles would differ accordingly, as shown in Sketch (b). The \( u/u_e \) is, of course, independent of \( \overline{\eta}_{\text{edge}} \) since \( u_e \) is a given value for a given \( \xi \); however, as shown in Sketch (c), the \( f'/a_H \) does not approach unity at the edge of the boundary layer, and, in fact, depends on the value of \( \overline{\eta}_{\text{edge}} \) chosen to represent the edge of the boundary layer.

In the absence of an entropy layer or other such effect, \( u_{\text{edge}} = u_e \) and \( f'/a_H \) does approach unity at the edge of the boundary layer as in the conventional solutions. It is for this reason that the \( f = 0 \) streamline is a convenient choice for the reference condition.
APPENDIX E

ONE-DIMENSIONAL RADIANT HEAT FLUX IN AN ABSORBING BOUNDARY LAYER WITH ANGULAR-DEPENDENT INCIDENT RADIATION

In this Appendix an expression is derived for the net one-dimensional radiant heat flux in the boundary layer normal to the surface, \( q_r \), which is needed in the energy equation (Eqs. (8), (30) or (56)). The wall value, \( q_{rw} \), which appears in the surface energy balance (Eq. (62)) is also presented. The multicomponent gas in the boundary layer is allowed to absorb diffusely as well as to emit, but scattering is neglected. The wall is assumed to emit spectrally and to reflect diffusely, but transmission of radiant energy is neglected. The incident radiation at the boundary layer edge is allowed to have an angular dependence to approximate intense radiation from the stagnation region of the inviscid flow field or from a nuclear explosion outside of the boundary layer. The derived relations are an extension of the basic relations of Goulard and Goulard (Eqs. (17) and (18) of Ref. E-1) to include the specific boundary conditions described above. The present result also reduces to that of Cess (Eq. (5) of Ref. E-2) if the radiation layer is considered to extend to infinity with no incident flux at this edge boundary condition.

The one-dimensional approximation implies that the flow field extends uniformly to infinity on planes which parallel the plane tangent to the surface at the streamwise position of interest, but that properties may vary from plane to plane. It also means that the net radiation transfer along a ray which lies in one of these planes and passes over the streamwise position of interest is constant but may differ from the value along a different ray in the same plane and passing over the same streamwise location. Although this approximation sounds crude at first exposure, it is probably satisfactory for most boundary-layer applications, since the contribution to \( q_r \) depends upon the cosine of the angle between the radiant source and the normal to the surface and decreases rapidly with distance. Use of the approximation affords great simplification in boundary-layer problems since \( q_r \) then depends only on the state of the boundary layer at the local streamwise station. On the basis of these considerations, the one-dimensional approximation has been used extensively in boundary-layer studies and seems appropriate for use in the present study.

Absorption has been shown to be important at high reentry velocities (above 45,000 feet per second) in an air boundary layer (e.g., Ref. E-3).
Furthermore, it can be significant at much lower velocities when foreign species are injected by ablation of the surface material. Hence, for generality, it is necessary to consider absorption as well as emission. The neglect of scattering, on the other hand, is a good assumption under reentry conditions as long as solid particles or droplets are not present in the flow field.\[E-2\]

For local thermodynamic equilibrium, the equation of radiative transfer can be expressed as\[E-1\]

$$\frac{1}{c} \frac{dI_{v}}{dt} = I_{v} - B_{v}(T)$$

where $\rho$ is the density, $k_{v}$ is the absorption coefficient for the multicomponent gas, $I_{v}$ is the specific intensity, and $B_{v}(T)$ is Planck's function defined by

$$B_{v}(T) = \frac{2h}{c^{3}} \frac{v^{3}}{(e^{hv/kT} - 1)}$$

where $h$ is Planck's constant, $c$ is the velocity of light, $v$ is the frequency, $k$ is Boltzmann's constant, and $T$ is temperature. The flux of radiative energy across the surface $d\sigma$ in the frequency interval $dv$ is obtained by integrating $I_{v} \cos \theta d\Omega$ over all solid angles $d\Omega = \sin \theta d\theta d\phi$

$$q_{\nu} = \int_{0}^{\theta} \int_{0}^{2\pi} I_{v}(\theta, \phi) \cos \theta \sin \theta d\phi d\theta$$

where $\theta$ is the angle between $\vec{n}$ (the normal to the surface $d\sigma$) and $\vec{I}$ (the direction of incident radiation) and $\phi$ is the angle between a reference line in the $d\sigma$ plane and the trace of $\vec{I}$ on the $d\sigma$ plane (see sketch).
In order to allow the incident flux at the edge of the boundary layer to be a function of $\varphi$ and $\theta$ it is expedient to consider the radiant flux in the angular interval $d\theta$, $q_{r_{\nu},\theta}$, obtained by differentiating Eq. (E-3) with respect to $\theta$.

