Wind and Structures, Vol. 7, No. 5 (2004) 317-332 DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12989/was.2004.7.5.317

Unsteady 2-D flow field characteristics for perforated plates with a splitter

Subhash C. Yaragal[†]

Department of Civil Engineering, National Institute of Technology Karnataka, Surathkal, PO: Srinivasnagar - 575 025, Mangalore, India (Received November 15, 2003, Accepted June 25, 2004)

Abstract. Wind tunnel experiments were conducted under highly turbulent and disturbed flow conditions over a solid/perforated plate with a long splitter plate in its plane of symmetry. The effect of varied level of perforation of the normal plate on fluctuating velocities and fluctuating pressures measured across and along the separation bubble was studied. The different perforation levels of the normal plate; that is 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50% are studied. The Reynolds number based on step height was varied from 4×10^3 to 1.2×10^4 . The shape and size of the bubble vary with different perforation level of the normal plate that is to say the bubble is reduced both in height and length up to 30% perforation level. For higher perforation of the normal plate, bubble is completely swept out. The peak turbulence value occurs around 0.7 to 0.8 times the reattachment length. The turbulence intensity values are highest for the case of solid normal plate (bleed air is absent) and are lowest for the case of 50% perforation of the normal plate that is observed that

 $\sqrt{u'^2} / (\sqrt{u'^2})_{\text{max}}$, (the ratio of RMS velocity fluctuation to maximum RMS velocity fluctuation), is uniquely

related with dimensionless distance y/Y', (the ratio of distance normal to splitter plate to the distance where RMS velocity fluctuation is half its maximum value) for all the perforated normal plates. It is interesting to note that for 50% perforation of the normal plate, the RMS pressure fluctuation in the flow field gets reduced to around 60% as compared to that for solid normal plate. Analysis of the results show that the ratio $[C'_p \max / -C_{pb}(1-\eta)]$, where $C'_p \max$ is the maximum coefficient of fluctuating pressure, C_{pb} is the coefficient of base pressure and η is the perforation level (ratio of open to total area), for surface RMS pressure fluctuation levels seems to be constant and has value of about 0.22. Similar analysis show that the ratio $[C'_p \max / -C_{pb}(1-\eta)]$ for flow field RMS pressure fluctuation levels seems to be constant and has a value of about 0.32.

Keywords: RMS fluctuating pressures; two dimensional perforated plates; normal plate; bluff body; splitter plate; shear layer; flow separation; reattachment; wind tunnel testing.

1. Introduction

Pressure fluctuations are of common occurrence in unsteady fluid flows. Static pressure fluctuations in interior and exterior flows, away from flow boundaries, are important in aero-acoustics. Although not recognized widely, but of great technical significance, is the fact that

[†] Senior Lecturer, Currently, Wind Engineering Research Center, Department of Architecture, Tokyo Polytechnic University, 1583, Iiyama, Atsugi, Kanagawa 243-0297, Japan

pressure fluctuations away from flow boundaries can differ substantially from wall measured values. A need to measure these has been long recognized, with reference to aerodynamic applications like jet noise, aircraft cabin noise etc. A knowledge of pressure fluctuation characteristics is essential for understanding complex flows.

Basically, two types of pressure fluctuation measurements in turbulent flows have been attempted in the past, namely, at the surface and within the flow. From two review articles on the subject by Willmarth (1975), and George, *et al.* (1984), one can understand that pressure fluctuation measurements pose experimental difficulties, particularly for measurements within the flow.

Govinda Ram and Arakeri (1990), first attempted to measure both surface pressure fluctuations and pressure fluctuations within the flow in the region of separation and reattachment. They used isosceles triangular nose models of different included angle (2θ) , in which the fore body becomes a normal plate when 2θ equals 180°. One of their important findings was that except for the $2\theta = 180^{\circ}$ model, the maximum RMS pressure fluctuation levels in the shear layer are almost equal to the maximum surface RMS pressure fluctuation levels. This finding highlights the importance for measurement of pressure fluctuation level in the shear layer for the $2\theta = 180^{\circ}$ model.

Recently Tsai and Yang (1993), measured pressure fluctuations in the turbulent wake flow behind a two-dimensional V-gutter by use of static pressure probe like the one used by Govinda Ram and Arakeri (1990).

