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ABSTRACT

Using an arc driven shock tube facility, measurements of convective heat transfer at the stagnation point of a blunt body have been carried out at simulated flight velocities ranging from 20,000 to 40,000 feet per second. These measurements were performed using standard calorimeter techniques with air as the test media.

The present results indicate no significant ionization effects on aerodynamic heating and indicate that the Lee's approximate equation for stagnation point heat transfer can be used for engineering calculations at flight velocities up to 40,000 feet per second.
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SYMBOLS

\( a_1 \) = speed of sound driven tube gas
\( c_{Pu} \) = specific heat constant pressure of gas adjacent to body surface
\( C \) = specific heat for gaseous material
\( C_{1} \) = Fay and Riddell recombination parameter
\( \frac{du}{dx} \) = stagnation point velocity gradient
\( h_w \) = static enthalpy of gas adjacent to body surface
\( h_{t,0} \) = total enthalpy of gas flow
\( I \) = current
\( l \) = gage thickness
\( M_0 \) = moving shock Mach number, \( V_0/a_1 \)

\( Nu = \frac{h_w \times c_{Pu}}{K_0(h_{t,0} - h_w)} \)
\( P_1 \) = initial pressure driven tube
\( P_2 \) = pressure behind moving normal shock
\( P_t \) = stagnation point pressure
\( Pr_w \) = Prandtl number of gas adjacent to body surface
\( q_w \) = heat transfer rate to body
\( R_N \) = blunt body nose radius
\( \gamma \) = universal gas constant
\( R \) = specific gas constant
\( R_o \) = gage resistance at reference temperature
\( Re_X = \frac{u_1 X}{V_w} \)
SYMBOLS (continued)

\( t \) = time
\( T_a \) = stagnation temperature
\( T_b \) = blunt body surface temperature
\( u_1 \) = velocity at boundary layer edge
\( V_m \) = flight velocity
\( V_s \) = moving normal shock velocity
\( x \) = coordinate along body surface
\( \Xi \) = compressibility factor for gas adjacent to body surface
\( \Delta R_g \) = change in gas resistance with temperature
\( \Delta \) = shock detachment distance
\( \Delta \Xi \) = change in voltage drop across heat transfer gage
\( \nu_g \) = viscosity of gas adjacent to body surface
\( \nu_w \) = kinematic viscosity of gas adjacent to body surface
\( \rho_2/\rho_1 \) = density ratio across moving normal shock
\( \rho_b \) = stagnation point density
\( \rho_0 \) = free stream density for free flight condition
\( \rho \) = density gage material
I. INTRODUCTION

The heat transfer associated with the atmospheric re-entry of a space vehicle traveling at super-orbital or hyper-velocities is characterized by two key aspects. One of these is the presence of ions and electrons in appreciable amounts in the stagnation region which, in influencing transport properties, may have an effect on the aerodynamic heating rates. The second aspect is that of the increased importance of radiative heating. Both of these phenomena have received considerable attention during the past two years; however, there still exists some uncertainty with regard to the prediction of re-entry heating rates at super-orbital velocities.

Until 1962, the problem of stagnation point aerodynamic heat transfer in partially ionized air had been the center of considerable controversy because of the wide disagreement in the results of existing theoretically and experimental investigations. In particular, the theoretical results of Scala and the experimental results of Warren both indicated stagnation point heat transfer rates to be a factor of two or more greater than that predicted by other investigators for flight velocities in excess of the escape velocity. However, it has been shown recently that the high heat transfer rates calculated by Scala were due to the use of what would appear to be unreasonable transport properties. Excluding Scala's results, the aforementioned theories show moderate agreement, i.e., within 30 per cent of each other at flight velocities up to 50,000 feet per second.

The stagnation point convective heating rate data presented in this report were obtained to help define super-orbital velocity convective heating rates to the extent required for preliminary design of re-entry vehicles. These measurements were made in The Ohio State University arc-driven shock tube facility which is capable of generating hyper-velocity flows possessing total enthalpies of more than 60,000 BTU/lb 

Standard calorimeter techniques were used to measure the aerodynamic heating rates at the stagnation points of four sphere models at simulated flight velocities from 20,000 to 40,000 feet per second. Simulated altitudes ranged from 100,000 to 192,000 feet.
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II. THE ARC-DRIVEN SHOCK TUBE FACILITY

The facility in which the present experiments were performed is The Ohio State University arc-driven 4-inch shock tube facility shown in Fig. 1. This facility, which uses arc-heated helium as the driver gas, is capable of generating shock velocities in excess of 40,000 feet per second. The energy for this facility is supplied by a capacitor bank which has an energy rating of 200,000 Joules at its maximum voltage of 6000. The driven tube, which is 28 feet long, terminates in a dump tank producing a high-enthalpy, supersonic free jet in which a model may be placed for aerodynamic testing. All of the measurements reported here were obtained in this manner using untreated room air.