It is also convenient for the purpose of evaluating boundary conditions to split the net flux $q_{r_{\nu},\theta}$ into the contribution $q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^+$ in the direction of the normal unit vector $\mathbf{n}$ and the contribution $q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^-$ in the opposite direction. Then

\[ q_{r_{\nu},\theta} = q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^+ - q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^- \quad (E-4) \]

where

\[
q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^+ = \int_0^{2\pi} I_{\nu}(\theta,\varphi) \cos\theta \sin\theta d\varphi \quad 0 < \theta < \pi/2 \]

\[
q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^- = -\int_0^{2\pi} I_{\nu}(\theta,\varphi) \cos\theta \sin\theta d\varphi \quad \pi/2 < \theta < \pi \] \quad (E-5)

Substituting Eqs. (E-5) into Eq. (E-1) and multiplying by $2\pi \sin \theta$ yields

\[
- \frac{1}{\rho x_{\nu}} \frac{dq_{r_{\nu},\theta}^+}{dl} \frac{1}{\cos \theta} = \frac{q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^+}{\cos \theta} - 2\pi \sin \theta B_{\nu}(T) \quad 0 < \theta < \pi/2 \]

\[
\frac{1}{\rho x_{\nu}} \frac{dq_{r_{\nu},\theta}^-}{dl} \frac{1}{\cos \theta} = -\frac{q_{r_{\nu},\theta}^-}{\cos \theta} - 2\pi \sin \theta B_{\nu}(T) \quad \pi/2 < \theta < \pi \] \quad (E-6)

Considering the sign convention of the following sketch such that the heat

\[ \text{boundary-layer edge} \]

\[ \text{wall} \]
flux toward the surface is positive

\[ dy = - \cos \theta dt \]  

(E-7)

Equations (E-6) can then be written

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{\rho x} \frac{dq^+_{r,v,\theta}}{dy} - \frac{q^+_{r,v,\theta}}{\cos \theta} &= -2\pi \sin \theta B_v(T) \quad 0 < \theta < \pi/2 \\
\frac{1}{\rho x} \frac{dq^-_{r,v,\theta}}{dy} - \frac{q^-_{r,v,\theta}}{\cos \theta} &= 2\pi \sin \theta B_v(T) \quad \pi/2 < \theta < \pi
\end{align*}
\]

(E-8)

Defining an optical thickness \( \tau_v \)

\[ \tau_v = \int_0^y \rho x dy \]  

(E-9)

Equations (E-8) become

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dq^+_{r,v,\theta}}{d\tau_v} - \frac{q^+_{r,v,\theta}}{\cos \theta} &= -2\pi \sin \theta B_v(T) \quad 0 < \theta < \pi/2 \\
\frac{dq^-_{r,v,\theta}}{d\tau_v} - \frac{q^-_{r,v,\theta}}{\cos \theta} &= 2\pi \sin \theta B_v(T) \quad \pi/2 < \theta < \pi
\end{align*}
\]

(E-10)

Solution of Eqs. (E-10) yields

\[
\begin{align*}
\left[ q^+_{r,v,\theta} e^{-t/\cos \theta} \right]_0^{\tau_v} &= -2\pi \int_0^{\tau_v} B_v(T) \sin \theta e^{-t/\cos \theta} dt \quad 0 < \theta < \pi/2 \\
\left[ q^-_{r,v,\theta} e^{-t/\cos \theta} \right]_{\tau_v}^{\tau_v} &= 2\pi \int_{\tau_v}^{\tau_v} B_v(T) \sin \theta e^{-t/\cos \theta} dt \quad \pi/2 < \theta < \pi
\end{align*}
\]

(E-11)
where the subscript \(e\) refers to the boundary-layer edge.

It is necessary to evaluate the boundary conditions on the left-hand-sides of Eqs. (E-11) and (E-12). First, consider the edge boundary condition for Eq. (E-12). The first step is to evaluate this equation at the wall.

\[
d_{r_{v, \theta}}^{*} = \left[ d_{r_{v, \theta}}^{*} \right] \int_{0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} B_{v}(T) \sin \theta e^{-t/\cos \theta} dt \right] e^{\frac{\theta}{e_{e}}} \quad \frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \pi
\]

(E-13)

where the subscript \(w\) refers to the wall. Assuming diffuse reflection and spectral emission from the wall with a transmissivity of zero, the heat flux away from the wall is given by (E-4)

\[
d_{r_{v, \theta}}^{*} = -2 \sin\theta \cos\theta \left[ d_{r_{v, w}}^{*} (1 - a_{v, w}) + \pi e_{v, w} B_{v}(T_{w}) \right] \quad \frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \pi
\]