The backward-facing step and the blunt rectangular plate have been investigated in considerable detail, and references may be found in George, *et al.* (1984) and Jenkins (1987). Disturbed flow over a bluff plate with a long splitter plate has received less attention, although it is an attractive case of re-circulating flow. Ruderich and Fernholz (1986), have reported a fairly detailed investigation of such a flow configuration using hot wire and pulsed-wire anemometry. Castro and Haque (1987), made a comprehensive set of measurements throughout the separated shear layer and compared their data with that of two-dimensional plane mixing layer. Gupta and Ranga Raju (1987), have put forth a method for predicting the mean velocity field downstream of solid and porous fences.

The purpose of this paper is to study experimentally the effect of varying perforation of the normal plate on fluctuating velocities and fluctuating pressures within the separating and reattaching flows, and to ascertain the possible correlations.

2. Experimental setup and methods

2.1. Facility

The facility used for the present experimental study is a suction-type low-speed wind tunnel driven by a four-bladed fan connected to a 15 HP slip-ring induction motor. Speed control of the 15 HP slip-ring induction motor over a wide range is achieved by using a combination of stator voltage control and rotor resistance control. The cross-sectional area of the test section is 610 mm × 610 mm and its length is 2100 mm. The tunnel contraction ration is 9:1. Several screens and a honeycomb are provided in the upstream settling chamber with a fine mull cloth cover at the bell mouth entry. A velocity survey in the test section showed that it was uniform within 2% of the centerline velocity except for the boundary layer regions. The centre-line turbulence level (u'_{rms}/U_{∞}) was measured to be 0.3% within the present experimental velocity range of 5-15 m/s.

2.2. Model details

The solid/perforated plate is of steel. The fence height 'h' above the splitter plate (of perspex, 10 mm thick and 650 mm long) is h=12 mm for all the cases except 50% perforated normal plate, for which it is h=14 mm. The configuration spanned the tunnel width. The perspex splitter plate has surface pressure tappings of hypodermic needles (0.7 mm inner diameter) every 10 mm centre to centre, connected by rubber tubing, details of which are shown in Fig. 1. Suitable number of 3 mm circular holes were drilled in stainless steel plates to result in different level of perforation. Six stainless steel plates having 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50% perforation levels were used in the present experiments. Fig. 2 shows the normal plates of varied perforation levels (0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50% from top to bottom respectively). Table 1 gives the details of the models used in the present study.

2.3. Flow visualization

Reattachment length was obtained by a flow-visualization technique. A mixture of titanium oxide,



Fig. 2 Normal plates of varied perforation levels (0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50% from top to bottom respectively)

Sl. No	Model	Model Notation	Perforation level of the model (%)	Reattachment length (X_R/h)	Aspect ratio	Solid blockage (%)
1	Normal plate	NS-0	0	25.2	51	5.6
	/ splitter plate combination					
2	"	NS-10	10	24.0	51	5.6
3	"	NS-20	20	23.2	51	5.6
4	"	NS-30	30	23.2	51	5.6
5	"	NS-40	40	_	51	5.6
6	"	NS-50	50	_	44	6.2
7	Right angle corner blunt edge plate	RBP	100	4.8	61	1.6

Table 1 Details of the models used in the study

a little oil and soap solution was prepared and a thin coating of this paint was applied on the splitter plate behind the bluff body. Smooth brush and sponge were used for applying the paint evenly on the surface. When the tunnel was started, the mixture moved over the surface, leaving white trails of bigger accumulation indicating the reattachment region. The location of the reattachment point behind the obstructions was in this way found to be within an uncertainty of 5 mm. The reattachment point thus obtained is denoted as X_R .

2.4. Fluctuating pressure measurements

Experiments of Kiya and Sasaki (1985) have shown that the surface pressure fluctuation can be measured by placing the static pressure probe 1 mm from the surface. A similar arrangement was used in the present measurements. A few preliminary investigations carried out agree well with the measurements of Kiya and Sasaki.

The static pressure probe shown in Fig. 3, is a thin round tube 1.3 mm in diameter, bent into an L-shape at a position 37 mm from one end, the other end closed by solder and shaped into a hemispherical form. Four pressure taps 0.5 mm in diameter were drilled onto the tube at a position 9 mm from the hemispherical edge, the other end was directly connected to a Kulite high-sensitive miniature pressure transducer.