The operating range of the OSU facility is shown in Fig. 2 in terms of the standard shock tube parameters, the shock Mach number \( M_s \), and the initial driven tube pressure \( p_1 \), and also in terms of the simulated altitude and flight velocity based on the simulation of total enthalpy and stagnation point pressure. Also shown are the velocity-altitude conditions simulated during this investigation and a typical re-entry trajectory for a super-orbital velocity lifting re-entry vehicle. Now the maximum shock Mach number attainable as a function of the initial driven tube pressure, and also the low density limit which is imposed by the available test duration.

It should be noted that the flight velocity simulated in the shock tube, based on total enthalpy, may be related, to as excellent approximation, with the standard shock tube parameters by the expression

\[
V_m = V_4 \sqrt{2\left(1 - p_1/p_2\right)}
\]  

Thus the flight velocity simulated depends only on shock velocity, being for all practical purposes independent of the initial driven tube pressure. The altitude simulated may then be determined from stagnation point density considerations through the use of references 12 through 14.

One important consideration in the application of shock tubes to the production of hypervelocity shock waves is the test duration available. The test duration, which decreases with increasing shock speed and decreasing tube pressure, may be quite small at the shock tube operating conditions necessary for the simulation of super-orbital velocity flight at altitudes above 100,000 feet. It is thus important that measurements of the test duration available be carried out for any particular facility. Extensive measurements of this type have been made in The Ohio State University facility and these are reported in reference 11. In addition, the variation in hot gas radiative emission was monitored on each run during the present program in order to obtain information on the test duration for that particular run. A random sample of test duration data obtained in this manner during the present experiments is presented in Fig. 3 for initial driver tube pressures of 1 mm Hg and 50 microns.
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Fig. 1. Arc-driven shock tube facility
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Fig. 2. Operating range for The Ohio State University arc-driven shock tube facilities, including flight conditions simulated.
Fig. 3. Arc-driven shock tube test duration measurements
Also shown are some data from reference 11 for a position 15 feet from the diaphragm station. Since it takes on the order of 5 microseconds, depending on the configuration being tested, to establish steady flow conditions in the nose region of a model, a test duration on the order of 10 microseconds should be taken as the minimum allowed for obtaining usable data. It can be seen that in general such a test duration is available. Data obtained during the present program have been disregarded for runs for which the test duration is believed to be insufficient.

A more complete description of this facility may be found in references 8-11, while similar shock tube facilities are reported in references 6 and 15.
III. MEASUREMENTS OF AERODYNAMIC HEATING

Stagnation point aerodynamic heat transfer measurements have been carried out over a range of simulated flight velocities and altitudes, and for several site models, using calorimeter heat transfer gages. The development and application of the calorimeter gage, for use in shock tube heat transfer experiments, has been discussed in detail by F. H. Rose,16,17 of the Avco-Everett Research Laboratory where much of the early development work was carried out. In essence, the calorimeter gage may be used to measure heat transfer rates by monitoring the time-rate-of-change of the gage heat content. Since this heat content is related to the average temperature of the gage, which in turn is related to the gage resistance, then the heat transfer rate may be determined by measuring the variation in gage resistance, or for a constant current circuit, the variation in voltage drop across the gage. It is important to minimize any heat loss from the gage, and thus the choice of gage thickness is critical.

The type of model used in the present experiments is shown schematically in Fig. 4. Each such model consisted of a pyrex or glass sphere, attached to a string, and having a calorimeter gage mounted at the stagnation point. The calorimeter gages were constructed from 0.001-inch thick uncoated platinum foil.

The properties of the platinum were obtained from reference 18. The room temperature resistance of each gage was measured before use and each was also periodically checked during use. It was found that at the extreme conditions of velocity and initial driver tube pressure, the resistance of the gage sometimes changed over a period of time because of the erosive action of diaphragm particles which impact on the gage as the driver gas passes over the model at the end of the shot.

