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Summary

This thesis is an account of various phenomena caused by the interaction of the motion of electrically conducting fluids with magnetic fields. Such phenomena, the study of which is usually known as Magnetohydrodynamics (MHD), occur on a galactic, planetary or laboratory length scale; however in this thesis we concentrate on those phenomena which can be reproduced in the laboratory.

In chapter 2 we study the laminar flow of uniformly conducting, incompressible fluids in rectangular ducts under the action of transverse magnetic fields. We begin by proving that when the duct has a constant cross-section the solution is unique and then analyse theoretically some of the curious effects on the flow of the duct's walls being electrically conducting. We find close agreement between the results of these theories and the experiments of Alty (1966) and Baylis (1966). We then analyse the flow in ducts with varying cross-sections.

In chapter 3 we analyse some of the curious flows and current streamline patterns produced by placing electrodes on the non-conducting walls of a container, filled with a conducting fluid, and passing electric currents between the electrodes in the presence of a strong magnetic field.

In chapter 4 we analyse some of the theoretical limitations on the use of Pitot tubes and electric potential (e.p.) probes in MHD flows, and provide some estimates of the errors to be expected.

In chapter 5 we analyse the stability of parallel flows in parallel magnetic fields and also some aspects of the stability of the flows analysed in chapters 2 and 3.

In chapters 6, 7 and 8 we describe our experimental apparatus, the experiments to investigate directly some of the flows analysed theoretically in chapters 2 and 3 by means of Pitot and e.p. probes, and experiments to measure the MHD errors inherent in the use of these probes. We concluded that the curious phenomena predicted actually exist. We also learnt much about the use of Pitot and e.p. probes, especially as some of the experimental results were as predicted in chapter 4.
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1. Introduction.

1.1. What magnetohydrodynamics is all about.

This thesis is an examination into various aspects of the dynamics of electrically conducting fluids under the action of magnetic fields, a subject usually known as Magnetohydrodynamics (MHD). Before describing the new work presented in this thesis we first briefly discuss the general principles of the subject and then mention a few of the reasons for its study.

MHD is a combination of the two subjects, classical electromagnetism, i.e. the study of the interaction of electric currents, electric fields, and magnetic fields, and fluid mechanics, i.e. the study of the interaction of forces and motion of liquids and gases, the principles of which are basically Newtonian. Normally, the motion of a fluid is examined without considering any electromagnetic effects; however, when the fluid is electrically conducting and in the presence of electric and magnetic fields, the mechanical and electromagnetic effects become interdependent because the electric currents are changed by the fluid's motion through the magnetic field and the forces on the fluid are altered by the electric currents and magnetic fields. The aim of MHD is to study the phenomena created by these combined effects. The method of the study is similar to those of fluid and solid mechanics, in that the phenomena are examined with a view to explaining them in terms of the basic principles of the subject, namely classical electromagnetism and fluid mechanics, and the physical properties of the fluid, e.g. its electrical conductivity and viscosity; the phenomena are not studied, as in plasma physics, with a view to explaining them in terms of atoms and electrons.

There are three main classes of reason for studying MHD, the first being that MHD is a comparatively unexplored and intrinsically fascinating branch of classical physics and applied mathematics, the second being that MHD effects are often believed to exert a controlling influence on many geo- and astro-physical phenomena, and the third being that many MHD phenomena can be used for practical purposes e.g. measuring the flow of liquids and accelerating, controlling, or generating electrical power from, streams of high temperature gases.
1.2. The aspects of MHD considered here.

In this thesis we concentrate on those MHD phenomena which can be reproduced in the laboratory as opposed to those phenomena which can only occur with very large magnetic fields or on planetary length scales. Also we confined ourselves to examining situations which have some similarity with those found in practical MHD devices, though the conclusions we draw from these studies have some considerably wider significance. The third limitation of our study was that we only consider situations which are simple enough to be analysed theoretically as well as experimentally.

Since the four main aspects of MHD examined in this thesis form a rather motley collection, a word of introduction is necessary to explain the actual reasons for choosing to study these particular aspects. (Formal introductions to each aspect of the thesis with a review of the previous work and a summary of the main results are given at the beginning of each chapter).

At the time of my joining the Cambridge University Engineering Laboratory MHD group under Professor J.A. Shercliff in October 1963, Messrs. C.J.N. Alty and J.A. Baylis were engaged in experiments to investigate the MHD flow of mercury through rectangular ducts of constant cross-section whose walls are electrically conducting. At the time the theory of such flows was very incomplete, but most of all we lacked a physical insight into the processes involved. Consequently, with the encouragement of Professor Shercliff, I began work on extending the existing theory of such flows which had been developed by Chang & Lundgren (1961) and Shercliff (1953), concentrating on the interesting physical effects which occur when the magnetic field strongly affects the flow. As a result of this theoretical work it became clear that the presence of electrically conducting walls radically alters the flow when the magnetic field is strong. This conclusion was justified by the experiments results of Alty (1965) and Baylis (1966) whose results agreed well with the theory developed by myself (Hunt, 1965) and that developed in collaboration with Professor K. Stewartson (Hunt & Stewartson, 1965). See also chapter 2.
The other interesting result of this work was that it showed that in some circumstances a magnetic field can make flow in a duct less stable, contrary to all previous evidence. This conclusion stimulated my interest in the problem of how a magnetic field affects the stability of a flow and some results of this study have been published (Hunt, 1966a) and others are mentioned in chapter 5.

Further work on MHD duct flows has been concentrated on the more important practical problem of flow in ducts whose cross-sections vary along their length (§2.7). This work has recently been extended to the study of compressible flows (Hunt, 1966b).

In parallel with the work on MHD duct flow, at the instigation of Professor Shercliff, I studied the theory of some of the interesting effects found in electrically driven flows in MHD i.e. those caused by current sources and sinks being placed round the boundary of a fluid placed in a strong magnetic field. (This problem may not be altogether academic since the walls of an MHD generator are divided into conducting and non-conducting strips which are like some of the situations considered in the analysis of chapter 3).

Since at the University of Warwick it was possible to obtain an electromagnet with a 3" gap, and therefore to have a duct with an internal dimension of 2\(\frac{1}{2}\)", I decided to concentrate on investigating some MHD flows internally, by using pressure and electric potential probes rather than investigating such flows by external measurements as performed by Alty and Baylis. Although some pioneering work on the use of such probes had been begun by East (1964), Lecocq (1964), and Moreau (1965), we have been involved in a considerable amount of trial and error in the design of a suitable duct and apparatus for moving the probes and there is still a lot more development which needs doing. We also extended the theory of the measurement of MHD flows by pressure and electric potential probes (chapter 4).

The experiments which have been performed have confirmed directly many of the phenomena predicted in the theory of MHD duct flows and electrically driven flows, as well as indicating the kind of errors to be expected in the use of pressure and electric potential probes.
Although these internal measurements have not been anything like as accurate as the external ones normally made, e.g. static pressure and electric potential on the boundaries, they show that such measurements can certainly indicate the nature of the flow quite satisfactorily when no theoretical model exists and therefore should be of use in studying turbulent flows.
2. *Magnetohydrodynamic flow in rectangular ducts*

2.1. Introduction to chapter 2.

2.2.1. Aims.

In this chapter we examine the theory of the flow in rectangular ducts of electrically conducting fluids under the action of a transverse magnetic field, confining ourselves to the study of steady, laminar flow of incompressible fluids whose conductivity, viscosity, and density are assumed to be constant. There are two main aims of the study.

The first aim is to examine how the flow through a rectangular duct is affected by the electrical conductivity of the walls of the duct and the external electrical connections made to them. To do this we make some further simplifying restrictions to our study; we only study flows which are fully developed, that is to say the velocity in the duct does not vary in the streamwise direction; we only consider uniform magnetic field which are perpendicular to two of the walls of the duct, and we only consider ducts whose walls have uniform conductivity, though the conductivity of different walls may vary. Although flows in rectangular ducts, subject to the same restrictions, have been studied before the only type of duct studied at all completely is that with non-conducting walls, the work on flows in ducts with conducting walls being very incomplete. For this type of duct there has been no attempt to understand the physical implications of the mathematics nor to compare the solutions for various types of ducts. Our aim is to use the mathematical solutions to the problem in order to obtain a sound physical understanding of the flow in different types of duct with various electrical connections, and to obtain useful formulae for volume flow rate through a duct, electric potential difference across the duct etc, which can readily be tested experimentally.

The second aim is to examine the flow in ducts whose cross-section varies in the streamwise direction, when the transverse magnetic field is very strong. In this case the restrictions we make are: only the dimension of the duct in the direction of the magnetic field varies, we can ignore the variation of the flow in the direction perpendicular to the streamwise and magnetic field.
directions, the magnetic Reynolds number, $R_m$, is low enough for induced magnetic fields to be ignored, and the magnetic field is uniform. These approximations and restrictions lead to a great simplification in the otherwise very complicated problem of calculating the flow over a body placed in a transverse magnetic field. We find that these same approximations also lead to great simplifications in calculating internal flows and our aim is to use and develop the existing mathematical solutions to provide a physical understanding of this problem and to provide formulae which can be tested in the laboratory.

2.1.2. Reasons

There are two main reasons for studying the incompressible flow of fluids with uniform properties through rectangular ducts under the action of a uniform transverse magnetic field (MHD duct flow for short).

Firstly there are practical reasons. The first practical use of MHD was in flow measurement and this affected most of the original work on MHD duct flow, as reviewed by Shercliff (1962). To find the flow rate through a duct when a transverse magnetic field is applied, the voltage between two electrodes in the walls of the duct is measured by drawing a very small current through the electrodes which has a negligible effect on the flow or the current in the duct. Most of such measurements are made in ducts whose walls have low or zero conductivity in order that the voltage should not be short circuited. Therefore much of the early work was on ducts whose walls were of low or zero conductivity and on flows not affected by external electrical circuits (e.g. Shercliff 1953). However, with the growing interest in using magnetohydrodynamic means to pump liquid metals, accelerate ionized gases and generate electricity from moving streams of ionized gas, it is now important to study the interaction of duct flows with external circuits when appreciable electric currents circulate between them. Also in order to minimise the electrical losses, the ducts must have highly conducting walls and the effects of such walls should also be studied. The analysis of the flow in these applications is extremely complicated, since the flows are usually turbulent and the fluids highly non-uniform, as well as being compressible in most cases. In order to make any
progress in our understanding, various simplifications are necessary: for example the flow velocity is assumed to be uniform across the duct with laminar boundary layers formed on the walls (Kemtbrock 1961, Hale and Kemtbrock 1964), or to be inviscid and two-dimensional (Sutton and Carlson 1961), or the approximations of one-dimensional gas dynamics are used (Resler and Sears 1958). The simplification considered in this dissertation that the flow is laminar and incompressible and that the fluids' properties are uniform is merely one amongst many. Each of the simplifications enable certain aspects of the flow to be studied and taken together an understanding of the overall process may emerge. The aspect of the flow which our simplification chiefly reveals is the interaction of the electro-magnetic and viscous forces in the boundary layers on the walls, an effect which becomes increasingly important as the size of the device and the strength of the magnetic field are increased.

The second reason for our examining MHD duct flows is that they are one of the few instances in MHD whereby the theory may be critically tested by experiment. Most theoretical and experimental work is concentrated in MHD is concentrated in compressible flows because of the greater practical and astrophysical interest in such flows, and in such flows it is very rare indeed for the experiments to be accurate or repeatable enough for the theory to be tested at all critically. On the other hand, using liquid metals experimentalists have been able to achieve accuracies of 1 or 2%, and such experiments provide real tests for the theory. Since the whole structure of MHD theory must be judged by the accuracy with which its predictions agree with those of experiment, the theoretical and experimental study of MHD duct flows is crucially necessary for the further understanding of MHD.

2.1.3. Contents

§2.2. We state the equations and boundary conditions of MHD for the incompressible flow of fluids with uniform properties, making some observations on the approximations in the equations.

§2.3. We present a novel derivation of the equations and boundary conditions for fully developed flow in ducts of constant cross-sectional
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area under the action of a uniform magnetic field, first formulated by Shercliff (1953). The essential feature of this derivation is a uniqueness theorem (a generalisation of one deduced by Moffatt (1964) for electrically driven flows), which proves conclusively that the assumptions made in deducing Shercliff's equations are justified.

§2.4. We analyse the fully developed flow in rectangular ducts under the action of a transverse magnetic field, concentrating on the effects of the duct having electrically conducting walls. To do this we generalise the mathematical solutions of Chang and Lundgren (1961) and Uflyand (1961), and Shercliff (1953), to cover flow in two main types of duct:

(i) The walls perpendicular to the field (AA) perfectly conducting and the walls parallel to the field (BB) of arbitrary conductivity.

(ii) Walls AA non-conducting and walls (BB) of arbitrary conductivity.

We then concentrate on the flow when the Hartmann number, \( M = B_0 a (\sigma / \nu)^{1/2} \), is large, where \( B_0 \) is the imposed magnetic field, \( a \) half the duct width, \( \sigma \) the conductivity and \( \nu \) the viscosity of the fluid. Various interesting physical effects are found in the boundary layers on the walls parallel to the magnetic field (BB) as the conductivities of the walls are altered. The most interesting and unexpected effect occurs when the walls of the duct perpendicular to the magnetic field are highly conducting and the walls parallel to the magnetic field are non-conducting; then when \( M \gg 1 \), large positive and negative velocities of order \( M V_c \) are induced in the boundary layers on the wall (BB), where \( V_c \) is the uniform velocity in the centre of the duct, usually known as the core velocity. It is therefore likely that, in contrast to all previous evidence, the magnetic field may in some situations have a destabilising effect on flow in ducts. (Rather than copy out the author's paper (Hunt, 1965), we refer the reader to the paper which is attached to this thesis).

Finally in this section we show that the experimental results of Alty (1966) agree remarkably closely with the theoretical predicted values and also that these results conclusively bear out the hypothesis
that the magnetic field destabilizes the flow.

§2.5. We continue the analysis of the effects of conducting walls, this time investigating the flow in a duct whose walls AA are non-conducting and walls BB are perfectly conducting. We also examine the effects of an external electrical circuit. Finally we compare the flows in rectangular ducts with all combinations of conducting and non-conducting walls. (In this section we refer to the paper Hunt & Stewartson (1965)).

§2.6. We apply the results of §2.5 to flow in a rectangular annulus which is driven by an electric current with an applied magnetic field parallel to the axis of the annulus. Then we compare the theoretically predicted values with those found by Baylis (1966) to find reasonable agreement between them.

§2.7. We analyse the steady, incompressible, two-dimensional flow of conducting fluids through ducts of arbitrarily varying cross-section when a strong, uniform, magnetic field is imposed. The direction of the magnetic field is perpendicular to the flow and parallel to the direction in which the ducts diverge. It is assumed that the interaction parameter, \( N \gg \) Re, where \( M \) is the Hartmann number and Re is the Reynolds number, and also that \( M \gg 1 \) and \( R_m \ll 1 \) where \( \frac{M}{R_m} = \mu \sigma / \mu \) is the magnetic Reynolds number, \( \mu \) is the magnetic permeability, \( \sigma \) the conductivity, \( \overline{U} \) a typical velocity and \( L \) a characteristic length of the flow.

We examine the flow in three separate regions:

(1) The 'core' region in which the pressure gradient is balanced by electro-magnetic forces.

(ii) Hartmann boundary layers where electromagnetic forces are balanced by viscous forces.

(iii) Thin layers parallel to the magnetic field in which electromagnetic forces, inertial forces, and the pressure gradient balance each other. These layers which have thickness \( O(N^{-1/2}) \) occur where the slope of the duct wall changes abruptly.

By expanding the solution as a series in descending powers of \( N \) we calculate the velocity distribution in regions (i) and (ii) for finite values of \( N \) attainable in the laboratory.
2.2. Equations and boundary conditions for incompressible magnetohydrodynamic flows.

2.2.1. The governing equations

The equations governing the flow of incompressible fluids with uniform electrical conductivity, viscosity and density have been derived in many text books e.g. Shercliff (1965). These equations describe the behaviour of liquid metals very accurately and in some circumstances may describe the flow of conducting gases if their velocity is low enough. They are:

the momentum equation,

\( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \)

\( 2.2.1. \)

\[ \mathcal{C} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} \right\} = -\nabla p + \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} + \eta \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}, \]

\( 2.2.2. \)

Ohm's Law,

\[ \mathbf{j} = \sigma (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}), \]

\( 2.2.3. \)

Maxwell's Equations,

\[ \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\partial \mathbf{B} / \partial t, \]

\( 2.2.4. \)

\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \]

\( 2.2.5. \)

\[ \mathbf{j} = \nabla \times \mathbf{H}, \]

\( 2.2.6. \)

where \( \mathcal{C} \) is the density, \( \mathbf{v} \) the velocity, \( p \) the pressure, \( \eta \) the viscosity, \( \mathbf{j} \) the current density, \( \mathbf{B} \) the magnetic flux density, \( \sigma \) the electrical conductivity, \( \mathbf{E} \) the electric field strength, and \( \mathbf{H} \) the magnetic field. Since we will only be considering materials, whose permeability, \( \mu_0 \) is that of a vacuum

\[ \mathbf{B} = \mu_0 \mathbf{H}. \]

\( 2.2.7. \)

Hence, using (2.2.5) and (2.2.6) we have:

\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} = 0 \]

\( 2.2.8. \)

Hereafter we will use the suffices \( x, y, z \) to refer to the components of vector quantities e.g. \( \mathbf{v}_x, \mathbf{v}_y, \mathbf{v}_z \) refer to the components of \( \mathbf{v} \).
2.2.1. **Approximations made in the equations.**

In these equations certain effects are ignored which we now state along with the conditions in which these effects are truly negligible. For further justification of the equations see, for example, Shercliff's book.

1. **Compressibility.** The velocities must be sufficiently low compared to the speed of sound in the fluid.

2. **Variation in fluid properties due to heating by electric currents and viscous dissipation.** This effect is negligible in most experimental situations with liquid metals, but it is an important effect with gases.

3. **Hall effect and 'ion slip'.** These effects which alter the relation between the electric current and the electric field, equation (2.2.3) are appreciable in gases, but may be ignored in liquid metals, unless the magnetic field is exceptionally high by laboratory standards. (i.e. greater than $10^5$ gauss).

4. **'Displacement Current'.** This effect, which produces a modification in the relation between current and magnetic flux density (equation (2.2.6)), is only significant for very high frequency electromagnetic oscillations and is quite negligible in laboratory MHD experiments.

5. **Charge concentration.** It may be shown that although charge concentrations exist (i.e. $\nabla \cdot E \neq 0$), the forces on the fluid due to $E$ and $\mathbf{q}$, the charge density, are negligible in all practical or experimental situations.

2.2.3. **Boundary conditions at a rigid surface.**

For future reference we state here the boundary conditions at an interface between a solid and fluid with finite viscosity, both of which have finite conductivity:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{v} & = \mathbf{0} , & \text{since there is no slip at the wall 2.2.9.} \\
\left[ \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right] & = 0 , & \text{since } \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} = 0 \text{ no current} \quad 2.2.10. \\
\left[ E \times \mathbf{n} \right] & = 0 , & \text{since } \nabla \times E = -\partial \mathbf{B} / \partial t \quad 2.2.11. \\
\end{align*}
\]
\[ [\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{n}] = 0 \quad \text{since} \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0 \quad 2.2.12. \]

\[ [\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{n}] = 0 \quad \text{since} \quad \mathbf{j} = \nabla \times \mathbf{H} \quad 2.2.13. \]

The brackets \([\ ]\) refers to the change across the boundary and \(\mathbf{n}\) is the vector normal to the boundary. For detailed derivation of these conditions see Shercliff (1965). Note that in steady flow, since \(\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{0}\), we can write \(\mathbf{E} = \nabla \phi\), where \(\phi\) is the scalar electric potential. Then (2.2.11) becomes:

\[ [\nabla \phi \times \mathbf{n}] = 0. \quad 2.2.14. \]
Fig 2.1. Cross-section of an arbitrarily shaped duct with external electrical connections.
2.3. The equations, boundary conditions and uniqueness theorem for MHD duct flows.

2.3.1. Formulation of the problem.

We now consider steady flows through ducts under the action of a transverse magnetic field. In this and the next two sections we will confine ourselves to examining flows in ducts of constant cross-sectional area which are fully developed, that is to say the velocity, the magnetic field, the electric field and the electric current do not vary along the length of the duct. Thus all the variables except pressure are independent of \( z \), (see fig. 2.1). (We show subsequently that it follows \( \frac{dp}{dz} \) is also independent of \( z \)).