(E-14)

where \(a_{v, w}\) is the hemispheric surface absorptivity and \(e_{v, w}\) is the hemispheric surface emissivity and the minus sign arises because of the definition of \(\theta\). If it is further assumed that the coefficients \(a_{v, w}\) and \(e_{v, w}\) for a given frequency \(v\) depend only upon the nature of the surface and the surface temperature but not on the radiation field to which the surface is exposed (E-4)

\[
e_{v, w} = a_{v, w}
\]

(E-15)

and Eq. (E-14) reduces to

\[
d_{r_{v, \theta}}^{*} = -2 \sin\theta \cos\theta \left[ d_{r_{v, w}}^{*} (1 - e_{v, w}) + \pi e_{v, w} B_{v}(T_{w}) \right] \quad \frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \pi
\]

(E-16)

The \(d_{r_{v, w}}^{*}\) which appears in Eq. (E-16) can be expressed in terms of known quantities by evaluating Eq. (E-11) at the edge. That is
\[ q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} = q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} \cdot e^{-\tau_{ve} / \cos \theta} \div e^{-\tau_{ve} / \cos \theta} \int_{0}^{\tau_{ve}} B_{v}(T) \sin \theta e^{-t \cos \theta} dt \quad 0 < \theta < \pi/2 \]  

(E-17)

which upon integration yields

\[ q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} = \int_{0}^{\pi/2} q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} \cdot e^{-\tau_{ve} / \cos \theta} d\theta + 2\pi \int_{0}^{\tau_{ve}} B_{v}(T) \sin \theta e^{-t \cos \theta} dt \]  

(E-18)

Exchanging the order of integration in the second term in Eq. (E-18) and utilizing the exponential integral, defined by

\[ E_{n}(t) = \int_{0}^{1} \mu^{n-2} e^{-t \mu} d\mu \]  

(E-19)

yields the following expression for \( q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} \)

\[ q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} = \int_{0}^{\pi/2} q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} \cdot e^{-\tau_{ve} / \cos \theta} d\theta + 2\pi \int_{0}^{\tau_{ve}} B_{v}(T) E_{2}(t) dt \]  

(E-20)

Introducing Eq. (E-20) into Eq. (E-16) yields the following expression for the one-sided heat flux away from the wall evaluated at the wall

\[ q_{-}^{-r,\theta}_{w} = -2\sin \theta \cos \theta \left\{ \left(1 - e_{r}^{-} \right) \left[ \int_{0}^{\pi/2} q_+^{r,\theta}_{w} \cdot e^{-\tau_{ve} / \cos \theta} d\theta \right] \right. \]

\[ + \left. 2\pi \int_{0}^{\tau_{ve}} B_{v}(T) E_{2}(t) dt \right] + \pi e_{v}^{-} B_{v}(T_{w}) \right\} \quad \pi/2 < \theta < \pi \]  

(E-21)
Substituting Eq. (E-21) into Eq. (E-13) yields the following expression for the one-sided heat flux away from the wall evaluated at the boundary-layer edge

\[
q_{r_v, \theta_e}^{-} = 2\tau_v e^{\tau_v e / \cos \theta} \int_0^{\tau_v e} B_v(T) \sin \theta e^{-t / \cos \theta} dt
\]

\[
- 2\sin \theta \cos \theta (1 - e_{v\theta}) e^{\tau_v e / \cos \theta} \int_0^{\pi/2} q_{r_v, \theta_e}^{+} e^{\tau_v e / \cos \theta} d\theta
\]

\[
- 4\pi \sin \theta \cos \theta (1 - e_{v\theta}) e^{\tau_v e / \cos \theta} \int_0^{\tau_v e} B_v(T) E_2(t) dt
\]

\[
- 2\pi \sin \theta \cos \theta e_{v\theta} B_v(T_w) e^{\tau_v e / \cos \theta} \pi/2 < \theta < \pi
\]

(E-22)

The first through fourth terms in Eq. (E-22) are, respectively, the contributions from the radiation emitted in the boundary layer at all angles \( \theta \) away from the surface, the radiation incident at the boundary-layer edge reflected from the wall, the radiation emitted in the boundary layer at all angles \( \theta \) toward the surface, and the radiation emitted from the surface. The common multiplier \( e^{\tau_v e / \cos \theta} \) represents the attenuation* of these types of radiation as they pass outward through the boundary layer whereas \( E_2(t) \) represents the attenuation of the incident flux as it passes through the boundary layer from the edge to the wall.