The circuit for measuring the variation in the gage resistance is shown in Fig. 5, and is the same as suggested in reference 16. Four leads are attached to each gage—two leads for the dc power circuit which provides a constant current flow, and the other two as part of the differential circuit for measuring the variation in voltage drop across the gage. The purpose of the resistors denoted by $R_2$ in Fig. 5 is to reduce the effects of transient voltages induced in the differential amplifier when charged particles from the partially ionized test gas impinge on the uncoated surface of the calorimeter heat transfer gage. These resistors must be several orders of magnitude smaller than the internal resistance of the differential amplifier, and several orders of magnitude larger than the calorimeter gage resistance. When these conditions exist, the particle-induced transients act as signals from an extremely high impedance source so the $R_2$'s short them to ground. By contrast, the voltage drop across the gage due to its instantaneous resistance is a signal from a low-impedance source so it is unaffected by the $R_2$'s. The noise voltage is thus reduced or eliminated while the signal is displayed by the oscilloscope. It was found that reasonable results are obtainable using $R_2$ in the range of 100 to 10,000 ohms. The best value for $R_2$ will depend on the
Fig. 5. Schematic of heat transfer gage electrical circuit
particular test conditions. For the present results an R1 of 3000 ohms was used and the two resistors were balanced to within 0.1 ohm.

The data reduction for the present measurements has been performed using the relation

$$
\frac{q_w}{I} = \frac{C}{\Delta V} \frac{\Delta \Delta V}{\Delta T}
$$

where $\Delta \Delta V/\Delta T$ is the time-rate-of-change of the voltage drop across the gage, $I$ is the gage current, and $C$ and $\Delta V$, $\Delta \Delta V/\Delta T$ are properties of the platinum gage material.\textsuperscript{17,18} Corrections were applied to account for variations in gage properties with temperature, and the distribution in heat transfer over the gage, using the results of Rose.\textsuperscript{16}

Several typical oscillograms of a calorimeter gage output are shown in Fig. 6. The vertical scale is the variation in the voltage drop across the gage, $\Delta V$, which for a constant current in the circuit is proportional to the variation in gage resistance. The horizontal scale is time. It can be seen that following the arrival of the shock, there is a period of 3 to 5 microseconds during which the flow is non-steady and both the heat transfer rate and the induced noise level are high. It should be noted that the induced noise is the most severe at the instant the travelling normal shock passes the gage, since there is at that time no boundary layer to at least partially insulate the gage from the ionized gas surrounding it. After the flow field is established the noise becomes reduced and the gage output increases linearly with time as predicted theoretically for a constant heating rate. After 10 to 50 microseconds the contact region arrives at the gage ending the test period. This is sometimes indicated by an erratic behavior in the output of the gage, such as shown in the upper left-hand oscillogram of Fig. 6, approximately 50 microseconds after passage of the incident shock.

Note in Fig. 6, the typical gage output for the case where the circuit has not been properly balanced. In this case the two $R_1$ resistors are out of balance by no more than a couple of ohms out of 5000. The noise present in the gage output is due to transients induced by the ionized test gas. This induced effect becomes more important at the higher electron densities.

The majority of the results in this report are at initial driven tube pressures of 1.05, 0.20, and 0.06 mm Hg. A few additional data points were obtained at pressures less than 0.060 mm Hg. Since the available test time decreases as the initial driven tube pressure is lowered (see Fig. 5), it was extremely difficult at initial pressures less than 0.060 mm Hg to perform the heat transfer measurements under conditions where sufficient test time was available. For this reason a large number of tests were performed at these pressures in order to obtain a few usable data points.
Fig. 6. Typical calorimeter gage oscillograms
Four hemispherical nose models were used in this study. The nose radii were 0.25, 0.50, 1.00, and 1.125 inches. The shock velocities ranged from 10,000 to 30,000 feet per second. The data obtained are shown in Fig. 7-10 and are also presented in tabular form in Tables 1-4. In Figs. 7-9, the data have been presented as \( \delta \sqrt{\frac{8g}{F}} \) versus the shock velocity so that the dependence of the heat flux on nose radius has been removed. Because various initial driven tube pressures were used in the range below 0.060 mm \( Hg \), these data have been plotted as \( \delta \sqrt{\frac{8g}{F}} \) versus the shock velocity. Thus both the pressure and nose radius dependence has been taken out in the data shown in Fig. 10. These results will be analyzed in Section IV; however, it should be noted that the data scatter increases with decreasing initial driven tube pressure. This is to be expected since the measurement of the lower heat transfer rate which is associated with the lower pressure, and the measurement of the initial pressure itself, would both be expected to be less accurate.
Fig. 7. Calorimeter gage heat transfer measurements, $P_1 = 1$ mm Hg.
Fig. 9. Calorimeter gage heat transfer measurements, $P_\perp = 0.06$ mm Hg
Fig. 10. Calorimeter gage heat transfer measurements, $P_1 = 0.06$ mm Hg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>Shock Velocity $V_e$ Kft/s</th>
<th>Initial Shock Tube Pressure $P_1$</th>
<th>Simulated Flight Velocity Kft/s</th>
<th>Approximate Geopotential Altitude* ft.</th>
<th>Simulated Free Stream Density $x10^6$ Slugs/ft$^3$</th>
<th>$q_w x10^{-3}$ BTU/ft$^2$-sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2546</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2547A</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2547B</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2549</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2553</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2554</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2555</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2565</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2856</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2867</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2868</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2869</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2870</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Altitude and free stream density based on 1959 ARDC atmosphere, reference 19.
## Stagnation Point Convective Heat Transfer Data