The duct may be connected to external electric circuits. Then, if the current leaving the duct per unit length and the electric potential at each of these connections are \( I_j \) and \( \Phi_j \) respectively, we assume that the external circuits uniquely define \( \Phi_j \) in terms of \( I_j \) or vice versa; a condition satisfied in all practical circuits. Now, given the flux density of the imposed magnetic field, we want to find the distribution of velocity, pressure, electric potential and electric current in the duct given the following data:

1. either the mean pressure drop per unit length in the \( z \)-direction \( \Delta \rho \), (we subsequently show that the pressure drop must be independent of \( x \) and \( y \)) or the volume flowrate, \( Q \), and
2. either \( I_j \) or \( \Phi_j \) at each connection of the duct with its external circuits.

The problem may now be expressed mathematically as follows:

Find \( \mathbf{q} = \{ \mathbf{u}, p, \Phi, j, \mathbf{B} \} \) which satisfy the equations (2.2.1. - 2.2.8) when \( \frac{d}{dt} = 0 \) given \( \Delta \rho \) or \( Q \) and \( I_j \) or \( \Phi_j \), provided the following boundary conditions are satisfied:

1. at the fluid-wall interface of the duct:
   \[
   \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}, \\
   (j \cdot \mathbf{n})_f = (j \cdot \mathbf{n})_w, \\
   (\nabla \Phi \times \mathbf{n})_f = (\nabla \Phi \times \mathbf{n})_w.
   \]
where \( \mathbf{n} \) is in the direction into the fluid and the subscripts \( f \), \( w \) indicates the value of the quantity inside the bracket at the fluid side and wall side of the interface respectively.

(ii) The boundary conditions at the exterior of the wall of the duct is:
\[
\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 ,
\]
except at the connections to the external electric circuits. (The equations for the wall are the same as 2.2.3 - 2.2.8 with \( \mathbf{v} - 0 \).)

(iii) As \(|x|, |y| \to \infty , \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}_0 (x, y) , 2.3.5.
where \( \mathcal{B}_0 \) is the imposed magnetic field. Since \( \mathcal{B}_0 \) is produced by currents outside the duct, it satisfies the equations:
\[
\nabla \times \mathcal{B}_0 = 0 ,
\]
\[
\nabla \cdot \mathcal{B}_0 = 0 .
\]
We assume \( \mathcal{B}_0 \) to be given in our problem.

2.3.2. Uniqueness theorem.

By considering the energy dissipated in the duct we now prove that there is a unique solution for \( \mathbf{v} \). (This analysis is similar to that of Moffatt (1964), though more general in that we consider inertial terms and make no restriction on \( R_m \), the magnetic Reynolds number).

From (2.2.1) and (2.2.3) we can eliminate \( \mathbf{B} \) to obtain:
\[
\sigma^{-1} |\mathbf{j}|^2 - \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla^2 \mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla p - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} - \nabla \phi - c \mathbf{v} \cdot (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v}
\]
Now integrate this equation unit distance along the duct and across the duct but not including the duct walls. Call this volume \( V_f \) and its surface \( S_f \). Then, using Gauss' theorem and equations (2.2.2) and (2.2.8), we obtain:
\[
\int_{V_f} \sigma^{-1} |\mathbf{j}|^2 \, dV - \mathbf{n} \int_{V_f} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla^2 \mathbf{v}) \, dV = -\int_{S_f} \left\{ (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) p + \rho \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\} \, dS
\]
\[-\rho \int_{V_f} \left\{ \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla (\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) - \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{w} \right\} \, dV \quad 2.3.6.
\]
where \( \mathbf{w} = \nabla \times \mathbf{v} \). Now
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\[
\int_{V_f} \nabla \cdot \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \, dV = - \int_{V_f} \mathbf{\nabla} \cdot (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{u}) \, dV + \int_{S_f} \left( \mathbf{n} \cdot (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{u}) \right) \, dS,
\]

since \( \mathbf{u} = 0 \) on the walls and \( \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} = 0 \).

Since \( (\mathbf{u} \cdot (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{u})) = 0 \) and \( u_z = 0 \) on the walls,

\[
\int_{V_f} \left( \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla (u_z^2) - u_z (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{u}) \right) \, dV = \rho \int_{V_f} \mathbf{\nabla} \cdot \left( \frac{u_z^2}{2} \mathbf{u} \right) \, dV = 0
\]

Since \( \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial j}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = 0 \),

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \phi (x, y, z) \int x y \mathbf{e}_z \right) = -\Delta \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial z} = 0
\]

Therefore \( \phi = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta \phi + f(x, y) \) where \( \Delta \phi \) is now a constant.

Therefore

\[
\int_{S_f} \left( \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \, dS = \int_A \Delta \phi \, dA = \mathcal{Q} \Delta \phi
\]

where \( A \) is the cross-sectional area of the duct and \( \mathcal{Q} \) the volume flow rate, and hence (2.3.6) becomes:

\[
\int_{V_f} \left( \sigma^{-1} \left| \mathbf{j} \right|^2 + \nabla \cdot \left| \mathbf{u} \right|^2 \right) \, dV = \mathcal{Q} \Delta \phi - \int_{S_f} \left( \mathbf{\nabla} \cdot \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \, dS
\]

Now consider the walls of the duct. If the walls are non-conducting, \( \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \) on the walls and (2.3.7) becomes:

\[
\int_{V_w} \left( \sigma^{-1} \left| \mathbf{j} \right|^2 + \nabla \cdot \left| \mathbf{u} \right|^2 \right) \, dV = \mathcal{Q} \Delta \phi
\]

If the walls are conducting, the potential \( \phi \) is continuous across the wall-fluid interface and \( \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} \) is also continuous. By integrating in a volume \( V_w \) of the wall also of unit length along the duct, with an external surface area of \( S_w \), its internal surface area being \( S_f \), we obtain:

\[
\int_{V_w} \sigma^{-1} \left| \mathbf{j} \right|^2 \, dV = \int_{S_f} \left( \mathbf{\nabla} \cdot \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \, dS - \int_{S_w} \left( \mathbf{\nabla} \cdot \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \, dS
\]

Since \( \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \) on the external surface of the duct except at the connections with the external circuits.
Thence (2.3.7) becomes:

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}_P} \left( \sigma^{-1} |\mathbf{j}_z|^2 + \mathbf{n} |\mathbf{w}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{V} + \int_{\mathcal{V}_W} \left( \sigma^{-1} |\mathbf{j}_z|^2 \right) d\mathbf{V}$$

$$= \zeta \Delta \mathbf{p} - \sum_j \Phi \mathbf{j}_j I_j.$$

2.3.8.

Now suppose that \( q' = \{ \mathbf{u}', \mathbf{p}', \phi', \mathbf{j}', \mathbf{z}' \} \) is a second solution of the equation (2.2.1 - 2.2.8) satisfying the same boundary conditions as \( q \) with \( \Delta \mathbf{p}' = \Delta \mathbf{p} \) or \( \zeta' = \zeta \) and \( I_j' = I_j \) or \( \Phi_j' = \Phi_j \) at each connection, depending on which condition was specified for the solution \( q \). Let

$$\mathbf{q}' = q - q'$$

be the difference between the two solutions. Then \( \mathbf{q}' \) satisfies the equations (2.2.1 - 2.2.8) and the boundary conditions (2.3.1 - 2.3.5.), but

$$\Delta \mathbf{p} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \zeta = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad I_j = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \Phi_j = 0.$$  

Then (2.3.8) becomes:

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}_P} \left( \sigma^{-1} |\mathbf{j}_z|^2 + \mathbf{n} |\mathbf{w}|^2 \right) d\mathbf{V} + \int_{\mathcal{V}_W} \left( \sigma^{-1} |\mathbf{j}_z|^2 \right) d\mathbf{V} = 0$$

Hence \( \mathbf{j} = 0 \) and \( \omega = 0 \). Then since \( \partial \mathbf{z} = 0 \), we can write \( \mathbf{v} = \partial \psi / \partial y \) and \( \mathbf{j} = - \partial \psi / \partial x \). And since \( \psi = 0 \),

$$\nabla^2 \psi = 0.$$  

Therefore \( \psi = \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{p} = 0 \) and since \( \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{w} = 0 \), \( \mathbf{v} = 0 \) and thence, since \( \mathbf{v} = 0, \mathbf{p} = 0 \) and \( \mathbf{z} = 0 \).

Thus \( \mathbf{q}' = 0 \) and \( \mathbf{q}' = \mathbf{q}_1 \), which shows that there is only one solution to the problem.

There are some interesting aspects of this uniqueness theorem. Firstly it is valid for all values of the magnetic Reynolds number, \( R_m \). Therefore even if the induced magnetic field is of the same order as the imposed magnetic field, the result is not affected. Secondly the result is independent of the orientation and distribution of the imposed magnetic field. Thirdly the result is not affected by having the walls of the duct conducting. Lastly we note that, in general, specifying \( Q \) and \( dp/dz \)
or $\Phi_j$ and $I_j$ does not uniquely determine the solution e.g. a current flowing between the walls perpendicular to the magnetic field in the duct examined by Hunt (1965) does not affect the flow and therefore, of course, specifying $I_j$ and $\Phi_j$ would give no information about the flow. On the other hand in the flow examined by Hunt & Stewartson (1965) specifying the current and potential between the electrically conducting walls does uniquely determine $Q$ and $\Delta p$, given $B_0$. This case is the exception.

2.3.3. The MHD duct flow equations

Since we have shown that there is only one solution to the problem of fully developed duct flow given suitable boundary conditions, if we assume a given flow and show that such a flow satisfies the equations and the boundary conditions, then we have found the solution to the problem.

We assume that there is no secondary flow and that the imposed magnetic field is constant i.e.

$$B_0 = (0, B_0, 0)$$

Then, making the same assumptions as in §2.3.1, that the cross-sectional area, $u$, $v$, $j$, and $\Phi$ do not vary in the z-direction, and using the result of §2.3.2 that $dp/dz$ is a constant, and $dp/dx$ and $dp/dy$ are functions of $x$ and $y$ only, the equations (2.2.1 - 2.2.8) reduce to:

$$\begin{align*}
0 &= -\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + j_y \mu_0 H_z, \\
0 &= -\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} - j_x \mu_0 H_z, \\
0 &= -\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + j_x B_0 + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) v_x, \\
j_x &= \sigma \left( -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} - v_z B_0 \right), \\
j_y &= \sigma \left( -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} \right), \\
j_z &= \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial y}, \\
\frac{\partial j_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial j_y}{\partial y} &= 0 .
\end{align*}$$

These equations may be rewritten in terms of $p$, $H_z$ and $v_z$:

$$\begin{align*}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( p + \frac{\mu_0 H_z^2}{2} \right),
\end{align*}$$
\[ 0 = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( p + \mu \frac{H_z^2}{2} \right) \]
\[ 0 = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + B_0 \frac{\partial^2 H_z}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) H_z \]
\[ \text{and} \quad 0 = B_0 \frac{\partial \sigma w}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) H_z \]

Thus \( p \) has the form deduced in \( \S 2.3.2 \). Also note that, given the boundary conditions \( \varphi p/dz \) or \( Q \) and \( I_j \) or \( \varphi j \) we can find \( v_z \) and \( H_z \) by only considering (2.3.17) and (2.3.18) which were first deduced by Shercliff (1953). When the walls of the duct are conducting, to find the value of \( H_z \) at the fluid-wall interface, in addition to examining (2.3.17) and (2.3.18) we have to analyze the current distribution in the walls of the duct and use the boundary conditions (2.3.1 - 2.3.5) to match the solution in the walls to that in the duct and to the external electrical circuit. We now write down the equation for \( H_z \) in the wall and these matching conditions in terms of \( H_z \) and \( v_z \). Let \( s \) be the co-ordinate parallel to the wall. Then, in the wall, \( H_z \) satisfies:

\[ 0 = \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) H_z \]

provided the conductivity of the wall is constant, and the matching conditions at the fluid-wall interface are:

\[ v_z = 0, \]
\[ \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial s} \bigg|_f = \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial s} \bigg|_w \]

and
\[ \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial x} \bigg|_f = \frac{1}{\sigma_w} \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial x} \bigg|_w \]

where \( \sigma_w \) is the conductivity of the wall.

At the outer boundary of the duct wall,

\[ \varphi H_z/\varphi s = 0 \]

except where the duct wall connects with an external circuit.
If the duct walls are non-conducting, the boundary conditions on $H_z$ becomes simply,

$$\left( \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial s} \right) = 0$$

2.3.23.

and the condition on $\partial H_z / \partial n$ is then ignored because in the wall the electric field

$$\left( - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial s} \right) = - \frac{1}{\delta_w} \left( \frac{\partial H}{\partial n} \right).$$

Shorcliff (1956) pointed out that these boundary conditions and the equation for $H_z$ in the wall may be simplified when the thickness of the wall, $t$, is small compared to the duct size.

Then $\frac{\partial H_z}{\partial x} \gg \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial s}$ and (2.3.19) becomes

$$\frac{\partial^2 H_z}{\partial n^2} = 0,$$

$$(\frac{\partial H}{\partial n})_w = \left( (H_z)_w - (H_z)_o \right) / t.$$

Consequently except where the duct wall connects with an external circuit, $(H_z)_w$ and $(H_z)_o$ being the value of $H_z$ at the outside and the inside of the duct wall respectively. From (2.3.20),

$$(H_z)_w = (H_z)_f.$$

Therefore the condition (2.3.21) becomes:

$$\frac{\partial H_z}{\partial n} = \frac{\delta}{\delta_n} \frac{H_w - H_z_o}{t}.$$
2.4. Magnetohydrodynamic flow in rectangular ducts. I.

2.4.1. Introduction to Hunt (1965)

In §§2.4 and 2.5 we merely introduce the work we have already published on steady fully developed flow in rectangular ducts of fluids with uniform properties under the action of a transverse magnetic field. In this section we refer to the author's paper, Hunt (1965), in which we generalize the mathematical solution of Chang & Lundgren (1961) and Shercliff (1953) to examine the flow in two kinds of rectangular ducts:

(i) those whose walls parallel to the magnetic field (AA) are of arbitrary conductivity and whose walls perpendicular to the magnetic field (BB) are perfectly conducting;

(ii) those whose walls (AA) are non-conducting and walls (BB) are of arbitrary conductivity. In the paper we concentrated on the interesting physical effects which occur when \( M \gg 1 \), (as have already been described in §2.1.3) and were led to make some speculation on the stability of the resulting flows in the conclusion of the paper. Since then we have examined the stability of these flows in greater detail and our conclusions are presented in §2.4.2. Finally in §2.4.3 we compare our theoretical results with the experimental results of Alty (1966).

Since the publication of Hunt (1965), we have found two papers by Chang, Atabek and Lundgren (1961) and Uflyand (1962) in which were analysed the flow in a duct whose walls (BB) are perfectly conducting and walls (AA) are non-conducting. However, owing to the form of solution used in these papers, the interesting properties of the flow as \( M \to \infty \) could not easily be seen and no physical discussion of the problem was attempted. A recent book by Hughes and Young (1966) also analyses the same problem using the same cumbersome techniques as Chang, Atabek and Lundgren (1961), but the book is of interest since velocity profiles and current stream lines have been computed in great detail for various values of \( M \).

2.4.2. The stability of the flows when \( M \gg 1 \).

In this section we discuss the stability of the high Hartmann number flows analysed in our paper, Hunt (1965), using the results of our
general analysis of the stability of MHD duct flows in §5.3.

In §5.3 it is shown that the analysis of the stability of a flow in a rectangular duct is simpler when \( M \gg 1 \) than when \( M = 0 \). The reason is that, when \( M \gg 1 \) a core flow develops in the centre of the duct and boundary layers form on the side walls and therefore the stability of the flow is determined by that of the boundary layers, which are simpler to analyse than the flow found at \( M = 0 \) which varies equally in two directions. Furthermore, it is found that the most unstable disturbances, which determine the stability of the boundary layers, are unaffected by the magnetic field. Therefore in examining the stability of these flows we can use our knowledge of the stability of boundary layers where there is no magnetic field.

Let us examine the stability of the boundary layers on the walls AA in a duct with perfectly conducting walls perpendicular to the field and insulating walls parallel to the field (\( d_A = 0, \ d_B = \infty \)). In this case as \( M \to \infty \) the velocity profile in the boundary layer becomes:

\[
\bar{v} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^j \cos(j \pi y)}{M^{j+1}} \exp \left(-\frac{M^j}{j^2} \right) \tan \left(\frac{\sqrt{M} y}{j}\right),
\]

where \( \eta = \frac{M^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi}{j} \) and thus \( MV \) becomes a function of \( \eta \) only. The stability of this boundary layer is then determined solely by the value of the Reynolds number for the layer \( R_{bl} \), since the velocity profile, suitably expressed, is independent of \( M \). We now have to determine the value of \( R_{bl} \) in terms of \( M \) and \( R \), the overall Reynolds number (= \( \bar{u}_z / \nu \)), where \( \bar{u}_z \) is the mean velocity, for various shapes of duct.

If \( a/b \ll M^{-\frac{1}{2}} \), i.e. a very thin duct with walls AA much shorter than walls BB, the mean velocity in the duct, \( \bar{u}_z \), closely approaches the core velocity and most of the flow is in the core. (For \( a/b \gg M^{-\frac{1}{2}} \) most of the flow is in the boundary layers on AA, Section 3 of Hunt (1965)). Then the mean velocity in the boundary layers on the walls AA is \( O(M) \bar{u}_z \) and since the thickness of these boundary layers is \( O(aM^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \), the Reynolds number of the boundary layer \( R_{b_0} = O(aM^\frac{3}{2} \bar{u}_z / \nu) \), where \( \nu \) is the kinematic viscosity. Hence,

\[
R_{b_0} = O(M^3) R.
\]
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where \( R \) is the overall Reynolds number, \( R = \frac{u}{\nu} \). Thus for
given \( R \), \( R_{bl,c} \) increases with \( M \): hence the critical overall Reynolds
number at which the boundary layers become unstable is reduced by
increasing \( M \). Note, however, that away from the remote walls AA the
flow would be very stable.

Now consider an approximately square duct with \( a/b = 0(1) \). We
see from equation (24) of Hunt (1965) that in this case most of the
flow is in the boundary layers on AA. The mean velocity in the
boundary layers on AA is \( U_c = O(M U_c) \), where \( U_c \) is the core velocity and,
since the thickness of these boundary layers is given by \( S = O(a M^{\frac{1}{2}}) \),
\[
\overline{U_c} = \frac{1}{2} \left( M u_c + u_c a \right) \quad O(1)
\]
Hence, if \( a/b = 0(1) \), \( R = O(M^2 u_c /\nu) \),
and since \( R_{bl,c} = O(1) \), \( R \approx R_{bl,c} \).
It is important to realise that the forms of the velocity profiles are a
function of \( M \) and not \( R \). Thus velocity over-shoot and reversed flow
can occur in the boundary layers on AA at arbitrarily small Reynolds
number. Using the usual sufficiency condition for boundary layer flows
we can show that below a certain value of \( R \) the flow is stable. Since
the velocity profile is in the form of a jet with an infinite number of
points of inflexion and since the critical Reynolds numbers of free jets
vary between about 2 and a few hundred it would seem that in this type of
duct, when \( M \gg 1 \), \( R_{crit} < 1000 \) whereas when \( M = 0 \), \( R_{crit} \approx 3000 \). If it could
be shown that when \( M \gg 1 \), \( R_{crit} < 1000 \) then, by definition, our hypothesis
that the magnetic field has a destabilizing effect would be verified.

When the walls of the ducts are all perfectly conducting \( d_A = d_B \)
\( = \infty \), the velocity profile of the boundary layer also contains points
of inflexion (fig.4) and hence raising \( M \) reduces the Reynolds number at
which the boundary layers become unstable. But in this case, for \( M \gg 1 \),
the velocity in the boundary layers on AA is of the same order as the
core velocity and since the boundary layer thickness is \( O(a M^\frac{1}{2}) \), \( R_{bl,c} = \frac{1}{2} \).
In this case, provided \( a/b < M^\frac{1}{2} \), the shape of the duct is
irrelevant. Raising \( M \) at a constant value of \( R \) may first tend to
destabilize the boundary flow and then stabilize it.
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\[ \Delta \phi = \frac{0.434B_0v_0a}{0.3 + M^{-1/2}} \] (Hunt's theory)

Fig 2.2. The potential at the mid-point of one insulating wall against Reynolds number in a duct: \( \Theta = \pm 90^\circ \), \( M = 227 \) (Altay, 1966)
Fig 2.3. Pressure gradient against Reynolds number. ½" duct: θ ≈ 90°, M = 227.
(Ahy, 1966)
Fig. 2.4 Potential profile along the insulating wall.

\( \frac{3}{8} \)" duct; \( \theta = 90^\circ \), \( M = 159 \), \( R \approx 800 \).

