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**Superscripts**

- Indicates a dimensional quantity

- Indicates an inner layer variable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscripts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Indicates a quantity evaluated at the point where the wall- and wake- velocity vectors are in the same direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indicates a quantity evaluated at the point of switching from the logarithmic overlap to the wake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Indicates maximum value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Indicates an X-wise quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>Indicates a Z-wise quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>Indicates a quantity evaluated at the endwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Indicates a quantity evaluated at the local freestream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \infty )</td>
<td>Indicates a quantity evaluated at the upstream position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Indicates a quantity evaluated at the blade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Indicates a quantity evaluated at the corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref</td>
<td>Indicates a reference quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>Indicates two-dimensional flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Three-dimensional turbulent boundary layers occur in both external and internal flows. Examples are boundary layers on swept wings and boundary layers on turbomachinery endwalls between compressor blades or turbine blades. Gaining physical understanding of such flows is very important for both analysis and design purposes.

The present work treats turbomachinery endwall boundary layers, pointing out some basic physics of such flows and suggesting a model which attempts to describe parts of the flow-field analytically.

Figure 1 shows a schematic of a turbomachinery flow-field, indicating the regions treated by the present work. Region I is the part of the endwall flow which is not influenced by the blades and which is pressure-driven. The crosswise pressure gradient creating the secondary flows which give this part of the flow its three-dimensional character. Region II is the blade/endwall juncture region, where the three-dimensionality of the flow is created by secondary flows induced by interference effects due to the mutual interaction of the two boundary layers on each side of the juncture. There is another juncture region between Region I and the suction
side of the other blade, which is omitted from Fig. 1 for clarity.
The cross-hatched plane depicts a typical streamwise station in
which the present analysis is done.

Region I is treated much more extensively in the literature
than Region II. Coles [1] was apparently the first to suggest the
possibility of treating three-dimensional turbulent boundary layers in
vector form, whereby the entire velocity profile is described by the
sum of two vectors: a wall component and a wake component.
Based on the experimental data available to him, he tentatively stat-
ed that if the wall component is in the direction of the surface shear
stress, then the wake component would be very nearly parallel to
the direction of the pressure gradient. Johnston [2] suggested the
approach of treating the secondary (or crosswise) component of a
three-dimensional turbulent boundary layer as a function of the main
(or streamwise) component and of certain additional parameters.
He was thus led through examination of data to the proposition of
his well known triangular model to describe the form of the velocity
hodograph. Based on his own experiments and those of others, he
suggested two explicit relationships to describe the triangular model:
one for the region adjacent to the wall and the other for that near
the freestream. His model is successful enough in the regions
away from the vertex of the triangle but fails to match the data ade-
quately in the vicinity of the vertex. As will be shown later, this
region corresponds to the transitional region from the wall- to the
wake-sublayer. In spite of its relative success, Johnston's model
suffers from being a product of data-correlation without the benefit of a supporting analysis.

The main phenomenon in juncture flows is the corner vortex [3–6], which is composed of two sources: the "horseshoe" vortex, created by the wrapping of the oncoming vorticity around the blades, and the "passage" vortex, which rolls up from the skewed boundary layer–induced crossflow. The blade leading edge region is predominantly inviscid and rotational. Shabaka’s [5] experiments indicate the existence of a Reynolds stress–induced "boundary jet" outflow from the juncture over the endwall. It is important to realize that, since the eddy viscosity scales are different for the blade and endwall, a single eddy viscosity model cannot work for juncture flows.

In order to gain further insight into the physics of three-dimensional, endwall turbulent boundary layers, it became clear that more analysis would be helpful. To this end, Mellor’s [7] two-dimensional asymptotic analysis for large Reynolds number turbulent boundary layers has been extended to three dimensions in the present work. The results of this analysis provide the scaling of three-dimensional boundary layers of both juncture – and pressure-driven – types, including rotational effects. The analysis of the former type includes both symmetric and asymmetric cases. The analysis of the latter type leads to the proposition of a composite three-dimensional Law-of-the-Wall and Law-of-the-Wake model, utilizing a vector approach in the wake sub-layer. This model is com-
pared with van den Berg and Eisenaar’s [8] infinite swept-wing flow data and Mueller’s [10] forced turning flow data with good agreement. It should be mentioned that Johnston’s triangle emerges as a particular limit of this model.

The analysis presented here does not include solutions of the equations of motion found for the various sub-regions, and therefore it comes short of predicting forces and moments acting on the blades of a turbomachinery component.
CHAPTER II

ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS

II.1. The Pressure-Driven Case (Region I)

A typical skewed boundary layer and basic nomenclature are shown in Fig. 2. For incompressible, steady flow, with no curvatures, the mean part of a turbulent flow is described by the following equations:

Mass conservation:

\[ \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_i} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Momentum:

\[ U_i \left( \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_i} \right) = - \frac{\partial P}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[ \epsilon^2 T_{ij} + \epsilon \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_i} \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where

\[ U_i = \bar{U}_i / \bar{U}_e, \quad P = \bar{P} / \rho \bar{U}_e^2, \quad T_{ij} = - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j / u^2. \]
\( X_1 = \tilde{X}_1 / l, \epsilon = \epsilon_u / \bar{U}_e, \epsilon^2 \hat{\epsilon} = \nu / (\bar{U}_e l) = R_{el}^{-1} \)

In the above equations, \( \epsilon^2 \) is the scale for the Reynolds stresses, with \( \epsilon^2 \) being an as of yet undetermined perturbation velocity scale. \( \epsilon^2 \hat{\epsilon} \) is the scale for the viscous stresses, which is also given by \( R_{el}^{-1} \). Thus \( \hat{\epsilon} \) is the relative magnitude of viscous- to Reynolds-stresses.

In addition, the following boundary conditions are required:

\[ U_i(X, 0, Z) = 0 \]

and, assuming a uniform external flow,

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
U_x \\
U_z
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
X, \infty, Z
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
1 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(for a fixed \((X, Z)\) location)

Next, an asymptotic analysis is carried out (following Mellor [7]) for the above equations, using the following expansions:

A. Outer Expansion

\[ Q = Q_1 + \epsilon Q_2 + \epsilon^2 Q_3 + \cdots \]

\( T_{ll} = 0 \) (This assumes no free-stream turbulence)
where \( Q \) stands for the three velocity components and pressure:

\[
Q = (U_x(X, Y, Z), U_y, U_z, P) \quad (1)
\]

B. Middle Expansion

\( y = Y/\epsilon \)

\[
U_x = u_{x_1}(X, y, Z) + \epsilon u_{x_2} + \epsilon^2 u_{x_3} + \cdots
\]

\[
U_y = \epsilon \left\{ u_{y_1} + \epsilon u_{y_2} + \epsilon^2 u_{y_3} + \cdots \right\}
\]

\[
U_z = u_{z_1} + \epsilon u_{z_2} + \epsilon^2 u_{z_3} + \cdots
\]

\[
P = p_1 + \epsilon p_2 + \epsilon^2 p_3 + \cdots
\]

\[
T_{II} = t_{1II} + \epsilon t_{2II} + \epsilon^2 t_{3II} + \cdots
\]

C. Inner Expansion

\( \hat{y} = y/\hat{\epsilon} = Y/\hat{\epsilon} \)

\[
U_x = \hat{u}_{x_1}(X, \hat{y}, Z) + \epsilon \hat{u}_{x_2} + \epsilon^2 \hat{u}_{x_3} + \cdots
\]

---

(1) NOTE: In the present analysis an expression of the form \( U(X, Y, Z) \) should be interpreted as \( U(Y) \) at a given \( (X, Z) \) location.
\[ U_y = \epsilon \epsilon \left[ \hat{u}_{y_1} + \epsilon \hat{u}_{y_2} + \epsilon^2 \hat{u}_{y_3} + \cdots \right] \]

\[ U_z = \hat{u}_{z_1} + \epsilon \hat{u}_{z_2} + \epsilon^2 \hat{u}_{z_3} + \cdots \]

\[ P = \hat{p}_1 + \epsilon \hat{p}_2 + \epsilon^2 \hat{p}_3 + \cdots \]

\[ T_{II} = \hat{t}_{1II} + \epsilon \hat{t}_{2II} + \epsilon^2 \hat{t}_{3II} + \cdots \]

These expansions are substituted into Eqs. (1) and (2) and the analysis proceeds in the manner of matched asymptotic expansions, the details of which are described in Appendices A, B and C. It should be noted that this analysis assumes that both \( \epsilon \) and \( \hat{\epsilon} \) are much smaller than unity. The features of the resulting equations in the three regions are summarized in Table 1 to the first three orders. The main features of the flow, as indicated in the table, are the following: the outer layer is inviscid; the middle layer is influenced by Reynolds stresses to orders 2 and 3, where the 2nd order equations are of the boundary layer type while the 3rd order ones are Navier Stokes equations; the inner layer is dominated by constant total shear (viscous- plus Reynolds-stresses) across it, with no pressure gradient or inertia effects through order 3. The important information for the subsequent analysis is contained in the 1st order outer region equations and in the 2nd order middle- and inner- region equations.
As a result of the asymptotic analysis and the matching procedure, the following conclusions emerge:

1. The flow possesses a 3-layer structure;
2. The inner and middle layers have a common logarithmic overlap;
3. The inner layer is exponentially thin compared to the middle layer: \( \varepsilon = O \left( \frac{1}{\phi \varepsilon} \right) \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \);
4. The pressure gradient does not influence the inner layer, hence the wall shear stress is the only driving force there. It is reasonable to assume that the shear field maintains its two-dimensionality within this sub-layer. Thus the flow is two-dimensional in the inner layer and the velocity vectors are co-planar in the \( \tau_w \)-direction.
5. Since the outer flow is in the freestream direction, all the turning from the \( \tau_w \) - direction to the \( \tilde{U}_e \) - direction must take place in the middle layer.

While the first three conclusions apply also to two-dimensional boundary layers, the last two are special to the three-dimensional case.

See Appendix G for the effects of rotation on the equations of motion in the pressure-driven case.

II.2. The Case of Juncture Flow (Region II)
Figure 3 describes the main features of the flow field in a juncture. An oncoming endwall boundary layer interacts with a blade situated normal to the endwall. This interaction gives rise to several phenomena: the vorticity carried by the oncoming b.l. wraps around the blade, thereby creating a "horseshoe" vortex; the stagnation line at the blade leading edge creates a pressure gradient that induces skewing of the oncoming b.l. and the formation of an endwall crossflow, which later rolls up into a so-called "passage vortex"; this and the "horseshoe" vortex augment each other and create the corner vortex which stretches downstream without diminishing its strength for quite a distance downstream of the blade leading edge; if the latter is blunt, the oncoming flow may separate upstream of it, creating one of several possible three-dimensional separation patterns, such as a saddle-point or a node.

As the oncoming flow hits the blade, a boundary layer develops over it. This b.l. interacts with the one which has been developing over the endwall, resulting in a corner (or juncture) flow which is investigated in this section.

11.2.1. Scaling and normalized equations

The flow variables in the juncture are normalized as follows:

\[ U_I = \frac{\bar{U}_I}{\bar{U}_e}, \quad P = \frac{\bar{P}}{\rho \bar{U}_e^2}, \quad T_{II} = -\frac{\bar{u}_I^* \bar{u}_J^*}{\bar{u}_e^2} \]
where \( (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \) is a locally cartesian coordinate system.

The scaling of \( \tilde{y} \) and \( \tilde{z} \) is based on the results of the analysis of the three-dimensional boundary layer outside the juncture region (Region I), which is performed in Section 2.1. (See also Appendix D). When the equations of motion are written in terms of these variables, the factors \( \lambda_{w} \Delta \) appear in them (see Appendix F1) and these require additional consideration. By using the \((1/n)\)th power law for turbulent flat plate flow as a model, it can be shown (Appendix F1) that the equations of motion for the juncture flow become

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial z} &= 0 \\
U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} &= -\frac{a P}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \xi^{-1} \epsilon \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} \right] + \\
&+ \frac{\epsilon_w^2}{\partial x} \frac{\partial T_{xx}}{\partial x} \\
&+ \frac{\xi}{\partial y} \left[ \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial T_{yx}}{\partial y} \right] + \frac{\xi}{\partial z} \left[ \xi^{-1} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} + \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial T_{zx}}{\partial z} \right] \\
U \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} &= -\xi \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \xi^{-1} \epsilon \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} \right] + \\
&+ \frac{\epsilon_w^2}{\partial y} \frac{\partial T_{xy}}{\partial y} \\
&+ \frac{\epsilon_w^2}{\partial y} \frac{\partial T_{xy}}{\partial x} \\
&+ \frac{\epsilon_w^2}{\partial z} \frac{\partial T_{zy}}{\partial z} \\
&+ \frac{\epsilon_w^2}{\partial z} \frac{\partial T_{zx}}{\partial z} \\
\end{align*}
\]
\[ + \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \left[ \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_w \frac{\partial V}{\partial \gamma} + \epsilon_w^2 T_{yy} \right] + \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left[ \zeta^{-1} \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_w \frac{\partial V}{\partial \zeta} + \epsilon_w^2 T_{yy} \right] \]

\[ \frac{\partial W}{\partial X} + \xi V \frac{\partial W}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial \zeta} = - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial}{\partial X} \left[ \xi^{-1} \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_w \frac{\partial W}{\partial X} \right] + \zeta^2 \sigma \epsilon_w^2 T_{xz} + \]

\[ + \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \left[ \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_w \frac{\partial W}{\partial \gamma} + \zeta^2 \sigma \epsilon_w^2 T_{yz} \right] + \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \left[ \zeta^{-1} \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_w \frac{\partial W}{\partial \zeta} + \zeta^2 \sigma \epsilon_w^2 T_{zz} \right] \]

where, in analogy with the treatment of Region I,

\[ \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_w^2 = \nu / (U e_{ac} \lambda_w \Delta), \epsilon_w = u_{ac} / \hat{U}_e \]

and the additional notation is

\[ \zeta = (\epsilon_b / \epsilon_w)^{1-2n}, \sigma = 1 / (1-2n), \xi = x_{ref} / (\lambda_w \Delta) \]

The boundary conditions are:

\[ U = V = W = 0 \text{ at } \begin{cases} Y = 0, Z \geq 0 \\ Z = 0, Y \geq 0 \end{cases} \]

II. 2. 2. Asymptotic treatment

Two independent parameters appear in Eqn. (3), namely \( \epsilon_w^2 \) and \( \zeta \) (the 3rd parameter, \( \hat{\epsilon}_w \), is related to \( \epsilon_w \) as shown in Appendix B). While \( \epsilon_w^2 \) is a small parameter everywhere along the juncture, \( \zeta \) increases from 0 at the blade leading edge to \( O(1) \) at the trailing edge, and may thus be viewed as a measure of both streamwise location and extent of asymmetry. For the purpose of
asymptotic analysis of Eqn. (3), a new parameter, $\epsilon_c$, is used as a basic perturbation parameter, to be determined (along with $\epsilon^h$) from matching conditions (Appendix F2). In order to avoid double expansions in terms of $\epsilon_w$ and $\zeta$, it is intended to stretch the juncture coordinates $Y_c$ and $Z_c$ in such a manner that the juncture equations derived from Eqn. (3) are symmetric w.r.t. these coordinates as well as w.r.t. $V_c$ and $W_c$, regardless of whether the flow itself is symmetric or not. Such a coordinate transformation leaves $\epsilon_c$ as the only perturbation parameter, enabling single expansions as for the Region I treatment. The details of the coordinate stretchings are given in Appendix F1, resulting in the following expansions, valid for an arbitrary (non-zero) $\zeta$:

**Middle region**

\[
\begin{align*}
y &= Y/(\xi \epsilon_c), \quad z = \zeta Z/(\xi \epsilon_c), \quad \xi = \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_c/(\epsilon_c \epsilon^h) \\
U &= u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \epsilon_c^2 u_3 + \cdots \\
V &= \epsilon_c \left[ v_1 + \epsilon_c v_2 + \epsilon_c^2 v_3 + \cdots \right] \\
W &= \epsilon_c \left[ w_1 + \epsilon_c w_2 + \epsilon_c^2 w_3 + \cdots \right] \\
P &= p_1 + \epsilon_c p_2 + \epsilon_c^2 p_3 + \cdots
\end{align*}
\]
\[ T_{II} = \left[ \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_w} \right]^2 \left[ 1 + \left( \zeta^{-2\sigma} - 1 \right) \delta_{lz} \right] \]

\[ \left[ t_{1II} + \varepsilon_c t_{2II} + \varepsilon_c^2 t_{3II} + \cdots \right] \cdot \delta_{lz} = \begin{cases} 0, & l \neq z \\ 1, & l = z \end{cases} \]

Inner region

\[ \hat{y} = Y/(\xi \hat{\varepsilon}_c \hat{\varepsilon}_e), \quad \hat{z} = Z/(\xi \hat{\varepsilon}_c \hat{\varepsilon}_e) \]

\[ U = \hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{u}_2 + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{u}_3 + \cdots \]

\[ V = \varepsilon_c \hat{\varepsilon}_c \left[ \hat{v}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{v}_2 + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{v}_3 + \cdots \right] \]

\[ W = \varepsilon_c \hat{\varepsilon}_c \left[ \hat{w}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{w}_2 + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{w}_3 + \cdots \right] \]

\[ P = \hat{p}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{p}_2 + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{p}_3 + \cdots \]

\[ T_{II} = \left[ \frac{\varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_w} \right]^2 \left[ 1 + \left( \zeta^{-2\sigma} - 1 \right) \delta_{lz} \right] \]

\[ \left[ \hat{f}_{1II} + \varepsilon_c \hat{f}_{2II} + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{f}_{3II} + \cdots \right] \]

As shown in Appendix F2,

\[ \lim_{\zeta \to \infty} \varepsilon_c = \varepsilon_w, \quad \lim_{\zeta \to \infty} \varepsilon_c = \varepsilon_b \]

These expansions are inserted into Eqn. (3) and the resulting equations are sorted out to orders 1, \( \varepsilon_c \) and \( \varepsilon_c^2 \) for the middle and inner regions, as shown in Appendix F1. It is important to realize
that the Reynolds stresses scale differently in the endwall- and
blade- boundary layers (Regions I). Thus, in the endwall b.l.:

\[ T_{\text{w}_{\text{ll}}} = t_{1_{\text{ll}}} + \epsilon_{\text{w}} t_{2_{\text{ll}}} + \cdots \]

with related expansion for the inner layer. In the blade b.l.:

\[ T_{\text{b}_{\text{ll}}} = t_{1_{\text{ll}}} + \epsilon_{\text{b}} t_{2_{\text{ll}}} + \cdots \]

and similarly for the inner layer. The juncture region contains Rey-
olds stress contributions from both boundary layers adjacent to it,
and this is taken into account by the series expansion representation
of \( T_{\text{c}_{\text{ll}}} \) as demonstrated below:

\[
\lim_{z_c \to \infty} T_{\text{c}_{\text{ll}}} = \begin{cases} 
  t_{1_{\text{ll}}} + \epsilon_{\text{w}} t_{2_{\text{ll}}} + \cdots, & i \neq z \\
  \zeta^{-2\sigma} \left[ t_{1_{\text{ll}}} + \epsilon_{\text{w}} t_{2_{\text{ll}}} + \cdots \right], & i = z 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\lim_{y_c \to \infty} T_{\text{c}_{\text{ll}}} = \begin{cases} 
  \zeta^{2\sigma} \left[ t_{1_{\text{ll}}} + \epsilon_{\text{b}} t_{2_{\text{ll}}} + \cdots \right], & i \neq z \\
  t_{1_{\text{ll}}} + \epsilon_{\text{b}} t_{2_{\text{ll}}} + \cdots, & i = z 
\end{cases}
\]

Thus, the factors \( \zeta^{\pm2\sigma} \) compensate for the two different scales for
\( T_{\text{ll}} \) on endwall and blade, enabling smooth matching of the juncture
region Reynolds stresses with those on the two Region I boundary
layers.
The equations of motion are derived in Appendix F1, while Appendix F2 includes a detailed description of the procedure to match the corner region with the boundary layers outside the corner. Since the equations are symmetric, it suffices to perform the matching to half of the corner, say the sector between the Z-axis and the bisector of the right angle between this and the Y-axis. The resulting matching lines are indicated in Fig. 4 by the numbers 1, 2 and 3. Important results from the matching procedure are given in Appendix F2 and summarized below:

1. The pressure in the corner region is imposed by the external flow; the gradients of the external pressure normal to the solid boundaries vanish along the corner.
2. The streamwise velocity has a common logarithmic overlap between the corner middle region and the inner layers on both endwall and blade.
3. The streamwise velocity component in the inner region vanishes to $O(1)$.

The final version of the equations of motion is given in Table 2. These equations indicate the following main features of turbulent corner flows:

1. The pressure field in the corner region is imposed by the outer flow.
2. In the middle region, the flow is inviscid and without Reynolds stresses to $O(1)$, and is described by an Euler-type equation for the streamwise momentum. This same
momentum equation becomes of a parabolized Navier–Stokes type with Reynolds stresses only, to $O(\epsilon)$. The $O(\epsilon^2)$ flow is described by a Re-averaged N-S-type equation for the streamwise momentum and by parabolized N-S equations for the two crosswise momenta. Again, these equations include Reynolds stresses only.

3. The inner region is characterized by the fact that the crosswise derivatives of the total shear (viscous + Reynolds stresses) on each wall are equal in magnitude and opposite in sign. Also, the $O(\epsilon^2)$ flow includes pressure gradients normal to both walls, which are balanced by crosswise Reynolds stress gradients. There are no inertia effects in the inner region through $O(\epsilon^2)$ at least.

It is noted that, unlike the Region I equations, those of Region II cannot be solved starting at the lowest order and continuing to higher orders based on previous solutions. Rather, one has to use simultaneously equations belonging to different orders, to have enough non-trivial equations for the number of unknowns [15, 16]. Specifically, in the middle region the continuity and streamwise momentum equations of $O(\epsilon^m)$ have to be coupled with the two crossflow momentum equations of $O(\epsilon^{m+2})$ to solve for the $O(\epsilon^m)$ velocity components and $O(\epsilon^{m+2})$ pressure; in the inner region the continuity and streamwise momentum equations of $O(\epsilon^m)$ must be
solved simultaneously with the crosswise momentum equations of $O(\varepsilon^{m+2})$ to get a complete flow picture. This means that considerably more terms of the asymptotic series must be retained in Region II than in Region I, especially in the inner region. Note also that a "composite profile" does not exist for the juncture flow, since the outer, middle and inner regions do not share common surfaces and thus do not have common asymptotes (see Fig. 4).

Finally, the extent of the juncture region for an arbitrary $\delta/\Delta$ ratio is of interest. This is determined by letting the coordinates of the various subregions be of the order of their scales. Thus

\[ y_c = O(1) \rightarrow Y = O(\xi \varepsilon_c) \rightarrow \tilde{y} = 0 \left[ \varepsilon_w^{-1} \varepsilon_c \xi \Delta \right] = 0 \left[ \xi \Delta u_{tc} / u_{tw} \right] \]

\[ \hat{y}_c = O(1) \rightarrow Y = 0 \left[ \xi \varepsilon_c \hat{\xi} \right] \rightarrow \tilde{y} = 0 \left[ \varepsilon_w^{-1} \varepsilon_c \xi \Delta \right] = 0 \left[ \xi \Delta u_{tc} / u_{tw} \right] \]

\[ z_c = O(1) \rightarrow Z = 0 \left[ \varepsilon_c \xi / \zeta \right] \rightarrow \tilde{z} = 0 \left[ \varepsilon_b^{-1} \varepsilon_c \zeta \right] = 0 \left[ \frac{u_{tc} \xi}{u_{tb} \zeta} \right] \]

\[ \hat{z}_c = O(1) \rightarrow Z = 0 \left[ \varepsilon_c \hat{\xi} / \zeta \right] \rightarrow \tilde{z} = 0 \left[ \varepsilon_b^{-1} \varepsilon_c \xi \zeta \right] = 0 \left[ \frac{u_{tc} \xi}{u_{tb} \zeta} \right] \]

Figure 4 shows the various sub-regions for a juncture flow with
nonzero but otherwise arbitrary $\delta/\Delta$ ratio. The corner vortex, discussed earlier in this Chapter, is situated in the juncture middle region.

For rotational effects on the equations of motion in the juncture, consult Appendix G.
III.1. General Discussion

Based on the results of the pressure-driven 3D analysis, the general forms for the Law-of-the-Wall and Law-of-the-Wake are the following:

Law-of-the-Wall

\[ u^+ \left[ y^+ \right] = \frac{\bar{U} \left[ \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z} \right]}{u_T \left[ \bar{x}, \bar{z} \right]} \]

where

\[ y^+ = \frac{\bar{y} u_T}{v}, \quad u_T = \left[ \tau_w / \rho \right]^{1/2} \]

Law-of-the-Wake

\[ \tilde{f} \left[ \tilde{x}, \eta, \tilde{z} \right] = \frac{\bar{U_e} \left[ \bar{x}, \bar{z} \right] - \bar{U} \left[ \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z} \right]}{u_T \left[ \bar{x}, \bar{z} \right]} \]

where
\[ \eta = \frac{\bar{y}}{\delta} \]

Matching these two laws yields the logarithmic overlap (see Appendix D):

\[ F \left[ \tilde{x}, \eta, \tilde{z} \right] = -\kappa^{-1} \ln \eta + A'. \eta \to 0 \]

\[ u^+ \left[ y^+ \right] = \kappa^{-1} \ln y^+ + B: y^+ \to \infty \]

where

\[ \kappa = .41, B = 5.0, A' = 2\kappa^{-1} \Pi \]

which are Coles' parameters.

If \( u^* \) is now chosen as \( u_T \), then the relationships between \( F \) and \( u^+ \) on the one hand and the 2nd order middle- and inner-variables on the other, become (see Appendix D):

\[ F = - \left( \frac{u_{x_2}}{2} + \frac{u_{z_2}}{2} \right)^{1/2}, \eta = y \]

\[ u^+ = \left( \frac{\hat{u}_{x_2}}{2} + \frac{\hat{u}_{z_2}}{2} \right)^{1/2}, y^+ = \hat{y} \]

This enables the construction of the composite velocity profile, following the general scheme

\[ \begin{align*}
\left[ \text{composite profile} \right] &= \left( \text{outer profile} \right) - \left( \text{common outer-middle asymptote} \right) + \left( \text{middle profile} \right) - \left( \text{common middle-inner asymptote} \right) + \left( \text{inner profile} \right)
\end{align*} \]
Written out explicitly, the composite profile, to order $\epsilon$, has the form (see Appendices C and D):

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_x \\ U_z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} U_{x_0} \\ U_{z_0} \end{bmatrix} (X,Y,Z) - \begin{bmatrix} U_x \\ U_z \end{bmatrix} (X,0,Z) + \epsilon \eta \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial Y} U_x \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial Y} U_z \end{bmatrix} (X,0,Z) +$$

$$- \begin{bmatrix} U_x \\ U_z \end{bmatrix} (X,0,Z) - \epsilon \begin{bmatrix} \cos \gamma \\ -\sin \gamma \end{bmatrix} F(X,\eta,Z)$$

$$- \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi \omega \\ \sin \phi \omega \end{bmatrix} \left[ \kappa^{-1} \ln^{+} + B \right] \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi \omega \\ \sin \phi \omega \end{bmatrix} U^{+} (y^{+}) \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$U = \left( U_x^2 + U_z^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad \phi = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{U_z}{U_x} \right]$$

and $\gamma$ is the angle between $\vec{F}$ and $\vec{U}_\theta$. In order to be able to use this profile in actual calculations, it is necessary to provide explicit models for the Wall- and Wake-Laws.

**III.2. LAW-OF-THE WALL**

22
Based on the results of the asymptotic analysis, the Wall-Law is written in the form:

\[ u^+ = f \left( y^+ \right) \phi = \phi_w \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

with components

\[ u_x^+ = u^+ \cos \phi_w, \quad u_z^+ = u^+ \sin \phi_w. \]

For \( f \) Musker's [12] explicit expression is chosen:

\[ f \left( y^+ \right) = 5.424 \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{2y^+ - 8.15}{16.7} \right) \]

\[ + \log_{10} \left[ \frac{\left( y^+ + 10.6 \right) 9.6}{\left( y^+ - 8.15y^+ + 86 \right)^2} \right]^{3.52} \]

### III.3. LAW-OF-THE-WAKE

In view of the conclusions from the asymptotic analysis, the wake function is defined in the form:

\[ \hat{f} = \frac{\nabla U_{\theta} - \nabla U}{U_T} \]

with streamwise component.
\[ F_x = F \cos \gamma = \frac{\ddot{U}_e - \ddot{U}_x}{u_T} \]

and crossflow component

\[ F_z = -F \sin \gamma = -\frac{\ddot{U}_z}{u_T} \]

See Fig. 5 for basic nomenclature.

The two-dimensional defect function may be expressed by Musker's [12] formula

\[ F_{2D} = \kappa^{-1} \left[ 2\pi \left( 1 - 3\eta^2 + 2\eta^3 \right) - \ln \eta - \eta^2 \left( 1 - \eta \right) \right] \]  

(5)

where the Wake Parameter, \( \Pi \), is determinable from \(^1\) (see Appendix E1).

\[ 2\Pi - \ln \left\{ \frac{1+\Pi}{\kappa \operatorname{Re} \delta_x^\infty} \right\} + \kappa \left( B - \lambda_x \right) = 0 \]

with

\[ \delta_x^\infty = \int_0^\delta \left[ 1 - U_x \right] d\tilde{y} \]

and

\[ \lambda_x = \left( \frac{2}{C_{f_x}} \right)^{1/2} = \frac{\lambda}{\left( \cos \phi_w \right)^{1/2}} \]

There is not an unique generalization of \( F_{2D} \) to three dimensions.

Possibilities for \( F_{2D} \) include:
1. \( \left| \vec{u}_\theta - \vec{U} \right| / u_T \);

2. \( \left| \vec{u}_\theta \right| - \left| \vec{U} \right| / u_T \);

3. \( \left[ \vec{u}_\theta - \vec{u}_x \right] / u_T \).

The first possibility was rejected since it led to poor data correlation; the second is difficult to test or use; the third possibility is the simplest and is the one used henceforth. Thus

\[
F = \frac{F_{2D}}{\cos \gamma}
\]  

(6)

The geometry of Fig. 5 provides the Wake-Law formulation:

\[
U = \left[ 1 - 2 \lambda^{-1} F \cos \gamma + \left( \lambda^{-1} F \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \sin \gamma
\]

\[
\phi = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\lambda^{-1} F \sin \gamma}{1 - \lambda^{-1} F \cos \gamma} \right)
\]

(7)

or, equivalently,

\[
tan \gamma = \left[ \frac{\lambda}{F \cos \gamma} - 1 \right] \tan \phi
\]

(8)

In order to complete the formulation of the Law-of-the-Wake, it is necessary to determine the function \( \gamma(\eta) \). Figure 6 shows a plot of experimental values of \( \Gamma = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma_m} \), where \( \gamma_m \) is the maximum value of \( \gamma \). The data are from Refs. 8 and 10. It is observed that
the lower portion of the plot is different for different stations and that these individual branches merge into a single curve further up. This suggests that \( \Gamma \) could be describable by a combination of two parts, one of which is a function of \( \eta \) and of some physical parameters peculiar to each measurement station, while the other is a function of \( \eta \) only. Pursuing this direction, one arrives at the formulation described below, the details of which are worked out in Appendix E2. In the logarithmic overlap region, \( \gamma \) is determined from the solution of

\[
\frac{d\gamma}{d\eta} = \frac{\lambda \cos^2 \gamma}{F^2_{2D}} \tan \gamma \left[ \frac{U}{k\eta} - \left( \frac{F_{2D}}{\lambda \cos^2 \gamma} - 1 \right) \frac{dF_{2D}}{d\eta} \right] \tag{9}
\]

where \( U \) is given by Eq. (7) and \( F_{2D} \) by Eq. (5).