The one-sided heat fluxes can now be evaluated. Integration of Eq. (E-12) yields

*In that the valid range of \( \theta \) is from \( \pi/2 \) to \( \pi \), the \( \cos \theta \) is always negative.
\[
q_{r,v}^{-} = \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \int_{\tau_v}^{T_v} v_{e} e^{-(\tau_v - t_v)/\cos\theta} \, d\theta \, dt
- 2\pi \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \int_{\tau_v}^{T_v} B_{v}(T) \sin\theta e^{-(t - \tau_v)/\cos\theta} \, d\theta \, d\tau_v
\]  \hspace{1cm} (E-23)

Substituting for \( q_{r,v,\theta}^{-} \) from Eq. (E-22) and inverting the order of integration yields

\[
q_{r,v}^{-} = 2\pi \int_{0}^{T_v} B_{v}(T) \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \sin\theta e^{-(\tau_v - t)/\cos\theta} \, d\theta \, dt
- 2(1 - e_v) \left[ \int_{0}^{\pi/2} \int_{\tau_v}^{T_v} e^{-(\tau_v - t)/\cos\theta} d\theta \, d\tau_v \right] \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \sin\theta \cos\theta e^{\tau_v/\cos\theta} \, d\theta
- 4\pi(1 - e_v) \left[ \int_{0}^{T_v} B_{v}(T) E_2(t) \, dt \right] \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \sin\theta \cos\theta e^{\tau_v/\cos\theta} \, d\theta
- 2\pi e_v B_{v}(T) \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \sin\theta \cos\theta e^{\tau_v/\cos\theta} \, d\theta
- 2\pi \int_{\tau_v}^{T_v} B_{v}(T) \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \sin\theta e^{-(t - \tau_v)/\cos\theta} \, d\theta \, dt
\]  \hspace{1cm} (E-24)
Utilizing the definition of the exponential integrals (Eq. (E-19)), Eq. (E-24) becomes

\[
q_{r_v}^- = 2\pi \int_0^{\pi/2} B_v(T) E_2(\tau_v - t) dt \\
+ 2(1 - e_{v_w}) E_3(\tau_v) \int_0^{\pi/2} q_{r_v, \theta_w} e^{-\tau_v / \cos \theta} d\theta \\
+ 4\pi (1 - e_{v_w}) E_3(\tau_v) \int_0^{\pi/2} B_v(T) E_2(t) dt \\
+ 2\pi e_{v_w} v_w B_v(T) E_3(\tau_v) - 2\pi \int_0^{\pi/2} B_v(T) E_2(\tau_v - t) dt 
\]  

(E-25)

Integration of Eq. (E-11) yields for the positive one-sided heat flux

\[
q_{r_v}^+ = \int_0^{\pi/2} q_{r_v, \theta_w} e^{\tau_v / \cos \theta} - 2\pi \int_0^{\pi/2} B_v(T) \sin \theta e^{-(t - \tau_v) / \cos \theta} d\theta d\theta 
\]  

(E-26)

Substituting for \( q_{r_v, \theta_w} \) from Eq. (E-17)

\[
q_{r_v}^+ = \int_0^{\pi/2} q_{r_v, \theta_w} e^{-(\tau_v - \tau_v) / \cos \theta} d\theta + 2\pi \int_0^{\pi/2} B_v(T) \sin \theta e^{-(t - \tau_v) / \cos \theta} d\theta dt \\
- 2\pi \int_0^{\pi/2} B_v(T) \sin \theta e^{-(t - \tau_v) / \cos \theta} d\theta dt 
\]  

(E-27)
Again, in terms of exponential integrals

\[
q_{\tau \nu}^+ \quad = \quad \int_{\theta_e}^{\pi/2} q_{\tau \nu, \theta_e}^+ e^{-(\tau \nu - \tau_e)}/\cos \theta \quad d\theta
\]

\[
+ \quad 2\pi \int_{\tau_e}^{\tau \nu} B_{\nu}(T)E_2(t - \tau \nu)dt - 2\pi \int_{\tau_e}^{\tau \nu} B_{\nu}(T)E_2(t - \tau \nu)dt \quad (E-28)
\]

In accordance with the definition of Eq. (E-4) the net radiant heat flux in the frequency interval \( d\nu \) is given by the difference of Eq. (E-28) and Eq. (E-25). Upon combining terms

\[
q_{\tau \nu} = \quad 2\pi \int_{\tau_e}^{\tau \nu} B_{\nu}(T)E_2(t - \tau \nu)dt - 2\pi \int_{\tau_e}^{\tau \nu} B_{\nu}(T)E_2(t - \tau \nu)dt
\]

\[
- \quad 2\pi e_{\nu \nu} B_{\nu}(T)E_3(\tau \nu) - 4\pi (1 - e_{\nu \nu})E_3(\tau \nu) \int_{\tau_e}^{\tau \nu} B_{\nu}(T)E_2(t)dt
\]

\[
+ \int_{\theta_e}^{\pi/2} q_{\tau \nu, \theta_e}^+ e^{-(\tau \nu - \tau_e)}/\cos \theta \quad d\theta
\]

\[
- \quad 2(1 - e_{\nu \nu})E_3(\tau \nu) \int_{\theta_e}^{\pi/2} q_{\tau \nu, \theta_e}^+ e^{-(\tau \nu - \tau_e)}/\cos \theta \quad d\theta \quad (E-29)
\]