(from Alty (1966))
2.4.3. Experimental results of Alty.

Since the publication of Hunt (1965), Alty has performed a series of experiments on the effect of a transverse magnetic field on the flow of mercury through a square duct with two walls conducting and two non-conducting. He was able to vary the direction of the magnetic field relative to the duct and in one series of experiments he investigated the flow when the magnetic field was perpendicular to the highly conducting walls.

In his Ph.D. thesis Alty has made a detailed comparison between the results predicted by our theory and his experimental results. We will merely present the three relevant figures which show most of the results. Fig. (2.2.) is a graph of the electric potential difference between the mid-point of a nonconducting wall and a conducting wall, $\Delta \phi$, against the overall Reynolds number, $R$. Note the close agreement between the theoretical and experimental values up to a value of $R$ of 6000. Fig. (2.3) is a graph of the variation of pressure gradient with $R$ at a given value of $M$, ($M>1$), and shows that for $R>1000$ the flow is not laminar, i.e. it is unstable, and also that for $R$ low enough the pressure gradient becomes very close to that predicted theoretically. Fig. (2.4) shows the distribution of $\phi$ along the non-conducting wall at a given value of $R$ and $M$. The theoretical values only agree with experimental values if the potential is calculated from the mean velocity and not the pressure gradient, though the explanation for this is not quite clear.

These experimental results have proved the following:

(i) The magnetic field, if sufficiently large, can lower the Reynolds number at which the flow in a duct becomes unstable.

(ii) In the particular duct flow studied, for a given value of $M (>1)$, the flow can be stabilised if $R$ is reduced low enough, as was shown in §2.4.2.

(iii) The theory of MHD flow in a duct with conducting walls can accurately predict the values of $\phi$, $(dp/dz)$ etc., found experimentally.

The experiments have also shown that various interesting effects occur when the boundary layer becomes unstable which we do not understand.
2.5. Magnetohydrodynamic flows in rectangular ducts II.

2.5.1. Introduction.

In this section we continue our examination of flow in rectangular ducts whose walls are electrically conducting. We begin by referring to the paper written jointly with Professor K. Stewartson, Hunt & Stewartson (1965), hereinafter referred to as H & S. In this paper we considered the case where the walls parallel to the magnetic field (AA) are perfectly conducting and those perpendicular to the field (BB) are non-conducting, this being the kind of duct used in MHD pumps and generators, which are usually connected to an external electric circuit.

In our analysis, which is only valid when \( M \gg 1 \), we considered the effects of such circuits, though it is found that for this particular duct they do not make the problem more difficult. (The demarcation of the work in the paper was precise in that Stewartson performed the asymptotic analysis of \( \S 2 \), while I wrote the other sections).

In the following sub-section we extend the order of magnitude argument of the paper to the duct flow examined in \( \S 2.4 \) and then compare the flow in rectangular ducts with all combinations of conducting and non-conducting walls. Finally we compare our results with the exact numerical solution of Tani (1962). Since the publication of our paper, the translation of a paper by Berezin (1963) has become available, in which he considers the same problem for all values of \( M \). However, he merely reduces the problem to a single infinite series of algebraic equations, which, he claimed, can be solved by the method of successive approximation. This does not seem to us a great step forward.

2.5.2. Comparison of all types of duct flow.

In this section we use the method of \( \S 4.1 \) and 4.2 of H & S to deduce the main result of Hunt (1965), namely that most of the flow occurs in the boundary layers on the walls (AA) if the walls (AA) are non-conducting and the walls (BB) are perfectly conducting. We call this type of duct flow case (iii).

Case (iii)

We use the same notation as for case (i) and note that for case (iii),
Fig 2.5 Cross-section of the duct when

\[ d_A = 0 \text{ and } d_B = \infty \quad (M \gg 1) \]
as may be seen from Hunt (1965), the core values of current and velocity, \( J_c \) and \( U_c \), are also the same.

\[
J_c = -B_o U_c / \sigma = (\partial \rho / \partial z) / B_o.
\]

2.5.1.

We consider the integral \( \int E_x \cdot dl \) taken round the path PQRS in fig. (2.)

Then, since \( B_y = 0 \) in the core and \( E_x = 0 \) on the walls BB, and since

\[
\int E_x \cdot dl = 0,
\]

\[
\int E_x dx + \int_s E_y dy = 0.
\]

2.5.2.

By considering current continuity in the secondary boundary layer:

\[
J_y = -\sigma [J_c y / \delta],
\]

and therefore,

\[
\int_s E_y dy = \int_s J_y dy = -\sigma [J_c a^2 / \sigma \delta].
\]

2.5.3.

Since \( E_x = 0 \) in the core, \( J_c / \sigma + B_o U_c = 0 \), and therefore

\[
\int_s E_x dx = \int_s J_s dx + B_o \int_s U_s dx.
\]

2.5.4.

Now since \( J_x = 0 \) on the wall it follows that \( J_s = -\sigma [J_c] \).

Therefore, using (2.5.2) and (2.5.3)

\[
-\sigma [J_c a^2 / \sigma \delta] = 0 [-J_c \delta / \sigma] + B_o \int_e U_s dx,
\]

whence \( B_o U_s \delta = -\sigma [J_c a^2 / \sigma \delta] \), since \( \delta \ll a \).

2.5.4.

From the equation of motion, since \( J_s = -\sigma [J_c] \),

and

\[
\frac{\partial U_s}{\partial x} = 0 \left[ \frac{U_s}{\delta^2} \right],
\]

it follows that

\[
\mu U_s = 0 \left[ J_c B_o \right],
\]

where \( \mu \) is the viscosity in this case.

Then dividing (2.5.4) by (2.5.5)

\[
\int \frac{U_s^4}{a^4} = 0 \left[ \frac{\mu}{\rho} \right] B_o^2 a^2, \]

or

\[
\int = 0 \left[ \frac{\mu}{\rho} \right] B_o^2 a^2.
\]

2.5.5.

Hence (2.5.4) leads to:

\[
U_s = -\sigma [J_c M / \sigma B_o] \]
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Therefore, from (2.5.1)

$$
\nu_S = O(M) \nu_C,
$$

and

$$
\int_0^\infty \nu_S \, dx = O\left( -\frac{(\partial P/\partial x) \alpha^2}{\lambda M^3 \nu} \right),
$$

2.5.6.

which result is the same as that of Hunt (1965).

As was mentioned in H & S, the form of the boundary layer on the walls AA is best explained in terms of the secondary currents induced in these layers. We now draw up a table showing the orders of magnitude of the secondary currents, relative to both the core current and the core velocity, including in this list the case (iv) where all the walls are non-conducting analyzed by Shercliff (1953). $d_A$ and $d_B$ are as defined by Hunt (1965), being proportional to the conductivities of the walls AA and BB respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>$d_A$</th>
<th>$d_B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) (open circuit)</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) (short circuit)</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From case (ii) we see that the value of the secondary currents relative to the core currents may vary, yet expressed as a fraction of $\nu_C$, $j_S$ is of the same order in both cases. This must be so for the viscous and electromagnetic forces to balance in the boundary layer. The most significant result from this table is that $j_S = -O(M^{-1} B_0 \nu_C)$ in every case except (iii) and, as we saw in §§4.1 and 4.2 of H & S, this means that in each of these cases $\nu_S = -O(j_S)$. It is only in case (iii) where $j_S$, relative to $\nu_C$, is $O(M)$ times the value of $j_S$ in the other cases and where, in consequence, the viscous stresses must be $O(M)$ times as great, that $\nu_S = O(M) \nu_C$. Other important differences are shown up by the order of magnitude arguments. This crude table only indicates the gross difference between the secondary boundary layer in case (iii) and the other cases.
2.5.3. Comparison with others' results.

Although the analysis in H & S is only valid when \( M \gg 1 \), Tani (1962) has provided a suitable variational method for calculating the velocity profiles and the volume flow rate, \( Q \), at values of \( M \) below about 25. It is interesting to compare his values for \( Q \) in a square duct when \( M = 25 \) and \( M = 15 \), with those calculated from our result (1.5.48).

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc}
M & \frac{\bar{u} A}{(- \frac{\partial p}{\partial z}) A a^2} & \text{Tani} & \text{From (3.5) of H & S} \\
15 & 0.047 & 0.0458 \\
25 & 0.0368 & 0.0371 \\
\end{array}
\]

We see that the difference at \( M = 25 \) is about 1%. Thus for square ducts, at least, the entire range of \( M \) is now covered.

It should be noted that in the analysis of H & S we found that the velocity profile was unchanged by an external circuit. This is only true if the conductivity of the walls AA is high enough. By analogy with the result of Hunt (1965) that, for given \( d_A \), as \( M \to \infty \), such that \( d_A M^2 \to \infty \), the solution becomes identical to that of the case where \( d_A = \infty \), it is likely that a similar result will hold when \( d_A \) is finite and \( d_B = 0 \). The physical reason is the same namely the relative resistance of the wall to the boundary layer on the wall AA decreases as \( M \to \infty \), because of the decreasing thickness and consequently conductance of the boundary layers. (This point has been analysed more rigorously by Chiang (1965)).

In the same series of experiments mentioned in §2.4.3, C.J.N. Alty examined the flow in his duct when the conducting walls were parallel to the field and the non-conducting walls were perpendicular. The conducting walls, AA, were connected together, the resistance between them being very small so that they were virtually short circuited. Therefore in measuring \( Q \) as a function of \( \frac{dp}{dz} \), the flux deficit due to the boundary layers on the walls AA is \( O(M^{-3/2}) \) that of the core, as shown in (3.9) of H & S. With \( M \gg 100 \), this term was too small to measure so these experiments gave no test to the theory of the secondary boundary layers. However, in some experiments on electrically driven flows in a curved duct with \( \frac{dp}{dz} = 0 \), J.A. Baylis (1966) has provided a critical test of the theory. We describe the theory for the flow and Baylis' results in the next section.
2.6. Flow in Curved Channels.

2.6.1. Equations for cylindrical flow.

We now consider the extension of the theory of H & S to flow in curved rectangular ducts. (See fig. 2.6). We will only examine the flow when the secondary or radial velocities due to the curvature of the duct are very small compared to those in the direction. Also, we assume that flow does not vary in the or streamwise direction and therefore the pressure gradient in the streamwise direction must be zero, the energy of the flow coming from electrical energy fed in at the walls.

The equations (2.6.1 - 2.6.8) for steady flow written in cylindrical, \((r, \theta, z)\) co-ordinates when \(\partial / \partial \theta = 0\) are (Chandrasekhar, 1961):

\[
\rho \left( u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} - \frac{u_r}{r} \right) = \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} + \frac{\eta}{r} \left( \frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial \theta^2} \right),
\]

\[
\rho \left( u_r \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} + u_r \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} \right) = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \frac{\eta}{r} \left( \frac{\partial^2 u_z}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 u_z}{\partial \theta^2} \right),
\]

\[
\rho \left( u_r \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right) = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \frac{\eta}{r} \left( \frac{\partial^2 u_z}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 u_z}{\partial \theta^2} \right),
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} + \frac{u_r}{r} = 0,
\]

\[
\gamma = \sigma \left( -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} + \sigma \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta} \right),
\]

\[
\gamma = -u_r B_0,
\]

\[
\gamma = \sigma \left( -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} \right),
\]

\[
\gamma = -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z}, \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \gamma \right).
\]

We now determine the conditions under which \(u_r, u_z \ll u_0\), when \(M > 1\). Differentiate (2.6.1) w.r.t. \(z\), and (2.6.3) w.r.t. \(r\), and subtract the equations. Assuming \(u_\theta > u_r, u_z\), we have in the primary or Hartmann boundary layers at \(z = \pm a\),

\[
-\rho \frac{\partial (u_r \cfrac{u_z}{r})}{\partial z} = \sigma \frac{B_0^2}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} + \frac{\eta}{r} \frac{\partial^3 u_r}{\partial z^3}.
\]
Fig 2.6 Cross-section of annular rectangular channel (Walls AA are perfectly conducting, walls BB are non-conducting.)
2.6. Flow in Curved Channels.

2.6.1. Equations for cylindrical flow.

We now consider the extension of the theory of H & S to flow in curved rectangular ducts. (See fig. 2.6). We will only examine the flow when the secondary or radial velocities due to the curvature of the duct are very small compared to those in the \( \phi \) direction. Also, we assume that flow does not vary in the \( \Theta \) or streamwise direction and therefore the pressure gradient in the streamwise direction must be zero, the energy of the flow coming from electrical energy fed in at the walls.

The equations (2.2.1 - 2.2.8) for steady flow written in cylindrical, \((r, \theta, z)\) co-ordinates when \( \partial / \partial \theta = 0 \) are (Chandrasekhar, 1961):

\[
\rho \left( u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} - \frac{u_r^2}{r} \right) = \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} + j_e B_0 + \eta \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right) u_r, \quad \text{2.6.1.}
\]

\[
\rho \left( u_r \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} + ur \right) = -j_y B_0 + \eta \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right) u_z, \quad \text{2.6.2.}
\]

\[
\rho \left( u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} \right) = \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \eta \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right) u_z, \quad \text{2.6.3.}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} + \frac{ur}{r} = 0, \quad \text{2.6.4.}
\]

\[
j_y = \sigma \left( - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} + ur B_0 \right), \quad \text{2.6.5a.}
\]

\[
j_e = -u_r B_0, \quad \text{2.6.5b.}
\]

\[
j_z = \sigma \left( - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} \right), \quad \text{2.6.5c.}
\]

\[
j_y = -\partial \phi / \partial z, \quad j_z = \frac{i}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \phi), \quad \text{2.6.6.}
\]

We now determine the conditions under which \( u_r, u_z \ll u_\phi \), when \( M \gg 1 \). Differentiate (2.6.1) w.r.t. \( z \), and (2.6.3) w.r.t. \( r \), and subtract the equations. Assuming \( u_\phi \gg u_r, u_z \), we have in the primary or Hartmann boundary layers at \( z = \pm a \),

\[
- \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{u_r^2}{r} \right) = \sigma B_0^2 \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} + \eta \frac{\partial^3 u_r}{\partial z^3}.
\]
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Since in these boundary layers \( \partial / \partial z = O(M) \) and \( U_B = O(U_C) \), where \( U_C \) is the core velocity, we have:

\[
\frac{U_Y}{U_C} = O \left[ \frac{\alpha}{r}, \frac{\rho U_C}{\sigma B_0^2} \right] = \kappa
\]

Therefore provided \( \kappa \) is small enough we can ignore \( U_Y \) and \( U_Z \) compared to \( U_B \), but it is important to realise that however small \( U_B \) is, \( U_Y \) is always present.

2.6.2. Flow in a rectangular annulus.

Consider the flow in a rectangular annulus of sides \( 2a \) and \( (r_2 - r_1) \) with walls parallel and perpendicular to the field being perfectly conducting and non-conducting respectively, as shown in fig. (2.6). The flow is driven by a total current \( I \) and therefore from (2.6.6) the boundary conditions on \( H_B \) are:

at \( z = \pm a \), \( \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r H_0) = 0 \),

at \( r = r_1, r_2 \), \( \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r H_0) = 0 \).

Then let \( H_0 = I_1 / 2\pi r \) at \( z = +a \),

and \( H_0 = I_2 / 2\pi r \) at \( z = -a \),

where \( I_1, I_2 \) are constants so that,

\[
2\pi \int_a^{+a} j_1 d_1 = I_2 - I_1 = I.
\]

We now normalize \( U_B, H_B \) by writing:

\[
U_B = \frac{v r I}{4\pi a \int \sigma \eta} , \quad H_B = \frac{I_1 + I_2 + \hbar}{4\pi a} , \quad M = \alpha B_0 (\sigma / \eta)^{1/2} , \quad \hat{c} = r / a , \quad \hat{z} = z / a .
\]

Then \( v \) and \( \hat{h} \) satisfy:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \hat{z}^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \hat{r}^2} + \frac{1}{\hat{c}} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \hat{c}} - \frac{v}{\hat{c}} \right) + M \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial \hat{z}} = 0 \\
\left( \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial \hat{z}^2} + \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial \hat{r}^2} + \frac{1}{\hat{c}} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \hat{c}} - \frac{h}{\hat{c}} \right) + M \frac{\partial v}{\partial \hat{z}} = 0
\end{array} \right. \\
\end{aligned}
\]

subject to:

\[
\begin{aligned}
&v = 0, \quad \hat{h} = \pm \frac{1}{\hat{c}} \quad \text{when} \quad \hat{z} = \pm 1, \\
&\hat{v} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \hat{h}}{\partial \hat{c}} + \hat{h} = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad \hat{c} = \hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2.
\end{aligned}
\]
Dividing up the duct into similar zones as in H & S, we can perform a similar asymptotic analysis when \( M \gg 1 \).

(i) Core: Since \( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2} \sim \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial \xi^2} = O(1) \),

\[ u_c = \bar{u}(\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad h_c = f(\xi), \]

where \( g \) and \( f \) are functions of \( \xi \) to be determined by the primary boundary layers.

(ii) Primary boundary layers: Since \( \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial \xi^2} \gg \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}}{\partial \xi^2} \), (2.6.6) becomes:

\[ \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial \xi^2} + M \frac{\partial \bar{h}}{\partial \xi} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}}{\partial \xi^2} + M \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial \xi} = 0 \quad 2.6.11. \]

where \( \bar{u} = u_p + u_c, \bar{h} = h_c + h_p \) and \( u_p, h_p \) are subject to:

\[ \begin{align*}
  u_p &= -u_c, \quad h_p = -\frac{1}{\xi} - h_c & \text{at } \xi = 1, \\
  u_p &= -u_c, \quad h_p = \frac{1}{\xi} - h_c & \text{at } \xi = -1, \\
  u_p &\to 0, \quad h_p \to 0 & \text{away from walls.}
\end{align*} \]

Then in the boundary layer at \( \xi = 1 \)

\[ u_p = \frac{1}{\xi} e^{-M(1-\xi)}, \quad h_p = -\frac{1}{\xi} e^{-M(1-\xi)} \quad 2.6.12a. \]

and at \( \xi = -1 \),

\[ u_p = \frac{1}{\xi} e^{-M(1+\xi)}, \quad h_p = \frac{1}{\xi} e^{-M(1+\xi)} \quad 2.6.12b. \]

It follows that \( f(\xi) = 0 \) and \( g(\xi) = \frac{1}{\xi} \) so that,

\[ u_c = -\frac{1}{\xi}, \quad h_c = 0 \quad 2.6.13. \]

(iii) Region d

The analysis for this region follows that in §2.5.2 with the result that on the wall \( \xi = 1 \),

\[ u_S(\xi, 1) + h_S(\xi, 1) = 0, \]

where \( u = u_c + u_p + u_S, \ h = h_c + h_p + h_S \). Thus we have a boundary condition on \( (u_S + h_S) \) at \( \eta = 1 \), which we need for the analysis of the secondary boundary layer - region (c).
(iv) **Secondary boundary layer**

In this region we assume, as in H & S (§2), that:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \gg \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}
\]

However in this case we make the additional assumption that,

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \gg \frac{1}{\epsilon}
\]

or in other words \( \xi = O(aM^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \ll \rho \), the radius of the inner wall.