The pressure transducer used is a silicon sensing diaphragm (Kulite model, Kulite semiconductor products, Inc., Ridgefield, NJ), 2.36 mm in diameter and 50.8 mm long, having high-frequency response and high signal-to-noise ratio. The sensing diaphragm is located below a screen which protects the transducer from particle contaminants. The amplifier gain was set to provide a sensitivity of 212 Pa/V in the present experiments. The frequency response of the pitot static-pressure probe housing miniature pressure transducer was studied by subjecting to a varied sound-pressure field over a frequency range of 20 Hz – 16 KHz. The response of the probe was found to be flat over a frequency range of 125 Hz to 3000 Hz. Jenkins (1987) has studied the effects of enclosing this type of transducer with various tip housings to improve its response for mean and fluctuating pressure measurements.

The output of the pressure transducer was fed to a 2210 signal conditioning amplifier, analogue to digital converter and then to the data acquisition system. Data for each point of pressure measurement consisted of 24000 samples, with the sampling interval of 500 μ s. Data were tested at each point for repeatability. The uncertainty of pressure data were found to be less than 5%.



Fig. 3 Unsteady pressure measurement instrumentation system

Parameter	Estimated Uncertainty	Main source of error					
X	±0.5 mm	-					
Y, h, D	±0.1 mm	-					
X_R	±5 percent	Locating the reattachment line from flow visualization studies.					
U_{∞}	±1.5 percent	Inaccuracies in reading the height of the meniscus in projection manometer					
U'_{rms}	±5 percent	Experimental day-to-day repeatability					
C_p	±6 percent	Inaccuracies in reading from projection manometer and day-to-day repeatability					
$\dot{C'_p}$	±5 percent	Inaccuracy in the dynamic pressure and repeatability of pressure					

Table 2 Gives the statement of experimental uncertainty

2.5. Mean and fluctuating velocity measurements

The mean velocity profiles are obtained from the measurements of single component hot-wire anemometer. The output of the hot-wire anemometer is taken directly to the data acquisition system via an analogue-to digital converter. The hot-wire data are acquired for all the models for different perforation levels and for different free-stream velocities viz, 5.0, 7.5, 10.0, 12.5 and 15.0 m/s. It is

seen that for all perforation levels reattachment length (where ever applicable) is independent of Reynolds number in the present range of experiments. The hot-wire data are later processed to obtain mean and RMS velocities from mean and RMS voltages.

3. Experimental results and discussions

3.1. Fluctuating velocities

Longitudinal fluctuating velocity components were measured along the central line of splitter plate at 10 stations using a hot-wire anemometer. At each station, 18 measurements were made along the vertical (y-direction). In the recirculating region and in the shear layer region the measurements were made at closer intervals (3 mm) to get better resolution.

In Fig. 4 the maximum longitudinal fluctuating velocities (u'_{rms}) , (height y above splitter is different) are plotted against axial distance for various cases of perforation levels and these are the maximum of the actual data points. In general the longitudinal turbulence intensity level increases gradually to a maximum just before reattachment (varies depending on the perforation as shown in Table 1) and there afterwards decreases as we move downstream from the point of separation. The turbulence intensity values are highest for the case of solid normal plate. The turbulence intensity values on the other hand are lowest for the case of 50% perforation of the normal plate, that is increased rate of bleed air brings down the turbulence intensity values in general.

Fig. 5 depicts in total the consolidated results of RMS longitudinal velocity fluctuations in flow field normalized with free-stream velocity for varied level of perforation of the normal plate (0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50%). It is seen from the Fig. 5 that the longitudinal velocity fluctuation is maximum for the solid normal plate and is farthest from the splitter plate in y direction when



Fig. 4 Variation of $(u'_{max})_{max}$ in the axial direction for different levels of perforation



Fig. 5 Consolidated picture of the variation of longitudinal fluctuating velocities with change in perforation U_{∞} =15.0 m/s

compared to other perforation levels.

It is interesting to observe that the point of maximum u'_{rms} is coming closer to the splitter plate with increasing bleed air.