The net radiation heat flux, \( q_{\tau} \), is obtained by integrating Eq. (E-29) over all frequencies

\[
q_{\tau} = \int_{\nu}^{\infty} q_{\tau \nu} d\nu \quad (E-30)
\]
This integration can be approximated by considering the entire range of \( \nu \) to be subdivided into \( M \) spectral bands of width \( \delta \nu_m \). The \( \kappa_\nu \) and \( e_{\nu w} \) are assumed to be frequency independent within a single band but to vary from band to band and are thus designated as \( \kappa_m \) and \( e_{m w} \), respectively. The choice of the number of bands, \( M \), and the frequency interval of each band, \( \delta \nu_m \), can be made such as to approximate the actual \( \kappa_\nu \) to a given degree of accuracy. The \( q_r \) for this smeared-band model is given by

\[
q_r = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_m + \delta \nu_m} q_{r \nu} \, d\nu
\tag{E-31}
\]

It is convenient to define

\[
B_m(T) = \frac{\int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_m + \delta \nu_m} B_{\nu}(T) \, d\nu}{\int_{0}^{\infty} B_{\nu}(T) \, d\nu}
\tag{E-32}
\]

where

\[
\int_{0}^{\infty} B_{\nu}(T) \, d\nu = \frac{\sigma \pi}{4}
\tag{E-33}
\]

The net radiant heat flux toward the surface at the nodal point \( i \) is then given by

\[
q_r^i = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left[ 2\sigma \int_{0}^{\tau_{m_i}} T^4 B_m(T) E_2(t - \tau_{m_i}) \, dt - 2\sigma \int_{0}^{\tau_{m_i}} T^4 B_m(T) E_2(\tau_{m_i} - t) \, dt \\
-2\sigma \epsilon_{m w} T^4 B_m(T) E_3(\tau_{m_i}) - 4\sigma (1 - \epsilon_{m w}) E_3(\tau_{m_i}) \int_{0}^{\tau_{m_i}} T^4 B_m(T) E_2(t) \, dt \\
\int_{0}^{\pi/2} \left[ \int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_m + \delta \nu_m} q_{r \nu} \, d\nu \right] \left[ e^{-(\tau_{m_i} - \tau_{m_i}^i)/\cos \theta} - 2(1 - \epsilon_{m w}) E_3(\tau_{m_i}) e^{-\tau_{m_i}/\cos \theta} \right] d\theta \right]
\tag{E-34}
\]
where from Eq. (E-9) \( \tau_{m_i} \) is given by

\[
\tau_{m_i} = \int_0^{Y_i} \frac{\rho m}{dy} \text{d}y
\]  
(E-35)

At the wall Eq. (E-34) simplifies to

\[
q_{r_w} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left\{ 2\sigma e m_w \int_0^{T_m} T^4 B_m(T) E_2(T) \text{d}T - \sigma e m_w T^4 B_m(T_w) \right\}
\]

\[
+ \left( \left[ \int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_{m+\delta m}} q_{r_v, \theta}^+ \text{d}\nu \right] e_m e - \frac{\tau_m}{\cos \theta} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left\{ 2\sigma e m_w \int_0^{T_m} T^4 B_m(T) E_2(T) \text{d}T - \sigma e m_w T^4 B_m(T_w) \right\}
\]

\[
+ \left( \left[ \int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_{m+\delta m}} q_{r_v, \theta}^+ \text{d}\nu \right] e_m e - \frac{\tau_m}{\cos \theta} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left\{ 2\sigma e m_w \int_0^{T_m} T^4 B_m(T) E_2(T) \text{d}T - \sigma e m_w T^4 B_m(T_w) \right\}
\]

\[
+ \left( \left[ \int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_{m+\delta m}} q_{r_v, \theta}^+ \text{d}\nu \right] e_m e - \frac{\tau_m}{\cos \theta} \right)
\]

\[
(\text{E-36})
\]

since \( \tau_m = 0 \) and \( E_3(\tau_m) = 1/2 \).