The initial condition is

\[
\gamma = \gamma_0 \quad \eta = \eta_0 \tag{9a}
\]

where \( \eta_0 \) is the point where the Wake-Law crosses \( \phi_w \) (see Appendix E2, and Figs. 7 and 8).

In the defect layer, \( \gamma \) is chosen in the form

\[
\Gamma = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma_m} = 1 - \beta \left[ 1 - \eta \right]^{\alpha} \tag{10}
\]

as shown in Appendix E2, where
\[ \alpha = \left(1 - \eta_1\right) \frac{\left[1 - \Gamma_1\right]^\eta_1}{\left[1 - \Gamma_1\right]^{1-\eta_1}} \quad \beta = \frac{1 - \Gamma_1}{1 - \eta_1} \]  

with subscripts 1 denoting the point of switching from the portion of the curve described by Eq. (9) to the one described by Eq. (10), (see Appendix E2). The dimensionless distance \( \eta_1 \) is a function of Reynolds number and pressure gradient. A typical value is 0.035. Figure 8 depicts the relation of \( \eta_1 \) to \( \eta_0 \), and Appendix E3 outlines the procedure to determine \( \eta_1 \).

At the upper edge of the defect layer \( \gamma \) attains its maximum value, \( \gamma_m \), which is calculable from

\[ \gamma_m = \tan^{-1} \left( 2U_e^2 \int_0^{\beta_\theta} \frac{d\psi}{U_\theta^2} \right) \]  

where \( \beta_\theta \) is the local freestream direction relative to the direction at the upstream position. Eqn. (11) is a result of integrating a shearless version of the boundary-layer equations along main-flow streamlines. This approach is based on the assumption that a shearless analysis can yield valid results in the outer part of boundary-layers which are well developed before being perturbed by a main-flow turning. Under such circumstances crossflows develop mainly as a result of the reorientation of vorticity in the layer, while frictional effects are felt only near the wall. The determination of \( \gamma_m \) thus requires knowledge of the external flow field only. Figure 9
depicts a typical comparison between the above model for \( \gamma \) and experimental data.

It should be noted that the entire analysis described above did not involve the actual solution of the equations of motion. Therefore, four parameters are required as input in order to enable calculations. These are:

1. \( C_f \)
2. \( \phi_w \)
3. \( Re_\theta \)
4. \( \beta_\theta \)

In addition, the determination of \( \gamma_m \) requires knowledge of the external flow field. In a real situation these would be unknowns, and the equations of motion would have to be solved, subject to a prescribed pressure distribution and initial velocity profile. However, regardless of the method of solution, the above model could then be incorporated into the solution scheme, since it does not introduce any additional unknowns of its own.

**III. 4. Comparison with Experimental Data**

The data of Refs. 8 and 10 have been used to check the validity of the proposed models for the Wall- and Wake-Laws. Both sources of data use flow geometries which lead to a build-up of adverse pressure gradient with eventual three-dimensional separation. The measurement stations chosen for comparison between theory and
data were all fully attached. Results of two stations from Ref. 8 and three from Ref. 10 are reported here: In station C4 of Ref. 10 an 8% crossflow is present; in station D5 the crossflow is about 12% and in station F7 it reaches about 25% of the streamwise flow component. In station 7 of Ref. 8 the crossflow is about 22% and in station 8 it reaches 27%. Figures 10A through 10E show comparisons between the present model and the data of the representative measurement stations. The figures include comparisons for both the hodograph and the resultant velocity profile (in terms of magnitude and direction). The agreement is good for all stations. In particular, it is noted that the model is able to predict the smooth transition from the wall- to the wake-region. The discrepancy between the model and the data of Ref. 10 involving the magnitude of the velocity (most pronounced in station F7) may be due to the fact that the experiment of Mueller has a curvature effect, which is not accounted for in the model.

III.5. Comparison with Johnston's Triangular Model

Johnston [2] assumed the following model for the $U_z-U_x$ hodograph:

$$U_z = \begin{cases} U_x \tan \phi_w, & U_x < U_p \\ 1-U_x, & U_x > U_p \end{cases}$$

In contrast, the present model assumes no geometric relationship.
Rather, the hodograph results on the basis of the fundamental assumption that the wake function is a vector quantity. In comparing the two models, it is observed that the first leg of Johnston's triangle corresponds to the Wall-Law of the present model, while the second leg corresponds to a special limit of the present model's Wake-Law, namely, $\Gamma = 1$ with $A = \tan \gamma_m$. However, this is an inadequate choice since it fails to correctly describe either the transition from the wall- to the wake-region or the magnitude and location of the maximum crossflow (see Fig. 7). These shortcomings are apparent from Johnston's own polar plots (see Ref. 2). The other basic difference between the two models stems from the fact that whereas Johnston regards the vertex of his triangle as the edge of the wall sublayer, the present model locates this point at $\eta_0$, corresponding to $\gamma_0$ (see Fig. 7).
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

An asymptotic analysis has been carried out for three-dimensional endwall turbulent boundary layers. This analysis indicates that, as in the two-dimensional case, the flow is multi-structured, possessing an inner (or wall) layer; a middle (or defect) layer; and an outer layer, and the pressure in the b.l. is imposed by the outer flow.

In the blade/endwall juncture, the defect region is describable by parabolized Navier-Stokes equations through $0(\epsilon^2)$ except for the streamwise momentum of $0(\epsilon^2)$ which is a Re-averaged N-S-type equation. Rotational effects appear in the form of centrifugal terms to $0(1)$, Coriolis terms to $0(\epsilon^2)$ and there is no influence on the $0(\epsilon)$ momentum components. Viscous stresses are absent from the defect region. The inner region is characterized by the crosswise total shear gradients on each wall being equal in magnitude and opposite in sign, and no inertia effects, except for centrifugal accelerations in the case of a rotor.

It is also found that the streamwise velocity has a common logarithmic overlap between the corner middle region and the inner layers on both endwall and blade.
The same equations which describe the non-symmetrical juncture flow also describe the symmetrical case, but the coordinates and Reynolds stresses scale differently in the two cases.

In the pressure-driven part of the endwall boundary layer outside the juncture, the inner layer is dominated by constant total shear across it, inertia and pressure gradients having no significant influence there. The middle layer is driven by both pressure gradients and Reynolds stresses, and may be described by boundary layer-type equations to \( O(\epsilon) \) and Re-averaged N-S equations to \( O(\epsilon^2) \). These two sub-layers share a common logarithmic overlap region. The outer layer is inviscid and generally rotational, describable by the Euler equations.

The results of the analysis indicate that the wall sub-layer is two-dimensional, flowing in the local wall shear direction, and all the turning from this to the freestream direction takes place in the defect sub-layer.

Based on the results of the analysis for the pressure-driven part of the b.l., a model is proposed for the three-dimensional counterpart of the Law-of-the-Wall and Law-of-the-Wake, which agrees quite well with experimental data.
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Table 1 - Momentum equation in the three sub-layers, to orders $1$, $\epsilon$, and $\epsilon^2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outer Region</th>
<th>Middle Region</th>
<th>Inner Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outer Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>Middle Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inner Region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_1 = \nu_1(X,0,Z)$ Euler equations (No Reynolds stresses)</td>
<td>$p_1 = p_1(X,0,Z)$ Euler equations</td>
<td>$\hat{p}_1 = p_1(X,0,Z)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{u}_x = \hat{u}_y = \hat{u}_z = 0$ Boundary-layer equations. Reynolds stresses only</td>
<td>$\hat{p}_2 = 0$</td>
<td>$\hat{p}_2 = 0$ Constant total shear across sub-layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euler equations</td>
<td>Re-averaged Navier-Stokes equations for $X$- and $Z$-momenta Reynolds stresses only</td>
<td>$\hat{p}_3 = p_3(X,0,Z)$ + $\hat{\nu}_i$ Constant total shear across sub-layer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Juncture equations for an arbitrary (non-zero) $\delta/\Delta$ ratio. (See text for definitions of coordinates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle region</th>
<th>Inner region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O(1)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| \[
\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = 0
\] | \[
\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = 0
\] |
| $u_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = \hat{p}_1 = P_1 (x, 0, 0)$ | \[
\frac{dP_1}{dx} (x, 0, 0)
\] |
| $O(\epsilon)$ |              |
| \[
\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = 0
\] | \[
\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = 0
\] |
| \[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 u_2) + v_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z}
\] | \[
0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} \right]
\] |
| $p_2 = 0$ | \[
\hat{p}_2 = 0
\] |
\( O(\varepsilon^2) \)

\[
\frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(u_1 u_3) + u_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial x} \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} = 0
\]
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Appendix A: Preliminary form of the equations of motion in the various layers to orders $1$, $\epsilon$ and $\epsilon^2$

After substituting the asymptotic expansions for the three layers into Eqns. (1) and (2) and collecting terms of the same order, the following equations are obtained:

1. Outer layer

$O(1)$

$$\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = 0$$

$$\left[ U_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \left[ U_1, V_1, W_1 \right]^T =$$

$$- \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right]^T \left[ P_1 \right]$$

(A1)

$O(\epsilon)$

$$\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = 0$$

$$\left[ U_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \left[ U_2, V_2, W_2 \right]^T +$$
\[
\left[ U_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \left[ U_1, V_2, W_1 \right]^T = \\
= - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right]^T \left[ P_2 \right] \\

0(\varepsilon^2)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial U_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial W_3}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\left[ U_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \left[ U_3, V_3, W_3 \right]^T + \\
\left[ U_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \left[ U_2, V_2, W_2 \right]^T + \\
\left[ U_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \left[ U_1, V_1, W_1 \right]^T = \\
- \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right]^T \left[ P_3 \right] \\

(A3)
\]

2. Middle layer

\[0(1)\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = 0
\]
\[ u_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial x} \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y} \]

\[ u_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z} \quad (A4) \]

\[ 0(\epsilon) \]

\[ \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = 0 \]

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( u_1 \begin{bmatrix} u_1 & u_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) + v_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = \]

\[ - \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_{1xy}}{\partial y} \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial y} \]

\[ u_1 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial x} + u_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( w_1 w_2 \right) = \]

\[ = - \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_{1yz}}{\partial y} \quad (A5) \]

\[ 0(\epsilon^2) \]

\[ \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial z} = 0 \]
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ u_1 u_3 \right] + u_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial z} + \\
w_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = \\
- \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_{1xx}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_{0yx}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_{1xz}}{\partial z} \\
u_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_{1yy}}{\partial y} \\
u_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + u_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial x} + u_3 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + \\
v_3 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ w_1 w_3 \right] + w_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = \\
- \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_{1xz}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_{2yz}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_{1zz}}{\partial z} \\
(A6)
\]

3. Inner layer

0(1)

\[
\frac{\partial \hat{u}_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \hat{v}_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \hat{w}_1}{\partial z} = 0 \\
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{u}_1}{\partial y^2} \\
\]
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\[ 0 = \frac{\hat{a}_{p_{1}}}{\hat{a}_{y}} \]
\[ 0 = \frac{\hat{a}_{w_{1}}}{\hat{a}_{y}^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A7)

\[ 0(\epsilon) \]
\[ \frac{\hat{a}_{u_{2}}}{\hat{a}_{x}} + \frac{\hat{a}_{v_{2}}}{\hat{a}_{y}} + \frac{\hat{a}_{w_{2}}}{\hat{a}_{z}} = 0 \]
\[ 0 = \frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{a}_{y}} \left\{ \hat{r}_{1_{xy}} + \frac{\hat{a}_{u_{2}}}{\hat{a}_{y}} \right\} \]
\[ 0 = \frac{\hat{a}_{p_{2}}}{\hat{a}_{y}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A8)

\[ 0(\epsilon^2) \]
\[ \frac{\hat{a}_{u_{3}}}{\hat{a}_{x}} + \frac{\hat{a}_{v_{3}}}{\hat{a}_{y}} + \frac{\hat{a}_{w_{3}}}{\hat{a}_{z}} = 0 \]
\[ 0 = \frac{\hat{a}}{\hat{a}_{y}} \left\{ \hat{r}_{2_{xy}} + \frac{\hat{a}_{u_{3}}}{\hat{a}_{y}} \right\} \]
\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( -\hat{\rho}_3 + \hat{\xi}_1 \right) \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \hat{t}_2 \frac{\partial \hat{w}_3}{\partial y} \right) \]  (A9)
Appendix B: Matching procedure

1. Formal matching of outer and middle layers

$U(x, Y, Z)$ is expanded by a Taylor series around $Y = 0$:

$$U(x, Y, Z) = U_1 (x, 0, Z) + \epsilon Y \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial Y} (x, 0, Z) + \epsilon^2 \frac{Y^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 U_1}{\partial Y^2} (x, 0, Z)$$

$$+ \ldots + \epsilon U_2 (x, 0, Z) + \epsilon^2 Y \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial Y} (x, 0, Z) + \ldots +$$

$$\epsilon^2 U_3 (x, 0, Z) + \ldots =$$

$$= u_1 (x, y, Z) + \epsilon u_2 (x, y, Z) + \epsilon^2 u_3 (x, y, Z) + \ldots; \quad y \to \infty$$

Thus

$$u_1 (x, y, Z) = U_1 (x, 0, Z); \quad y \to \infty \quad (B1)$$

$$u_2 (x, y, Z) = Y \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial Y} (x, 0, Z) + U_2 (x, 0, Z); \quad y \to \infty$$

$$u_3 (x, y, Z) = Y^2 \frac{\partial^2 U_1}{\partial Y^2} (x, 0, Z) + Y \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial Y} (x, 0, Z) +$$

$$U_3 (x, 0, Z); \quad y \to \infty$$

and similar relationships hold for the crossflow component, $w$.