Clearly if the condition is satisfied when \( \rho = \rho_1 \), it is also satisfied when \( \rho = \rho_2 \). Then, in the layer on the wall at \( \rho = \rho_1 \), if \( u_5 = -(M/\epsilon_1)w_5 \)

and \( h_s = (M/\epsilon_1)h_s' \), \( u_5' \) and \( h_s' \) satisfy (2.25) of H & S, namely:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 u_5'}{\partial \xi^2} + M \frac{\partial h_s'}{\partial \eta} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 h_s'}{\partial \xi^2} + M \frac{\partial u_5'}{\partial \eta} = 0
\]

and the boundary conditions:

\[
u_5' = -\frac{1}{M}, \quad \frac{\partial h_s'}{\partial \eta} = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad \rho = \rho_1,
\]

since \( \frac{\partial h_s}{\partial \rho} \sim \frac{h_s}{\rho} \), in virtue of (2.614). Now we can use the solutions for \( r_s \) and \( h_s \) in §2 of H & S. The result for the velocity deficiency on the wall \( \rho = \rho_1 \), is:

\[
\int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} u_5 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \rho \rho d\theta d\rho = \frac{M}{\epsilon} \frac{(-\frac{1}{2})!}{(\frac{1}{2})!} \frac{2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{M^\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\rho} = (\rho - \rho_1) M^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

and on the wall \( \rho = \rho_2 \):

\[
= M \frac{(-\frac{1}{2})!}{(-\frac{3}{2})!} \frac{2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{M^{\frac{3}{2}}} \frac{(\frac{1}{2})!}{(\frac{3}{2})!} \frac{2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\rho^2} \frac{1}{\rho_2^2} \frac{2}{\rho_2^2} + \int_0^\infty \int_0^{2\pi} u_5 \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \rho \rho d\theta d\rho.
\]

This may be rewritten:

\[
\bar{Q} = \int_{\rho_1}^{\rho_2} \int_{-a}^{+a} u_5 \rho d\rho d\zeta,
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln (\rho_2/\rho_1)}{\epsilon \eta} \left[ 1 - \frac{0.56 (r_2 - r_1) a}{M^{\frac{3}{2}} r_1 r_2 \ln (r_2/r_1) \eta} \right] 2.6.15.
\]

Now if we integrate (2.6.5a) across the duct, then:

\[
\int_{\rho_1}^{\rho_2} \int_{-a}^{+a} (\frac{\partial \bar{Q}}{\partial \zeta}) d\rho d\zeta = 2a \Delta \phi \text{where} \Delta \phi \text{is the fall in potential from}
\]
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the wall at \( r = r_1 \), to that \( r = r_2 \). Thence
\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta \phi &= -B_0 \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \frac{r}{\sigma} \, d\theta \, dr 
&= -B_0 \Delta \phi + \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \frac{1}{(\sigma 2\pi r)} dr 
\end{align*}
\]
Therefore
\[
\Delta \phi = \frac{B_0 \Delta \phi}{2a} - I \ln \left( \frac{r_2}{r_1} \right) \left( \frac{4\pi a}{\sigma} \right). 
\]
From (2.6.16) and (2.6.15) we obtain an expression for the resistance of the channel i.e. the ratio of \( \Delta \phi \) to \( I \):
\[
\frac{\Delta \phi}{I} = \frac{M \ln \left( \frac{r_2}{r_1} \right)}{4\pi a \sigma} \left[ -\frac{\frac{956}{2} \frac{(r_2 + r_1) \alpha}{M^2 \sigma^2} \ln \left( \frac{r_2 + r_1}{r_2 - r_1} \right) + \mathcal{O}(M^{-3/2})}{M^2 \ln \left( \frac{r_2}{r_1} \right)} \right]. 
\]

2.6.3. Experimental results.

J.A. Baylis performed some experiments in the Cambridge University Engineering Laboratory on electrically driven flows in square annular channels at high Hartmann number (Baylis, 1966). Although secondary flow was present in all his experiments, when the field was high enough and the current low enough it was negligible. (When secondary flow occurs, \( \Delta \phi \) does not increase linearly with \( I \), as is to be expected from (2.6.17), and is detected in this way). In order to analyze the experimental results in the non-linear regime, Baylis plotted the variable \( P = \frac{I B_0 \alpha}{(\tilde{M} R \tilde{N} \tilde{A})} \) as a function of \( M \), where \( Q \) is calculated from (2.6.16). The theoretical value of \( P \) from (2.6.16) and (2.6.17) is:
\[
P = \left[ \frac{R}{2a} \left( \ln \left( \frac{R + a}{R - a} \right) \right) \right] \left[ -1 - \frac{\frac{956}{2} \frac{\alpha}{R^2 - a^2} \ln \left( \frac{R + a}{R - a} \right)}{M^2 \ln \left( \frac{R_2}{R_1} \right)} + \mathcal{O}(M^{-3/2}) \right]. 
\]

where \( R = (r_2 + r_1)/2 \). The experimental results are compared with the theoretical in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( R/a )</th>
<th>( P_{\text{theor.}} )</th>
<th>( P_{\text{exp.}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.19 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>R/a</td>
<td>P_{theor.}</td>
<td>P_{exp.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.23 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.12 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>1.045 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, although most of the experimental results differ from the theoretical by less than the experimental error, they are systematically below the theoretical value, for which there is no ready explanation.

We note that the value of M is low enough for the term in \((M^{1/2})\) to be appreciable, so that the theory for the secondary boundary layers may be considered to be fairly well tested. Also the values of R/a are low enough for the effects of the curvature of the duct to be appreciable, so that the modification of the H & S theory for curved ducts may be considered satisfactory.
2.7. Magnetohydrodynamic flow in channels of variable cross section with strong transverse magnetic fields.*

2.7.1. Introduction.

In section 2.7 we consider the effects of a strong uniform magnetic field,

\[ \mathbf{B}_0 = (0, B_0, 0) \]

on steady two-dimensional flows, whose velocities are given by,

\[ \mathbf{u} = (u_x(x, y), u_y(x, y), 0) \]

through ducts with walls at

\[ y = f_t(x), f_b(x) \text{ and } z = \pm b, \]

where we assume \( b \gg (f_t - f_b) \) (The effects on the flow of boundary layers on the walls at \( z = \pm b \) are considered negligible). The analysis also enables us to examine the flow over a body placed in such a duct. Unlike a wind tunnel, a duct for investigating MHD flow over bodies has to be placed in a magnet whose gap is usually small. Consequently the duct size is severely limited and, for flow over a practical size of body, wall effects cannot be ignored even outside the boundary layers. We examine the inviscid regions taking into account the effects of the wall and we also examine the boundary layers on the walls.

Ludford (1961) and Ludford & Singh (1963) have developed much of the existing theory for external flows in transverse magnetic fields over two and three-dimensional bodies. They assume that the magnetic field is strong, and that the conductivity is weak enough to ignore the induced magnetic field. This is equivalent to assuming that the interaction parameter \( N = \sigma B_0^2 / \rho U_0 \gg 1 \), and that the magnetic Reynolds number

\[ R_m = \mu \alpha (U_0 a) \ll 1, \]

where \( B_0, \sigma, \rho, \mu, \alpha \) are the flux density of the imposed transverse magnetic field and the fluid's density, conductivity and magnetic permeability, respectively. \( U_0 \) and \( a \) are the characteristic velocity and length.

Making this approximation for two-dimensional flow, Ludford (1961)

* The analysis presented here is the same as that submitted jointly with Dr. S. Leibovich in a paper to the Journal of Fluid Mechanics. In the paper the problem of flow over two-dimensional bodies was considered in greater detail, this part of the paper being written by Leibovich. The work presented in this thesis is my own in all essentials.
found that in the 'inner' region near the body the inertial terms in
the momentum equation are negligible compared to the electromagnetic and
pressure forces, except in singular zones at the front and rear of the
bodies. In the 'outer' region sufficiently far in the field, or y
direction from the body he found that inertia forces again became
important. He discussed their effect by compressing the y co-ordinate
to retain the influence of inertia and found expressions for lift and
drag. The singularities in the inner region were left and the question
of how these may affect the flow was not resolved.

We apply Ludford's approximations to flows in ducts in which we
also consider viscous effects in boundary layers at the walls. Then the
region outside the boundary layers where viscous forces are negligible
 corresponds to Ludford's 'inner' region and we treat this region in a
similar manner to Ludford, though, unlike Ludford, we succeed in
analysing the singular zones which occur whenever the duct wall curvature
is O(N). We then examine the boundary layers by assuming that the
Hartmann number M>>1. We are able to extend the usual analysis of
these layers (Stewartson 1960) by calculating the higher order approxi-
mations, which is possible because of the simplicity of the core flow
solution (away from the singular zones), for which an expansion in
inverse powers of N may easily be found.

The approximation used by Ludford has also been used very success-
fully by Bornhorst (1965) to calculate the effect of a magnetic field on
the free surface of a mercury flow when N>>1. The fact that the
theory accurately predicted the free surface profiles found experimentally
demonstrates the usefulness of the approximation. It is worth observing
that, in general, it is not difficult to devise laboratory experiments
which satisfy our criteria that N>>1, R_m <= 1 and M>>1, while having
the Reynolds number large enough for accurate readings of pressure,
velocity, etc to be taken. With regard to the practical usefulness of
our approximation, our criteria are not satisfied by the flows in most
MHD devices at the moment, (e.g. in the biggest MHD generators N is only
O(1)). However, as their size and their field strength increase, so
that N increases, our approximate methods may become increasingly useful
in examining the flows in MHD pumps, generators, etc.
2.7.2. **Statement of the problem.**

The Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations for steady, incompressible flow when the fluid properties are constant are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{v} &= -\nabla p + \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} + \eta \nabla^2 \mathbf{v}, \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} &= 0, \\
\mathbf{j} &= \sigma (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}), \\
\nabla \times \mathbf{E} &= 0, \\
\mathbf{J} &= \frac{1}{\mu} \nabla \times \mathbf{B}, \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \mathbf{v} \), \( p \), \( \mathbf{j} \), \( \mathbf{B} \), \( \mathbf{E} \) are velocity, pressure, current density, magnetic flux density and electric field respectively. When \( R_m \ll 1 \), we can ignore the induced magnetic field due to \( \mathbf{j} \) and assume that, in equations (2.7.1) and (2.7.3)

\[
\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_0,
\]

where \( \mathbf{B}_0 \) is the imposed magnetic field.

If now we consider a two-dimensional flow in the \( x-y \) plane, such that

\[
\mathbf{v}_z = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} = 0
\]

then,

\[
\frac{\partial E_x}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial E_y}{\partial z} = 0
\]

and hence from (2.7.4)

\[
\frac{\partial E_x}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial E_y}{\partial y} = 0
\]

Whether the walls at \( y = f_1(x) \), \( f_2(x) \) are conducting or not, provided there are no current sources or sinks along these walls, it may be shown that \( E_x = E_y = 0 \). (If the electrical boundary conditions on the walls at \( z = \pm b \) vary rapidly in the \( x \)-direction then it follows that \( \partial \mathbf{E} / \partial z \neq 0 \) and \( E_x \neq 0 \); thus the applicability of the basic assumptions to real flows must always be carefully checked. We discuss this point further in the conclusion). If the magnetic field \( \mathbf{B}_0 \) lies in the \( y \)-direction and if we reduce the parameters to a non-dimensional form in terms of \( Q \), the total flow rate through the duct per unit depth, \( \frac{B_0}{\alpha} \), and \( \alpha \), a representative channel width, the equations become:
Fig. 2.7. Flow regions: core (C), boundary layers (B) and Ludford layers (L) discussed in § 2.7.2.

'\textit{Ludford} Layer'

Fig. 2.8. Illustration of the basic problem for the \textit{Ludford layer}.
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} &= -\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - N (u + E_0) + R^{-1} \nabla^2 u, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} &= -\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} + R^{-1} \nabla^2 v, \\
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} &= 0, \\
\end{align*}
\]

where \( u = u_x / (\Theta / \alpha) \), \( v = v_y / (\Theta / \alpha) \), \( p = p / (\Theta / \alpha^2) \), \( E_0 = E / (\Theta / \alpha) \)
\( \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} = x, y, z / \alpha \), \( N = \sigma B_0 \alpha / \rho \), \( \alpha \) and \( \tilde{B} \).

To solve these equations and satisfy the boundary conditions we postulate the existence of various regions in the flow, which we examine in turn. The solutions which are found to satisfy the boundary conditions, match each other at the boundaries of the regions and are consistent with the original assumptions. We will now discuss the approximations to be used (see figure 2.7) by looking at the general problem of flow over a body placed in a duct with diverging walls.

**Regions C (core flow).**

In these regions, away from the boundaries, velocity gradients may be assumed to be \( O(1) \) so that viscous forces are negligible and, since \( \alpha \gg 1 \), the electromagnetic forces are very much greater than the inertial forces. Thus in these regions the electromagnetic force is balanced by the pressure gradient, and consequently the body force, \( \dot{\jmath} \times \tilde{B} \), is irrotational. Since, as pointed out by Shercliff (1965), the \( \dot{\jmath} \times \tilde{B} \) force only affects the motion of an incompressible fluid with no free surfaces when it is rotational, it appears paradoxical that, when no viscous effects are present, as the \( \dot{\jmath} \times \tilde{B} \) force becomes sufficiently large it becomes irrotational. The explanation is that, although in the final flow pattern the \( \dot{\jmath} \times \tilde{B} \) force is irrotational, in the setting-up process the \( \dot{\jmath} \times \tilde{B} \) force has to be rotational. Note that, when the inertial forces are negligible, the velocity is very simply determined by Ohm's Law and the continuity equation, as shown in $83$. But, as Indford
has shown, this approximation breaks down in the region near a discontinuity in the slope of the boundary walls, as illustrated by the kink in the streamlines between $C_1$, $C_2$ and $C_2C_3$ in figure 2.7.

**Regions L.** (Ludford Layers).

These regions emanate in the field direction from places where the slope of the boundary walls changes rapidly. Consequently $U'$ changes rapidly in the x direction and therefore in these regions the inertial and viscous forces are appreciable. These are the singular regions near the front and rear of a body which Ludford did not analyse. The structure of these regions, which we shall call 'Ludford' layers, is analysed in §4 and is shown to depend on the relative size of $M$ and $R$. For the parameter range of interest it is shown that the thickness of these layers is $O(N^{-1/3})$. Our analysis assumes the slopes of the boundaries is always finite, though their rate of change may be infinite. This means we do not analyse the layers emanating from the rear of the body in figure 2.7, but only from the front. However, since duct walls usually have finite slopes, the analysis is valid for most practical situations.

**Regions B.**

In these regions boundary layers are formed. We shall assume that their thickness is small compared with the size of the duct and that in these layers the dominant forces are viscous and electromagnetic. These assumptions are shown in §5 to be equivalent to assuming $N >> 1$ and $M >> 1$, the thickness of the boundary layer being $O(N^{-1})$. In this analysis we implicitly assume that, as a result of several experimental and theoretical investigations, if $N$ and $M$ are sufficiently large there is no separation of the boundary layers. In experimental investigations of the flow over cylinders, spheres and flat plates, (Tsinober, 1963, and Tsinober, Shtern & Shcherbinin, 1963), and flow through a diverging channel, (Heiser, 1964), it was shown that when the magnetic field is sufficiently great, it can completely suppress the separation of a boundary layer, while some theoretical evidence for this phenomenon has been provided by Moreau (1964) who demonstrated that a transverse magnetic field can suppress the separation of boundary layers on a flat plate and on a cylinder.
2.7.3. Core flow.

As Ludford (1961) has shown, in the limit \( N \to \infty \), Equations (2.7.7) reduce to

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) \quad & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} + N (u + E_0) = 0, \\
(b) \quad & \frac{\partial (\tilde{f}/N)}{\partial y} = 0, \\
(c) \quad & \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = 0,
\end{align*}
\]

2.7.8.

on allowing \( p \) to grow large with \( N \) and assuming that velocity gradients are \( o(N) \). Equations (2.7.8) have the solution

\[
\begin{align*}
u &= -f^\prime(\tilde{x}), \quad \tilde{p} = N\left[ f(\tilde{x}) - \tilde{x}E_0 \right],
\end{align*}
\]

2.7.9.

Clearly, this solution cannot satisfy the no-slip condition \( u = 0, v = 0 \) at the walls. In fact, Hartmann layers must form there, of thickness \( o(N^{-1}) \) to reduce the tangential velocity of the core flow (2.7.9) to zero. (See § 2.7.5). We therefore relax the no-slip condition, and require only that the normal velocity at the walls vanish.*

For flow in a duct the top and bottom walls of which are described by the equations \( \tilde{y} = F_t(\tilde{x}), \tilde{y} = F_b(\tilde{x}) \) respectively, the boundary conditions are satisfied if

\[
F_t f''(\tilde{x}) + g(\tilde{x}) = F_t f' u, \quad F_b f'' + g = F_b f' u,
\]

or

\[
g(\tilde{x}) = \frac{F_b f' - F_t f'}{F_b - F_t} \left[ -f(\tilde{x}) \right].
\]

2.7.10.

Furthermore, to satisfy the continuity requirement,

\[
\int_{F_t}^{F_b} u \, d \tilde{y} = \tilde{\omega} = (f' F_t - F_b) \tilde{\omega},
\]

2.7.11.

Thus,

\[
u = \frac{1}{F_t - F_b}, \quad \tilde{\omega} = \frac{1}{(F_t - F_b)^2} \left[ F_t (\tilde{y} - F_b) + F_b (F_t - \tilde{y}) \right],
\]

2.7.12.

* Ludford (1961) also deals with the solution (3.2). Since he is concerned with an infinite domain, however, he must take \( f' = \text{constant} \), and cannot satisfy boundary conditions at infinity. These are satisfied by considering inertial effects for large \( y \).
and $\tilde{p}$ may be found in terms of $E$ and $Q$ by integration.

If now a body is placed in the duct the top and bottom walls of which are at $\tilde{y} = c_t(X)$, $\tilde{y} = c_b(X)$, ($l_1 < X < l_2$), then the solution when $l_1 < X < l_2$ for the flow between the body and the top wall is:

$$u = \frac{1}{f_t - C_t}, \quad v = \frac{1}{(f_t - C_t)^2} \left[ f_t' (\tilde{y} - C_t) + C_t' (f_t - \tilde{y}) \right], \quad 2.7.13a$$

and for the flow between the body and the bottom wall is:

$$u = \frac{1}{c_b - F_b}, \quad v = \frac{1}{(c_b - F_b)^2} \left[ C_b' (\tilde{y} - F_b) + F_b' (c_b - \tilde{y}) \right], \quad 2.7.13b$$

The solution for $X < l_1$, and $X > l_2$ is unaltered by the presence of the body. Thus the flow over a body in a duct is identical to the flow in two separate ducts, their walls being the top and bottom walls of the duct, the dividing streamlines and the top and bottom walls of the body. Therefore in the following analysis, where we only mention flows in ducts, we are implicitly treating flows over bodies as well.

Our duct flow solution (2.7.12) (or pseudo duct flow (2.7.13)) holds whenever the wall slopes and curvatures are finite, since:

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{\partial u}{\partial X} = \frac{1}{N(f_t - F_b)^2} \left[ f_t'' (\tilde{y} - F_b) + F_b'' (f_t - \tilde{y}) \right]$$

$$- 2 \frac{f_t' - F_b'}{f_t - F_b} \left[ f_t' (\tilde{y} - F_b) + F_b' (f_t - \tilde{y}) \right].$$

However, if $f_t'_{,b}$ or $F_b'_{,b} = 0(N)$, (2.7.8) fails to hold. As discussed in §2, we only deal with the case where $f_t'_{,b} = 0(1)$, so that we only consider situations where (2.7.12) fails to hold owing to the curvature being $O(N)$. (The solution (2.7.13) always fails at the front and rear of a body except in the unlikely event of the body being casp shaped at these points).

The solution (2.7.12) may be regarded as the leading terms in an asymptotic expansion:

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde{u} &= u_0 + N^{-1} u_1 + N^{-2} u_2 + \ldots \\
\tilde{v} &= v_0 + N^{-1} v_1 + N^{-2} v_2 + \ldots \\
\tilde{p} &= N (\tilde{p}_0 + N^{-1} \tilde{p}_1 + \ldots)
\end{align*} \quad 2.7.14$$
To consider the higher approximations and still ignore viscous effects
M has to be sufficiently large. But since we are only interested in
the first or second order approximations, if $M \gg N$ we can ignore viscous
effects in the core. To find $u_1$, $u_1^-$, $p_1$, we substitute (2.7.14)
into (2.7.7) and equate terms of $O(1)$.

The solutions for $u_1$ and $u_1^-$ that satisfy the boundary condition
that the normal velocity vanishes at the walls are

$$u_1 = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \frac{y^2 - F_t^3 - F_b^3}{6(F_t - F_b)} \right] \frac{d G_1}{d x} - \left[ \frac{y^2}{2} \right] \frac{d G_2}{d x},$$

$$u_1^- = \frac{2}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{y^2 - F_b^3}{6} \right] \frac{d G_1}{d x} - \left[ \frac{y^2}{2} \right] \frac{d G_2}{d x},$$

where

$$G_1 = \frac{d}{(F_t - F_b)^2} \frac{d x}{d x} \left( \frac{F_t^3 - F_b^3}{F_t - F_b} \right),$$

$$G_2 = \frac{d}{(F_t - F_b)^2} \frac{d x}{d x} \left( \frac{F_t F_b^3 - F_b F_t^3}{F_t - F_b} \right).$$

We note that if the wall slope becomes $O(N^{1/3})$, $N^{-1}$ becomes of the same
order as $u_0$, so that $F_t^3, F_b^3 \ll O(N^{1/3})$ for the first approximation to be
valid.

2.7.4. The Ludford layer equations.

In regions where the wall curvature is $O(N)$ the inertial forces
cannot be neglected and the solution for the core flow, (2.7.12), is no
longer valid. Suppose such a region exists at $x = 0$, then we see from
(2.7.12) that $U_0$ has an $O(1)$ jump while $U_0$ is continuous at this point.
(See the example of §2.7.6). Now let us assume that
the width of this region in the streamwise direction, $\delta$, is very much
less than the width of the channel, i.e. $\delta \ll 1$, and that the region
appears to be a discontinuity in the limit $N \to \infty$. Then the problem is
to show that such a layer can exist by finding a solution for $u_1, u_1^-$ in
the layer which matches $u_0, u_0^-$ in the core (See figure 2.8).