The incident flux at the boundary-layer edge can be a function of frequency and the angles \( \theta \) and \( \phi \). Differentiating Eq. (E-3) with respect to \( \theta \) while considering \( \theta < \pi/2 \) and integrating over the frequency range \( \delta \nu_m \) yields

\[
\int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_{m+\delta m}} q_{r_v, \theta}^+ \text{d}\nu = \cos \theta \sin \theta \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{\nu_m}^{\nu_{m+\delta m}} I_{v_\theta}(\theta, \varphi) \text{d}v \text{d}\varphi \quad 0 < \theta < \pi/2
\]

\[
(\text{E-37})
\]

The integrations in this term with respect to \( \nu \) and \( \varphi \) can be performed a priori for each spectral band. The result is then substituted into Eq. (E-34) and (E-35) where the integration with respect to \( \theta \) is performed.

The calculation of \( q_{r_i} \) proceeds as follows. Given the temperature and particle densities across the boundary layer, the \( \tau_{m_i} \) and \( B_m(T_i) \) matrices are computed for each spectral band \( m \) and for a finite number of points across the boundary-layer \( i \) (nodal points in the numerical solution procedure). The integrations in Eqs. (E-34) and (E-35) are then performed for each spectral band, and the contribution from each spectral band is added to yield the \( q_{r_i} \).
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APPENDIX F

A STUDY OF DIFFERENTIAL VERSUS INTEGRAL PROCEDURES
EMPLOYING IDENTICAL SPLINE-FIT APPROXIMATIONS

There are three basic aspects to the integral matrix solution procedure described in this report: connected cubics (spline functions) are employed to relate the primary dependent variables to the transverse coordinate $\eta$; the differential equations are solved in integral form with a weighting function which is unity between neighboring nodal points and zero elsewhere; and Newton-Raphson iteration is utilized to solve the resulting set of linear and nonlinear equations. The spline-fit approximation of the dependent variables was a natural choice since smooth functions were desired to minimize the number of nodal points and recent studies have shown spline functions to be superior to single higher-order polynomials. Newton-Raphson iteration was chosen in order to effect linearized coupling throughout the boundary layer. However, the decision of whether or not to integrate and the choice of a weighting factor necessitated some study. The results of these studies are reported in this appendix.

As pointed out by Dorodnitsyn, solution of the boundary-layer equations in differential form is equivalent to an integral solution using the Dirac delta function as the weighting function. The question at hand then resolves down to the choice of weighting functions. There are three approaches here: the Dirac delta function (differential approach), a step weighting function such as that used by Pallone, or a smooth weighting function across the entire boundary layer such as that employed by Dorodnitsyn. The primary distinction between these three approaches is that the first takes an infinitesimally small sample (restricted to the nodal points themselves), the second samples over a portion of the boundary layer, and the third samples over the entire boundary layer.

Parallel developments were made for the first two approaches for non-similar incompressible boundary layers, the only distinction being the choice of weighting function. The results of this study were inconclusive with regard to accuracy, convergence stability, and the number of iterations required to achieve convergence. In particular, it was found that the accuracy depends more upon the distribution of the nodal points than upon the size of the sample. Therefore the choice of weighting function was made on the basis of algebraic simplicity which favored step weighting functions over Dirac delta functions or smoothly varying functions such as those used by Dorodnitsyn.
In the remainder of this appendix, Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas are presented for the nonsimilar incompressible momentum equation for the integral and the differential approaches. Results are then compared for the case of an incompressible boundary layer on a flat plate and for a nonsimilar boundary layer with an adverse pressure gradient. Finally, the algebraic complexity of the two approaches is discussed.

In the case of an incompressible boundary layer, the energy and species conservation equations are not needed, and the transformed momentum equation (Eq. (55)) reduces to

\[
ff'' + \frac{f'''}{a_H^2} + \beta (a_H^2 - f'^2) - 2 \left( f' \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \ln \xi} - f'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} - f' \frac{d \ln a_H}{d \ln \xi} \right) = 0
\]

(P-1)

The boundary layer at a given streamwise station is divided into \( N \) nodal points, \( \eta_i \), where \( i = 1 \) at the wall and \( N \) at the boundary-layer edge. In the integral approach, Eq. (P-1) is integrated at constant \( \xi \) between neighboring nodes, \( \eta_{i-1} \) and \( \eta_i \):

\[
\int_{\eta_{i-1}}^{\eta_i} ff'' \, d\eta + \frac{1}{a_H^2} \left( f'' \right)_{i-1} \eta_i - \beta \int_{\eta_{i-1}}^{\eta_i} f'^2 \, d\eta - \int_{\eta_{i-1}}^{\eta_i} \left( f' \frac{\partial f'}{\partial \ln \xi} - f'' \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ln \xi} - f' \frac{d \ln a_H}{d \ln \xi} \right) \, d\eta
\]

\[
+ 2 \frac{d \ln a_H}{d \ln \xi} \int_{\eta_{i-1}}^{\eta_i} f'^2 \, d\eta = 0
\]

(P-2)