Following the same procedure as above, yields:
\[ V_1(x,0,Z) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (B2)

\[ V_2(x,0,Z) = \lim_{y \to \infty} \left[ v_1(x,y,Z) - y \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y}(x,0,Z) \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (B3)

\[ V_3(x,0,Z) = \lim_{y \to \infty} \left[ v_2(x,y,Z) - y \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y}(x,0,Z) - \frac{y^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 v_1}{\partial y^2}(x,0,Z) \right] \]

\[ p_1(x,Z) = P_1(x,0,Z) \quad (since \ \partial p_1/\partial y = 0) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B4)

\[ p_2(x,Z) = y \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y}(x,0,Z) + P_2(x,0,Z) ; y \to \infty \]  \hspace{1cm} (B5)

\[ p_3(x,y,Z) = \frac{y^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 p_1}{\partial y^2}(x,0,Z) + y \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial y}(x,0,Z) + P_3(x,0,Z) ; y \to \infty \]

\[ t_{\text{II}}(x,y,Z) \to 0 ; y \to \infty, \text{ for } n = 1,2,3,\ldots \]

(since no freestream turbulence was assumed to exist)

2. Formal matching of middle and inner layers

Again, variables are expanded in Taylor series around \( y = 0 \):

\[ V(x,y,Z) = \epsilon v_1(x,0,Z) + \epsilon \hat{y} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y}(x,0,Z) + \ldots + \]
\[ \varepsilon^2 v_2 (x, 0, Z) + \]
\[ + \varepsilon^2 \hat{v} \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z) + \ldots + \varepsilon^3 v_3 (x, 0, Z) + \varepsilon^3 \hat{v} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z) + \ldots = \]
\[ = \varepsilon \hat{v}_1 (x, \hat{y}, Z) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{v}_2 (x, \hat{y}, Z) + \varepsilon^3 \hat{v}_3 (x, \hat{y}, Z) + \ldots ; \]
\[ \hat{y} \to \infty \]

Hence

\[ v_1 (x, 0, Z) = v_2 (x, 0, Z) = v_3 (x, 0, Z) = \ldots = 0 \quad (B6) \]

\[ \hat{v}_i (x, \hat{y}, Z) = \hat{v} \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z); \hat{y} \to \infty, \ i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \]

\[ P = p_1 (x, Z) + \varepsilon p_2 (x, Z) + \varepsilon^2 p_3 (x, 0, Z) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{v} \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z) + \ldots = \]
\[ = \hat{p}_1 (x, Z) + \varepsilon \hat{p}_2 (x, Z) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{p}_3 (x, \hat{y}, Z) + \ldots \]

Thus

\[ \hat{p}_1 (x, Z) = p_1 (x, Z) = \hat{P}_1 (x, 0, Z) \]
\[ \hat{p}_2 (x, Z) = p_2 (x, Z) \quad (B7) \]
\[ \hat{p}_3 (x, \hat{y}, Z) - p_3 (x, 0, Z); \hat{y} \to \infty \]

and similarly
\[ \hat{t}_{n,l} (x, \hat{y}, Z) - t_{n,l} (x, 0, Z); \hat{y} \to \infty, \ n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \]

The U and W components require a special treatment.

\[ U (x, y, Z) = u_1 (x, 0, Z) + \epsilon \hat{y} \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z) + \cdots + \]
\[ \epsilon u_2 (x, 0, Z) + \cdots + \]
\[ + \epsilon^2 u_3 (x, 0, Z) + \cdots = \hat{u}_1 (x, \hat{y}, Z) + \epsilon \hat{u}_2 (x, \hat{y}, Z) + \]
\[ \epsilon^2 \hat{u}_3 (x, \hat{y}, Z) + \cdots; \hat{y} \to \infty \]  \hspace{1cm} (B8)

From Eqn. (A7) and the boundary condition \( \hat{u}_1 (x, 0, Z) = 0 \), it follows that \( \hat{u}_1 \) must be of the form
\[ \hat{u}_1 (x, \hat{y}, Z) = f (x, Z) \hat{y} \]

which is unbounded as \( \hat{y} \to \infty \). Thus the first order terms in Eqn. (B8) cannot be matched directly. Therefore Eqn. (B8) is differentiated w.r.t. \( y \), yielding:
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\[
\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[ f(x, z) + \epsilon \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} (x, \hat{y}, z) + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} (x, \hat{y}, z) + \cdots \right]_{\hat{y} \to \infty} = \\
= \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} (x, 0, z) + \epsilon \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} (x, 0, z) + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} (x, 0, z) + \cdots \tag{B9}
\]

Since the leading term in the inner expansion is of \(O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right)\) and that in the middle expansion is of \(O(1)\), the only possibility for a match is that both vanish identically. A similar argument holds for the \(W\)-component. Thus

\[\hat{u}_1 = \hat{w}_1 = 0,\]

and from the continuity Eq. and B.C. \(\hat{v}_1 = 0 \theta \hat{y} = 0\) it also follows that \(\hat{v}_1 = 0\). Also

\[\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \begin{array}{c} u_1 \\ w_1 \end{array} \right] (x, 0, z) = 0\]

and this combined with the B.C. \(\left[ \begin{array}{c} U \\ W \end{array} \right] \hat{y} = 0\) uniquely determines \(u_1\) and \(w_1\) at \(y = 0\):

\[
\left[ \begin{array}{c} u_1 \\ w_1 \end{array} \right]_{y = 0} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \cos \hat{\phi}_w \\ \sin \hat{\phi}_w \end{array} \right] \text{ at a given } (x, z) \text{ location.}
\]

Since \(\hat{y} = y/\hat{\epsilon}\), the only possibility for a match in the remaining part of Eqn. (B9) is
\[
\begin{aligned}
&a_u_2'/\alpha y = b_2/\alpha y, & a_u_3'/\alpha y = b_3/\alpha y; \ldots; \; y \to 0 \\
&\hat{a}_u_2'/\alpha \hat{y} = b_2/\alpha \hat{y}, & \hat{a}_u_3'/\alpha \hat{y} = b_3/\alpha \hat{y}; \ldots; \; \hat{y} \to \infty
\end{aligned}
\]

which, after integrating gives

\[
\begin{aligned}
u_2 &= b_2 \ln y + C_2, \quad u_3 &= b_3 \ln y + C_3; \ldots; \; y \to 0 \quad (B10)
\end{aligned}
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\hat{u}_2 &= b_2 \ln \hat{y} + \hat{C}_2, \quad \hat{u}_3 &= b_3 \ln \hat{y} + \hat{C}_3; \ldots; \; \hat{y} \to \infty \quad (B11)
\end{aligned}
\]

where the \( b \)'s and \( C \)'s are functions of \( x \) and \( Z \). Similar expressions hold for the \( w \) and \( \hat{w} \) components. This establishes the existence of a logarithmic overlap between the inner and middle layers. Inserting these results into (B8) yields

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\left[ \epsilon b_2 + \epsilon^2 b_3 + \cdots \right] \ln \hat{y} = u_1 (x, 0, Z) + \left[ \epsilon b_2 + \epsilon^2 b_3 + \cdots \right] \ln y + \\
&\quad + \epsilon \left[ C_2 - \hat{C}_2 \right] + \epsilon^2 \left[ C_3 - \hat{C}_3 \right] + \cdots
\end{aligned}
\]

or

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\left[ \epsilon b_2 + \epsilon^2 b_3 + \cdots \right] \ln \hat{\epsilon} = u_1 (x, 0, Z) + \epsilon \left[ C_2 - \hat{C}_2 \right] + \epsilon^2 \left[ C_3 - \hat{C}_3 \right] + \cdots
\end{aligned}
\]

whence it follows that

\[ -\epsilon \ln \hat{\epsilon} = 0(1) \rightarrow \hat{\epsilon} = 0 \left( e^{-1/\epsilon} \right) \text{ as } \epsilon \to 0 \]

This confirms the assumption that \( \hat{\epsilon} = 0(\epsilon^n) \) which allowed a single parameter asymptotic expansion approach.
3. Results from the matching procedure

A. From the continuity Eqn. of (A4):

\[ v_1 = - \int \left[ \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} \right] dy + v_1 \bigg|_{y=0} = 0 \quad \text{(Eq. (B6))} \]

and using Eq. (B1).

\[ \lim_{y \to \infty} v_1 = - \int \left[ \lim_{y \to \infty} \left[ \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} \right] \right] dy = \]

\[ - \int \left[ \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial W_1}{\partial z} \right] (x, 0, z) dy = \]

\[ = - y \left[ \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial W_1}{\partial z} \right] (x, 0, z) \quad \text{(B12)} \]

Also, from the cont. eqn. of (A1),

\[ \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} (x, 0, z) = - \left[ \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial W_1}{\partial z} \right] (x, 0, z) \]

Substituting this and (B12) into Eqn. (B3) yields

\[ V_2 (x, 0, z) = 0 \]

This, together with the fact that the 1st order outer solution satisfies all the B.C.'s at \( Y = \infty \), so that the 2nd order equations must satisfy homogeneous B.C.'s there as well as at \( Y = 0 \), dictate that the solution to Eqn. (A2) be the trivial one:
\[ U_2 = V_2 = W_2 = P_2 = 0 \]

B. From Eqn. (B2) and the fact that \( \frac{\partial V_1}{\partial y} (x, 0, z) \) does not necessarily vanish, it follows that \( V_1 \) has the form

\[ V_1 = Yf(x, y, z), \text{ so that } \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \end{bmatrix} V_1 (x, 0, z) = 0. \text{ The Y-mom.} \]

part of Eqn. (A1) thus dictates that \( \frac{\partial P_1}{\partial y} (x, 0, z) = 0 \). Combined with the previous result \( P_2 = 0 \), Eq. (B5) yields

\[ p_2 = 0 \]

It then follows from Eqn. (B7) that

\[ \hat{p}_2 = 0 \]
Appendix C: Final form of the equations of motion and their matching- and boundary- conditions

1. Outer layer

0(1)

\[
\frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial W_1}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\left[ U_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \begin{bmatrix} U_1 & V_1 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}^T = - \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} p_1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

0(\(\varepsilon\))

\[ U_2 = V_2 = W_2 = p_2 = 0 \]

0(\(\varepsilon^2\))

\[
\frac{\partial U_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial W_3}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\left[ U_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \begin{bmatrix} U_3 & V_3 & W_3 \end{bmatrix}^T + \left[ U_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + V_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + W_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right] \begin{bmatrix} U_1 & V_1 & W_1 \end{bmatrix}^T = \]
\[
\begin{align*}
&= - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right]^{T} [P_3] \\
\end{align*}
\]

2. Middle layer

\(O(1)\)

\[
\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = 0 \\
u_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial x} \\

0 = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y} \\
u_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z}
\]

\(O(\epsilon)\)

\[
\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = 0 \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ u_1 u_2 \right] + v_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} \\
u_1 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial x} + u_2 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ w_1 w_2 \right] = \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y}
\]

\(O(\epsilon^2)\)

\[
\frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial z} = 0
\]
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ u_1 u_3 \right] + u_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z}
\]

\[
u_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y}
\]

\[
u_1 \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial x} + u_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial x} + u_3 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + v_3 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + w_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z}
\]

3. Inner layer

\[O(1)\]

\[\hat{u}_1 = \hat{v}_1 = \hat{w}_1 = 0\]

\[\hat{p}_1 = P_1(x, 0, \hat{z})\]

\[O(\varepsilon)\]

\[\frac{\partial \hat{u}_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \hat{v}_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \hat{w}_2}{\partial z} = 0\]
\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \hat{f}_{1,xy} + \frac{\partial \hat{u}_2}{\partial y} \right] \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \hat{f}_{1, yz} + \frac{\partial \hat{w}_2}{\partial y} \right] \]

\[ 0(\epsilon^2) \]

\[ \frac{\partial \hat{u}_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \hat{v}_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \hat{w}_3}{\partial z} = 0 \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \hat{f}_{2,xy} + \frac{\partial \hat{u}_3}{\partial y} \right] \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \hat{f}_{2, yz} + \frac{\partial \hat{w}_3}{\partial y} \right] \]

4. Outer-middle matching conditions

\[ u_1(x, y, Z) = U_1(x, 0, Z); y \to \infty \]

\[ u_2(x, y, Z) = y \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y}(x, 0, Z); y \to \infty \]

\[ u_3(x, y, Z) = \frac{y^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 U_1}{\partial y^2}(x, 0, Z) + U_3(x, 0, Z); y \to \infty \]

with similar relationships for \( w \).
\[ V_1(x, 0, Z) = 0 \]

\[ v_1(x, y, Z) = -y \left[ \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial W_1}{\partial Z} \right]_{(x, 0, Z)} : y \to \infty \]

\[ v_2(x, y, Z) = V_3(x, 0, Z) + \frac{y^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V_1}{\partial y^2} (x, 0, Z); \ y \to \infty \]

\[ p_1(x, Z) = p_1(x, 0, Z) \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z) \]

\[ p_3(x, y, Z) = \frac{y^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 p_1}{\partial y^2} (x, 0, Z) + p_3(x, y, Z); \ y \to \infty \]

\[ t_{n, ff} (x, y, Z) = 0; y \to \infty, \ for \ n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \]

5. Middle - Inner matching conditions

\[ v_1(x, 0, Z) = v_2(x, 0, Z) = v_3(x, 0, Z) = 0 \]

\[ \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ v_1 \\ w_1 \end{bmatrix}_{(x, 0, Z)} = 0 \]

\[ \hat{v}_2(x, \hat{y}, Z) = \hat{y} \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z); \ \hat{y} \to \infty \]
\[ \hat{v}_3 (x, y, Z) = \hat{y} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial y} (x, 0, Z); \hat{y} \to \infty \]

\[ \hat{p}_1 (x, Z) = p_1 (x, 0, Z) \]

\[ \hat{p}_3 (x, y, Z) = p_3 (x, 0, Z) \hat{y} \to \infty \]

\[ \hat{t}_{n_{lj}} (x, y, Z) = t_{n_{lj}} (x, 0, Z); \hat{y} \to \infty, n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \]

\[ u_2 = b_2 \ln y + C_2, u_3 = b_3 \ln y + C_3; y \to 0 \]

\[ \hat{u}_2 = b_2 \ln \hat{y} + \hat{C}_2, \hat{u}_3 = b_3 \ln \hat{y} + \hat{C}_3; \hat{y} \to \infty \]

with similar relationships for \( w \) and \( \hat{w} \).

B.C.'s: \[ \hat{u}_n (x, 0, Z) = \hat{v}_n (x, 0, Z) = \hat{w}_n (x, 0, Z) = 0, n = 2, 3, \ldots \]
Appendix D: Determination of the 3D logarithmic overlap

In vector form, we have

\[ \frac{\vec{U}}{u_T} = \vec{f}(y^+) \] (D1)

\[ \text{Law-of-the-Wall:} \quad \left[ \frac{\vec{U}_\theta}{u_T} - \frac{\vec{U}}{u_T} \right] = \vec{f}(\eta) \] (D2)

From Eqn. (D1):

\[ \frac{\vec{U}}{d\vec{y}} = \frac{u_T}{v} \frac{d\vec{f}}{dy^+} \] (D3)

and from Eqn. (D2):

\[ \frac{d\vec{U}}{d\vec{y}} = -\frac{u_T}{\delta} \frac{d\vec{f}}{d\eta} \] (D4)

Multiplying Eqns. (D3) and (D4) by \( \vec{y}/u_T \) and equating, yields

\[ y^+ \frac{df^+}{dy^+} = -\eta \frac{df}{d\eta} = \vec{C} \] (D5)

where \( \vec{C} \) is a constant vector.

Rewriting Eqn. (D5) in component form.
\[ y^+ \left( \frac{df_x}{dy^+} \hat{\theta}_x + \frac{df_z}{dy^+} \hat{\theta}_z \right) = -\eta \left( \frac{dF_x}{d\eta} \hat{\theta}_x + \frac{dF_z}{d\eta} \hat{\theta}_z \right) = C_x \hat{\theta}_x + C_z \hat{\theta}_z \]

Thus

\[ y^+ \frac{df_x}{dy^+} = -\eta \frac{dF_x}{d\eta} = C_x \rightarrow \begin{cases} f_x = C_x \ln y^+ + B_x \\ F_x = -C_x \ln \eta + A_x \end{cases} \quad (D6) \]

\[ y^+ \frac{df_z}{dy^+} = -\eta \frac{dF_z}{d\eta} = C_z \rightarrow \begin{cases} f_z = C_z \ln y^+ + B_z \\ F_z = -C_z \ln \eta + A_z \end{cases} \quad (D7) \]

Comparing these results with Eqns. (B10) and (B11) yields

\[ u^+ = f_x = \hat{u}_2, \quad C_x = b_2, \quad B_x = \hat{C}_2, \quad y^+ = \hat{y} \quad (D8) \]

\[ F_x = -u_2, \quad A_x = -C_2, \quad \eta = \hat{y} \]

with similar expressions for the z-components. Note that \( \eta = y \) dictates the scale of the outer flow as \( l = \lambda \delta \).