We first stretch the x-co-ordinate according to the rule:

-41-
\( \tilde{x} = \delta x \).

Then, since \( U_0 \) has an \( O(1) \) jump in the layer, if the change in the layer is \( \Delta u = O(\delta) \). Accordingly, in the layer put

\[
u = \frac{1}{h(c)} + \delta (u(x, y)), \quad \tilde{p} = p/\delta,
\]

where \( h(\tilde{x}) = F_t(\tilde{x}) - F_b(\tilde{x}) \) is the channel width at station. Also let \( h(c) = h_0^* \). (In the following analysis we assume that \( \delta \gg o(N^{-1}) \)) in order that we can ignore higher order approximations to the core flow).

In terms of \( U, v, P, x, \tilde{y} \), equations (2.7.7) are

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) \quad \frac{1}{h_0} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \delta \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} &= -\frac{1}{h_0} \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} - \delta N u - N (E_0 + \frac{1}{h_0}) + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2}, \\
(b) \quad \frac{1}{h_0} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + \delta \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} &= -\frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{h_0} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2}, \\
(c) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where terms of \( O(R^{-1}) \) have been neglected compared to those of \( O(\delta^2 R^{-1}) \).

All unknown quantities appearing in (2.7.20) and their derivatives, are assumed to be \( O(1) \). Equation (2.7.20a) is then

\[
\frac{\partial P}{\partial x} = -\delta^3 N u - \delta^2 N (E_0 + \frac{1}{h_0}) + O(\delta^2) + O(\delta R^{-1})
\]

while (2.7.20b) is

\[
\frac{1}{h_0} \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{R \delta} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} + O(\delta)
\]

On eliminating the pressure and the core value of the \( \tilde{x} \times \mathbf{B} \) force, and ignoring the error terms, one obtains the equation

\[
\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + h_0 \delta^2 N \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} - \frac{h_0}{R \delta} \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial y^4} = 0,
\]

which is also satisfied by \( U \).

Depending on the values of \( N \) and \( R \) four possible situations may arise, leading to different values of \( \delta \).
(a) **Electromagnetic-viscous balance**: \( \dot{S}^4 N = \dot{S}^4 M^2 = 1 \), and \( \dot{S} R \ll 1 \). Thus \( \dot{S} = M^{-\frac{3}{2}} \), and \( M \gg R^2 \) is the requirement for the existence of such a layer. (This condition satisfies the criterion (4.3) for ignoring higher order terms).

(b) **Inertial-viscous balance**: \( \dot{S} = R^{-1} \) and \( \dot{S}^3 N \gg 1 \), which holds if \( 1 \ll R^2 \ll M \ll R^2 \). (To satisfy (2.7.19) this condition must be altered to \( 1 \ll R \ll M \ll R^2 \)).

(c) **Inertial-viscous-electromagnetic balance**: \( \dot{S}^3 N = \frac{M^2}{R^2} = O(1) \), \( \dot{S} = R^{-1} \)

which holds if \( M = R^2 \). (This also satisfies 2.7.19).

(d) **Inertial-electromagnetic balance**: \( \dot{S} = \left( \frac{h}{M} \right)^{1/3} \ll 1 \), \( R \gg 1 \), which holds if \( M = R \ll M \ll R^2 \) (Since \( \dot{S} = 0(N^{-1/3}) \), \( \dot{S} \gg 0(N^{-1}) \) and (2.7.19) is satisfied).

We now concentrate on the type of layer which occurs when \( M, R \) and \( N \) have typical experimental values, e.g. \( M = 500 \), \( R = 5000 \), \( N = 50 \). Thus we can ignore situations (a) and (c), but we have to consider both the situations (b) and (d) since they may both occur in the same range of \( M \) and \( R \). However, there is no solution to (2.7.23) which satisfies the required boundary condition as \( X \to \pm \infty \), if the electromagnetic term is neglected and a balance of the inertial and viscous forces is supposed to exist. Therefore we must consider the very much thicker layer which occurs in situation (d) where \( \dot{S} = O(N^{-1/3}) \). We call this layer the Ludford layer in recognition of the similarities between this work and that of his 1961 paper and assume its structure to be governed by the equation

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial X^2} + \frac{h}{M} \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial Y^2} = 0 \tag{2.7.24}
\]

We find that it is possible to construct a solution to this equation satisfying the boundary conditions and therefore we conclude that the errors, due to neglecting the higher order terms in (2.7.23) of \( O(N^{-1/3}) \), and due to neglecting the viscous terms of \( O(M/R^2)^{2/3} \), do not affect the solution to this order of approximation.

It is important to note that, with this length scale, the boundary curvature still tends to infinity with \( N \); in fact it is \( O(N^{-1/3}) \) in \((X, Y)\) space. Thus, the wall still has an abrupt change of slope at \( X = 0 \).

Since the problem is linear, we may break it into two parts. The core flow, from (2.7.12), may be written as \( v_0 = v_1 + v_2 \) where
\( \nu_1 = F_t^{-1}(\gamma - F_b)/h^2, \nu_2 = F_b^{-1}(F_t - \gamma)/h^2 \), and separate solutions for the Ludford layer may be found which match with \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_2 \) as \( X \to \pm \infty \).

Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that it is the bottom wall which curves abruptly and consider only the problem of matching with \( \nu_2 \). Let \( k_- = \lim_{x \to -0}(F_t'(x)/\lambda) \), \( R_+ = \lim_{x \to 0^+}(F_b'(x)/\lambda) \), and put \( F_t(0) - \gamma = h(-\gamma) = h_0(-\gamma) \).

The lower wall is then given by \( Y = 0 \) in the layer. The boundary conditions on \( \nu(x,t) \) in the layer are then

\[
\nu(X,1) = 0, \\
\nu(X,0) = k_-, X < 0, \\
= k_+, X > 0 \tag{2.7.25}, \tag{2.7.26}
\]

\( v \to k_-(1-Y) \) as \( X \to -\infty \), \( v \to k_+(1-Y) \) as \( X \to +\infty \), \( \tag{2.7.27}, \tag{2.7.28} \)

in order to match with \( \nu_2 \).

**Structure of the layer.**

The problem for \( \nu \) may be further divided by writing

\[
\nu = k_-(1-Y) + (k_+ - k_-)u^* \tag{2.7.29},
\]

where

\[
\nu^*(X,1) = 0, \\
\nu^*(X,0) = 0, X < 0, \\
= 1, X > 0 \tag{2.7.30},
\]

\( u^* \to 1-Y \) as \( X \to +\infty \), \( u^* \to 0 \) as \( X \to -\infty \)

\( \frac{\partial^3 u^*}{\partial X^3} + \frac{\partial^2 u^*}{\partial Y^2} = 0 \) \( \tag{2.7.31} \)

The solution to (2.7.31) may be found by separating the variables and using a Fourier series solution first making the further simplification:

\[
\nu^{\pm} = 1-Y + u^{\pm}_1 \tag{2.7.32},
\]

\( \equiv u^{\pm}_0 \) for \( X > 0 \), \( \equiv u^{\pm}_1 \) for \( X < 0 \).
Figure 2.9(a) Variation of $v$ with $x$ in the Littledford layer, at various values of $y$. 
Fig 29(b). Variation of $1 - y$ with $x$ in the Ludford layer of various values of $y$. 

$y = 0.8, y = 0.6, y = 0.4, y = 0.2$
Then these two solutions for $U^*$ and $V^*$ are found by matching $U^*$
and $\frac{\partial^2 U^*}{\partial X^2}$ at $X = 0$. The solution is:

for $X > 0$:
$$U^* = 1 - Y - \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n\pi} \cos\left(\frac{n\pi}{\sqrt{2}} X\right) e^{-\frac{(n\pi)^2}{2}} \sin(n\pi(1-y))$$

for $X < 0$:
$$U^* = \frac{2}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n\pi} e^{-\frac{(n\pi)^2}{2}} \sin(n\pi(1-y))$$

We see that these series for $\frac{\partial U^*}{\partial X}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 U^*}{\partial X^2}$ are divergent at $X = 0$, and therefore our method involves matching divergent series. However, the series are convergent for $|X| = \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon$ as small as we like. Therefore if we equate $\frac{\partial U^*}{\partial X}$ at $X = \varepsilon$ to $\frac{\partial U^*}{\partial X}$ at $X = +\varepsilon$, our method is legitimate.

These series for $U^*$ may also be derived using a Fourier Integral, as Leibovich has shown, (Hunt & Leibovich (1967)) and then the difficulty of matching diverging series is avoided. Graphs of $U^*$ and $I - Y - U^*$ against $X$ are plotted in figure 2.9; the discussion of the graphs is left to the conclusion of §2.7.

2.7.5. Hartmann boundary layers.

We turn now to the boundary layers, $B$, and show how to calculate the flow there to the same order of accuracy as in the core. Consider the non-dimensional equations (2.7.7) written in terms of the $s$, $n$, $z$ co-ordinate shown in figure 2.10 so that $\vec{u}$ is parallel to the wall and $\vec{V}$ is normal to the wall, and the magnetic field is at an angle $\alpha$ to the normal of the wall. We have:

$$\frac{\partial \vec{u}}{\partial s} + \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \nabla \vec{u}}{\partial n} = -\frac{\partial \vec{p}}{\partial s} - N \cos \alpha \left( E_o + \vec{u} \cdot \nabla \vec{u} \cdot \vec{m} \right) + \frac{1}{R} \nabla^2 \vec{u}, \quad 2.7.33.$$

$$\frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial s} + \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \nabla \vec{v}}{\partial n} = -\frac{\partial \vec{p}}{\partial s} - N \sin \alpha \left( E_o + \cos \alpha \cdot \vec{u} \cdot \vec{m} \right) + \frac{1}{R} \nabla^2 \vec{v}, \quad 2.7.34.$$

$$\frac{\partial \vec{u}}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial n} = 0 \quad 2.7.35.$$
Fig. 2.10 Notation for the boundary layer analysis in §2.7.5.

2.11(a) Velocity distribution in the core of a diverging flow in a right walled duct at $x=a$, $\theta=45^\circ$. 

\[ B_0 \]

\[ (1 + 1.68 N^{-1})(Q_{14a}) \]

\[ (1 - 0.083 N^{-1})(Q_{14a}) \]
These equations may be simplified by ignoring terms of order, \( \delta_i \), where \( \delta_i (\ll 1) \), is the non-dimensional boundary layer thickness.

Then if we write \( J = n/\delta \), and \( \bar{V} = \delta \bar{v} \), the above equations become:

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{u} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial \bar{y}} + \bar{V} \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial \bar{y}} &= -\frac{\partial P}{\partial \bar{y}} - N \cos \alpha (E_0 + \bar{u} \cos \alpha) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\delta_i R} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}}{\partial \bar{y}^2} + o(\delta_i, N), \\
\frac{\partial \bar{V}}{\partial \bar{y}} &= -\frac{\partial P}{\partial \bar{y}} + o(\delta_i, N) + o(\bar{R}^{-1}),
\end{align*}
\]

As with the 'Hudford' layer, the structure of this boundary layer also depends on the relative sizes of \( M \) and \( R \). In this case if \( N(\sim M^2/R) \gg 1 \) there is only one possible type of boundary layer i.e. one in which the electromagnetic and viscous terms are very much greater than the inertial terms and balance each other. Hence it follows from (2.7.36) that

\[
N = O(\delta_i^2 R^{-1})
\]

or \( \delta_i = O(N R)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = O(M^{-1}) \)  

For the boundary layer thickness to be small compared with the duct width, \( \delta_i \) must be small, or \( M \gg 1 \).

With this approximation and, using (2.7.37) we can obtain the zeroth order solution for \( \bar{u} \), \( \bar{u}_o \), which satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= - \frac{1}{N} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \bar{y}} - \cos \alpha (E_0 + \bar{u}_o \cos \alpha) + \frac{1}{\delta_i R} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_o}{\partial \bar{y}^2} \\
&= - \frac{1}{N} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \bar{y}} - \cos \alpha (E_0 + \bar{u}_o \cos \alpha)
\end{align*}
\]

and the no slip condition at the wall. The solution is

\[
\bar{u}_o = \bar{u}_o \infty (1 - e^{-\int \cos \alpha})
\]

where \( \bar{u}_o \infty \) is the component of the zeroth order core velocity parallel to the wall (Stewartson 1960).

The higher order approximations to \( \bar{u} \), \( \bar{V} \) and \( \bar{P} \) depend on the relative magnitude of \( M \) and \( N \), \( (\sim M^2/R) \), since \( \bar{u} \), \( \bar{V} \) and \( \bar{P} \) may be expressed as asymptotic expansions in \( M^{-1}, N^{-1} \), or in a combination of powers of \( M^{-1} \) and \( N^{-1} \). Let us consider the two limiting cases when \( M^{-1} \gg M^{-1} \) and \( M^{-1} \gg N^{-1} \) and the expansion may be written:
\( \bar{v} = \bar{v}_0 + (N^{-1} \bar{v}_{1n} + N^{-2} \bar{v}_{2n} + \ldots) + [M^{-1} \bar{v}_{1m} + M^{-2} \bar{v}_{2m} + \ldots] \),
\( \bar{u} = \bar{u}_0 + (N^{-1} \bar{u}_{1n} + N^{-2} \bar{u}_{2n} + \ldots) + [M^{-1} \bar{u}_{1m} + M^{-2} \bar{u}_{2m} + \ldots] \),
\( \bar{p} = N \left\{ P_0 + (N^{-1} P_{1n} + N^{-2} P_{2n} + \ldots) + [M^{-1} P_{1m} + \ldots] \right\} \),

where the expansion in either the square or round brackets vanish in the two cases. Then, in the first case, i.e. \( N^{-1} \gg M^{-1} \), the expansion can only proceed until \( N^{-r} \sim M^{-1} \) for some \( r \), at which point it must either be terminated or a new mixed expansion of the form \( N^{-r} M^{-s} \) must be considered. We may note that in this case \( M \) and \( R \) have the same relative magnitudes as in our analysis of the Ludford layer, i.e.

\[ R^2 \ll M \ll R^2 \]

which is a condition satisfied in many experiments. Also in the first case it is important to realise that the higher order approximations may be matched to those in the core.

In the second case, i.e. \( M^{-1} \gg N^{-1} \), \( M \gg R \), the expansion is carried out in terms of \( M^{-1} \), or equivalently \( \mathcal{E} \), which means that at the wall the core velocity is not regarded as parallel to it. Therefore the core velocity also has to be expressed as a series in \( \mathcal{E} \) and has to be matched to the boundary layer solution in such a way that the core velocity ceases to be independent of the boundary layer flow. We ignore this expansion since it is of no practical use and concentrate on the first case.

We first find \( \bar{u}_{1n} \), using the zeroth order solution (2.7.39);

\( \bar{u}_{1n} \) satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{u}_0 \frac{\partial \bar{u}_2}{\partial s} + \bar{u}_0 \bar{u}_0 \left( \int_0^s \frac{\partial \bar{u}_0}{\partial s} \, ds \right) &= -\frac{\partial P_{1n}}{\partial s} - \bar{u}_{1n} \cos^2 \alpha \left( \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_{1n}}{\partial s^2} \right), \\
0 &= -\frac{\partial P_{1n}}{\partial s}.
\end{align*}
\]

Hence

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_{1n}}{\partial s^2} - \bar{u}_{1n} \cos^2 \alpha &= \bar{u}_0 \cos \frac{d(u_0 \cos \alpha)}{ds} \left[ (1 - e^{-s \cos \alpha}) \right. \\
&- \cos \alpha \left( e^{-s \cos \alpha} \left( \frac{1 - e^{-s \cos \alpha}}{\cos \alpha} \right) + \frac{\partial P_{1n}}{\partial s} \right),
\end{align*}
\]

2.7.41.
Outside the layer \( \bar{u}_{in} = \bar{u}_{in} \) and
\[
\frac{d \rho_{in}}{ds} = - \bar{u}_{in} \cos \alpha = \bar{u}_{\infty} \frac{d \bar{u}_{in}}{ds}
\]
Hence we can rewrite (2.7.41) as
\[
\frac{d^2 \bar{u}_{in}}{ds^2} - \bar{u}_{in} \cos \alpha = \frac{d}{ds} \left( \bar{u}_{\infty}^2 \right) \left[ (1 + f \cos \alpha) e^{-f \cos \alpha} \right] - \bar{u}_{\infty} \cos \alpha
\]
The solution for \( \bar{u}_{in} \), is
\[
\bar{u}_{in} = \bar{u}_{\infty} (1 - e^{-f \cos \alpha}) + \frac{d}{ds} \left( \bar{u}_{\infty}^2 \right) \left[ \frac{3 \cos \alpha + 2 \cos^2 \alpha}{8 \cos \alpha} \right] e^{-f \cos \alpha}
\]
To find \( \bar{u}_{\infty} \) and \( \bar{u}_{\infty} \) we use the results of §2.7.3, noting that
\[
\bar{u}_{\infty} = u_o \cos \alpha + v_o \sin \alpha,
\]
and
\[
\bar{u}_{\infty} = u_o \cos \alpha + v_1 \sin \alpha,
\]
where \( u_o = F_j \) and \( u_o, v_o, u_1, v_1 \), are as defined in §2.7.3.
In principle, higher order terms in the expression for \( \bar{u} \) may be found, since only linear equations need be solved. The algebra is complicated, however.

2.7.6. Example: flow through a straight-walled converging and diverging ducts.
We now consider the flow through a simple duct as an example.
Let it have walls at:
\[
\bar{y} = \pm 1 \quad \text{for} \quad \bar{x} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{y} = \pm (1 + \bar{x} \tan \alpha) \quad \text{for} \quad \bar{x} \geq 0,
\]
where the upper inequality is appropriate for the diverging duct and the lower for the converging.
Then the zeroth order solution outside the Ludford layers is
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{x} &< 0 \quad \text{core; } \quad u_o = \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad v_o = 0, \\
\partial p_o / \partial \bar{x} & = - N(1 + E_o),
\end{align*}
\]
boundary layer; \( u_o = 1 - e^{-\bar{x}} \)
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{x} &> 0 \quad \text{core; } \quad u_o = \frac{1}{2(1 + \bar{x} \tan \alpha)}, \quad v_o = \frac{\bar{y} \tan \alpha}{2(1 + \bar{x} \tan \alpha)^2}, \\
\partial p_o / \partial \bar{x} & = - N \left[ \frac{\bar{y} \tan \alpha}{2(1 + \bar{x} \tan \alpha)^2} + E_o \right],
\end{align*}
\]
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Fig 2.11.(b) Velocity distribution in the core of a converging flow in a straight walled duct at $x = -a, \theta = -45^\circ$
Figure. Velocity profiles of $U_{s_0}$ and $U_{s_1}$ in the boundary layer, where $x = \pm a, \alpha = \pm 45^\circ$. (Note that $U_s = U_{s_0} + N^{-1}U_{s_1}$ and $y = M^{-1}n$, where $n$ is the co-ordinate normal to the wall.)
boundary layer:  
\[ \overline{u}_c = \frac{(1-e^{-\gamma j})}{(2\cos\alpha(1+\alpha \tan \alpha))} \]  
\[ \text{where} \quad \gamma = \frac{M (1-\beta)}{M (1-\beta)} \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma > 0, \quad \beta > 0 \]
\[ = \frac{M (1-\beta)}{M (1-\beta)} \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma < 0, \quad \beta > 0 \]
\[ = (1+\alpha \tan \alpha - \gamma) \cos \alpha \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma > 0, \quad \beta < 0 \]
\[ = (1+\alpha \tan \alpha - \gamma) \cos \alpha \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma < 0, \quad \beta < 0 \]

When \( x \leq 0 \) the first order solution is:
\[ u_1 = u_1 = \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = 0 \]
(All higher orders are also zero).

When \( x \geq 0 \) the first order solution is:

\[ u_1 = \frac{\tan^2 \alpha}{2(1+\alpha \tan \alpha)^3} \left( \gamma^2 - \frac{(1+\alpha \tan \alpha)^2}{3} \right), \quad v_1 = \frac{\tan^2 \alpha}{2(1+\alpha \tan \alpha)^3} \left( \frac{5\gamma^2}{3} -(1+\alpha \tan \alpha)^2 \right) \]

\[ \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = -\left( u_0 \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x} + u_1 \right), \quad 2.7.47 \]

boundary layer:

\[ \overline{u}_1 = \frac{\tan^2 \alpha}{3 \cos \alpha(1+\alpha \tan \alpha)^3} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{1+\alpha \tan \alpha}{16 \sin^2 \alpha} \right) \right] \]

In figure 2.11 we show velocity profiles in the core for flow in diverging and converging ducts, i.e., positive and negative \( \alpha \), and in figure 2.12 we show velocity profiles for the components of velocity parallel to the wall, \( \overline{u}_1 \), in the boundary layers.