**Table 2**

Nose Radius = 0.5 inch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>Shock Velocity $V_s$ Kft/s</th>
<th>Initial Shock Tube Pressure $P_i$</th>
<th>Simulated Flight Velocity $V_f$ Kft/s</th>
<th>Approximate Geopotential Altitude ft.</th>
<th>Simulated Free Stream Density $\rho_f$ $\times 10^3$ Slugs/ft$^3$</th>
<th>$q_m x 10^{-3}$ BTU/ft$^2$sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012A</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012B</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2534</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2892</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2896</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2897</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>33.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2899</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>30.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2556</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2558</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2559</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2560</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2561</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2562</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run No.</td>
<td>Shock Velocity ( V_s ) Ktt/s</td>
<td>Initial Shock Tube Pressure ( P_t )</td>
<td>Simulated Flight Velocity ( V_f ) Ktt/s</td>
<td>Approximate Geopotential Altitude* ft.</td>
<td>Simulated Free Stream Density* ( \rho_w \times 10^{-3} ) slug/ft(^3)</td>
<td>( q_w \times 10^{-3} ) BTU/ft(^2)sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2563</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2564</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2565</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2566</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2567</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2568</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2569</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2570</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2571</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2572</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.86 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2573</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.86 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2574</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.62 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2575</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.95 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2576</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.82 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2577</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.35 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2578</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.80 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2579</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.79 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2580</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.23 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2581</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.99 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2582</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.90 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2583</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5.63 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2584</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>8.90 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2585</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.10 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2586</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.90 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2587</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.48 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2588</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.94 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2589</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.80 (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2590</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.71 (n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Altitude and free stream density based on 1959 ARDC atmosphere, reference 19.

"n" indicates that chemical non-equilibrium effects may possibly be present (see discussion in Section IV).
# Stagnation Point Convective Heat Transfer Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>Vg (Kft/s)</th>
<th>F1* (1.00)</th>
<th>Simulated Flight Velocity (Kft/s)</th>
<th>Simulated Geopotential Altitude (ft)</th>
<th>wa x 10^-3 (Btu/ft^2/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2520</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2522</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2523</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2524</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2525</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2526</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2527A</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2528</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2528A</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2528B</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2529</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2531</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2532</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2533</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2535</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2537</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2436</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2431</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2434</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2435</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2436</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2437</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2439</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2440</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2450</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run No.</td>
<td>Shock Velocity $V_s$ (Kft/s)</td>
<td>Initial Shock Tube Pressure $P_1$</td>
<td>Simulated Flight Velocity $V_f$ (Kft/s)</td>
<td>Approximate Geopotential Altitude (ft)</td>
<td>Simulated Free Stream Density $\rho_0$ x 10$^6$ (Slugs/ft$^3$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2454</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2455</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2456</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2457</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2459</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2460</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2461</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2462</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2463</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2467</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2468</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2470</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2471</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2472</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2473</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2474</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2479</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2496</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2499</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2503</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2505</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2506</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2509</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3 (continued)

Nose Radius = 1 inch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>Shock Velocity $V_s$ Kft/s</th>
<th>Initial Shock Tube Pressure $P_0$</th>
<th>Simulated Flight Velocity $V$ Kft/s</th>
<th>Simulated Geopotential Altitude $H$ ft</th>
<th>Simulated Free Stream Density $\rho_f$ x10$^{-5}$ Slugs/ft$^3$</th>
<th>$\dot{M}$ x10$^{-3}$ BTU/ft$^2$sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2511</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.57 (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.782 (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.921 (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.735 (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2516</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.735 (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.05 (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3054</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3.50 (N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Altitude and free stream density based on 1959 ARDC atmosphere, reference 19.