Since the Law-of-the-Wall is 2D (in \( \tau_w \)-direction), it follows that

\[ u^+ = \kappa^{-1} \ln y^+ + B; \quad y^+ \rightarrow \infty \quad (D9) \]

whence
\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} u_x^+ \\ u_z^+ \end{bmatrix} &= u^+ \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_w \\ \sin \phi_w \end{bmatrix} - \kappa^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_w \\ \sin \phi_w \end{bmatrix} \ln y^+ + \\
\begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_w \\ \sin \phi_w \end{bmatrix} B : y^+ \to \infty
\end{align*}
\]

comparing this with Eqn. (D8) and its z-counterpart, one gets
\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} b_2 \\ d_2 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} C_x \\ C_z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_w \\ \sin \phi_w \end{bmatrix} \kappa^{-1} \\
\begin{bmatrix} \hat{c}_2 \\ \hat{d}_2 \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} B_x \\ B_z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_w \\ \sin \phi_w \end{bmatrix} B
\end{align*}
\]

Eqns. (D6) and (D7) then imply that
\[
F \cos \gamma = F_x' - \kappa^{-1} \cos \phi_w \ln \eta + A_x', \quad \eta \to 0 \quad (D10)
\]
\[
- F \sin \gamma = F_z' - \kappa^{-1} \sin \phi_w \ln \eta + A_z'
\]

if one now assumes that
\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} A_x' \\ A_z' \end{bmatrix} &= A' \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_w \\ \sin \phi_w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi_w \\ \sin \phi_w \end{bmatrix} \frac{2 \Pi}{\kappa}
\end{align*}
\]

then it follows from Eqn. (D10) that
\[ F = \sqrt{F_x^2 + F_z^2} - \kappa^{-1} \left( \ln \eta - 2 \Pi \right); \quad \eta \to 0 \]

which establishes, together with (D9), the logarithmic overlap for the 3D case. This was also established by the matched asymptotic analysis, Eqns. (B10), (B11) and their crosswise counterparts.
Appendix E: Details Pertaining to Profile Relations

E1: Determination of the Wake Parameter. II

Since $F_{2D}$ is the defect function of the streamwise component of the skewed boundary layer, the following log. friction law applies to it:

$$k \lambda_\chi = \ln \left( \frac{\text{Re} \delta / \lambda_\chi}{\text{Re} \delta} \right) + \kappa B + 2 \Pi$$

(E1-1)

where

$$\lambda_\chi = \sqrt{\cos \phi_w}^{1/2}$$

By using Coles' [11] formulation of the 2D Law-of-the-Wake, subject to his normalizing conditions, a further relationship involving $\Pi$ is

$$k \lambda_\chi \text{Re} \delta / \text{Re} \delta = 1 + \Pi$$

(E1-2)

Combining Eqns. (E1-1) and (E1-2) then yields the equation for $\Pi$ in the form

$$2 \Pi - \ln \left( \frac{1 + \Pi}{k \text{Re} \delta} \right) + \kappa \left( \beta - \lambda_\chi \right) = 0$$

from which $\Pi$ is determinable, using a root finder algorithm [13].
E2: Determination of the function \( \gamma(\eta) \)

From the Law-of-the-Wall, Eq. (4), one gets

\[
\frac{d\bar{U}}{d\bar{y}} = \frac{u'}{\nu} \frac{df}{dy^+}
\]

From the Law-of-the-Wake, Eq. (7), one gets

\[
\frac{d\bar{U}}{d\bar{y}} = \frac{u'}{\bar{U}} \left[ F \frac{dF}{d\eta} - \lambda \left[ \frac{dF}{d\eta} \cos \gamma - F \sin \gamma \frac{d\gamma}{d\eta} \right] \right]
\]

Multiplying both expressions by \( \frac{\bar{y}}{u'} \) and equating, yields

\[
y^+ \frac{df}{dy^+} = \frac{\eta}{\bar{U}} \left[ \left( \frac{F}{\lambda} - \cos \gamma \right) \frac{dF}{d\eta} + F \sin \gamma \frac{d\gamma}{d\eta} \right] \kappa^{-1} \]

(E2-1)

Since the L.H.S. is a function of \( y^+ \) only and the R.H.S. of \( \eta \) only (these are independent variables in the context of asymptotic analysis), both are equal to the same constant, \( \kappa^{-1} \). Integration of the L.H.S. yields

\[
\eta = \kappa^{-1} \ln y^+ + B
\]

which is the logarithmic overlap expressed in terms of wall variables.

Substituting Eq. (6) into the R.H.S. of Eq. (E2-1) yields

\[
\frac{\eta}{\bar{U}} \left[ \left( \frac{F^2}{\lambda \cos^2 \gamma} \right)^{-1} \frac{dF}{d\eta} \left( \frac{F^2}{\lambda \cos^2 \gamma} \right) + \frac{F}{\lambda \cos^2 \gamma} \frac{d\gamma}{d\eta} \right] = \kappa^{-1}
\]

from which
\[
\frac{d\gamma}{d\eta} = \frac{\lambda \cos^2 \gamma}{F_{2D}^2 \tan \gamma} \left[ \frac{U}{\kappa \eta} - \left( \frac{F_{2D}}{\lambda \cos^2 \gamma} - 1 \right) \frac{dF_{2D}}{d\eta} \right]
\]  

(9)

where \( U \) is given by Eq. (7) and \( F_{2D} \) by Eq. (5). The initial condition required for the solution of Eq. (9) is determined as follows: according to the asymptotic analysis the hodograph (Fig. 7) starts deviating from the \( \phi_w^- \) direction at the point in the logarithmic overlap where the wall- and wake-velocity vectors are in the same direction. This point is designated as \( \eta_o \).

From Fig. 7,

\[
u^+ = \left[ \frac{\lambda}{\cos \phi_w + \frac{\sin \phi_w}{\tan \gamma}} \right]
\]

combining this with Eqs. (6) and (8) yields

\[
\tan \phi(\eta) = \frac{\sin \phi_w}{\left[ \frac{\lambda}{u^+} - \cos \phi_w \right] \left[ \frac{\lambda}{F_{2D}(\eta)} - 1 \right]}
\]

(E2-2)

In the logarithmic overlap. Here

\[
y^+ = \frac{\Re \theta}{\lambda} \eta
\]

and \( u^+ \) and \( F_{2D} \) are given by Eqs. (4) and (5) respectively. Eq. (E2-2) is solved iteratively for \( \eta_o \) which is the largest \( \eta \) for which \( \phi(\eta) = \phi_w^- \). \( \gamma_o \) is then found from Eq. (8) with \( \eta = \eta_o \) and \( \phi = \phi_w^- \). This determines the required initial conditions for Eq.
the solution of which provides $\gamma(\eta)$ in the logarithmic overlap region, which is the lower portion of the $\gamma(\eta)$ curve.

At the upper portion of the defect layer, $\gamma = \gamma_m$ [Eq. (11)]. To complete the formulation of $\gamma$, it is necessary to devise a curve-fit which smoothly connects the lower and upper portions of the $\gamma(\eta)$ curve. To this end one defines the function

$$\Gamma = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma_m} = 1 - \beta \left[1 - \eta\right]^\alpha$$

(10)

The following requirements are necessary to be met by this function:

1) $\Gamma(1) = 1$

2) $\frac{d\Gamma}{d\eta} > 0$

3) $\lim_{\eta \to 1} \frac{d\Gamma}{d\eta} = 0$

4) $\frac{d^2\Gamma}{d\eta^2} < 0$

5) $\lim_{\eta \to 1} \frac{d^2\Gamma}{d\eta^2} = 0$

(zero curvature as $\eta \to 1$).

These requirements are met provided that $\alpha > 2$ and $\beta > 0$. The latter two parameters are determined by matching $\Gamma$ to the curve described by Eq. (9) at a matching point, $\eta_1$, where the velocity profile switches from the logarithmic overlap to the wake (see Fig. 8):
\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma &= \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_m} \quad \theta \eta = \eta_1 \\
\frac{d\Gamma}{d\eta} &= \frac{\gamma_1}{m \frac{d\gamma}{d\eta}} \quad \theta \eta = \eta_1
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \gamma(\eta) \) is the function at the logarithmic overlap region, and \( \gamma_1 \) is its value at \( \eta = \eta_1 \). From this one gets:

\[
\alpha = \frac{1-\eta_1}{1-\Gamma_1} \frac{d\Gamma}{d\eta} \bigg|_{\eta=\eta_1}
\]

and

\[
\beta = \frac{1-\Gamma_1}{(1-\eta_1)^\alpha}
\]

\( \eta_1 \) is generally a function of \( \text{Re}_0 \) and pressure gradient. Based on experimental data, a typical value for it is 0.035. See Appendix E3 for an outline of an iterative procedure to determine \( \eta_1 \).

E3: Procedure to Determine \( \eta_1 \)

\( \eta_1 \) is a function of both \( \text{Re} \) number and pressure gradient, for which a model does not seem to exist at the present time. In this work, \( \eta_1 \) is found by an iterative procedure such that the correct value produces a branch of \( \Gamma(\eta) \) where \( \Gamma \) first becomes unity at the correct value of \( \eta \) for the particular case under investigation. In the example of Fig. 11, the first guess, labelled \( \eta_1 \), produces a branch such that \( \Gamma \) first becomes 1 at an \( \eta \) which is lower than the correct value for this particular case (which would
typically be taken from an actual experiment). The next guess, $\eta_1''$, leads to a branch in which $I'$ first attains unity at an $\eta$ which is higher than the true value. Iterating between $\eta_1'$ and $\eta_1''$ eventually produces the correct branch, shown in the figure as a solid line.
Appendix F: Detailed Analysis of a Juncture Flow

F1: Preliminary form of juncture equations

Introducing the normalized variables of Section 2.2.1. (2) into the 3D Navier-Stokes equations, the juncture region equations become

\[ \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\dot{x}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_w} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_b} \frac{\dot{x}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_w} \frac{\partial W}{\partial z} = 0 \]

\[ U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\dot{x}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_w} V \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} + \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_b} \frac{\dot{x}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_w} W \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} + \]

\[ \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_{\text{ref}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{v}{\bar{U}_{\theta}} \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \left( \frac{u_{T_w}}{\bar{U}_{\theta}} \right)^2 \right] \left( T_{xx} \right) \]

\[ + \frac{\dot{x}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_w} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{v}{\bar{U}_{\theta}} \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} + \left( \frac{u_{T_w}}{\bar{U}_{\theta}} \right)^2 \right] \left( T_{yx} \right) + \]

(2) \[ U_l = \dot{U}_l / \bar{U}_{\theta}, \quad P = \bar{P} / \rho \bar{U}_{\theta}^2, \quad T_{ll} = - \dot{u}_l / \rho \bar{u}_l^2 \]

\[ x = \dot{x}_{\text{ref}}, \quad y = \dot{y} / (\lambda_w), \quad z = \dot{z} / (\lambda_b) \]

83
\[
\frac{\lambda_w \Delta \ddot{x}_{ref}}{\lambda_b \delta \lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\lambda_w \Delta}{\lambda_b \delta} \frac{\nu}{\bar{U}_e \lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} + \right. \left. \frac{\left( \frac{U}{\bar{U}_e} \right)^2}{T_{xx}} \right] \\

U \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + \frac{\ddot{x}_{ref}}{\lambda_w \Delta} V \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + \frac{\lambda_w \Delta}{\lambda_b \delta} \frac{\ddot{x}_{ref}}{\lambda_w \Delta} W \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} = \\

- \frac{\ddot{x}_{ref}}{\lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + \\

\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\lambda_w \Delta}{\ddot{x}_{ref} \bar{U}_e \lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\nu}{\partial y} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + \left( \frac{U}{\bar{U}_e} \right)^2 \frac{\partial T_{xy}}{T_{xy}} \right] + \\

\frac{\ddot{x}_{ref}}{\lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\nu}{\bar{U}_e \lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + \left( \frac{U}{\bar{U}_e} \right)^2 \frac{\partial T_{yy}}{T_{yy}} \right] + \\

\frac{\lambda_w \Delta \ddot{x}_{ref}}{\lambda_b \delta \lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\lambda_w \Delta}{\lambda_b \delta} \frac{\nu}{\bar{U}_e \lambda_w \Delta} \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} + \right. \left. \frac{\left( \frac{U}{\bar{U}_e} \right)^2}{T_{zy}} \right]
\]
\[
U \frac{\partial w}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial^{\prime}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_w} \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} + \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_b} \frac{\partial^{\prime}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_{\Delta}} W \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} =
\]

\[
- \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_b} \frac{\partial^{\prime}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_{\Delta}} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_{\Delta}} \frac{\nu}{\partial x} \frac{\partial W}{\partial x} + \left( \frac{u_{\tau b}}{u_{\tau w}} \right)^2 \right].
\]

\[
\left( \frac{u_{\tau w}}{U_e} \right)^2 T_{xz} +
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_{\Delta}} \frac{\nu}{\partial y} \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} + \left( \frac{u_{\tau b}}{u_{\tau w}} \right)^2 \right].
\]

\[
\left( \frac{u_{\tau w}}{U_e} \right)^2 T_{yz} +
\]

\[
\frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_b} \frac{\partial^{\prime}_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_{\Delta}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_{\Delta}} \frac{\nu}{\partial z} \frac{\partial W}{\partial z} + \right.
\]

\[
\left( \frac{u_{\tau b}}{u_{\tau w}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{u_{\tau w}}{U_e} \right)^2 T_{zz}
\]

with the notation
\[ \varepsilon_w = \frac{u_{Tw}}{U_e}, \quad \varepsilon_w^2 \frac{\dot{\gamma}}{w} = \frac{v}{U_e \lambda_w \Delta}, \quad \zeta = \frac{\lambda_b \delta}{\lambda_w \Delta}, \quad \xi = \frac{x_{ref}}{\lambda_w \Delta}, \]

these equations become Eqns. (3) of Section 2.2.1.

Before treating these equations by an asymptotic analysis, it is of interest to relate \( \zeta \) to the parameters \( \varepsilon_w \) and \( \varepsilon_b \).

Both \( \delta \) and \( \Delta \) increase with \( x \). At the blade leading edge, \( \delta/\Delta \approx 0 \), while at the trailing edge \( \delta/\Delta \approx 1 \). For the purpose of scaling, the \((1/n)\)th power law growth for turbulent flat plate flow is used, according to which \( \delta \approx x^n \). Thus, for any streamwise location along the blade,

\[ \frac{\delta}{\Delta} = \left[ \frac{x - x_{L.E.}}{x - x_{\infty}} \right]^{n-1} \]

This relation may be expressed in terms of \( \lambda \)'s, using another relationship from the \((1/n)\)th power law, namely

\[ C_f = K \operatorname{Re}_x^{-1/n} \quad (K \text{ a constant}) \]

Thus
\[
\frac{\delta}{\Delta} = \left[ \frac{U_e}{v} \left( \frac{x - x_{L.E.}}{x - x_{\infty}} \right) \right]^{n-1} = \left[ \frac{\text{Re}_{x-x_{L.E.}}}{\text{Re}_{x-x_{\infty}}} \right]^{n-1}_n
\]

\[
\left[ \frac{C_f b}{C_f w} \right]^{1-n} = \left[ \frac{\lambda w}{\lambda b} \right]^{2(1-n)} = \left[ \frac{\epsilon_b}{\epsilon_w} \right]^{2(1-n)}
\]

and hence

\[
\zeta = \left[ \frac{\epsilon_b}{\epsilon_w} \right]^{1-2n} = \left[ \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \right]^{2n-2}
\]

Thus \(\zeta\) is a measure of the streamwise development of the corner-flow asymmetry. The case \(\delta/\Delta = 1\) formally reduces Eqns. (3) to Eqns. (1) and (2), since then also \(\xi = \frac{x_{\text{rel}}}{\lambda \Delta} = 1\). This case corresponds to the symmetric corner flow. In the present work, both this and the asymmetrical situation, which occurs in large portions of turbomachinery blade/endwall juncture flows, are investigated.