2.7.7. Discussion.

a) Core and boundary layers.

The example presented in \( \S 2.7.6 \) reveals some of the effects of considering higher order terms in the core and boundary layer flows.

Although the zeroth order approximations for the core flow are identical in converging and diverging ducts (except for direction, of course), the first order approximations differ, and in a surprising way, in that, for a given value of \( x \), the core velocity in a straight walled diverging duct, such as that considered in \( \S 2.7.6 \) is greater near the walls and least in the centre, whereas for flow in a converging duct the reverse is true.
There seems to be no obvious physical explanation for this effect, which only occurs in certain types of duct since, if the duct width is proportional to $1/(1-x)$ for $1 > x > 0$, the velocity is greatest in the centre for a diverging duct and least in a converging duct. Thus we conclude that the first and, presumably, higher approximations to the velocity profiles are very sensitive to the rate of change of the duct width with distance along it.

It is of interest to compare the values of $\omega_0$ and $\omega_1$ in our example of §2.7.6 in order to calculate the value of $N$ which enables the required condition, $N^{-1} \omega_1 < \omega_0$, to be satisfied. For example, when $\zeta = 45^\circ$, $\frac{z}{y} = 1$ and $\frac{\nu}{y} = 0$, $\frac{\omega_1}{\omega_0} = \tfrac{1}{12}$, so that, even if $N$ is as low as 5, the conditions for the analysis of the core would be well satisfied.

On the other hand, for the analysis of the Ludford layers we must satisfy the condition that $N^{1/3} \gg 1$ so that in an experiment where $N \simeq 10$, say, the experimental core flow would be adequately described by our theory but not the experimental Ludford layers.

Figure 2.12 indicates how inertial effects become apparent in the Hartmann boundary layers when the first order approximation is considered, so that, when the core flow is decelerating as in a diverging duct, there is a slight tendency for back flow to develop near the wall, whereas when the core flow is accelerating, the flow near the wall is faster. It is interesting that the tendency for back flow to develop in a diverging duct is very much greater when $\omega_0 < 0$, as in a duct whose width is proportional to $1/(1-x_0)$, than when $\omega_0 > 0$, as in the example of §2.7.6 which indicates that the first order approximation of the core flow has an important effect on the boundary layer flow.

b) Ludford layers and the relation between Ludford's solution and the duct flow problems.

We have considered the structure of the Ludford layer when the core flow is continuous in $U_0$ and when the predominant forces are pressure, inertial and electro-magnetic, the criteria to be satisfied by $M$ and $R$ for our analysis being

$$R^2 \gg M \gg R^3$$

2.7.49.
In this case the thickness of the layer, $\delta$, being $O(N^{-1/3})$. The key to a physical understanding of the layer lies in the role of the pressure gradients; the pressure gradient in the $y$-direction, $\partial p/\partial y$, is $O(N^{-1})$ in the core while in the Ludford layer it is $O(N^{1/3})$, because it is the pressure gradient which accelerates the fluid in the $y$-direction, not, of course, the electromagnetic force. Since the pressure varies in the $y$-direction, there must be a component of $dp/dx$ of $O(N^{2/3})$ which also varies in the $y$-direction, i.e., different from the core value of $dp/dx = O(N)$, and this secondary component of $dp/dx$ is balanced by the $j \times B$ force produced by a perturbation velocity $U$ of $O(N^{-1/3})$. The practical significance of the pressure gradient is that, since pressures are measured more easily than velocities, probably the best way to confirm the existence of Ludford layers is to check whether the pressure difference across an asymmetric channel at a point where the wall slope changes suddenly is $O(N^{1/3})$.

Note that the graphs of $U^+$ and $(1 - Y - U^+)$ shown in figure 2.6, can be interpreted directly since $U^+$, $(= U/|k_+|)$ is proportional to $v$ when $k_+ = 0$, that is, for a straight duct joining a diverging duct; and $(1 - Y - U^+) = U/|k_-|$ is proportional to $v$ when $k_- = 0$, that is, for a converging duct joining a straight duct. From $U^+$ and $(1 - Y - U^+)$ we can calculate $v$ for the general case in which $k_+$ and $k_-$ are both non-zero. Also note that the damped wave, for which there is no obvious explanation, always occurs downstream of any change in the duct wall.

3) Limitations of the analysis.

Our analysis has been for two-dimensional flows, but since experiments have to be performed in finite sized ducts the effects of the side walls parallel to the fields must be considered. Also it is only by considering the side walls that we can determine $E_z$. These walls may be non-conducting, or, if conducting, they may be split up into segments. They may also diverge in the $z$-direction. In these cases $E_z$ may vary in the $x$ direction and $E_x$ is likely to be non-zero, in which case secondary flows may result, and our analysis will not hold except perhaps in the centre of the duct away from the side walls. However, our analysis is expected to be most applicable in a duct with
continuous conducting walls parallel to $B_0$ since then $E_z$ will be uniform in the core and $E_x = 0$. $E_z$ will then be determined by considering the external electrical circuit and the total current leaving the duct. Even in this case the analysis will fail where the conducting-electrode walls end at the edge of the power extraction or injection region.

A preliminary analysis of the effect on compressible duct flows of very strong magnetic fields was given at the conference on MHD Power Generation at Salzburg. (Hunt, 1966b).
3. Some electrically driven flows in magnetohydrodynamics.

3.1. Introduction and summary

A common feature of many magnetohydrodynamic flows where the magnetic field strength is very high is the existence of narrow regions extending in the direction of the magnetic field across which discontinuities in velocity, electric potential or current density occur. The universality of such regions was first hinted at by Braginskii (1960) in examining the MHD equations, since when many specific flows have been analysed in which such regions have been found to occur e.g. the various 'wakes' which occur in the flow over bodies placed in transverse and parallel magnetic fields, (Hasimoto, 1960, Ludford, 1961, and Childress, 1963). Although Braginskii himself outlined the possibility of such regions being caused by sudden changes in the electrical boundary conditions, he did not analyse any particular physical situation so as to conclusively demonstrate the existence of such a layer. However, various analyses have recently been made of such situations and since they are not widely known it is pertinent to briefly describe them.

Yakubenko (1963) examined the pressure-driven, laminar, incompressible flow of a uniformly conducting fluid in a rectangular duct whose walls perpendicular to the magnetic field, BB, are very much longer than the walls parallel to the magnetic field AA, and whose walls BB are perfectly conducting for \( x < 0 \) and non-conducting for \( x > 0 \). Then, when the Hartmann number \( M = 1 \), the velocity expressed in terms of the pressure gradient is \( O(M^{-2}) \) when \( x < 0 \) and \( O(M^{-1}) \) when \( x > 0 \), so that some shear layer must exist near \( x = 0 \). Although Yakubenko obtained an exact solution to this problem by means of the Wiener-Hopf technique he did not interpret the result physically nor did he produce any numerical data.

Waechte (1966) has recently analysed the flow in the same long duct in which there is no pressure gradient, the walls AA are non-conducting, the wall B at \( y = a \), for \( x < 0 \) is perfectly conducting and held at a potential \( \phi_0 \), the wall B at \( y = -a \) for \( x < 0 \) is also perfectly conducting but held at a potential \( -\phi_0 \), and both the walls BB are non-conducting for \( x > 0 \). In this case there is no flow in the core when \( x < 0 \) and therefore no discontinuity in the velocity. However, there is a
discontinuity at \( x = 0 \) in \( \partial \Phi / \partial y \), which necessitates the existence of a layer at \( x = 0 \) in which the velocity is non-zero. Such a layer was first discussed by Moffatt (1964) who examined the case where the wall at \( y = \pm a \) is perfectly conducting and held at a potential \( \Phi_0 \) for \( x > 0 \) and for \( x < 0 \) is also perfectly conducting but held at zero potential. There has to be an infinitely small insulating segment of wall at \( x = 0 \). The wall at \( y = \mp a \) is perfectly conducting, and held at zero potential. Again in this case there is a layer at \( x = 0 \), through which \( \partial \Phi / \partial y \) is discontinuous and in which the velocity is non-zero. Moffatt discussed in detail the physics of such a layer, though which there is a discontinuity in the electric field parallel to it, so that we now have a clear physical picture of what to expect when such a discontinuity occurs.

However, there were some anomalies in his mathematical solution which Waeche (1966) has now clarified.

Alty (1966) examined an altogether more difficult problem; he undertook a theoretical and experimental investigation of the pressure driven flow in a square duct, two of whose walls are highly conducting and two non-conducting, when a uniform magnetic field is imposed at an arbitrary angle to the walls. By only considering the flow when \( M \gg 1 \) by dividing the flow up into various regions, which he investigated in turn, and by using some of the results of Moffatt's (1964) analysis he was able to provide an approximate asymptotic analysis in which he discovered the existence of thin layers emanating from the corners of the duct in the direction of the magnetic field. In these layers the velocity and electric field changed discontinuously, in a similar way to the layers of Yakubenko and Moffatt. The existence of these layers was confirmed by the experiments, though indirectly from pressure and electric potential measurements at the walls, no probes being inserted into the flow.

The main interest in these studies has been on the curious layers which emanate in the direction of the magnetic field from the places where the conductivity changes. In each case different layers are found; yet, despite their similarities, a complete analysis and description of these layers in pressure or electrically driven flows is still awaited.
The mathematical difficulty is similar to that of analysing MHD duct flows in that two coupled linear partial differential equations of second order must be solved (equations (2.4) and (2.5) of H & S). These equations may be decoupled by increasing their order as shown by Braginskii (1960), though in that case the boundary conditions for the various parameters, e.g. velocity and potential, then become coupled, this being the method of Moffatt and Waechte. This method is only suitable for the simplest boundary conditions and types of boundary.

The other approach to solving the coupled equations is to add and subtract them, as originally performed by Shercliff (1953), and as we did in H & S. Then, provided the current distribution along the boundary is specified, we can obtain a solution, the problem becoming the transformation of the current boundary condition to that required, e.g. the specification of the potential, or matching to a finitely conducting electrode, which in general requires the solution of an integral equation, one such being that solved in §2 of H & S. The great advantage of this method, particularly when \( M \gg 1 \), is that one is dealing with an elliptic second order equation whose asymptotic properties are fairly well understood. In this chapter we adopt the latter approach (suggested to me by Professor Shercliff) to examine the flow produced by various electrode configurations.

In §3.2 we examine the simplest situation in which two line electrodes are placed opposite and parallel to each other in parallel non-conducting planes; an electric current travels between the electrodes and a magnetic field is applied perpendicular to the planes. Assuming that the flow is laminar, uniform and incompressible we find an exact solution for arbitrary values of \( M \) and an asymptotic solution when \( M \gg 1 \). We show these are identical when \( M \gg 1 \), and how the results may be interpreted in physical terms. We then analyse the flow when the electrodes are displaced relative to each other, the magnetic field remaining in the same direction; this flow is similar to that discussed by Alty (1966).

In §3.3 we analyse the flows due to circular electrodes. We first analyse the flow due to point electrodes placed in non-conducting planes opposite each other, before analysing the flow due to finite circular
Fig 3.1 Alined line electrodes

Fig 3.2 Asymptotic regions between the electrodes when $M \gg 1$
electrodes. We consider two cases where the current distribution at the electrodes is constant and where the potential of the electrodes is constant, our analysis in the latter case not being complete. Many of the salient physical phenomena found from this analysis were shown to exist in the experiments described in chapter 7.

3.2. Two-dimensional electrode configurations.

3.2.1. The Equations.

We consider the steady flow of an incompressible fluid with uniform properties driven by the interaction of imposed electric currents and a uniform, transverse magnetic field. In this section we consider two-dimensional situations, in which all the physical variables, including pressure, and the boundary conditions are functions of \( x \) and \( y \) only. Therefore any external circuit connected to the conducting walls of the duct is continuous and unvarying in the \( z \) direction. (This condition may be relaxed if the magnetic field due to the applied currents is small compared to the imposed magnetic field.) We can apply the uniqueness theorem of §2.3 to this situation, the only difference being that \( \frac{dp}{dz} = 0 \). Therefore, if we can construct a solution consistent with the boundary conditions, it is the correct one. We will assume that there is only one component of velocity (in the \( z \)-direction) and since this assumption provides a solution we are justified in making it. Then, using the axes defined in figure 3.1, the equations describing such flows are the same as those of MHD duct flow but with \( \frac{dp}{dz} = 0 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
  j_x &= \sigma (-\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} - v_z B_0) , \\
  j_y &= \sigma (-\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y}) , \\
  \frac{\partial j_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial j_y}{\partial y} &= 0 ,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  j_x &= \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial y} , \\
  j_y &= -\frac{\partial H_z}{\partial x} ,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  \rho &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( p + \mu \frac{\partial^2 H_z}{\partial z^2} \right) , \\
  \rho &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( p + \mu \frac{\partial^2 H_z}{\partial z^2} \right) ,
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  \rho &= j_x B_0 + \bar{\eta} \left( \frac{\partial^2 v_z}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v_z}{\partial y^2} \right) 
\end{align*}
\]
We can ignore equations (3.2.4) and (3.2.5) since we do not consider free surfaces and we can rewrite the rest of the equations to give two coupled second order partial differential equations in \( u_z \) and \( h_z \). By normalising in terms of some reference value of \( h_z, H_1 \) say, such that,

\[
\frac{u}{u_z} = \frac{u_z}{H_1 / \sqrt{c_v \eta}},
\]

and \( \xi = x/a, \eta = y/a \), where \( a \) is some characteristic length, then the governing equations become:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \eta^2} + M \frac{\partial h}{\partial \eta} = 0, \tag{3.2.7}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial \xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial \eta^2} + M \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} = 0, \tag{3.2.8}
\]

where \( M = B_0 a (c_v / \sqrt{\eta})^{1/2} \), is the Hartmann number. We can rewrite these equations in terms of \( X = u + h \), and \( Y = u - h \), by adding and subtracting them as follows:

\[
\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta^2} \right) X + M \frac{\partial X}{\partial \eta} = 0, \tag{3.2.9}
\]

and

\[
\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta^2} \right) Y + M \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \eta} = 0. \tag{3.2.10}
\]

3.2.2. Aligned line electrodes.

We now analyze the flow between two walls at \( y = \pm a \) induced by a current \( I \) per unit length in the \( x \)-direction entering the fluid at a line electrode (i.e., one of vanishingly small width in the \( x \)-direction) at \( x = 0, y = \pm a \), and leaving the fluid at \( x = 0, y = -a \). A magnetic field is imposed in the \( y \)-direction. Let \( H_1 = I/2 \); then the boundary conditions are:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\{ & u_z = 0, \quad h_z = H_1, \quad x > 0, \quad y = \pm a, \\
& u = 0, \quad h = 1, \quad \xi > 0, \quad \eta = \pm 1 \} \\
& u_z = 0, \quad h_z = -H_1, \quad x < 0, \quad y = \pm a, \\
& u = 0, \quad h = -1, \quad \xi < 0, \quad \eta = \pm 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.11}
\]

We can rewrite these boundary conditions in terms of \( X \) as...
\[ X = 1, \quad \zeta > 0, \quad \eta = \pm 1, \]
\[ X = -1, \quad \zeta > 0, \quad \eta = \pm 1, \]

and therefore we need only consider this combined variable. \( u \) and \( h \) may be found independently from the relations,
\[
u(\zeta, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ X(\zeta, \eta) - X(\zeta, -\eta) \right],
\]
\[
h(\zeta, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ X(\zeta, \eta) + X(\zeta, -\eta) \right].
\]

We can obtain a solution for \( X \) as a Fourier series in \( \eta \), by finding solutions for \( \zeta > 0 \) and \( \zeta < 0 \) and equating them at \( \zeta = 0 \). We obtain for \( \zeta > 0 \):
\[
X = 1 - 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j e^{-\left(\frac{\lambda j^2}{M} M \right)} \left[ j \cosh(M\zeta) e^{-\frac{\lambda j^2}{M} \cos(j\eta)} \right]
\]
\[
- \beta j \sinh(M\zeta) e^{-\frac{\lambda j^2}{M} \sin(j\eta)} \right],
\]
and for \( \zeta < 0 \):
\[
X = -1 + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j e^{-\left(\frac{\lambda j^2}{M} M \right)} \left[ j \cosh(M\zeta) e^{-\frac{\lambda j^2}{M} \cos(j\eta)} \right]
\]
\[
- \beta j \sinh(M\zeta) e^{-\frac{\lambda j^2}{M} \sin(j\eta)} \right],
\]

where
\[
l = (j + \frac{1}{2}) M, \quad \beta = j \Pi, \quad \lambda j^2 = M^2 + \alpha j^2, \quad \alpha j^2 = M^2 + \beta j^2.
\]

This solution for \( X \) is convergent when \( \zeta = 0 \) and therefore we match convergent series at \( \zeta = 0 \). Also the solution is valid for all values of \( M \).

Asymptotic solution for large \( M \).

As \( M \to \infty \), the flow may be examined separately in certain regions (see fig. 3.2). We examine these regions in turn making approximations in each. Showing that a solution exists consistent with the approximations and the boundary conditions justifies the approximations. In this case we can also show that the asymptotic solution is equal to the exact solution for large values of \( M \) by comparing values of \( X \) computed for various points.
\[ x = 1, \quad \xi > 0, \quad \eta = \pm 1, \]
\[ x = -1, \quad \xi > 0, \quad \eta = \pm 1, \]  

and therefore we need only consider this combined variable. \( \xi \) and \( \eta \) may be found independently from the relations,

\[
u(\xi, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ X(\xi, \eta) - X(\xi, -\eta) \right],
\]

\[
u(\xi, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ X(\xi, \eta) + X(\xi, -\eta) \right].
\]

We can obtain a solution for \( X \) as a Fourier series in \( \eta \), by finding solutions for \( \xi > 0 \) and \( \xi < 0 \) and equating them at \( \xi = 0 \). We obtain for \( \xi > 0 \):

\[
X = 1 - 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j e^{-\left(M/2\right)^2} \left[ \frac{\lambda_j^2 \cosh(M/\lambda_j) e^{-\lambda_j S \cos \lambda_j \eta}}{\lambda_j^2} \right. \\

\left. - \frac{\lambda_j \sinh(M/\lambda_j) e^{-M j \xi \sin \lambda_j \eta}}{M j^2} \right],
\]

and for \( \xi < 0 \):

\[
X = -1 + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j e^{-\left(M/2\right)^2} \left[ \frac{\lambda_j^2 \cosh(M/\lambda_j) e^{\lambda_j S \cos \lambda_j \eta}}{\lambda_j^2} \right. \\

\left. - \frac{\lambda_j \sinh(M/\lambda_j) e^{M j \xi \sin \lambda_j \eta}}{M j^2} \right],
\]

where

\[ \lambda_j = \left( j + \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi, \quad \beta_j = j \pi, \quad \lambda_j^2 = M^2 + \alpha_j^2, \quad M_j^2 = M^2 + \beta_j^2. \]

This solution for \( X \) is convergent when \( \xi = 0 \) and therefore we match convergent series at \( \xi = 0 \). Also the solution is valid for all values of \( M \).

**Asymptotic solution for large \( M \).**

As \( M \to \infty \), the flow may be examined separately in certain regions (see fig.3.2). We examine these regions in turn making approximations in each. Showing that a solution exists consistent with the approximations and the boundary conditions justifies the approximations. In this case we can also show that the asymptotic solution is equal to the exact solution for large values of \( M \) by comparing values of \( X \) computed for various points.
Fig. 3.3. Aligned line electrodes:

velocity profiles in region (1) at \( \eta = 0.5 \) and \( n = 1 \) (outside the boundary layer)

The dotted line indicates how the velocity varies in region (3)
Region (1).

Here \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \xi = 0(1) \) and \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \eta = 0(\eta^2) \). Hence \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \eta \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \xi \) and equation (3.2.9) becomes:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 X}{\partial \xi^2} + M \frac{\partial X}{\partial \eta} = 0
\]

which has the solution:

\[
X_1 = \operatorname{erf} \left( \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \xi \right)
\]

where the suffix refers to the value of \( X \) in region (1).

Regions (2a) and (2b).