**N** indicates that chemical non-equilibrium effects may possibly be present (see discussion in Section IV).
## STAGNATION POINT CONVECTIVE HEAT TRANSFER DATA

### Table 4

Nose Radius = 1.125 inch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>Shock Velocity $V_{sh}$ Kft/s</th>
<th>Initial Shock Tube Pressure $P_1$ mm Hg</th>
<th>Simulated Flight Velocity Kft/s</th>
<th>Simulated Geopotential Altitude ft.</th>
<th>Approximate $q_{sh} \times 10^{-3}$ Btu/ft$^2$-sec</th>
<th>Simulated Free Stream Density $\rho_0 \times 10^6$ Slugs/ft$^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2860</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2861</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2845</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2846</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2849</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2852</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>140,000*</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2853</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Altitude and free stream density based on 1959 ASIO atmosphere, reference 19.
IV. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Before making any comparison between the stagnation point heat transfer measurements reported here and the existing theoretical treatments, it is important to understand the chemical nature of the highly dissociated and even ionized flow in the stagnation region of the blunt models used in the present investigation and any resulting effect on the heat transfer rate. The questions that must be answered in considering these phenomena are: (1) is the gas at the outer edge of the boundary layer in equilibrium, chemically frozen, or reacting with a finite rate; and (2) are the recombination rates in the boundary layer rapid enough so that the boundary layer is in equilibrium at all points. Because the chemical composition affects the transport properties, which in turn affect the boundary layer profiles, a knowledge of the chemical nature is extremely important. For the case where both the inviscid flow and the boundary layer are in chemical and thermodynamic equilibrium, there will be one heat transfer rate, the equilibrium boundary layer heat transfer rate, associated with the flow. However, for the same equilibrium inviscid conditions but with a chemically frozen boundary layer and a non-catalytic wall, the heat transfer rate may be much less than the equilibrium value because of the energy involved in dissociation and ionization. Because of the non-catalytic surface effect, the wall enthalpy in this case is higher than in the equilibrium case for the same wall temperature, and the driving potential for the heat transfer, $h_{w}-h_{y}$, is reduced. It should be noted that the wall enthalpy in this case includes the energy of dissociation and ionization in addition to the normal energy modes and pressure energy.

Another example which demonstrates the importance of the effect of the chemical state on aerodynamic heat transfer is as follows:

Consider an equilibrium inviscid flow where the boundary layer is chemically frozen and the surface is highly catalytic so that the chemical state of the gas at the wall is an equilibrium one. If the inviscid stream is dissociated but un-ionized, then the heat transfer rate is unaffected by the non-equilibrium boundary layer and will be approximately equal to the equilibrium heat transfer rate. However, if the free stream is highly ionized, then the resulting heat transfer rate may be much higher than for the equilibrium boundary layer because of the transport of energy by electron and ion diffusion.

Thus it can be seen that in analyzing the results obtained in this study, it is important that consideration be given to the chemical state of stagnation region flow field. Consider first the question of whether the gas at the outer edge of the stagnation point boundary layer is in equilibrium. This can be answered by considering the relaxation process behind a normal shock. This process has been extensively studied for dissociation processes behind a normal shock moving into an undisturbed fluid\(^{20,21}\) and based on the results of such studies, Rose and Stanek\(^{22}\) have estimated the relaxation distance behind a standing shock under conditions such as encountered in the
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present tests. These equilibrium distances were estimated by determining the particle time required to reach equilibrium conditions, identical to the model stagnation conditions, behind a shock moving into an undisturbed fluid, and converting this time into the distance behind the standing model bow shock. However, because the gas in front of the model bow shock is already vibrationally excited and dissociated, it would be expected that the actual relaxation distances would be shorter. Although there is presently no information in the literature that supports this, initial results obtained in this laboratory by studying reflected shocks indicate that the relaxation process for conditions such as encountered for a standing shock in a shock tube flow may be, by as much as a factor of two, more rapid than for a moving shock in an undisturbed fluid. Shown in Fig. 11 are both the calculated relaxation distances by Rose and Stankevics and an estimated lower limit for the relaxation distance behind the model bow shock.

In order to determine the chemical state of the gas at the outer edge of the stagnation point boundary layer, the shock detachment distance must also be known. A recent study at this laboratory of shock shapes in shock tube generated flows indicated that in the shock Mach number range of interest here, the shock detachment distance was approximately 0.156 times the model nose radius. If the shock detachment distance is approximately equal to or greater than the chemical relaxation distance, then the gas at the outer edge of the boundary layer will be in equilibrium. From this it can be seen that for all the convective heating data taken at an initial driven tube pressure of 1 atm Hg, the gas at the outer edge of the boundary layer is in equilibrium; while at 0.200 atm Hg the gas at the outer edge of the boundary layer should be in a near equilibrium state. For all the measurements performed at 0.060 atm Hg and below, the gas is in non-equilibrium at the outer edge of the boundary layer.