As discussed in the present report, the \( f_i', f'' \), \( f''' \), and \( f_i'''' \) are expanded about point \( i \) in terms of their \( \eta \)-derivatives by the use of Taylor series. These series are truncated by considering the \( f_i'''' \) to be constant between \( \eta_i \) and \( \eta_{i+1} \). Thus, between each \( i \) and \( i+1 \) the \( f \) is represented as a quartic, the \( f' \) as a cubic, and the \( f'' \) as a quadratic, whereas the \( f'''' \) is considered to vary linearly between each pair of \( \eta \)-stations, all of these functions joining continuously at the nodal points. Utilizing the same procedure described in the present report for representing the streamwise derivatives and evaluating the integrals which appear in Eq. (F-2), differentiation yields the following Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas:
where the ERROR is given by the left-hand side of Eq. (F-2) evaluated in the previous iteration and the XP₁, XP₂, XP₃ and XP₄ are defined by Eqs. (86), the d₀, d₁ and d₂ by Eqs. (88) or (89), and the ZP₁, ZP₂, ZP₃ and ZP₄ by Eq. (94).

In the differential approach, Eq. (F-1) is solved at each nodal point i without integration. Utilizing the same procedure for representing the streamwise derivatives, differentiation yields the following Newton-Raphson recurrence formulas:

\[
\left( f'' (1 + d_0) \Delta f - \left[ 2 \beta f' + d_1 f_{l-1}' + d_2 f_{l-2}' - 2 f' \left( \frac{d_1 \alpha_{H_{l-1}} + d_2 \alpha_{H_{l-2}}}{\alpha_H} \right) \right] \Delta f' \right)
\]
\[
+ \left[ f (1 + d_0) + d_1 f_{l-1} + d_2 f_{l-2} \right] \Delta f'' + \frac{1}{\alpha_H} \Delta f''
\]
\[
+ \left[ 2 \beta \alpha_H - \frac{1}{\alpha_H} \left( f'' + f'^2 \left( \frac{d_1 \alpha_{H_{l-1}} + d_2 \alpha_{H_{l-2}}}{\alpha_H} \right) \right) \right] \Delta \alpha_H = - \text{ERROR}
\]

where the ERROR is given by the left-hand side of Eq. (F-1) evaluated in the previous iteration.

Velocity profiles for incompressible flow over a flat plate as reported by Howarth (F-3) and as obtained with the above-described integral and matrix procedures are presented in Table F-1 in terms of the η defined by Howarth (which is \( \sqrt{2} \) times the η defined in the present report for this problem).
### TABLE F-1

VELOCITY PROFILES FOR INCOMPRESSIBLE FLOW OVER A FLAT PLATE
AFTER HOWARTH COMPARED TO 11-POINT INTEGRAL-MATRIX
AND DIFFERENTIAL-MATRIX SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Velocity ratio</th>
<th>Howarth</th>
<th>Howarth F-3</th>
<th>Integral-matrix</th>
<th>Differential-matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.13277</td>
<td>0.1328</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.26471</td>
<td>0.2646</td>
<td>0.2636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.39378</td>
<td>0.3937</td>
<td>0.3916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.51676</td>
<td>0.5166</td>
<td>0.5139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.62977</td>
<td>0.6297</td>
<td>0.6263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.84605</td>
<td>0.8462</td>
<td>0.8431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.95552</td>
<td>0.9553</td>
<td>0.9564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.99155</td>
<td>0.9913</td>
<td>0.9938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.99898</td>
<td>0.9990</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.99992</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identical 11-point nodal distributions were employed in the present calculations, namely, \( \eta = 0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.9, 1.4, 2.0, 2.7, 3.5, 4.4, 5.4 \) and 6.5. The values of \( \frac{u}{u_e} \) reported in Table F-1 were then computed from the \( f' \) and their derivatives by use of the Taylor series expansions (Eqs. (78)). It can be seen that the integral-matrix solution agrees with Howarth's results to four significant places and that the differential-matrix solution agrees within a few tenths of a percent. Corresponding, the wall shear function, \( f''_w \), was 0.3320 and 0.3308 for the integral and differential procedures, respectively, compared to 0.33206 reported by Howarth.