The analysis is carried out for an arbitrary, but non-zero, \(\delta/\Delta\) ratio (or \(\zeta\)), so that the leading edge region is excluded from the present discussion.
The following generalized expansions are defined:

**Middle region**

\[ y = \frac{Y}{\phi} , \ z = \frac{Z}{\Psi} \]

\[ U = f \left[ u_1 (x,y,z) + \epsilon_c u_2 + \epsilon_c^2 u_3 + \cdots \right] \]

\[ V = g \left[ v_1 (x,y,z) + \epsilon_c v_2 + \epsilon_c^2 v_3 + \cdots \right] \]

\[ W = h \left[ w_1 (x,y,z) + \epsilon_c w_2 + \epsilon_c^2 w_3 + \cdots \right] \]

\[ P = p_1 (x,y,z) + \epsilon_c p_2 + \epsilon_c^2 p_3 + \cdots \]

\[ T_{ll} = \left[ \left( \frac{\epsilon_c}{\epsilon_w} \right)^2 + q \ \delta_{lz} \right] \left[ t_{1l} (x,y,z) + \epsilon_c t_{2l} + \epsilon_c^2 t_{3l} + \cdots \right] \]

**Inner region**

\[ \hat{y} = \frac{Y}{\hat{\phi}} , \ \hat{z} = \frac{Z}{\hat{\Psi}} \]

\[ U = \hat{f} \left[ \hat{u}_1 + \epsilon_c \hat{u}_2 + \epsilon_c^2 \hat{u}_3 + \cdots \right] \]

\[ V = \hat{g} \left[ \hat{v}_1 + \epsilon_c \hat{v}_2 + \epsilon_c^2 \hat{v}_3 + \cdots \right] \]

\[ W = \hat{h} \left[ \hat{w}_1 + \epsilon_c \hat{w}_2 + \epsilon_c^2 \hat{w}_3 + \cdots \right] \]
\[ P = \hat{P}_1 + \epsilon_c \hat{P}_2 + \epsilon_c^2 \hat{P}_3 + \cdots \]

\[ T_{II} = \left[ \left( \frac{\epsilon_c}{\epsilon_w} \right)^2 + \hat{\gamma} \partial_{lz} \right] \left[ \hat{\gamma}_{II} + \epsilon_c \hat{\gamma}_{2II} + \epsilon_c^2 \hat{\gamma}_{3II} + \cdots \right] \]

Here the parameters \( f, g, h, q, \hat{f}, \hat{g}, \hat{h}, \hat{q} \) are in general functions of \( \epsilon_c, \hat{\epsilon}_c, \epsilon_w, \hat{\epsilon}_w, \zeta \) and \( \xi \) or of some of them; \( \epsilon_c \) and \( \hat{\epsilon}_c \) are small perturbation parameters appropriate to the juncture, to be determined later from matching conditions; and \( \phi, \hat{\phi}, \psi \) and \( \hat{\psi} \) are stretching parameters whose purpose is to create symmetric juncture equations regardless of whether the flow itself is symmetric or not. These stretching parameters are also functions of \( \epsilon_c, \hat{\epsilon}_c, \epsilon_w, \hat{\epsilon}_w, \zeta \) and \( \xi \). The above expansions are inserted into Eqns. (3), yielding:

**Middle region**

\[ f \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 + \cdots) + \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} (v_1 + \cdots) + \frac{\xi}{\zeta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} (w_1 + \cdots) = 0 \]

\[ f^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v_1 + \cdots) + \frac{\xi}{\phi} (v_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (u_1 + \cdots) + \frac{\xi}{\zeta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} (w_1 + \cdots) + \frac{\xi}{\zeta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \psi} (w_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (u_1 + \cdots) = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (p_1 + \cdots) + \]

\[ + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{f}{\xi} \epsilon_w^2 \epsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 + \cdots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1xx} + \cdots \right] \right] + \]
\[
\frac{\xi}{\phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{I}{\phi} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (u_1 + \cdots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1y} + \cdots \right] \right] + \\
+ \frac{\xi}{\zeta} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{I}{\zeta} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (u_1 + \cdots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1z} + \cdots \right] \right] \\
f_g (u_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (v_1 + \cdots) + \xi \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y (v_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v_1 + \cdots) + \\
+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (v_1 + \cdots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1x} + \cdots \right] \right] + \\
+ \frac{\xi}{\phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v_1 + \cdots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1y} + \cdots \right] \right] + \\
+ \frac{\xi}{\zeta} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (v_1 + \cdots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1z} + \cdots \right] \right] \\
f_h (u_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (w_1 + \cdots) + \xi \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} (v_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (w_1 + \cdots) + \\
+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (w_1 + \cdots) + \zeta^2 \epsilon_w^2 \left[ \frac{\epsilon_c}{\epsilon_w} \right]^2 + q \right].
\]
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\left[t_{1xz} + \cdots \right] + \\
\frac{\xi}{\phi} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{h}{\phi} e_w w \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (w_1 + \cdots) + \zeta^2 \sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{e_c}{e_w} \right)^2 + q \right].
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\left[t_{1yz} + \cdots \right] + \\
\frac{\xi}{\zeta^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{h}{\zeta^2} + \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (w_1 + \cdots) + \zeta^2 \sigma \epsilon_w^2 \left( \frac{e_c}{e_w} \right)^2 + q \right].
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\left[t_{1zz} + \cdots \right]
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

Imposing symmetry in Y and Z and in V and W on these equations results in the following relations:

\begin{equation}
q = \left( \frac{e_c}{e_w} \right)^2 \left( \zeta^{-2\sigma} - 1 \right)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
f = 1, \; g = h = e_c
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\phi = \zeta^2 = \xi e_c
\end{equation}

and
\[
\varepsilon = \frac{2 \varepsilon_w}{\varepsilon_c} \frac{\varepsilon_w}{\varepsilon_c}
\]

**Inner region**

\[ f \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) + \xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} (\hat{v}_1 + \cdots) + \frac{\xi h}{\zeta \hat{\phi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{w}_1 + \cdots) = 0 \]

\[ f^2 \left( \hat{u}_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) + \xi \frac{\hat{f}}{\hat{\phi}} \left( \hat{v}_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) + \]

\[ + \frac{\xi h}{\zeta \hat{\phi}} \left( \hat{w}_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{p}_1 + \cdots) + \]

\[ + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ f \varepsilon_w \varepsilon_w \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) + \varepsilon_c \left( \hat{f}_{1xx} + \cdots \right) \right] + \]

\[ + \frac{\xi}{\hat{\phi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \left[ f \varepsilon_w \varepsilon_w \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) + \right. \]

\[ \left. \varepsilon_c \left( \hat{f}_{1yx} + \cdots \right) \right] + \]

\[ + \frac{\xi}{\zeta \hat{\phi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ f \varepsilon_w \varepsilon_w \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) + \varepsilon_c^2 \left( \hat{f}_{1zx} + \cdots \right) \right] \]

\[ \hat{f} \hat{\phi} (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{v}_1 + \cdots) + \xi \frac{\hat{f}^2}{\hat{\phi}} (\hat{v}_1 + \cdots) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \hat{\rho}^2} (\hat{v}_1 + \cdots) + \]
\[
\frac{\xi \hat{h}}{\zeta \hat{\psi}} (\hat{w}_1 + \ldots) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{v}_1 + \ldots) = - \frac{\xi}{\hat{\phi} \hat{a}_y} (\hat{p}_1 + \ldots) + \\
+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\hat{h}}{\xi} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{w}_1 + \ldots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ \hat{f}_{1,xy} + \ldots \right] \right] + \\
\frac{\xi}{\hat{\phi} \hat{a}_y} \left[ \frac{\hat{h}}{\zeta \hat{\psi}} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{v}_1 + \ldots) + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ \hat{f}_{1,zy} + \ldots \right] \right] + \\
\frac{\xi h^2}{\zeta \hat{\psi}} (\hat{w}_1 + \ldots) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{w}_1 + \ldots) + \frac{\xi \hat{h}}{\hat{\phi} \hat{a}_y} (\hat{v}_1 + \ldots) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\hat{w}_1 + \ldots) + \\
+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\hat{h}}{\xi} \epsilon_w^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{w}_1 + \ldots) + \xi^2 \sigma \epsilon_w^2 \left[ \frac{\epsilon_c}{\epsilon_w} \right]^2 \right] \\
\left[ \hat{f}_{1,xz} + \ldots \right] +
\]
\[
\frac{\xi}{\hat{\phi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\hat{\phi}}{\hat{\phi}} \epsilon_{\omega}^2 \epsilon_{\omega} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{y}} (\hat{\omega}_1 + \cdots) + \zeta^2 \sigma \epsilon_{\omega}^2 \right) + \\
\left( \left[ \frac{\epsilon_{c}}{\epsilon_{\omega}} \right]^2 + \hat{q} \right) \left[ f_{1y} + \cdots \right] + \\
\frac{\xi}{\zeta \hat{\psi}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\hat{\psi}}{\hat{\psi}} \epsilon_{\omega}^2 \epsilon_{\omega} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{z}} (\hat{\omega}_1 + \cdots) + \zeta^2 \sigma \epsilon_{\omega}^2 \right) + \\
\left( \left[ \frac{\epsilon_{c}}{\epsilon_{\omega}} \right]^2 + \hat{q} \right) \left[ f_{1z} + \cdots \right] 
\]

Imposing symmetry again, one obtains

\[ \hat{q} = q, \quad \hat{f} = 1, \quad \hat{g} = \hat{h} = \epsilon_{c} \hat{e}_c, \quad \hat{\phi} = \zeta \hat{\psi} = \xi \epsilon_{c} \hat{e}_c \]

With the scales thus determined, the equations are rewritten as follows:

Middle region

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( v_1 + \epsilon_c v_2 + \cdots \right) + \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( w_1 + \epsilon_c w_2 + \cdots \right) = 0
\]

\[
\left( u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right) + 
\]
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\[
\begin{align*}
[\nu_1 + \epsilon_c \nu_2 + \cdots] & \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right] + \left[ w_1 + \epsilon_c w_2 + \cdots \right] \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right] & = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ p_1 + \epsilon_c p_2 + \cdots \right] + \\
& \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \epsilon_c^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right] \right] + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1xx} + \epsilon_c t_{2xx} + \cdots \right] \\
& + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \epsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right] \right] + \epsilon_c \left[ t_{1yx} + \epsilon_c t_{2yx} + \cdots \right] \\
& + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \epsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ u_1 + \epsilon_c u_2 + \cdots \right] \right] + \epsilon_c \left[ t_{1zx} + \epsilon_c t_{2zx} + \cdots \right] \\
& + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ v_1 + \epsilon_c v_2 + \cdots \right] \\
& + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \nu_1 + \epsilon_c \nu_2 + \cdots \right] \\
& = - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ p_1 + \epsilon_c p_2 + \cdots \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \epsilon_c^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ v_1 + \epsilon_c v_2 + \cdots \right] \right] + \\
& \epsilon_c^3 \left[ t_{1xy} + \cdots \right] + \\
& + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \epsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \nu_1 + \cdots \right] \right] + \epsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1yy} + \cdots \right] \\
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial z}\left[ \varepsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( v_1 + \cdots \right) + \varepsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1,zy} + \cdots \right] \right]
\]
\[
\varepsilon_c^2 \left[ \left( u_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( w_1 + \cdots \right) + \left( v_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( w_1 + \cdots \right) + \left( w_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( w_1 + \cdots \right) \right] =
\]
\[
- \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ p_1 + \varepsilon_c p_2 + \varepsilon_c^2 p_3 + \cdots \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \varepsilon_c \varepsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( w_1 + \cdots \right) + \varepsilon_c^3 \left[ t_{1,xz} + \cdots \right] \right] +
\]
\[
+ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \varepsilon_c \varepsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( w_1 + \cdots \right) + \varepsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1,yz} + \cdots \right] \right] +
\]
\[
+ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \varepsilon_c \varepsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( w_1 + \cdots \right) + \varepsilon_c^2 \left[ t_{1,zz} + \cdots \right] \right]
\]

Inner region

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \hat{u}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{u}_2 + \cdots \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \hat{v}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{v}_2 + \cdots \right] +
\]
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \hat{w}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{w}_2 + \cdots \right] = 0
\]
\[
\hat{\varepsilon}_c \left[ \left( \hat{u}_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \hat{u}_1 + \cdots \right) + \left( \hat{v}_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \hat{u}_1 + \cdots \right) + \left( \hat{w}_1 + \cdots \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \hat{u}_1 + \cdots \right) \right] =
\]
\[
- \varepsilon_c \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{P}_1 + \cdots) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \varepsilon_c^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{U}_1 + \cdots) +
\varepsilon_c^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \hat{F}_{1x} + \cdots \right] \right] +
\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\hat{U}_1 + \cdots) + \varepsilon_c \left[ \hat{F}_{1y} + \cdots \right] \right] +
+ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{U}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{U}_2 + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{U}_3 + \cdots) + \varepsilon_c \left[ \hat{F}_{1z} + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{F}_{2z} + \cdots \right] \right] \]

\[
\left[ \varepsilon_c^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \hat{F}_{1x} + \cdots \right] \right] =
\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{P}_1 + \varepsilon_c \hat{P}_2 + \varepsilon_c^2 \hat{P}_3 + \cdots) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \varepsilon_c^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\hat{V}_1 + \cdots) + \varepsilon_c^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \hat{F}_{1x} + \cdots \right] \right] +
\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \varepsilon_c^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\hat{F}_1 + \cdots) + \varepsilon_c^2 \left[ \hat{F}_{1y} + \cdots \right] \right] +
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \varepsilon_c^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\hat{F}_1 + \cdots) + \varepsilon_c^2 \left[ \hat{F}_{1z} + \cdots \right] \right] +
\]
\[
\frac{a}{a^2} \left[ \epsilon_\alpha^2 \epsilon_\beta \frac{a}{a^2} \left( \hat{v}_1 + \cdots \right) + \epsilon_\alpha^2 \left( \hat{\nu}_1 + \cdots \right) \right] \\
\left[ \epsilon_\alpha \epsilon_\beta \right]^2 \left[ (\hat{u}_1 + \cdots) \frac{a}{a^x} (\hat{w}_1 + \cdots) + (\hat{\nu}_1 + \cdots) \frac{a}{a^y} (\hat{\nu}_1 + \cdots) + (\hat{w}_1 + \cdots) \frac{a}{a^z} (\hat{w}_1 + \cdots) \right] = \\
- \frac{a}{a^2} \left[ \hat{p}_1 + \epsilon_\alpha \hat{p}_2 + \epsilon_\alpha^2 \hat{p}_3 + \cdots \right] + \frac{a}{a^x} \left[ \epsilon_\alpha^4 \epsilon_\beta \frac{a}{a^x} (\hat{w}_1 + \cdots) + \epsilon_\alpha^3 \epsilon_\beta \left( \hat{\nu}_1 + \cdots \right) \right] + \\
\epsilon_\alpha^3 \epsilon_\beta \left( \hat{\nu}_1 + \cdots \right) + \\
\frac{a}{a^y} \left[ \epsilon_\alpha^2 \frac{a}{a^y} \left( \hat{w}_1 + \cdots \right) + \epsilon_\alpha^2 \left( \hat{\nu}_1 + \cdots \right) \right] + \\
\frac{a}{a^z} \left[ \epsilon_\alpha^2 \frac{a}{a^z} \left( \hat{w}_1 + \cdots \right) + \epsilon_\alpha^2 \left( \hat{\nu}_1 + \cdots \right) \right]
\]