Even though equilibrium conditions may prevail at the outer edge of the boundary layer, the boundary layer itself may be in non-equilibrium because of the presence of finite recombination rates. Ray and Hiddell, in their comprehensive treatment of the stagnation point heat transfer problem in a dissociated gas, established a parameter to measure the effect of a finite recombination rate on the boundary layer flow and on the heat transfer. Based on this parameter, Rose and Stankevics analyzed the case of stagnation point heat transfer measurements in a shock tube. Their results are shown in Fig. 12 in terms of the Ray and Hiddell recombination parameter, \( C_1 \), where

\[
C_1 = K_1 \left( \frac{P_e}{P} \right) \left( \frac{4u}{L} \right)^{-1.5},
\]

and \( K_1 \) is a constant arising from the recombination rate of oxygen. In Fig. 12, \( C_1 \) is presented as a function of the initial driven tube pressure and for several shock velocities. For \( C_1 \) greater than unity, equilibrium boundary layer calculations should be in good agreement with experimental data because the recombination effects will be small. Frozen boundary layer calculations
Fig. 11. Estimated relaxation distance behind standing normal shock in shock tube flow
Fig. 12. Fay and Riddell recombination parameter for shock tube conditions (Reference 22)
for a catalytic surface should serve as a good approximation for $C_t$ less than unity. For $C_t$ on the order of $10^{-4}$ or less, surface effects will be important and must be considered. Actually the temperature dependence of the recombination rate is less than that assumed by Fay and Riddell, and Chung\textsuperscript{52} has shown that this results in a delay in the onset of boundary layer freezing until lower densities.

It should be noted that Rose and Stankevic\textsuperscript{22} have considered the ionization processes involved in equilibrium being attained in both the inviscid and viscous stagnation region flow; and although there is little knowledge of ionization processes at temperatures such as those attained in the present experiments, it appears that the ionization behind the shock will proceed at a faster rate than that shown in Fig. 11, and that the Fay and Riddell parameter $C_t$ may still be used as the governing recombination parameter in the boundary layer.

It should also be noted that most metal surfaces are catalytic, while glasses such as pyrex or quartz are non-catalytic. Although the cleanliness of a surface will affect its catalytic efficiency, the uncoated platinum foil calorimeter gages used in the present investigation are considered to be catalytic.

Based on Figs. 11 and 12, it would thus be expected that all of the convective heating results obtained at initial driven tube pressures of 1 mm Hg and 0.250 mm Hg should be at conditions where equilibrium boundary layer calculations serve as a good approximation. The data taken at 0.060 mm Hg and below would be expected to agree better with chemically frozen boundary layer calculations. These data have been identified in Tables 1-4 through the use of the symbol "$t". However, it should be noted that at flight velocities below 32,000 feet per second and with a catalytic surface, for all practical purposes there is no difference between the heat transfer rate associated with a chemically frozen or an equilibrium boundary layer.\textsuperscript{27}

A comment should be made relative to the importance of hot gas radiative heat transfer on the calorimeter gage measurements of aerodynamic heating. If a comparison is made of the radiative heat transfer rate, using the theoretical results of reference 26, and the measured convective heat transfer rate for the most extreme condition, which is a 1.0 inch radius model at a simulated velocity of 56,000 feet per second and an initial driven tube pressure of 1 mm Hg, then it can be shown that the radiative contribution to the convective heat transfer measurements is less than 15 per cent, assuming that the calorimeter gage absorbs all the incident radiation. However, using a realistic estimate for the absorptivity of the gage, then the radiative contribution for this extreme case must be less than 10 per cent. It should be noted that initially the platinum calorimeter gages are highly reflecting; however, after a couple of runs the surface becomes grayish and has a higher absorptivity, which is estimated to be 20 per cent. For the smaller models the effect is much less since the ratio of stagnation point radiative heat transfer to convective heat transfer goes as the nose radius to the three-halves power. The effect
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is also less at lower simulated flight velocities. Thus this effect has been ignored. It should be noted that a comparison of calorimeter gage measurements for models of different nose radius indicates no discernible contribution due to radiative transfer.

In correlating convective heat transfer data for laminar boundary layers, the basic parameter is the $\frac{Nu}{\sqrt{Re_x}}$, which may be expressed as:

$$\frac{Nu}{\sqrt{Re_x}} = \frac{\frac{c_p}{V_f} \frac{\sqrt{Fr}}{Pr} \frac{1}{(h_{lg}+h_y)}}{\frac{1}{(\nu/RT)^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Pr}} \frac{d\sqrt{P}}{dx}}$$

There are many theoretical solutions which result in the determination of this parameter for stagnation point boundary layers. The important solutions for ionized air or nitrogen are shown in Table 5 and are compared with the present experimental data in Fig. 13.

In calculating the $\frac{Nu}{\sqrt{Re_x}}$ for the experimental measurements, the inviscid gas properties were evaluated through the use of reference 13 and the velocity gradient using the modified Newtonian form:

$$\frac{d\sqrt{P}}{dx} = \sqrt{\frac{2(P_f-P)}{P}}$$

The data shown in Fig. 13 represent average values for data points obtained at approximately the same run condition. This averaging was done to reduce the data scatter and allow a more meaningful interpretation.