The problem of linearly retarded flow \( \frac{u_e}{u_{eo}} = 1 - ax \) with \( a = 1/8 \), first studied by Howarth F-3 and later investigated by Smith and Clutter F-4, among others, was also considered. Wall shear function, \( f''_w \), as obtained with 6-point and 10-point integral and differential solutions are compared in Table F-2 to results reported by Smith and Clutter. The latter results can be considered as precise since they agree closely with those of other investigators. They obtained this degree of accuracy by the use of small streamwise spacing. The present results, on the other hand, were obtained with relatively large streamwise spacing. (All stations considered in the present calculations are shown whereas only a sampling of the Smith and Clutter results are presented. The fact that streamwise spacing is affecting the present results...
TABLE F-2

WALL SHEAR FUNCTION ALONG A FLAT PLATE WITH LINEARLY RETARDED FLOW,

\[ u_e = 1 - \frac{x}{8} \], after Smith and Clutter compared to 10-POINT AND 6-POINT INTEGRAL-MATRIX AND DIFFERENTIAL-MATRIX SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Differ-</th>
<th>Integral</th>
<th>Integral</th>
<th>Differ-</th>
<th>Integral</th>
<th>Integral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of ( \eta )-points*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normalized distance, ( x )</td>
<td>Shear function evaluated at the wall, ( f''_w )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.4696</td>
<td>.4678</td>
<td>.4695</td>
<td>.4695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.4645</td>
<td>.4663</td>
<td>.4663</td>
<td>.4656</td>
<td>.4660</td>
<td>.4660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.4635</td>
<td>.4629</td>
<td>.4633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.4555</td>
<td>.4573</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4579</td>
<td>.4582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.4451</td>
<td>.4469</td>
<td>.4471</td>
<td>.4472</td>
<td>.4473</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.4343</td>
<td>.4361</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.4230</td>
<td>.4249</td>
<td>.4242</td>
<td>.4249</td>
<td>.4248</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.4114</td>
<td>.4133</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.3866</td>
<td>.3886</td>
<td>.3872</td>
<td>.3887</td>
<td>.3879</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.3601</td>
<td>.3622</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.3315</td>
<td>.3338</td>
<td>.3309</td>
<td>.3340</td>
<td>.3320</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.3006</td>
<td>.3030</td>
<td>.3002</td>
<td>.3034</td>
<td>.3002</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.2667</td>
<td>.2692</td>
<td>.2667</td>
<td>.2698</td>
<td>.2651</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.2288</td>
<td>.2316</td>
<td>.2291</td>
<td>.2323</td>
<td>.2251</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.1852</td>
<td>.1882</td>
<td>.1857</td>
<td>.1892</td>
<td>.1778</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.1653</td>
<td>.1605</td>
<td>.1638</td>
<td>.1612</td>
<td>.1649</td>
<td>.1504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.1329</td>
<td>.1365</td>
<td>.1337</td>
<td>.1378</td>
<td>.1186</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.1100</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td>.1042</td>
<td>.1010</td>
<td>.1059</td>
<td>.0809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.0736</td>
<td>.0506</td>
<td>.0582</td>
<td>.0519</td>
<td>.0615</td>
<td>.0350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.94</td>
<td>non***</td>
<td>non</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.96</td>
<td>0 (extrap)</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>non</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*10-point \((\eta = 0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.9, 1.4, 2.0, 2.7, 3.5, 4.4, 5.4)\),
6-point \((\eta = 0, 0.8, 1.8, 3.0, 4.4, 6.0)\).

**Smith and Clutter results shown for representative streamwise stations only.

***Nonconvergent
can be seen by comparing the two 10-point integral solutions and the two 6-point integral solutions.) Looking first at the 10-point solutions, the integral solution is slightly better except in the vicinity of \( x = 0.20 \) where the differential approach agrees with that of Smith and Clutter. In the 6-point solutions, the integral and differential methods yield comparable results until an \( x \) of 0.60 or so, after which the differential approach yields better accuracy.

Since the comparison between the integral and differential approaches was inconclusive with regard to accuracy and convergence considerations, it was appropriate to consider algebraic complexity. Comparison of Eqs. (F-3) and (F-4) indicates that the differential approach is algebraically simpler for the incompressible nonsimilar boundary layer. However, in the multicomponent boundary layer the situation is strikingly reversed. All of the complexities introduced by multicomponent thermodynamic and transport properties in the energy equation and elemental species equations appear in flux divergence terms (see Eqs. (56) and (58)). Integration by a unity weighting factor thus eliminates a derivative with respect to \( \gamma \) so that it is not necessary to evaluate flux derivatives in the evaluation of the ERRORS. The fluxes, in turn, contain derivatives with respect to \( \gamma \) (see, e.g., the \( q^* \) given by Eq. (50)). Thus, complete Newton-Raphson iteration requires evaluation of second derivatives of state functions with respect to \( h \) and \( \vec{R}_k \) as well as first derivatives (see Eqs. (129) and (132)). The differential approach, on the other hand, would require the evaluation of second and third derivatives of state functions with respect to \( h \) and \( \vec{R}_k \) for full Newton-Raphson iteration. Thus, integration between \( i \) and \( i-1 \) is by far the most desirable approach from the standpoint of algebraic simplicity.

REFERENCES