It is also clear from the above figure that as we go downstream of reattachment the u'_{rms} values become independent of the level of perforation very close to the splitter plate. The orderly spread of the shear layer from the point of separation is illustrated in Fig. 5.

The elevation y at which $\left(\sqrt{u^2}\right) = \left(\sqrt{u^2}\right)_{\max}$ is designated as Y^* is made use of in Fig. 6. In Fig. 6 $\left(\sqrt{u^2}\right) / \left(\sqrt{u^2}\right)_{\max}$ is plotted against y/Y^* for the case of solid normal plate at $U_{\infty} = 10$ m/s. The solid line in this figure represents the empirical fit to the data points.

Fig. 7 shows the empirical fitted curves for various levels of perforations. The behavior of the curves of 40% and 50% perforation level is quite different compared to other cases. It is observed



Fig. 6 Similarity profile of longitudinal turbulence Fig. 7 Empirical fit similarity profiles for 0%, 10%, intensity for solid normal plate

20%, 30%, 40% and 50% perforated normal plates

that the turbulence intensity at a given location decreases with increase in perforation level of the normal plate - a behavior which is consistent with the observation made in the study that the velocity gradient at that location decreases with increase in perforation level.

A more rigorous analysis was attempted to get better collapse of the data. In order to do so, the elevation y above the splitter plate at which $\sqrt{u'^2} = \left(\sqrt{u'^2}\right)_{\text{max}}/2$ is designated as Y'. In Fig. 8, $\left(\sqrt{u'^2}\right)/\left[\sqrt{u'^2}_{\max}/2\right]$ is plotted against y/Y' for the case of solid normal plate at $U_{\infty}=10$ m/s. The solid line in this figure represents the empirical fit of the data points. It is interesting to see that there is better collapse of the data in the upper limb of the graph. For all the models a similar behavior in the variation of $\left(\sqrt{u'^2}\right) / \left[\sqrt{u'^2}_{\max} / 2\right]$ with non -

dimensionalized vertical distance y was observed. The upper limb of the plots behave like the wall jet, showing very good collapse. However the non-dimensionalized velocity fluctuations in the separated zone does show a marked difference.

Fig. 9 shows the empirically fitted curves for all the levels of perforation. As before the behavior



turbulence intensity for solid normal plate

Fig. 8 An improved similarity profile of longitudinal Fig. 9 Empirical fit similarity profiles for 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40% and 50% perforated normal plate

of the curves of 40% and 50% perforation level of the normal plate is different compared to other cases, but the scatter is relatively less. Further it is observed that the disturbance in the separated zone is progressively decreasing with increase in the perforation level.

3.2. Fluctuating surface pressure

Suzuki and Kiya (1985) have conducted fluctuating surface pressure measurements for isosceles triangular body. The present results of solid normal plate compare well with those of Suzuki and Kiya [for the limiting case of $2\theta = 180^{\circ}$] as shown in Fig. 10. The experimental result shows similar trend in the curve, that is the RMS values of surface fluctuating pressure increases gradually. It is observed that the maximum RMS values of pressure fluctuation occurs around $0.9X_R$, along the plate, and the fluctuating pressures in the separated region is low as compared to the fluctuating pressures across the shear layer. The difference in the C'_p values at $X/X_R=1$, is attributed to the background noise in measurements. The location of the maximum $C'_{p rms}$ upstream of reattachment was observed in several other studies including that of Mabey (1972), who considered several geomentries of separated flows. Kiya and Sasaki (1983) investigated the separated flow over a blunt flat plate and surmised that the maximum energy associated with the pressure fluctuations near the

Subhash C. Yaragal



Fig. 10 Distribution surface C'_p for solid normal plate compared with results of similar measurements

Table 3 Comparison of peak values of RMS fluctuating surface pressures for right angle corner body of different blunt edge thickness

Reference	D [*] (mm)	$\left(\frac{X_R}{D}\right)$	$\sqrt{\frac{u'^2}{u'^2}}/U_{\infty}$ (%)	Reynolds number	$-C_{pb}$	$\frac{\sqrt{p'^2}}{(\%)}/q$
Hiller & Cherry (1981)	38.1	4.88	0.1	3.4 to 8×10^4	0.75	13
Kiya & Sasaki (1982)	20	4.7	0.3	2.6×10^{4}	0.65	15
Present results	10	4.8	0.3	0.4 to 1.2×10^4	0.65	12

*Thickness of the right-angle corner model nose

reattachment region was due to the shedding of large scale vortices from the separation bubble.