It can be seen in Fig. 13 that although there is general agreement with all of the theories shown, no one theory correctly predicts the level of heat transfer over the entire range of flight velocities as determined experimentally.

It was previously noted that equilibrium boundary layer calculations should serve as a good approximation for analyzing the data obtained at 1 mm Hg and 0.200 mm Hg, while chemically frozen boundary layer calculations for a catalytic surface would serve best at an initial driven tube pressure of 0.060 mm Hg. If this is the case, then it might be expected that at simulated flight velocities ranging from 30,000 to 40,000 feet per second there would be a variation in the heat transfer parameter with density. This variation is indicated by Pay and Kemp's calculations of a higher value for the heat transfer parameter in a chemically frozen boundary layer than in an equilibrium boundary layer (see Fig. 13). However, there is no such variation discernible in the present experimental results. Certainly the data scatter makes any
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Correlation Formula</th>
<th>Chemical State</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>( \frac{\text{Nu}}{\sqrt{\text{Re}}} = 0.767 \left( \text{Pr}<em>\text{v} \right) \left( \frac{\rho \mu_1}{\rho \mu</em>\text{v}} \right)^{0.43} \left( \frac{\nu}{\nu_\text{v}} \right)^{0.43} \left( \frac{\nu_\text{v}}{\nu} \right) )</td>
<td>equilibrium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Van Tassell</td>
<td>( \frac{\text{Nu}}{\sqrt{\text{Re}}} = 0.90 \left( \text{Pr}<em>\text{v} \right) \left( \frac{\rho \mu_1}{\rho \mu</em>\text{v}} \right)^{0.43} \left( \frac{V_\text{v}}{32500} \right) )</td>
<td>equilibrium</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoshizaki</td>
<td>( \frac{\text{Nu}}{\sqrt{\text{Re}}} = 0.672 \left( \text{Pr}<em>\text{v} \right) \left( \frac{\nu</em>\text{v}}{900} \right)^{0.2} \left( \frac{\nu}{\nu_\text{v}} \right)^{0.51} )</td>
<td>equilibrium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Correlation Formula*</th>
<th>Chemical State</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay and Kemp</td>
<td>[ \frac{N}{\sqrt{Re}} = 0.47 ]</td>
<td>[ 10 &lt; \varepsilon'/\varepsilon &lt; 24 ]</td>
<td>equilibrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ \frac{N}{\sqrt{Re}} = 0.47 \left( \frac{\varepsilon'}{2\varepsilon} \right)^{-0.83} ]</td>
<td>[ 24 &lt; \varepsilon'/\varepsilon &lt; 60 ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ \frac{N}{\sqrt{Re}} = 0.47 \left( \frac{\varepsilon'}{2\varepsilon} \right)^{-0.83} ]</td>
<td>[ 24 &lt; \varepsilon'/\varepsilon &lt; 34 ]</td>
<td>frozen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ \frac{N}{\sqrt{Re}} = 0.35 ]</td>
<td>[ 34 &lt; \varepsilon'/\varepsilon &lt; 60 ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{10^3} \]

\[ N = 0.83 - 0.11 \log P_s - 0.02 \left( \log P_s \right)^2 \]
Fig. 13. Non-dimensional heat transfer parameter, \( \frac{N_u}{\sqrt{Re}} \), versus simulated flight velocity, \( V_{\infty} \), in K ft/sec.
formal conclusion at this time rather presumptuous. It should be noted, how-
ever, that the presently accepted reaction rate for the oxygen recombination
process, together with Chung's analysis, indicates a delay in the onset of
boundary layer freezing as compared to Fay and Haddad's results. This would
serve to explain the absence, in the present results, of any variation in the
heat transfer parameter with density, since the boundary layer for all exper-
imental conditions may be in a near-equilibrium state.

It can be seen in Fig. 13 that although no one theory is in full agree-
ment with the experimental results, the equilibrium calculations of Fay and
Kemp appear to more nearly predict the correct trend. However, the pre-
dicted magnitude, when compared to the measurements, is approximately 20 per
cent high over the entire range of flight velocities. It is well known that
the accuracy of numerical calculation depends on the procedures used. For
example, the equilibrium air calculations of Cohen, Hoshizaki, and Pallone
and Van Tassel all make use of the same transport properties yet show dif-
ferences of 20 per cent or more in their results. Thus the difference between
the theoretical results of Fay and Kemp and the present experimental results
may be due to inherent numerical calculation inaccuracies. This same differ-
ence appears between the Fay and Kemp results and the experimental data of
Rose and Stankovic. It thus appears that the theoretical analysis of Fay
and Kemp correctly predicts the effects of ionization on stagnation point heat
transfer; and although there is some question as to the magnitude of the heat
transfer predicted, the chemical model used by Fay and Kemp should prove useful
in other boundary layer problems.