Sorting the above equations according to orders of magnitude results in the following equations:

Middle region

\( O(1) \)

\[
\frac{a u_1}{a^x} + \frac{a v_1}{a^y} + \frac{a w_1}{a^z} = 0
\]
\[
u_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial x}
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y}
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z}
\]

\[O(\varepsilon_c)\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1u_2) + v_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} =
\]

\[
- \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial r_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial r_1}{\partial z}
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial y}
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial z}
\]

\[O(\varepsilon_c^2)\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1u_3) + u_2 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} + v_3 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} +
\]
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\[
\begin{align*}
    w_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} &= \\
    - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial z} &= \\
    u_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial z} &= - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} \\
    u_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} &= - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z}
\end{align*}
\]

**Inner region**

\( O(1) \)

\[
\begin{align*}
    \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v_1}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 w_1}{\partial z^2} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
    0 &= \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial z^2} \quad \text{(F1)} \\
    0 &= \frac{\partial^2 v_1}{\partial y^2} \\
    0 &= \frac{\partial^2 w_1}{\partial z^2}
\end{align*}
\]

\( O(\epsilon_c) \)
\[
\frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v_2}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 w_2}{\partial z^2} = 0
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + f_{1_{yx}} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} + f_{1_{zx}} \right)
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial^2 \rho_2}{\partial y^2}
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial^2 \rho_2}{\partial z^2}
\]

\[
O \left( \varepsilon_0^2 \right)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} + f_{2_{yx}} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial z} + f_{2_{zx}} \right)
\]

\[
0 = - \frac{\partial^2 \rho_3}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial y \partial z}
\]

\[
0 = - \frac{\partial^2 \rho_3}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial y \partial z} + \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial z^2}
\]

\textit{F2: Matching procedure}
The following relationships exist between the juncture coordinates and those of the endwall and blade:

\[
y_c = \frac{\gamma_c}{\xi e_c} = \frac{\gamma_b}{\lambda_b \lambda e_c} = \frac{\xi \gamma_b}{\xi e_c} = \frac{\xi}{\xi e_c}
\]

\[
z_c = \frac{z_c}{\xi \lambda_b \lambda e_c} = \frac{z_c}{\xi \lambda_b \lambda e_c} = \frac{\xi \lambda_b \lambda e_c}{\xi \lambda_b \lambda e_c}
\]

\[
y_c = \frac{\lambda_w \Delta e_w \hat{e}_w \hat{y}_w}{\lambda \xi e_c} = \frac{\lambda_w \Delta e_w \hat{e}_w \hat{y}_w}{\xi e_c}
\]

\[
z_c = \frac{\hat{e}_b \hat{z}_b}{\xi \lambda_b \lambda e_c} = \frac{\hat{z}_c}{\xi \lambda_b \lambda e_c}
\]

The first pair of relations indicates that for smooth matching between the juncture and the blade,

\[
\lim_{y \to \infty} y_c = \frac{\gamma_b}{\xi e_b} = \hat{y}_c \quad \text{blade matching} \quad (F2-A)
\]

The second pair indicates the requirement for smooth matching between juncture and endwall:
\[ \lim_{y \to 0} y_c = \epsilon_w \hat{y}_w \]  
\[ \lim_{z \to -\infty} z_c = \frac{Z_w}{\epsilon_w} \]  
\[ \implies \epsilon_c \to \epsilon_w \xi \text{ (endwall matching)} \quad (F2-B) \]

Since \( \xi = \frac{x_{\text{ref}}}{\lambda_w} \Delta \) and from Eqns. (F2) it follows that

\[ \lim_{\xi \to -\infty} \xi = 1 \to \lim_{z_c \to -\infty} \epsilon_c = \epsilon_w \]  
\[ \lim_{y_c \to -\infty} \xi = \zeta \to \lim_{y_c \to -\infty} \epsilon_c = \epsilon_b \]  
\[ (F3) \]

In a similar manner

\[ \lim_{\hat{z}_c \to -\infty} \hat{\epsilon}_c = \hat{\epsilon}_w, \quad \lim_{\hat{y}_c \to -\infty} \hat{\epsilon}_c = \hat{\epsilon}_b \]

Eqns. (F3) are in agreement with the previously obtained result \( \xi = \frac{\epsilon_w^2}{\epsilon_c^2} \).

Thus \( \epsilon_c \) and \( \hat{\epsilon}_c \) have the correct limiting values to guarantee smooth matching with Regions I on both endwall and blade. Hence, one may define \( \epsilon_c \) and \( \hat{\epsilon}_c \) in a similar manner to the corresponding definitions of \( \epsilon_w \), \( \hat{\epsilon}_w \), \( \epsilon_b \) and \( \hat{\epsilon}_b \), namely: \[ \text{Eqn.}(F3) \]
\[
\epsilon_c = \frac{u_{\tau_c}}{U_e}, \quad \hat{\epsilon}_c = \frac{\nu}{u_{\tau_c} \Delta_c}
\]

where \( u_{\tau_c} \) and \( \Delta_c \) are, respectively, friction velocity and length scale characteristic of the juncture region.

Since the equations of motion derived earlier are symmetric, it suffices to perform the matching procedure for one half of the juncture region. The matching will be done with the endwall, along the following limiting lines:

1. Juncture middle region and endwall middle layer:
2. Juncture inner region and endwall inner layer;
3. Juncture middle region and endwall inner layer.

These lines are denoted by the numerals 1, 2 and 3 in Fig. 4. A completely analogous procedure applies for the blade-matching, denoted by the numerals 4, 5 and 6 in the figure.

In the following, the subscript \( w \) is dropped from \( \epsilon_w \), since both juncture- and endwall- expansions are using this same perturbation parameter, as demonstrated earlier [Eqns. (F4)]. The expansions for the endwall layers incorporate the results found earlier for the case of pressure-driven boundary layer (see Appendix C).
1. \[
\begin{align*}
Z_w &\to 0 \\
Z_c &\to \infty
\end{align*}
\]

\[U_w = u_{w_1} (x,y,Z_w) + \epsilon u_{w_2} + \epsilon^2 u_{w_3} + \cdots = u_{w_1} (x,y,0) + \]

\[\epsilon z_c \frac{\partial u_{w_1}}{\partial z_w} (x,y,0) + \epsilon^2 z_c^2 \frac{\partial^2 u_{w_1}}{\partial z_w^2} (x,y,0) + \cdots + \epsilon u_{w_2} (x,y,0) + \]

\[\epsilon^2 z_c \frac{\partial u_{w_2}}{\partial z_w} (x,y,0) + \cdots + \epsilon^2 u_{w_3} (x,y,0) + \cdots - u_{c_1} (x,y,z_c) + \]

\[\epsilon u_{c_2} (x,y,z_c) + \epsilon^2 u_{c_3} (x,y,z_c) + \cdots; Z_c \to \infty
\]

\[u_{c_1} (x,y,z_c) - u_{w_1} (x,y,0); Z_c \to \infty
\]

\[u_{c_2} (x,y,z_c) - z_c \frac{\partial u_{w_1}}{\partial z_w} (x,y,0) + u_{w_2} (x,y,0); Z_c \to \infty
\]

\[u_{c_3} (x,y,z_c) - z_c^2 \frac{\partial^2 u_{w_1}}{\partial z_w^2} (x,y,0) + z_c \frac{\partial u_{w_2}}{\partial z_w} (x,y,0) + \]

\[u_{w_3} (x,y,0); Z_c \to \infty
\]

\[\vdots\]
\[ V_w = \epsilon v_{w1} + \epsilon^2 v_{w2} + \cdots = \epsilon v_{w1} (x, y, 0) + \epsilon^2 z_c \frac{\partial v_{w1}}{\partial z} (x, y, 0) + \cdots + \epsilon^2 v_{w2} \]

\[ + \epsilon z_c \left[ v_{w1} (x, y, z_c) + \epsilon v_{w1} (x, y, z_c) + \cdots \right] z_c \to \infty \]

\[ v_{c1} (x, y, z_c) \to v_{w1} (x, y, 0) : z_c \to \infty \]

\[ v_{c2} (x, y, z_c) \to z_c \frac{\partial v_{w1}}{\partial z} (x, y, 0) + v_{w2} : z_c \to \infty \]

\[ \vdots \]

\[ W_w = w_{w1} + \epsilon w_{w2} + \epsilon^2 w_{w3} + \cdots = \epsilon w_{w1} + \epsilon^2 w_{w2} \]

Differentiate w.r.t. \( Z_w \):

\[ \frac{\partial w_{w1}}{\partial z} (x, y, 0) + \epsilon z_c \frac{\partial^2 w_{w1}}{\partial z^2} (x, y, 0) + \cdots + \frac{\partial^3 w_{w1}}{\partial z^3} (x, y, 0) + \cdots \]

\[ + \epsilon \frac{\partial w_{w2}}{\partial z} (x, y, 0) + \epsilon^2 z_c \frac{\partial^2 w_{w2}}{\partial z^2} (x, y, 0) + \cdots + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial w_{w3}}{\partial z} (x, y, 0) + \cdots \]

\[ - \frac{\partial w_{c1}}{\partial z} (x, y, z_c) + \epsilon \frac{\partial w_{c2}}{\partial z} (x, y, z_c) + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial w_{c3}}{\partial z} (x, y, 0) \cdots z_c \to \infty \]
\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{aw_{c1}}{az_c} (x, y, z) - \frac{aw_{w1}}{az_w} (x, y, 0); z_c \to \infty \\
\frac{aw_{c2}}{az_c} (x, y, z) - \frac{aw_{w1}}{az_w} (x, y, 0) + \frac{aw_{w2}}{az_w} (x, y, 0) + z_c \frac{a^2w_{w2}}{az_w^2} (x, y, 0) + \\
\frac{aw_{c3}}{az_c} (x, y, z) - \frac{z^2}{2} \frac{a^3w_{w1}}{az_w^3} (x, y, 0) + z_c \frac{a^2w_{w2}}{az_w^2} (x, y, 0) + \\
\frac{aw_{w3}}{az_w} (x, y, 0); z_c \to \infty \\
\end{aligned}
\]

\[P_w = P_1 (x, 0, 0) + \varepsilon z_c \frac{a^2p_{w1}}{az_w} (x, 0, 0) + \]

\[\varepsilon^2 \frac{z^2}{2} \frac{a^2p_{w1}}{az_w} (x, 0, 0) + \cdots + \]

\[+ \varepsilon^2 p_{w3} (x, y, 0) + \cdots - p_{c1} (x) + \varepsilon p_{c2} (x) + \]

\[\varepsilon^2 p_{c3} (x, y, z) + \cdots; z_c \to \infty \]

\[p_{c1} (x, y, z) = P_1 (x, 0, 0) \quad \text{(F4)} \]
\[ p_{c_2}(x,y,z_c) = z_c \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z_w}(x,0,0) : z_c \to \infty \]  

\[ p_{c_3}(x,y,z_c) = -\frac{z_c^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 p_1}{\partial z_w^2}(x,0,0) + p_{w_3}(x,y,0) : z_c \to \infty \]  

\[ T_{w_{1j}} = t_{w_{1j}}(x,y,0) + \varepsilon_c \frac{\partial t_{w_1}}{\partial z_w}(x,y,0) + \varepsilon^2 \frac{z_c^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 t_{w_1}}{\partial z_w^2}(x,y,0) + \cdots + \varepsilon^2 t_{w_3}(x,y,0) + \varepsilon^2 t_{c_{11}}(x,y,z_c) + \varepsilon^2 t_{c_{21}}(x,y,z_c) + \varepsilon^2 t_{c_{31}}(x,y,z_c) + \cdots : z_c \to \infty \]  

\[ t_{c_{11}}(x,y,z_c) = t_{w_{1j}}(x,y,0) : z_c \to \infty \]  

\[ t_{c_{21}}(x,y,z_c) = z_c \frac{\partial t_{w_1}}{\partial z_w}(x,y,0) + t_{w_{2j}}(x,y,0) : z_c \to \infty \]  

\[ t_{c_{31}}(x,y,z_c) = \frac{z_c^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 t_{w_1}}{\partial z_w^2}(x,y,0) + \varepsilon \frac{z_c^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 t_{w_2}}{\partial z_w^2}(x,y,0) + t_{w_{3j}}(x,y,0) : z_c \to \infty \]
\[\begin{align*}
2. \quad & \begin{cases}
    z_w^{-0} \\
    \hat{z}_c^{-\infty}
\end{cases} \\
U_w = \varepsilon \hat{u}_{w_2} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + O(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{u}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + \cdots - \varepsilon \hat{u}_{c_1} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \\
+ \varepsilon^2 \hat{u}_{c_2} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \varepsilon^3 \hat{u}_{c_3} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \cdots; \hat{z}_c \to \infty
\end{align*}\]

\[\hat{u}_{c_1} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) = 0; \hat{z}_c \to \infty \quad (F6)\]

\[\hat{u}_{c_2} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) - \hat{u}_{w_2} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty\]

\[\hat{u}_{c_3} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) - \hat{u}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty\]

\[\vdots\]

\[V_w = \varepsilon^2 e \hat{v}_{w_2} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + O(\varepsilon^2) + \varepsilon^3 e \hat{v}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + \cdots - \varepsilon e \hat{v}_{c_1} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \varepsilon^2 e \hat{v}_{c_2} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \varepsilon^3 e \hat{v}_{c_3} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \cdots; \hat{z}_c \to \infty\]
\[ \hat{v}_{c_1}(x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) = 0; \hat{z}_c \to \infty \] (F7)

\[ \hat{v}_{c_2}(x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) = \hat{v}_{w_2}(x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \hat{v}_{c_3}(x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) = \hat{v}_{w_3}(x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \vdots \]

\[ W_w = \varepsilon \hat{w}_{w_2}(x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_w) + \varepsilon^2 \hat{w}_{w_3}(x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_w) + \cdots \]

\[ \begin{cases} 
Z_w \to 0 \\
\hat{z}_c \to \infty 
\end{cases} \]

Differentiate w.r.t. \( Z_w \):

\[ \varepsilon \frac{\partial \hat{w}_{w_2}}{\partial \hat{z}_w} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + O(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^2 \frac{\partial \hat{w}_{w_3}}{\partial \hat{z}_w} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + \cdots \]

\[ \vdots \]

\[ \frac{\partial \hat{w}_{c_1}}{\partial \hat{z}_c} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \varepsilon \frac{\partial \hat{w}_{c_2}}{\partial \hat{z}_c} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \]
\[ \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial^3 w_c}{\partial z_c^3} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \frac{\partial^2 w_c}{\partial z_c^2} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) = 0; \hat{z}_c \to \infty \quad \text{(F8)} \]

\[ \frac{\partial^2 w_c}{\partial z_c^2} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) \to - \frac{\partial^2 w_w}{\partial z_w^2} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \frac{\partial^2 w_c}{\partial z_c^2} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) \to - \frac{\partial^2 w_w}{\partial z_w^2} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \vdots \]

\[ P_w = P_1 (x, 0, 0) + O(\epsilon) + \epsilon^2 \hat{\rho}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + \cdots - \hat{\rho}_{c_1} (x) + \epsilon \hat{\rho}_{c_2} (x) + \]

\[ + \epsilon^2 \hat{\rho}_{c_3} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \cdots; \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \hat{\rho}_{c_1} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) = P_1 (x, 0, 0) \quad \text{(F9)} \]
\( \hat{\rho}_{c_2} = 0 \) \hfill (F10)

\[ \hat{\rho}_{c_3} = \ell_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) - \hat{\rho}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ T_{w_{II}} = \ell_{w_{1II}} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + O(\varepsilon) + \ell_{w_{2II}} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + \cdots + \]

\[ \ell_{w_{3II}} (x, \hat{y}, 0) + \]

\[ + \cdots - \ell_{c_{1II}} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \ell_{c_{2II}} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \)

\[ \ell_{c_{3II}} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) + \cdots; \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \ell_{c_{1II}} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) - \ell_{w_{1II}} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \ell_{c_{2II}} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) - \ell_{w_{2II}} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]

\[ \ell_{c_{3II}} (x, \hat{y}, \hat{z}_c) - \ell_{w_{3II}} (x, \hat{y}, 0); \hat{z}_c \to \infty \]
3. \[
\begin{cases}
\dot{y}_c \rightarrow 0 \\
\dot{y}_w \rightarrow \infty
\end{cases}
\]

\[U_c = u_{c_1}(x,y,z_c) + \epsilon u_{c_2}(x,y,z_c) + \epsilon^2 u_{c_3}(x,y,z_c) + \cdots\]

\[- \epsilon \dot{u}_{w_2}(x,y,z_w) + \epsilon^2 \dot{u}_{w_3}(x,y,z_w) + \cdots; \quad \dot{y} \rightarrow 0 \]

\[\dot{y}_w \rightarrow \infty\]