Table 3 shows comparison of peak values of fluctuating surface pressures for right- angle corner body with other similar investigations. The body thickness D, the non-dimensional reattachment length X_R/D , upstream turbulence level (%), Reynolds number based on the body thickness, pressure coefficient C_{pb} at separation and maximum pressure fluctuation are all tabulated.

RMS value of fluctuating surface pressures normalized with dynamic pressure are plotted against x/h for various levels of perforation in Fig. 11. The fluctuating surface pressure distribution trend for all cases considered except the 50% perforated normal plate is the same, that is pressure fluctuations increase from the point of separation and reach a maximum around the reattachment region. The fluctuating surface pressure distribution for 50% perforated normal plate seems to be oscillatory in nature with a local hump in pressure distribution. There is orderly decrease in maximum fluctuating surface pressure with increase in level of perforation of the normal plate. However for the case of 40% perforated normal plates. This could possibly be due to some sort of far wake instability. It is likely that at 40% perforation level the bleed air is just sufficient to



Fig. 11 Distribution of surface C'_p for various levels of perforation

introduce instability to the separated shear layer making it unstable and possibly starts to 'flap'. Eventually the flow field pressure fluctuations could be observed to be higher.

The point of maximum surface pressure fluctuation is farthest from the separation point for the solid normal plate and progressively gets closer to the separation point with increase in perforation level. There is a 4.5 step height shift if we compare 0% and 50% perforated normal plate maximum fluctuating surface pressure values. The maximum fluctuating surface pressure is 11.5% of the dynamic pressure corresponding to the case of solid normal plate and is 5.25% of the dynamic pressure corresponding to 50% perforated normal plate.

The fluctuating surface pressures normalized with dynamic pressure are plotted for higher values of x/h in Fig. 11 to study the effect further downstream of reattachment for varied level of peroration. It is observed that for all cases downstream of reattachment the fluctuating surface pressure is seen to decrease asymptotically. It is interesting to note that in the case of 40% perforated normal plate after reattachment, fluctuating surface pressure value is less than that of 30% perforated normal plate, that is to say recovered fluctuating surface pressures are in order.

3.3. Shear layer pressure fluctuation

In the present study the shear layer static pressure fluctuation levels is measured by traversing the static pressure probe across the shear layer at fixed axial location of x/h=3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 26 and 28. The experiments were carried out for three free-stream velocities viz, 10.0 m/s, 12.5 m/s and 15.0 m/s, to study the speed effects. It is found that the shear layer pressure are independent of Reynolds number in the study range.

Normalized RMS values of pressure fluctuation in the separated bubble region, is shown in Fig. 12. This figure gives the overall qualitative and quantitative picture of the development of shear layer subsequent to separation. The maximum value of shear layer pressure fluctuation is reached upstream of reattachment at an axial location of x equal to about 0.76 X_R . This is in contrast to the



Fig. 12 The comparative magnitudes of pressure fluctuations in the flow field as a consequence of varying perforation level of the normal plate

observed location of maximum surface pressure fluctuation levels which occurs at $X/X_R=0.9$. Next possible peak was near the separation point. This peak value may not be only due to the pressure fluctuation, since the pressure measurements were carried out with a finite size transducer probe which leads to spatial averaging of the signal, in addition to unknown interaction of the probe in very thin shear layer at the separation. It was also found for small angles of attack of the probe tube, in the order of ± 5 degrees, there was no appreciable change in the readings. Downstream of separation, as the separated shear layer grows, the probe size becomes comparatively small with respect to the eddy size. Consequently, the error involved in the measurement also reduces considerably.

The comparative magnitudes of pressure fluctuations are presented in Fig. 12 that occur as consequence of varying perforation level. As discussed the maximum value of the shear layer pressure fluctuation is reached upstream of reattachment (when it exists) at an axial location of x equal to about $0.76X_R$ in the case of 0%, 10%, 20% and 30% perforation. With the increase in the level of perforation the point of maximum RMS pressure fluctuation in the flow field moves closer to the splitter plate in a systematic manner. This is indicative that the shear layer gets altered substantially for varied level of perforation.