Here \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \xi = O(M) \) and \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \eta = O(\xi^2) \). Hence \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \eta \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \xi \) and equations (3.2.9) become:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 X}{\partial \eta^2} + M \frac{\partial X}{\partial \eta} = 0
\]

The boundary conditions for (2a) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= 1 \quad \text{for } X > 0, \eta = 1 \\
X &= -1 \quad \text{for } X < 0, \eta = 1 \\
X &= X_1 (\eta = 1) \quad \text{as } (\eta = \infty)
\end{align*}
\]

Hence

\[
X_{2a} = 1 \quad \text{for } X > 0
\]

\[
= -1 \quad \text{for } X < 0
\]

since \( X_1 \) satisfies the boundary conditions of \( X_{2a} \) at \( \eta = 1 \).

The boundary conditions for (2b) are:

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= 1 \quad \text{for } X > 0, \eta = -1 \\
X &= -1 \quad \text{for } X < 0, \eta = -1 \\
X &= X_1 (\eta = -1) \quad \text{as } (\eta = \infty)
\end{align*}
\]

Hence

\[
X_{2b} = e^{-M(1+\eta)} + \left[ \operatorname{erf} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{\eta^2}} \right) \right] \left[ 1 - e^{-M(1+\eta)} \right]
\]

for \( X > 0 \),

\[
= -e^{-M(1+\eta)} + \left[ \operatorname{erf} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\xi}{\eta^2}} \right) \right] \left[ 1 - e^{-M(1+\eta)} \right]
\]

for \( X < 0 \), 3.2.17.

Regions (3a) and (3b).

We can see that both \( X_{2a} \) and \( X_{2b} \) are discontinuous when \( \xi = 0 \), though \( X_1 \) is not. Hence there must be a region we call (3) near the electrodes in which \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \) and hence the full equation (3.2.9) must be
Fig 3.4 Current streamlines between line electrodes when $M \gg 1$

Fig 3.5 Displaced line electrodes showing asymptotic regions
considered rather than \((3.2.15)\). Since regions \((3a)\) and \((3b)\) are imbedded in \((2)\), but do not extend into \((1)\), \(\partial/\partial \eta = o(M)\). Hence \(\partial/\partial \xi = o(M)\) and thus these regions extend a distance \(o(M^{-1})\) round the points \(\xi = 0, \eta = \pm 1\). Since these regions are small compared to \((1)\) and \((2)\) and do not exert any controlling influence, we can ignore them.

If we compare the values of \(X\) computed from the exact solution at \(M = 20, 40\) and those taken from the asymptotic solution we find that the agreement is clearly good enough to show that these two solutions are identical when \(M \rightarrow \infty\). In fig. \((3.3)\) the velocity profiles for two values of \(\eta\) are shown and in fig. \((3.4)\) the current lines are shown schematically.

The best way of understanding the physical reasons for the distribution of velocity and current is by considering what happens to the current and the velocity when the magnetic field is turned on. When there is no magnetic field there is no velocity and a current passes between the electrodes the current spreads out from the top electrode at least a distance of order \(2a\) before curving back to the bottom electrode. Let us consider the quadrant \(\xi > 0, \eta > 0\) when the magnetic field is applied; the large component of \(j \times B_0\) accelerates the fluid in the \(+z\) direction. However, as \(U_z\) increases \(U_x B_0\) increases and thus \(j_x\) decreases. Then, since \(j_x B_0\) decreases, the acceleration of \(U_z\) decreases. This process continues until \(j_x\) is reduced to a value sufficient for the \(j_x B_0\) force to balance the viscous stresses produced by \(U_z\).

Thus as we see from figs \((3.3)\) and \((3.4)\) in the regions \((2a)\) and \((2b)\) where the viscous stresses are greatest, i.e. \(o(M^2)\), there is a large component of current perpendicular to the magnetic field such that
\[
 j \times B_0 = o(M^2)
\]
In region \((1)\), however, the viscous stresses are much less, i.e. \(o(M)\), and consequently the current has a smaller component perpendicular to \(B_0\).

It is perhaps worth noting that we can construct a solution for

---

More recently Prof. Williams has shown analytically that the asymptotic and exact solutions are identical as \(M \rightarrow \infty\). (Hunt & Williams, 1967).
electrodes which have a finite thickness, \( \delta \), where \( \delta \ll a \), provided we specify the current distribution on the electrodes. Then it is easily shown that as \( \delta \to 0 \), the solution becomes that of the line electrodes. Therefore our solution is a limiting solution of the electrode thickness tending to zero.

3.2.3. Displaced line electrodes.

We now analyze the flow between two walls when the electrodes are displaced sideways by a distance, \( 2b \). See figure (3.5). If \( b/a = \ell \) and \( \ell_1 = 1/2 \), the boundary conditions are:

\[
\begin{align*}
    v = 0, & \quad h = x = 1, \quad \xi > \ell, \quad y = a, \\
    v = 0, & \quad h = x = 1, \quad \xi < \ell, \quad y = a, \\
    v = 0, & \quad h = x = 1, \quad \xi < -\ell, \quad y = -a.
\end{align*}
\]

\( u \) and \( h \) may be found independently from the relations:

\[
\begin{align*}
    u & = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ X \left( \xi, \eta \right) + X \left( -\xi, -\eta \right) \right\}, \\
    h & = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ X \left( \xi, \eta \right) - X \left( -\xi, -\eta \right) \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Although it is possible to obtain a Fourier Series solution there is little interest in doing so. We move straight on to the asymptotic solution.

Asymptotic solution.

We now consider the solution when \( M \to \infty \). We will assume that \( M \) is large enough to satisfy the condition that \( aM^{-\frac{3}{2}} \ll b \). Then in this situation there is one new type of region not found in the aligned electrode problem. This is the region, \( (4) \) (see fig. 3.5), where

\[
\lambda - O(M^{-\frac{3}{2}}) > \xi > -\lambda + O(M^\frac{1}{2}),
\]

\[
1 - O(M^{-1}) > \eta > 1 + O(M^{-1}),
\]

in other words this region lies between the Hartmann layers on the walls and the layers of thickness \( O(M^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \) emanating from the electrodes. The solution in this region is simply,

\[
X = -1
\]

3.2.19.
Fig 3.6a. Velocity profiles for flow between displaced line electrodes in regions (1) and (4) - profiles are schematic (M ≫ 1)

Fig 3.6b. Current streamlines for flow between displaced line electrodes when M ≫ 1. (Velocity profile in region (2) is also shown)
Therefore \( \varphi = -1 \), \( \lambda = 0 \).

The solution for region (1a) is
\[
X = \text{erf} \left( \frac{(\xi - \ell)}{2 \sqrt{1 - \eta}} \right)
\]
and in (1b):
\[
X = -1
\]
Thus \( X \) does not change in (1b) which is to be expected since \( X = -1 \) in (4) and \( X \to -1 \) as \( \xi \to -\infty \).

The solution for (2a) is much the same as for the aligned line electrodes, i.e.
\[
\begin{align*}
X &= 1, \quad \xi > \ell \\
X &= -1, \quad \xi < \ell
\end{align*}
\]
and the solution for (2b) is:
\[
\xi > \ell: X = - e^{-\frac{(\xi - \ell)}{\sqrt{1 - \eta}}} + \text{erf} \left( \frac{(\xi - \ell)}{\sqrt{1 - \eta}} \right) \left( \frac{X}{1 - \frac{1}{M}} \right)
\]
for \( (\ell - \xi) \eta \to 1 \) this becomes:
\[
X = -1 + 2e^{-M(1+\eta)}
\]
when \( \xi < \ell \), \( X = -1 \).

Thus we again must have two regions (3) with thickness \( O(\lambda^{-1}) \) near the electrodes in which \( \frac{\partial X}{\partial \xi} \) is of the same order as \( \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \eta} \).

We see from (3.2.19) and (3.2.20) that the major difference between this case and the aligned electrode situation is that a net flow is induced. This is simply calculated to be:
\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} & \int_{a}^{b} u\varphi d\xi d\eta = - 4 \ell \left( 1 - \frac{1}{M} \right), \\
\text{or} & \\
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} & \int_{a}^{+a} u_{\infty} d\xi d\eta = - 2 \frac{I \alpha b}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{e} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}}}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{M} \right).
\end{align*}
\]

The reason for this net flow is that, since the current must pass between the electrodes, and since there can be no current in the inviscid core (region (4)) because the flow is steady and there is no pressure gradient, all the current has to pass along Hartmann boundary layers on the two walls, a current \( I/2 \) along each. Now Shercliff (1965) has shown that the relation between the total current flowing along a Hartmann boundary layer (\( I/2 \) in our case) and the velocity outside it
Fig 3.7 Notation for aligned point electrodes

Fig 3.8 Aligned circular electrodes with asymptotic regions
\[ V = I/(2\sqrt{\eta}), \]

whence we can obtain the first term in our expression for \( Q \). It is important to note that the first term (3.2.22) is independent of the value of \( B_0 \), though if the electrodes were finite such that there was a finite potential difference between them, \( \Delta \phi \), it would be found that the relation between \( Q \) and \( \Delta \phi \) depends on \( B_0 \). This result was to be expected from § 3 of H & S where we examined the flow in a rectangular duct with perfectly conducting walls parallel to the field and showed that for such a flow when there is no pressure gradient the first term in the \( Q - I \) relation is independent of \( B_0 \), whereas the \( Q - \Delta \phi \) relation is not. It is also worth noting that the first term in (3.2.21) is the same as that of the \( Q - I \) relation for a rectangular duct with sides \( 2a \) and \( 2b \) which is to be expected since Shercliff's Hartmann layer relation shows that the distribution of current along the lines \( X = \pm b \) does not affect the first term in (3.2.22).

3.3. Circular Electrodes.

3.3.1. Introduction

The disadvantage of studying flows due to line electrodes is that such flows are difficult to produce experimentally. Inevitably at the end of the container enclosing the fluid some recirculation occurs which may upset the flow elsewhere. However if circular flows are used there are no such end effects, although the flows, being more unstable, entail other problems. In this section we examine the theory of flows produced by circular electrodes and thence predict some of the effects found experimentally, as shown in chapter 7.

3.3.2. Aligned point electrodes.

We consider the axisymmetric flow induced between two point electrodes set in insulating planes opposite to each other (see fig.3.7). We discover in §2.6 how such flows induce radial pressure gradients which in turn induce radial flow and why, if the magnetic field is strong enough, these effects may be ignored. We make the same assumption again,
only considering the azimuthal or swirl component of velocity, and the radial and axial components of current. Then, in terms of \( \psi \) and \( \phi \), the azimuthal components of velocity and induced magnetic field, the governing equations are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta \psi &= B \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z^2} + \mu^2 \left( \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \theta^2} \right), \quad \text{(3.3.1)} \\
\Delta \phi &= B \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} + \frac{1}{r} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \theta^2} \right), \quad \text{(3.3.2)}
\end{align*}
\]

Let the current entering the electrode on the wall at \( z = -a \) and leaving the electrode on the wall at \( z = +a \), be \( I \), then the boundary conditions are:

\[
\begin{align*}
at z = \pm a: & \quad r \psi = \frac{I}{2\mu} \\
& \quad \psi_r = 0 \\
& \quad \psi_\theta \text{ and } \phi \text{ are continuous.}
\end{align*}
\]

We now nondimensionalize in terms of \( I \):

\[
\begin{align*}
u &= \frac{\psi}{(I/2\mu a)^{1/2}}; \quad \eta = \frac{\phi}{(I/2\mu a)^{1/2}}; \quad \xi = \frac{r}{a} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = \frac{z}{\alpha}
\end{align*}
\]

Then (3.3.1) and (3.3.2) become:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{M}{\xi} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{\xi}{\xi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi} \right) + \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \xi^2} &= 0 \quad \text{(3.3.3)} \\
\text{and} \quad \frac{M}{\xi} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{\xi}{\xi} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} \right) + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \xi^2} &= 0 \quad \text{(3.3.4)}
\end{align*}
\]

We can rewrite these equations as one in \( \xi \) and \( \eta \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{M}{\xi} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} \left( \psi (\eta + \alpha) + \left( \frac{\xi}{\xi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \xi^2} \right) \psi(\eta + \alpha) \right) &= 0 \quad \text{(3.3.5)}
\end{align*}
\]

and the boundary conditions become:

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi (\eta + \alpha) &= 1 \quad \text{at} \quad \eta = \pm 1. \quad \text{(3.3.6)}
\end{align*}
\]

The solution of (3.3.5) subject to the boundary condition (3.3.6)

\[
\begin{align*}
\psi (\eta + \alpha) &= 1 \quad \text{at} \quad \eta = \pm 1. \quad \text{(3.3.6)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
u (\eta + \alpha) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^j e^{-M^2 j/4} J_1 (M \eta) e^{-M^2 j/4} J_1 (M \eta)}{J_0 (M \eta) J_1 (M \eta)} \quad \text{(3.3.7)}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_j &= (j + \frac{1}{2}) \eta, \quad \beta_j = j \eta, \quad \lambda_j = \alpha_j^2 + M^2 j/4, \quad \mu_j^2 = \beta_j^2 + M^2 j/4. \quad \text{(3.3.8)}
\end{align*}
\]
As we have found before, the asymptotic solution is simpler and physically clearer. Dividing the flow into 3 regions, as in (fig.3.2), with region (1) lying between the electrodes, regions (2a) and (2b) lying on the two walls, and regions (3) extending a distance \(O(M^{-1})\) round the electrodes. Then in regions (2a) and (2b), (3.3.5) becomes:

\[
\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + M \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) \left[ e(u+h) \right] = 0
\]

and the solution in (2a) is:

\[
e(u+h) = 1
\]

In region (1), \(\frac{\partial}{\partial y} = 0\), \(\frac{\partial}{\partial e} \sim O\left(M^{1/2}\right)\) and \(e = O\left(M^{-1/2}\right)\) and therefore (3.3.5) becomes:

\[
\left( M \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial e} \right) e(u+h) \right) = 0
\]

The boundary conditions are:

\[
e(u+h) = 1 \quad \text{as} \quad e \to \infty \quad \text{and when} \quad j = 1
\]

Thence

\[
e(u+h) = 1 - e^{-M e^2/4(1-j)} \int [1 - e^{-M e^2/4(1+j)}]
\]

In region (2b), the solution to equation (2.3.7) is:

\[
\rho(u+h)_{2b} = 1 - e^{-M e^2/4(1-j)} \int [1 - e^{-M e^2/4(1+j)}]
\]

By considering the symmetry of the flow we see that in (1),

\[
u = \frac{1}{2e} \left\{ e^{-M e^2/4(1+j)} - e^{-M e^2/4(1-j)} \right\}
\]

and

\[
h = \frac{1}{2e} \left\{ 2 - e^{-M e^2/4(1-j)} - e^{-M e^2/4(1+j)} \right\}
\]

Though the form of the velocity profile is similar to that for the line electrode, the important difference is that in this case

\[
U^- = O\left(M^{1/2}\right)
\]

* Prof. Williams has again shown analytically that, as \(M \to \infty\), this asymptotic solution is equivalent to the exact solution (3.3.7). Hunt & Williams, 1967.
whereas for a line electrode,

$$
\nu = 0(1).
$$

We can also deduce this result by an order of magnitude argument:

In the region (1),

$$
\frac{B_0 \nu}{e} \approx \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} = \frac{O[\phi \sigma = o/\delta]}{r = O(a m^{-2})} \text{ is the thickness of region (1) and, since at } r = 0, \phi = O(IA/\nu W^2)
$$

$$
= O(In/a \delta).
$$

$$
\nu = O(\frac{IM}{a \delta})
$$

For a line electrode, at \( x = 0 \),

$$
\phi = O(IA/\sigma \delta)
$$

and thence \( \nu = O(\frac{I}{\sqrt{\sigma \eta}}) \)

where \( I \) in this case is the current passing between the electrodes per unit length. Thus the different values of \( \nu \) in terms of \( M \) result from the much higher potential which occurs in the point electrode case than the line electrode case.

### 3.3.3. Asymptotic analysis of aligned circular electrodes.

In this section we examine the flow induced by current passing between the two electrodes shown in fig. (3.8) when \( M \gg 1 \). The analysis presented is not complete, but even in this incomplete form it is useful in interpreting the experimental results presented in chapter 7. We will only examine the flows when the Hartmann number is large, since the interesting physical effects are then seen most easily both analytically and experimentally.

We first analyse the flow when the electrodes are perfectly conducting using the same non-dimensionalized parameters as in §3.3.2. Thus we consider the current \( I \) to be given and the electric potential, \( \Delta \phi \), on the electrodes to be a dependent variable. We have one further parameter, if the radius of the electrodes is \( b \) and \( \lambda = b/a \) then
the boundary conditions in non-dimensionalized form are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\xi &= \pm 1, \quad \xi < 0, \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial \xi} = 0, \quad v = 0, \\
\xi &= 0, \quad h = \frac{1}{e}, \quad v = 0, \\
\xi &\to \infty, \quad h = \frac{1}{e}, \quad u \to 0
\end{align*}
\]

Now in order to solve this problem, following the method used to examine the boundary layers on walls AA in H & S, we specify the value of \(h\) on the electrodes and then find an equation which this distribution of \(h\) must satisfy in order that \(\partial h/\partial \xi = 0\) on the electrode. Let \(h = f(\xi)\) on \(\xi = \pm 1, \xi < 0\), where \(f = 0\) when \(\xi = 0\) and \(f = 1/\xi\) when \(\xi = k\). The latter condition follows from the necessity of \(h\) being continuous on the wall.

As before we divide the flow into various regions as shown in fig. 3.8. For this analysis we assume that \(M\) is large enough to satisfy the two criteria: \(M > 1\) and \(l > 0(M^{1/2})\).

Region \((\xi)\).

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} f = O(1), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} e = O(l^{-1}) \ll O(M^{1/2}).
\]

Therefore \((3, 3, 5)\) becomes:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{\xi (u + \xi)}{e} \right) = 0,
\]

and therefore

\[
u = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h = f(\xi).
\]

Therefore,

\[
-\frac{\partial h}{\partial \xi} = \frac{1}{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} (\xi f),
\]

and since \(h\) is constant at \(\xi = \pm 1\), it follows that:

\[
\frac{1}{\xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} (\xi f) = 2 \lambda \xi,
\]

where \(\lambda\) is some constant to be determined. Therefore:

\[
\xi = \lambda \xi^2
\]

3.3.14.

Region \((5)\).

In this region \((\xi - \xi) \gg O(M^{1/2})\) and \(u = 0\) and \(h = \xi^2\). We see that though \(u\) and \(h\) may be continuous at \(\xi = \xi\), as calculated in
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regions (4) and (5), \( \partial h/\partial \rho \) and \( \partial \Theta/\partial \rho \) are discontinuous. Therefore regions must exist in which \( \partial \Theta/\partial \rho \) changes from its value in (4) to zero in (5), these being (1) and (2).

Regions (2a) and (2b).

We treat these regions as in §3.3.2, \( \partial \rho/\partial S = 0(M) \), \( \partial \rho/\partial \rho = 0(M^2) \) and therefore \( \partial \rho/\partial S \gg \partial \rho/\partial \rho \) so that (3.3.5) becomes:

\[
\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} + M \frac{\partial}{\partial S} \right) (\nu + h) = 0.
\]

Therefore, in (2a),

\[
\nu + h = f(x) \quad \text{for } x < \rho,
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{e} \quad \text{for } x > \rho.
\]

Region (1).

Let us postulate that:

\[
\partial \rho/\partial \rho = 0(M^2), \quad \text{and } \partial \rho/\partial S = 0(1).
\]

Then since \( \rho > 0(M^2) \)

\[
\partial \rho/\partial \rho \gg 1/e.
\]

and (3.3.5) becomes:

\[
\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} + M \frac{\partial}{\partial S} \right) (\nu + h) = 0.
\]

The boundary conditions in this region are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho' &< 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \nu + h = f(\rho) \\
\rho' &> 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \nu + h = \frac{1}{e} \quad \rho' \sim \frac{1}{\rho} - \frac{\rho}{\rho^2}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \rho' = \rho - \rho \). \( \rho' = 0(M^2) \) in region (1).

Thence, using the standard solution to the heat conduction equation, (3.3.17),

\[
(\nu + h) = \frac{M^2}{2\pi^2 (1-\rho)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t) e^{\{-(t-\rho)^2\rho^2/4(1-\rho)\}^2} dt
\]

\[
+ \frac{M^2}{2\pi^2 (1-\rho)} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{t-\rho}{e^2} e^{\{-(t-\rho)^2\rho^2/4(1-\rho)\}^2} dt.
\]

3.3.18.
Region (2b).

Using the solution for (1) we can now write down the solution for (2b) \( \text{viz:} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } p' < 0, \quad (v + h)_{2b} &= f(p') e^{-M(1 + \frac{S}{p'})} + (v + h)_{1} \left[ 1 - e^{-M(1 + \frac{S}{p'})} \right], \\
\text{for } p' > 0, \quad (v + h)_{2b} &= \frac{\mu}{\ell^{2}} e^{-M(1 + \frac{S}{p'})} + (v + h)_{1} \left[ 1 - e^{-M(1 + \frac{S}{p'})} \right].
\end{align*}
\]

where \((v + h)_{1} \left( f_{s} = -1 \right) \) is the value of \((v + h)_{1} \) when \( f = -1 \). Note that, except when \( p' = 0, \quad \frac{\partial (v + h)}{\partial f} = 0 \), \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial f} = 0 \), and therefore our solution for this region is consistent with our assumption.