Differentiate w.r.t. \(y\):

\[
\frac{\partial u_{c_1}}{\partial y}(x,y,z_c) + \epsilon \frac{\partial u_{c_2}}{\partial y}(x,y,z_c) + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial u_{c_3}}{\partial y}(x,y,z_c) + \cdots
\]

\[- \epsilon \dot{u}_{w_2}(x,y,z_w) + \epsilon \dot{u}_{w_3}(x,y,z_w) + \epsilon^2 \dot{u}_{w_4}(x,y,z_w) + \cdots; \quad \dot{y} \rightarrow 0 \]

\[\dot{y}_w \rightarrow \infty\]

In analogy with the discussion in Appendix B,

\[
\frac{\partial u_{c_1}}{\partial y}(x,0,z_c) = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_{c_2}}{\partial y} - \frac{\phi_2(x,z_c)}{y}, \quad \frac{\partial u_{c_3}}{\partial y} - \frac{\phi_3(x,z_c)}{y}, \quad \cdots; \quad y \rightarrow 0
\]
\[
\frac{\partial \hat{w}_2}{\partial \hat{y}} - \phi_2(x, Z_w), \quad \frac{\partial \hat{w}_3}{\partial \hat{y}} - \phi_3(x, Z_w), \quad \ldots; \quad \hat{y} \to \infty
\]

or

\[
u_{c_l} = \begin{cases} 
\phi_l(x, z_c) \ln y + \psi_l(x, z_c), & l = 2, 3, \ldots; \ y \to 0 \\
\hat{\nu}_{w_l} - \phi_l(x, z_w) \ln \hat{y} + \hat{\psi}_l(x, z_w), & l = 2, 3, \ldots; \ \hat{y} \to \infty 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
V_c = \epsilon v_{c_1}(x, y, z_c) + \epsilon^2 v_{c_2}(x, y, z_c) + \ldots + \epsilon^2 \hat{v}_{w_2}(x, \hat{y}, z_w) + \\
+ \epsilon^3 \hat{v}_{w_3}(x, \hat{y}, z_w) + \ldots; \begin{cases} 
\hat{y} \to 0 \\
\hat{y} \to \infty 
\end{cases}
\]

Differentiate w.r.t. \( y \):

\[
\epsilon \frac{\partial v_{c_1}}{\partial y}(x, y, z_c) + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial v_{c_2}}{\partial y}(x, y, z_c) + \ldots + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial \hat{v}_{w_2}}{\partial \hat{y}}(x, \hat{y}, z_w) + \\
+ \epsilon^3 \frac{\partial \hat{v}_{w_3}}{\partial \hat{y}}(x, \hat{y}, z_w) + \ldots; \begin{cases} 
\hat{y} \to 0 \\
\hat{y} \to \infty 
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial v_{c_1}}{\partial y}(x, 0, z_c) = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial v_{c_2}}{\partial y}(x, 0, z_c) - \frac{\partial \hat{v}_{w_2}}{\partial \hat{y}}(x, \hat{y}, z_w); \quad \hat{y} \to \infty
\]
\[ W_c = \epsilon w_{c_1} (x, y, z_c) + \epsilon^2 w_{c_2} (x, y, z_c) + \cdots - \epsilon \hat{w}_{w_2} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w) + \]

\[ + \epsilon^2 \hat{w}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w) + \cdots; \quad \lim_{\hat{y} \to 0} \]

\[ w_{c_l} (x, 0, z_c) - \hat{w}_{w_l} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w); \quad \hat{y} \to -\infty, \; l = 1, 2, \cdots \]

\[ P_c = P_1 (x, 0, 0) + \epsilon p_{c_2} (x) + \epsilon^2 p_{c_3} (x, y, z_c) + \cdots \]

\[ - p_1 (x, 0, Z_w) + \epsilon^2 \hat{p}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w) + \cdots; \quad \lim_{\hat{y} \to 0} \]

\[ p_{c_2} = 0 \quad \text{(F12)} \]

\[ p_{c_3} (x, 0, z_c) - \hat{p}_{w_3} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w); \quad \hat{y} \to -\infty \]

\[ T_{c_{ll}} = t_{c_{1l}} (x, y, z_c) + \epsilon t_{c_{2l}} (x, y, z_c) + \epsilon^2 t_{c_{3l}} (x, y, z_c) + \cdots \]

\[ - \hat{t}_{w_{1l}} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w) + \epsilon \hat{t}_{w_{2l}} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w) + \epsilon^2 \hat{t}_{w_{3l}} (x, \hat{y}, Z_w) + \cdots; \quad \lim_{\hat{y} \to -\infty} \]
Important results from matching procedure:

1. From Eqns. (F1) - (F6) and the one equivalent to (F6) for \( \hat{y}_c \to \infty \) plus the boundary conditions \( \hat{u}_{c_1} = 0 \) if

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{z}_c &= 0 \\
\text{or} \\
\hat{y}_c &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

It follows that \( \hat{u}_{c_1} \) is described by Laplace's equation with homogeneous boundary conditions. By the Maximum and Minimum Theorem, \( \hat{u}_{c_1} = 0 \).

2. From Eqns. (F4) and (F9), both \( p_{c_1} \) and \( \hat{p}_{c_1} \) are given by the external pressure evaluated at the corner. Moreover, since both \( p_{c_2} \) and \( \hat{p}_{c_2} \) vanish [Eqns. (F10) and (F12)], the above conclusion carries through order \( \epsilon \).

3. By Eqns. (F5) and (F12), \( \partial P_1 / \partial Z_w \) vanishes along the corner. From symmetry, \( \partial P_1 / \partial Y_b \) also vanishes along the corner.

4. From Eqns. (F11) and their equivalents on the blade, the streamwise velocity has a common logarithmic overlap between the corner middle region and the inner layers on both endwall and blade.
Appendix G. Effects of Rotation

If the \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})\) coordinate system is rigidly attached to a rotor, rotating at a constant angular velocity \(\Omega\) around the \(\tilde{x}\)-axis, the inertia terms of the N-S equation will include centrifugal and Coriolis accelerations and will assume the following form [14]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{u} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \tilde{x}} + \tilde{v} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \tilde{y}} + \tilde{w} \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \tilde{z}} - \Omega^2 \tilde{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{r}}{\partial \tilde{x}} \\
\tilde{u} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial \tilde{x}} + \tilde{v} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial \tilde{y}} + \tilde{w} \frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial \tilde{z}} - 2 \Omega \tilde{w} - \Omega^2 \tilde{r} \frac{\partial \tilde{r}}{\partial \tilde{y}}
\end{align*}
\]
\[ \dot{U} \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial x} + \dot{V} \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial y} + \tilde{w} \frac{\partial \tilde{w}}{\partial z} + 2\Omega \dot{V} - \Omega^2 \dot{R} \frac{\partial \tilde{r}}{\partial z} \]

After the usual normalization, these become

\[ \frac{\dot{U}^2}{\lambda \Delta} \left[ U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} \right] - \left[ \frac{\Omega \tilde{R}_0}{\lambda \Delta} \right]^2 R \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} \]

\[ \frac{\dot{V}^2}{\lambda \Delta} \left[ U \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \right] - 2 \Omega \tilde{U}_e W - \left[ \frac{\Omega \tilde{R}_0}{\lambda \Delta} \right]^2 R \frac{\partial \tilde{R}}{\partial y} \]

\[ \frac{\dot{W}^2}{\lambda \Delta} \left[ U \frac{\partial W}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial W}{\partial z} \right] + 2 \Omega \tilde{U}_e V - \left[ \frac{\Omega \tilde{R}_0}{\lambda \Delta} \right]^2 R \frac{\partial \tilde{R}}{\partial z} \]

Multiplying through by \( \lambda \Delta / \tilde{U}_e^2 \), as done before for the non-rotating case, yields:

\[ U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} - \left[ \frac{\Omega \tilde{R}_0}{\tilde{U}_e} \right]^2 R \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} \]

\[ U \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} - \left[ \Omega \Delta \tilde{U}_e \right] W - \left[ \frac{\tilde{R}_0}{\tilde{U}_e} \right]^2 R \frac{\partial \tilde{R}}{\partial y} \]
\[ \begin{align*}
&U \frac{\partial W}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial W}{\partial z} + 2 \frac{\Omega \lambda \Delta}{\bar{U}_e} V - \left( \frac{\Omega \bar{R}_0}{\bar{U}_e} \right)^2 R \frac{\partial R}{\partial z} \\
\end{align*} \]

In turbomachinery components,

\[ \frac{\Omega \bar{R}_0}{\bar{U}_e} = O(1) \]

Also, \( \bar{R}_o \gg \Delta \) and hence \( \bar{R}_o \) scales with the outer, inviscid scale:

\[ \bar{R}_o = O(\lambda \Delta) \rightarrow \frac{\Omega \lambda \Delta}{\bar{U}_e} = O(1) \]

With these non-dimensional parameters thus established, it is now possible to determine the effect of rotation on the various sub-layers and sub-regions found earlier. This is done by the usual sorting out of terms in each sub-region to orders 1, \( \epsilon \) and \( \epsilon^2 \).

The following momentum equations are thus found for the case of a rotor, rotating at constant angular velocity about the x-coordinate:

1. Outer flow:

\[ \begin{align*}
&U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} - R \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} = - \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} \\
&U \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} - 2 W - R \frac{\partial R}{\partial y} = - \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} \\
\end{align*} \]
$$U \frac{\partial W}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} + W \frac{\partial W}{\partial z} + 2 V - R \frac{\partial R}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p}{\partial z}$$

2. Middle layer (Region 1):

$$O(1)$$

$$u_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} - R \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial x}$$

$$R \frac{\partial R}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y}$$

$$u_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} - R \frac{\partial R}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z}$$

$$O(\epsilon)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 u_2) + v_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} =$$

$$- \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y x}$$

$$2 w_1 = \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial y}$$

$$u_1 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial x} + u_2 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (w_1 w_2) + 2 v_1 =$$

$$- \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y z}$$

$$O(\epsilon^2)$$
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 u_3) + u_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial z} + \\
w_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = \\
- \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} \\
u_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial z} - 2 w_2 = - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} \\
u_1 \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial x} + u_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial x} + u_3 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial y} + v_3 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + \\
w_2 \frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (w_1 w_3) + \\
2 v_2 = - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z}
\]

3. Inner layer (Region I):

\( O(1) \)

\[
0 = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{u}_1}{\partial y^2} \\
R \frac{\partial R}{\partial \hat{y}} = \frac{\partial \hat{p}}{\partial \hat{y}}
\]
\[ 0 = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{w}_1}{\partial y^2} \]

\( O(\epsilon) \)

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \hat{f}_{1yx} + \frac{\partial \hat{u}_2}{\partial y} \right) \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_2}{\partial y} \]

\( O(\epsilon^2) \)

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \hat{f}_{2yx} + \frac{\partial \hat{u}_3}{\partial y} \right) \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( -\hat{\rho}_3 + \hat{f}_{1yy} \right) \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \hat{f}_{2yz} + \frac{\partial \hat{w}_3}{\partial y} \right) \]

4. Middle region (Region II)

\( O(1) \)
\[ u_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} - R \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} = - \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial x} \]

\[ R \frac{\partial R}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial y} \]

\[ R \frac{\partial R}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial p_1}{\partial z} \]

\[ O(\varepsilon) \]

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 u_1) + v_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial z} = \]

\[ - \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z} \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial y} \]

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial p_2}{\partial z} \]

\[ O(\varepsilon^2) \]

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (u_1 u_3) + u_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial y} + v_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial y} + v_3 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial z} + \]

\[ w_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial z} + w_3 \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial z} = - \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_2}{\partial z} \]

\[ u_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial z} - 2 w_1 = \]
\[-\frac{\partial p_3}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z}\]

\[u_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial x} + v_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial y} + w_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z} + 2 v_1 =\]

\[-\frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial t_1}{\partial z}\]

5. Inner region (Region II)

\[O(1)\]

\[0 = \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial z^2}\]

\[R \frac{\partial R}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial y}\]

\[R \frac{\partial R}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial z}\]

\[O(\varepsilon)\]

\[0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial \hat{u}_2}{\partial y} + \hat{f}_1 \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\partial \hat{u}_2}{\partial z} + \hat{f}_1 \right)\]

\[0 = \frac{\partial \hat{p}_2}{\partial y}\]

\[0 = \frac{\partial \hat{p}_2}{\partial z}\]

\[O(\varepsilon^2)\]
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\[
0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial \hat{t}_{2}}{\partial y} + \hat{t}_{2y} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\partial \hat{t}_{2}}{\partial z} + \hat{t}_{2z} \right)
\]

\[
0 = -\frac{\partial \hat{p}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \hat{t}_{1}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \hat{t}_{1}}{\partial z}
\]

\[
0 = -\frac{\partial \hat{p}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial \hat{t}_{1}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \hat{t}_{1}}{\partial z}
\]

From these equations, the following effects of rotation are observed:

1. In the outer flow, there is a centrifugal term in the streamwise component of momentum and both Coriolis and centrifugal terms in the crosswise and normal components.

2. In the middle layer of Region I, there are centrifugal terms to \(O(1)\) in all three momentum components, and Coriolis terms in the normal- and crosswise- components to orders \(\varepsilon\) and \(\varepsilon^2\). The streamwise momentum component is not affected by rotation to these orders.

3. The inner layer of Region I is unaffected by rotation except for the \(O(1)\) normal momentum, where the pressure gradient is balanced by a centrifugal acceleration.

4. In the middle region of Region II, there are centrifugal terms in all three momentum components to \(O(1)\). In particular, crosswise pressure gradients are balanced by centrifugal accelerations. There are no rotational effects
on the $O(\varepsilon)$ equations, while Coriolis terms reappear in the two crosswise momentum components of $O(\varepsilon^2)$.

5. The only effect of rotation on the inner region of Region II is in the $O(1)$ crosswise momentum components, where pressure gradients and centrifugal accelerations balance each other.
**Abstract**

The method of matched asymptotic expansions is employed to identify the various sub-regions in three-dimensional, turbomachinery end-wall turbulent boundary layers, and to determine the proper scaling of these regions. The two parts of the b.l. investigated are the 3D pressure-driven part over the endwall, and the 3D part located at the blade/end-wall juncture. Based on the results of the analysis for the pressure-driven part, models are proposed for the 3D Law-of-the-Wall and Law-of-the-Wake. Comparisons between these models and the data of van den Berg and Elsenaar and of Mueller show good agreement between models and experiments.