However it is to be noted that maximum RMS levels except for the local maxima immediately downstream of separation were observed at about $X/X_R = 0.7$ to 0.8 for the case of 0%, 10%, 20% and 30% perforation and it is interesting to note that for 50% perforation, the RMS pressure



Fig. 13 Peak RMS values of pressure fluctuation in the separated bubble region and on the surface of the splitter plate for different levels of perforation

fluctuation in the flow field gets reduced to around 60% as compared to solid normal plate.

It was observed as discussed in section 3.2 that the distribution of fluctuating surface pressures, for the 40% perforated normal plate was not in order, the same trend is also seen in the distribution of fluctuating pressures in flow field. After x/h = 18 the distribution is in order.

In Fig. 13 the magnitude of RMS values of pressure fluctuations measured in the separated shear layer is compared with that obtained in the case of surface pressure fluctuation measurements for varied perforation. It is clear that flow field fluctuating pressures are substantially higher than the surface pressure fluctuations for the cases considered in the present study. As discussed earlier both the surface and flow field fluctuating pressures decrease with increase in the level of perforation. The difference between the surface and flow field maximum pressure fluctuations is highest for solid normal plate (5.4%) and lowest for 50% perforation of the normal plate (2.8%).

It is observed from Table 4, that $[C'_p \max / -C_{pb}(1-\eta)]$ varies from 0.200 to 0.238. Analysis of the results seems to indicate a correlation between the maximum of normalized surface RMS pressure fluctuation levels with the $C_{pb}(1-\eta)$. Taking into account the uncertainties in the measurements, the ratio $[C'_p \max / -C_{pb}(1-\eta)]$ seems to be relatively constant and has a value of around 0.22.

Table 4	Ratios of	f maximum :	fluctuating	surface	RMS	pressure	level	ls to	base	pressure	coefficien	lt
---------	-----------	-------------	-------------	---------	-----	----------	-------	-------	------	----------	------------	----

Sl. No	Model notation	C_P' max	$-C_{Pb}$	$\left[\frac{C_p'\max}{-C_{pb}(1-\eta)}\right]$
1	NS-0	0.109	0.540	0.200
2	NS-10	0.106	0.533	0.220
3	NS-20	0.081	0.495	0.205
4	NS-30	0.060	0.370	0.231
5	NS-40	0.064	0.485	0.220
6	NS-50	0.050	0.420	0.238

Subhash C. Yaragal

Table 5 Ratios of maximum fluctuating flow field RMS pressure levels to base pressure coefficient

Sl. No	Model notation	C_P' max	$-C_{Pb}$	$\left[\frac{C_p'\max}{-C_{pb}(1-\eta)}\right]$
1	NS-0	0.168	0.540	0.311
2	NS-10	0.154	0.533	0.321
3	NS-20	0.123	0.495	0.310
4	NS-30	0.087	0.370	0.335
5	NS-40	0.095	0.485	0.327
6	NS-50	0.070	0.420	0.334

Table 6 Comparison between pressure fluctuation and velocity fluctuation measurements for solid normal plate

x/h	$\left[\frac{u'_{rms}}{U_{\infty}}\right]_{\rm max}$	$\left[\frac{y}{h}\right]_{\max}$ for u'_{\max}	$C_{p_{\max}'}$	$\left[\frac{y}{h}\right]_{\max}$ for P'_{\max}	$\frac{C_{p'_{\max}}}{\left[\frac{u'_{rms}}{U_{\infty}}\right]_{\max}}$	$k = \frac{C_{p'_{\max}}}{\left[\frac{u'_{rms}}{U_{\infty}}\right]^2_{\max}}$
3	0.200	2.75	0.115	2.92	0.575	2.875
6	0.218	3.25	0.117	3.33	0.537	2.462
9	0.227	3.50	0.133	3.75	0.586	2.581
12	0.236	3.75	0.146	3.33	0.619	2.621
15	0.246	3.50	0.159	3.33	0.646	2.627
18	0.267	3.50	0.168	3.33	0.629	2.357
21	0.267	3.25	0.172	2.92	0.644	2.413
24	0.257	3.25	0.158	2.92	0.615	2.392
26	0.244	3.00	0.149	2.92	0.611	2.503
28	0.237	2.75	0.133	3.33	0.561	2.368

It is observed from Table 5, that $[C'_p \max / -C_{pb}(1-\eta)]$ varies from 0.310 to 0.335. Similar analysis of the results indicate a correlation between the maximum of normalized flow field pressure fluctuation levels with the $C_{pb}(1-\eta)$ value. Taking into account the uncertainties in measurements, this ratio seems to be constant and has a value about 0.32.