The present experimental results are also shown in Fig. 14 in the form
of \( \frac{q}{\sqrt{R_m} \sqrt{T_a}} \) as a function of \( \frac{(h_{to}-h_v)}{V_S} \). The solid line has the equation

\[
\frac{q}{\sqrt{R_m} \sqrt{T_a}} = 4.7 \times 10^{-3} \left( \frac{(h_{to}-h_v)}{V_S} \right),
\]

and is virtually identical to a correlation by Scala and Gilbert of solutions
conducted for dissociated gases of different molecular weight. It can be
seen that the agreement is reasonably good (on the order of ±20 per cent)
even out at high enthalpies where ionization is appreciable. Thus for engi-
neering purposes, the above equation should give satisfactory results in ad-
dition to being practical.

It can also be seen that there are no serious ionization effects on stаг-
nation point aerodynamic heating at velocities up to 40,000 feet per second.
This is in agreement with recent experimental results in air, carbon
dioxide, and nitrogen-carbon dioxide mixtures.
Fig. 14. High enthalpy stagnation point heat transfer correlation
Note that if $h_{to}$ is replaced by $V_m^2/2$, and $P_S$ by $c_w V_m^2$, (6) reduces to

$$
\frac{\dot{m} \sqrt{V_m}}{\left(1 - \frac{h_w}{h_{to}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{V_m}{1000}\right)^{3}} = \frac{20.5}{(c_w)}
$$

which differs from the approximate form of Lees' equation only in the constant, which is 21.7 in Lees' equation. Here $c_w$ is in slugs/ft$^3$, $V_m$ in ft/sec, $h_w$ in ft, and $\dot{m}$ in BTU/ft$^2$/sec.

The present experimental results have been statistically analyzed by L. E. Hooks. This analysis assumed first that $\dot{m}$, $h_w$, $c_w$, and $V_m$ were related by Eq. 7, and that $h_w = 5006 (525^oF) \text{ BTU}/\text{lb mole}$. Equation 7 was solved for each of the 130 data points to yield the numerical constant. The characteristics of the set of constants are as follows:

- average $= 20.56$
- non-dimensional standard deviation $= 21.74\%$
- non-dimensional skewness $= 0.6416$
- non-dimensional kurtosis $= 0.9177$

(zero for a normal distribution).

Next, the exponents of $h_w$, $c_w$, and $V_m$ were varied to find those which gave the minimum non-dimensional standard deviation of the numerical constants, the constants being recomputed for each exponent change. The results are as follows:

$$
\frac{\dot{m} \sqrt{h_w}}{\left(1 - \frac{h_w}{h_{to}}\right)^{0.4116}} = \frac{12.72}{(c_w)} \left(\frac{V_m}{1000}\right)^{3.1536}
$$

- non-dimensional standard deviation $= 21.19\%$
- non-dimensional skewness $= 0.6982$
- non-dimensional kurtosis $= 0.7981$
The exponent of $W_0$ in Eq. 8 is nearly the value advocated by Detra, Kemp, and Riddell,\(^\text{35}\) that is, 3.15. Recomputing the numerical constants from Eq. 7 with the exponent of $W_0$ set to 3.15 gives

\[
\text{average} = 12.29 \\
\text{non-dimensional standard deviation} = 21.60\% \\
\text{non-dimensional skewness} = 0.5327 \\
\text{non-dimensional kurtosis} = 0.8788
\]

On the basis of present data, no clear choice can be made among Lees' equation, Eq. 8, and Detra, Kemp, and Riddell's equation. Lees' equation, with the corrected constant of 20.5, is recommended for use in re-entry calculations at flight velocities up to 40,000 feet per second since it is the simplest of the three equations and it is a physically grounded equation rather than a curve fit.
V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of this investigation, the following conclusions may be made with regard to aerodynamic heating at super-orbital velocities:

(1) There appear to be no significant ionization effects on aerodynamic heating at flight velocities up to 40,000 feet per second.

(2) The theoretical analysis of Fay and Kemp\textsuperscript{27} appears to correctly predict the trend in the variation of the heat transfer parameter for ionized air; however, there is a 20 per cent discrepancy in the magnitude of the heat transfer as predicted by Fay and Kemp and as measured in the present experiments. Other theoretical analyses show general agreement with the present data but do not indicate the correct trend.

(3) For engineering purposes, the approximate equation of Lees\textsuperscript{32} with a numerical constant of 20.5 is recommended. The standard deviation of the present data from this modified Lees' equation is 21.7\%.
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