In Table 6 a comparison between pressure fluctuations and velocity fluctuations are made for the solid normal plate. From this table it can be observed that the maximum fluctuation levels for both the velocity and pressure occur at about the same axial location. However, there is a small difference in its vertical location. Also the pressure fluctuation profiles were relatively flat in the maximum region, whereas the velocity profiles show a much sharper peak. This could be associated with the pressure probe being much larger than the hot-wire probe.

The ratio of the two normalized (pressure maximum and velocity maximum) values show the trend of increase in the downstream direction from separation to reattachment. It is interesting to see that the maximum value of quantity $C'_p \max / [u'_{rms}/U_{\infty}]_{\max}$ being 0.64 is close to the value of 0.73 predicted by Arndt and Nilsen (1971), for a round jet on the basis of a theory due to Kraichman (1956). If one looks for a correlation of the type $C'_p = k[\{(u'_{rms}/U_{\infty})_{\max}\}]^2$, the values of k obtained are shown in Table 7. Arndt and Nilsen (1971), have suggested that k is approximately equal to 1.4 for isotropic turbulent flow; whereas its value should exceed 1.4 for shear flows and present experiments shows this confirmation.

Model	$\left[\frac{u'_{rms}}{U_{\infty}}\right]_{\max}$	$\left[\frac{y}{h}\right]_{\max}$ for u'_{\max}	$C_{p_{\max}'}$	$\left[\frac{y}{h}\right]_{\max}$ for P'_{\max}	$\frac{C_{p'_{\max}}}{\left[\frac{u'_{rms}}{U_{\infty}}\right]_{\max}}$	$k = \frac{C_{p'_{\max}}}{\left[\frac{u'_{rms}}{U_{\infty}}\right]^2_{\max}}$
NS-0	0.267	3.25	0.172	2.92	0.644	2.413
NS-10	0.256	3.00	0.156	2.92	0.609	2.380
NS-20	0.243	2.25	0.131	2.50	0.539	2.218
NS-30	0.226	2.00	0.092	2.08	0.407	1.801
NS-40	0.216	2.25	0.100	2.08	0.463	2.143
NS-50	0.188	1.75	0.073	2.08	0.388	2.065

Table 7 Comparison between pressure fluctuation and velocity fluctuation measurements for different models studied

4. Conclusions

There is substantial modification brought about in the velocity and pressure fields as a consequence of change in perforation level of the normal plate, apart from the characteristics of the approach flow itself. From the analysis of data it is observed that $\sqrt{u'^2} / (\sqrt{u'^2})_{\text{max}}$ is uniquely related with the dimensionless distance y/Y' for all the perforated normal plates.

It is interesting to note that for 50% perforation, the RMS pressure fluctuation in the flow field gets reduced to around 61.5% as compared to that of the solid normal plate. Analysis of the results show that the ratio $[C'_p \max / -C_{pb}(1-\eta)]$ for surface RMS pressure fluctuation levels seems to be constant and has value of about 0.22. Similar analysis show that the ratio $[C'_p \max / -C_{pb}(1-\eta)]$ for flow field RMS pressure fluctuation levels seems to be constant and has a value of about 0.32.

Acknowledgements

The author is extremely thankful to the reviewers, whose very valuable suggestions have improved the quality of this paper. The author expresses his sincere thanks to Prof. S S Murthy, The Director, National Institute of Technology Karnataka, Surathkal for his moral support extended to the author to join the 21st Century Center of Excellence program "Wind Effects on Buildings and Urban Environment" as COE Researcher under Prof. Yukio Tamura at Tokyo Polytechnic University, Japan.

Notation

 $C_{pb} C_{p} \max D$ D η h P_{b} $P_{\infty} \sqrt{p'^{2}}$ Cbase pressure coefficient, $(P_b - P_{\infty})/0.5\rho U_{\infty}^2$ maximum fluctuating pressure coefficient width of the two dimensional body perforation of the normal plate (ratio of open to total area) step height mean base static pressure free-stream pressure root mean square pressure fluctuation (P'_{rms}) dynamic head

 Re_h Reynolds number based on step height, $U_{\infty}h/v$ Re_d Reynolds number based on body width, $U_{\infty}D/v$ turbulence intensity T_u U_{∞} u'free-stream velocity fluctuating stream-wise velocity component $\sqrt{u'^2}$ root mean square velocity fluctuation (u'_{rms}) $/U_{\infty}$ up stream turbulence intensity axial distance downstream of shoulder (point of separation) х X_R reattachment length distance normal to surface of the splitter plate y elevation y above splitter plate at which $\sqrt{u'^2} = \left(\sqrt{u'^2}\right)_{\text{max}}$ Y^* elevation y above splitter plate at which $\sqrt{u'^2} = \left(\sqrt{u'^2}\right) / 2$ Y'included angle of the fore body 2**0** kinematic viscosity of the fluid v density of the fluid ρ

References

- Arndt, R.E.A. and Nilsen, A.W. (1971), "On the measurement of fluctuating pressure in the mixing zone of a round jet", *Fluid Engineering Division, ASME, Paper no.* 71-FE-31.
- Castro, I.P. and Haque, A. (1987), "The structure of a turbulent shear layer bounding a separation region", J. Fluid Mech., 179, 439-468.
- Cherry, N.J., Hillier, R. and Latour, M.E.M.P. (1984), "Unsteady measurements in a separated and reattaching flow", J. Fluid Mech., 144, 13-46.
- Eaton, J.K. and Johnston, J.P. (1981), "A review of research on subsonic turbulent flow reattachment", AIAA Journal, 19, 1093-1100.
- George, W.K., Benther, P.D. and Arndt, R.E.A. (1984), "Pressure spectra in turbulent free shear flows", J. Fluid Mech., 148, 155-191.
- Govinda Ram, H.S. and Arakeri, V.H. (1990), "Studies on unsteady pressure fields in the region of separating and reattaching flows", J. Fluids Eng., 112, 402-408.
- Gupta, V.P. and Ranga Raju, K.G. (1987), "Separated flow in lee of solid and porous fences", J. Hyd. Eng., 113, 1264-1276.

Jenkins, R.C. (1987), "Effects on pitot shape on measurement of flow turbulence", AIAA J. 25, 889-892.

Kiya, M. and Sasaki, K. (1983), "Structure of turbulent separation bubble", J. Fluid Mech., 137, 83-113.

- Kiya, M. and Sasaki, K. (1985), "Structure of large scale vortices and unsteady reverse flow in the reattaching zone of a turbulent separation bubble", *J. Fluid Mech.*, **154**, 463-491.
- Kraichnan, R. (1956), "Pressure field within homogeneous anisotropic turbulence", J. Acoust. Soc. of America, **28**(1), 64-72.
- Mabey, D.G. (1972), "Analysis and correlation of data on pressure fluctuations in separated flow", J. Aircraft, **9**(9), 642-645.
- Roshko, A. and Lau, J.C. (1965), "Some observations on transition and reattachment of a free shear layer in incompressible flow", *Proc. Heat Transfer, Fluid Mech. Institute.*, **18**, 157-167.

Ruderich. R. and Fernholz, H.H. (1986), "An experimental investigation of a turbulent shear flow with separation, reverse flow, and reattachment", J. Fluid Mech., 163, 283-322.

Suzuki,Y. and Kiya, M. (1985), "Effect of free stream turbulence on separated reattching flows for different angles of separation", *Bulletin of JSME.*, 28(243), 1887-1892.

- Tsai, G.L. and Yang, J.T. (1993), "Pressure fluctuation in correlation with velocity fluctuations in turbulent wake flow", J. Fluids Eng., 462-463.
- Willmarth, W.W. (1975), "Pressure fluctuations beneath a turbulent boundary layer", *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, **7**, 13-38. *MM*