To find \( f(p) \).

We now find an equation for which \( f(p) \) must be a solution in order that \( \partial h / \partial f = 0 \) at \( f = \pm 1 \) when \( p < \ell \).

Now

\[
\frac{\partial h}{\partial f} = \frac{\partial [(v + h) \cdot (p, f)]}{\partial f} - \frac{\partial [(v + h) \cdot (p_{1}, f)]}{\partial f},
\]

and therefore, since in (2a),

\[
\frac{\partial (v + h)}{\partial f} = 0,
\]

and since \( \partial h / \partial f = 0 \), when \( f = \pm 1, p < \ell \),

\[
\left. \frac{\partial [(v + h) \cdot (p_{1}, f)]}{\partial f} \right|_{f = -1} = 0.
\]

In order to satisfy (3.3.20), we use our solution for region (2b).

Thus, when \( p < \ell \) or \( p' < 0 \),

\[
\left. \frac{\partial [(v + h) \cdot (p + f)]}{\partial f} \right|_{f = -1} = -M \left\{ f(p') - \frac{\mu}{2} \right\} \int_{0}^{2\pi} f(t) \exp \left[ \frac{-M(t - p')}{\ell^{2}} \right] dt + O(M^{-k})
\]

Thus, to find \( f(p) \), we have to solve this integral equation (3.3.21), to do which we first need to know the boundary conditions.

However, before determining the boundary conditions on \( f \) in the
regions (2a) and (2b), we must consider the regions (3). Since when \( \frac{\partial h}{\partial \xi} = 0 \) and when \( \frac{\partial h}{\partial \xi} > 0 \), a discontinuity exists at \( \xi = 0 \), which implies that some regions (3a) and (3b) must exist in which \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} = 0 \). 

Now in the regions (3a) and (3b) for line electrodes, (3.2.1), \( h \) changes from +1 to -1, so that we have to determine whether the change in (3) is comparable with that in (2). We now show that this must be the case for the integral equation (3.3.21) to be satisfied.

The equation (3.3.21) specifies \( f(\xi) \) such that, when \( \xi' < 0 \) in region (1), \( v + h \) has the same value at \( \xi = -1 \) as at \( \xi = 1 \). If the change of \( f \) in region (3) is negligible, when in region (2) \( f = (v + h) \) when \( \xi = 0 \).

Therefore the maximum value of \( (v + h) \) in region (2) when \( \xi' < 0 \) and \( \xi = 1 \) is the maximum value anywhere in the plane \( \xi = 1 \). Since in region (1), \( (v + h) \) satisfies the heat conduction equation (3.3.17), the maximum value of \( v + h \) at the boundary between regions (1) and (2b) is less than that at \( \xi = 1 \). Therefore it is impossible to satisfy the equation (3.3.21) and the boundary condition \( f = \sqrt{\ell} \) when \( \xi' = 0 \).

However, if the change of \( f \) in region (3) is comparable with that in (2), so that the boundary condition for \( f \) in region (2) at \( \xi = 0 \) is:

\[ f = \frac{n}{\ell}, \text{ where } n < 1 \]

it follows that it may be possible to find values of \( n \) and \( \lambda \) as well as a solution for \( f \) in region (2) by means (3.3.21). This result implies that \( \partial f'/\partial \xi = 0(M) \) in (3) and thus, near \( \xi = 1 \) when \( \xi' = 0(M^{-1}), \partial f'/\partial \xi = 0(M^2) \), whereas for \( \xi' = 0(M^{-1}), \partial f'/\partial \xi = 0 \) near \( \xi = 1 \). We believe that we can find \( n \) and \( \lambda \) by invoking the minimum dissipation theorem mentioned by Moffatt (1964).

Since the materials used for electrodes in experiments are not perfectly conducting it would be of interest to examine the effects of finitely conducting walls. But, since no analysis has been developed for this situation, as a first approximation to a finitely conducting electrode we make the assumption that the current distribution is uniform over the electrode. Then

\[ f(\xi) = \frac{e}{\ell^2}, \]

and dividing up the flow into regions as before we find that in region (4)
Density across the electrode is assumed constant.

The current $I_a = \frac{\phi}{0.26(b-a)}$ at $f = 1.0$.
\[ \nabla = 0, \quad \text{in region (5)} \]
\[ \nabla = 0, \quad h = \frac{1}{2} e, \quad \text{in region (1)} \]

\[ \psi + \lambda = \frac{e}{\lambda^2} \left[ \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^1} - \operatorname{erf} \alpha - \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \pi} \exp(-\alpha^2) \right] \] 3.3.22.

where

\[ \alpha = \frac{e^{\prime} \sqrt{M}}{2 \sqrt{1 - s}}. \]

\( \psi + \lambda \) for region (2b) can be calculated as before.

It is interesting to see how the electric potential varies along the electrode when we make the assumption that the current distribution is constant. Using the solution for region (2b) i.e.

\[ \psi + \lambda = \frac{e^{\prime} + \lambda^1}{\lambda^2} e^{-M(1 + s)} \quad + \frac{e}{\lambda^2} \left[ \frac{\lambda^1}{\lambda^1} - \operatorname{erf} \bar{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \pi} \exp(-\bar{\lambda}^2) \right] \left[ 1 - e^{-M(1 + s)} \right] \]

where \( \bar{\lambda} = e^{\prime} \sqrt{M}/s \),

we find \( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial s} \) at \( s = \pm 1 \) and hence,

\[ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \lambda} \bigg|_{s = 1} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial s} \bigg|_{s = 1} \]

\[ = \frac{2 \lambda^1}{\lambda^2} \left( \frac{\lambda^1}{\lambda^1} - \operatorname{erf} \bar{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \pi} \exp(-\bar{\lambda}^2) \right) \]

Therefore,

\[ \frac{\alpha}{\lambda^1} = \frac{2 \lambda^1}{\lambda^2} \left[ 1 - (1 + \lambda^2 + \frac{1}{2})(1 + \operatorname{erf} \bar{\lambda}) + \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \pi} \bar{\lambda} e^{-\bar{\lambda}^2} \right] \] 3.3.23.

A graph of \( \phi \) against \( \lambda^2 \) is plotted in fig. (3.9) and we see that the potential rises from its constant value in region (4) to half that value when \( \bar{\lambda} = 2 \) or \( p^1 = 0 \). Note that, on \( s = 1, \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \) is negative and that this change in potential occurs in a distance \( O(M^{-2}) \), so that as \( M \) increases, the potential across the disc becomes more nearly uniform.

Thus for the potential across the electrode to be constant it follows that the current density near \( \bar{\lambda} = \lambda \) must increase, which we found when examining perfectly conducting electrodes. It also shows why in a finite conductor the distribution of the current density on the electrode or...
is likely to depend on the value of $M$. As regards the flow, the chief significance of this potential rise is that it implies the existence of a current of density $O(M^2)$ parallel to the electrode and consequently a velocity of $O(M^2)$ outside the Hartmann boundary on the electrode.

When the potential of the electrode is constant, although a velocity of $O(M^2)$ exists outside the boundary layer on the insulator where $\rho' > 0$, there is no current parallel to the disc when $\rho' < 0$ and consequently there the velocity is zero, to first order.

We now show that if $f(f)$ is a function of $p^1 \sqrt{M}$ in region (2), then in region (1) the distribution of $\Phi$ for a given value of $f$ is similar for all values of $M \gg 1$. If we let

$$ f(f) = \frac{1}{\xi} + \frac{1}{\xi^2} M^2 g(p^1 \sqrt{M}) $$

then in region (1)

$$ u + \xi = \frac{M^2}{2 \sqrt{\pi}(1-\xi)} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{\xi} + \frac{1}{\xi^2} M^2 g(p^1 \sqrt{M}) \right) \frac{1}{\xi^2} \right\} e_{\xi} \left[ \frac{(4-\xi^2)^2 M}{4(1-\xi)} \right] d\xi $$

whence

$$ u = \frac{1}{4 \sqrt{\pi} \sqrt{M}} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(p^1 \sqrt{M}) e_{\xi} \left[ -(t - \xi) + \xi \right] d\xi - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(p^1 \sqrt{M}) e_{\xi} \left[ -(t - \xi) - \xi \right] d\xi \right\}, $$

where

$$ p_- = p^1 \sqrt{M} / (2 \sqrt{1-\xi}), \quad p_+ = p^1 \sqrt{M} / (2 \sqrt{1+\xi}). $$

Thus for given $f$, $\Phi$ is a function of $p^1 \sqrt{M}$ only. (Note that the case of uniform current distribution is covered by this analysis). Now in region (1), since $\partial \Phi / \partial f = O(M^2)$ and $\partial u / \partial f = O(M^2)$, it follows that $\partial \Phi / \partial \mathbf{e} = M \mathbf{r}$

(3.3.24) as was first noted by Moffatt (1964). Thence

$$ \Phi = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( M^2 f \right) d \left( p^1 \sqrt{M} \right), $$

and therefore $\Phi$ is a function of $(p^1 \sqrt{M})$ only, for a given value of $f$. 
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We use the converse of this result in chapter 7 to deduce from our experimental results that $f(p)$ is a function of $p' \int M$.

We now show how the resistance between the two discs may be calculated for an arbitrary distribution of current and why the resistance must always tend to the same limiting value as $M \to \infty$. We define the resistance, $R$, between the two discs as follows.

$$ R = \frac{2 \Delta \phi}{I} $$

where

$$ 2 \Delta \phi = -\frac{1}{\pi b^2} \int_a^b \left[ \phi(r) \right]_{-a}^{+a} 2\pi r \, dr, $$

is the mean value of the potential difference between the two discs.

Since,

$$ -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{\sigma \tau} \frac{2}{\sqrt{r}} \left[ \phi(r) \right]_{-a}^{+a} 2\pi r \, dr, $$

which may be rewritten in a non-dimensionalized form as:

$$ R = \frac{2}{\pi h b} \int_I |h| \, dJ $$

If $h = f(p)$ at $J = \pm 1$, then in region (1) near $p = 1$, we can use the same formula to find $(v + h)$ in terms of $f(p)$, which we found in our investigation of perfectly conducting electrodes, namely,

$$ u + h = \frac{M}{2} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(r) \exp \left[ -r^2 (1/4)(1-S) \right] \, dr \right\} $$

$$ + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{A-r}{\sqrt{2}} \exp \left[ -r^2 (1/4)(1-S) \right] \, dr. $$

Since $f = 1/\kappa$ when $p = \kappa$, (we are only considering region (1) and not considering any distinction between regions (2) and (3), as in our discussion of a perfectly conducting electrode), it follows that when $M \to \infty$

$$ v + h = 1/\kappa \quad \text{when} \quad p = \kappa. $$
Then, since \( v \) is antisymmetric in \( f \),
\[
\int_{1}^{t} \left| h \right|_{\xi=\ell} \, df = \int_{1}^{t} \left| b+h \right|_{\xi=\ell} \, df = 2/\ell,
\]
and from (3.3.26) it therefore follows that
\[
R = R_{\infty} = \frac{2a}{\pi \sigma b^2}. \tag{3.3.27}
\]
Note that this result only depends on the condition that \( f = 1/\ell \) when \( \rho = \ell \). It does not depend on the form of \( f \) and therefore the value of \( R \) will be the same whether the electrodes emit current at a constant potential or with a constant current density.

To calculate \( R \) when the current density is constant we use (3.3.26) whence
\[
R = \frac{2a}{\pi \sigma b^2} \int_{1}^{t} \frac{1}{\ell} \left( 1 - \frac{2\sqrt{1-\xi}}{\pi (\ell M^2)} \right) \, df,
\]
or
\[
R = R_{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1.064}{\lambda M^2} \right). \tag{3.3.28}
\]
Thus the form of the current distribution on the electrodes will only be indicated by how the resistance varies with \( M \) and not by its ultimate value. We expect the form of the variation of \( R \) with \( M \) to be similar for all types of electrode because the thickness of the region (1) is always \( O(M^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \) and therefore the current density in the \( z \) direction, for given \( I \), is reduced by \( O(1/M^2) \). This implies that \( (\partial^2/\partial z^2) \) and consequently the resistance are also reduced by \( O(1/M^2) \).
4. On the use of pitot tubes and electric potential probes in MHD flows.

4.1. Introduction and summary.

In fluid mechanics and MHD when a flow can be theoretically analysed, e.g. Poiseuille flow in a tube, then measurements of pressure, electric potential, electric current etc., taken at the boundaries of the flow, e.g. on the walls of a duct or on the surface of an aerofoil, can be compared with those theoretically predicted and, if they are in agreement, the analysis is considered to be verified. However, if no such analysis has been made, then external measurements often give little indication as to the nature of the flow, and in that case direct, internal, measurements of velocity, electric potential etc., become necessary. To take such measurements we need to use pitot tubes, static pressure probes, electric potential probes, and hot wire anemometers to name a few.

In fluid mechanics we measure total and static pressure and velocity whereas in MHD we can measure several more variables, e.g. the electric potential and induced magnetic field (Ahlstrom 1964), so that in principle we have a further check on our measurements. However, this advantage is more apparent than real in that the difficulties of measuring all these variables are very much greater in MHD flows, in particular a magnetic field changes the relation between the velocity and the total pressure measured by a pitot tube, the velocity and reading of a hot-wire anemometer, and the electric potential and that measured by an electric potential (e.p.) probe. In this chapter we analyse the way in which these relations are affected for Pitot and e.p. probes. (D.G. Malcolm of the University of Warwick is investigating the behaviour of hot-wire anemometers).

Most of the internal measurements of MHD flows have been in gases where the magnetic field has not been strong enough to induce errors in the probes, but where the errors, particularly with e.p. probes, have resulted from electronic and ionic phenomena. The only investigations of the continuum errors have been made by those interested in liquid metal flows, (as we are). Lecocq (1964) developed some of the basic theory of pitot and e.p. probes which we develop further, however his experiments were such that he could not test his theory since the magnetic
Fig 4.1. Notation for Pitot tubes and electric potential probes.
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Fig 4.2. Error free Pitot-static tube.
field effects were so small. He measured velocity profiles by means of pitot and e.p. probes, but did not correlate his results between the probes and, since the flows were turbulent so that no theory for the velocity profiles exists, the experimental results could not be correlated with theoretical results. East (1964) performed some experiments on pitot tubes to determine the MHD errors involved in measuring uniform flows; he did not use the pitot to examine shear flows or flows with electric currents present. Moreau (1966) has used a pitot tube to examine turbulent velocity profiles where the MHD probe errors are negligible.

In §4.2 we consider pitot tubes in uniform flows where the magnetic and electric fields are perpendicular to the flow and analyse in detail various special probes, finding that the MHD error is highly dependent on the probe shape. We then give a physical explanation for the prominent effects and discuss some of the practical consequences of our analysis.

In §4.3, we consider e.p. probes, though in this case we do consider the errors of using such probes in shear flows. We first find that with uniform flows there is no probe error, owing to the symmetry of the flow, but when the flows are non-uniform certain interesting effects occur. We examine these analytically and then discuss the physical reasons for the errors.

In chapters 7 and 8 we make use of the results of this chapter in the interpretation of our experimental results.

4.2. Pitot tubes

4.2.1. Non-dimensional equations, boundary conditions.

In this section we consider the relation between the pressure at the tip of a blunt body, i.e. a pitot tube, and the velocity of the uniform flow impinging on it, and examine how this relation is affected by the application of a magnetic field to the flow. The three major assumptions we make are: (1) \( R_m \ll 1 \); (2) the velocity to be measured is uniform; (3) the shape of the probe near its tip is symmetric about the planes \( y = 0 \) and \( z = 0 \), with the point \( 0, x = y = z = 0 \), being the centre of the total pressure measuring aperture (See fig.4.1). If for
example the probe is supported by a stem well downstream of the tip, we
assume its effect on the flow at the tip is negligible.

In order to non-dimensionalize the equations we use a characteristic
length, \( d \), which may for example be equal to \( a, b \) or \( c \). Then the
following forms are the most suitable for the non-dimensional variables:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{r} &= \frac{r}{\bar{u}} = \left( \frac{u}{\bar{u}}, \frac{v}{\bar{u}}, \frac{w}{\bar{u}} \right)/\bar{u}, \\
\tilde{z} &= \frac{z}{r_m \bar{u}}, \quad \tilde{j} = \frac{j}{\sigma \bar{u} B_0}, \quad \tilde{p} = \frac{p}{\rho \bar{u}^2} \\
\tilde{\phi} &= \frac{\phi}{d \bar{u} B_0}, \quad \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} = x, y, z/d, \quad \tilde{y} = \frac{B_0}{|B_0| d^2} \end{align*}
\]

and \( \bar{u} \) is a characteristic velocity (e.g. the value of \( \bar{u}_\infty \) at \( y = z = 0 \)). Then the equations \((2.2.1)\) to \((2.2.6)\) become:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\hat{\nabla} \cdot \hat{\nabla}) \hat{\bar{u}} &= -\nabla \hat{p} + N(\hat{\bar{y}} \times \hat{\bar{j}}) + \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}} \nabla^2 \bar{u}, \quad (a), \\
\nabla \hat{v} &= 0, \quad (b), \quad \hat{\bar{j}} = -\nabla \hat{\phi} + \hat{\bar{y}} \times \hat{\bar{u}}, \quad (c) \quad \text{(2.2.2)}.
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \nabla \equiv (\partial/\partial \hat{x}, \partial/\partial \hat{y}, \partial/\partial \hat{z}) \) (we assume the flow is steady).

Since \( R_m \ll 1 \) we deduce from \((4.2.2c)\) to \((4.2.2e)\) that

\[
0 = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{\bar{u}}}{\partial \hat{y}^2} + \frac{1}{R_m} \nabla^2 \hat{\bar{u}}, \quad 4.2.3,
\]

with an error of order \( R_m^2 \).

In specifying the boundary conditions in the free stream we consider
some typical flows in which pitot tubes are likely to be used, which
include the flows we examined experimentally, as described in chapters 7
and 8. As regards boundary conditions on the probe we will consider
two kinds of probe: (a) those which are non-conducting or, which amounts
to the same thing, probes whose surface contact resistance is very large,
(b) those whose conductivity is large compared to that of the fluid.

In the free stream (or \( |\tilde{x}|, |\tilde{y}|, |\tilde{z}| \to \infty \)),

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{\bar{u}} &= \hat{\bar{u}}_\infty = \left( \bar{u}_\infty, 0, 0 \right), \quad (a) \\
\nabla \hat{\phi} &= \nabla \hat{\phi}_\infty = \left( 0, 0, \partial \hat{\phi}_\infty / \partial \tilde{z} \right), \quad (b)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \hat{\phi} \) is defined as before.
whence \[ \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_{\infty}}{\partial \tilde{x}} = -N (u_\infty - \partial \tilde{\phi}_\infty / \partial \tilde{z}), \quad \partial \tilde{\phi}_{\infty} = \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_\infty}{\partial \tilde{z}} = 0, \quad 4.2.5. \]

\[
\left\{ \begin{align*}
\tilde{x} & = \frac{1}{k} \left( \frac{\partial b_{z_\infty}}{\partial \tilde{y}} - \frac{\partial b_{y_\infty}}{\partial \tilde{z}} \right) = 0, \\
\tilde{y} & = \frac{1}{k} \left( \frac{\partial b_{y_\infty}}{\partial \tilde{z}} - \frac{\partial b_{z_\infty}}{\partial \tilde{y}} \right) = 0
\end{align*} \right\} \quad 4.2.6.
\]

\[
\tilde{x} = \frac{1}{k} \left( \frac{\partial b_{y_\infty}}{\partial \tilde{y}} - \frac{\partial b_{y_\infty}}{\partial \tilde{z}} \right) = u_\infty - \partial \tilde{\phi}_\infty / \partial \tilde{z}.
\]

The conditions on the probe are:

a) Non-conducting probe

\[
\tilde{\tau} = 0, \quad \tilde{\phi}_\infty = \left( \nabla \tilde{\phi} \right)_n \quad (a)
\]

b) Highly conducting probe

\[
\tilde{\tau} = 0, \quad \nabla \tilde{\phi}, \quad (b)
\]

where \( n_0 \) and \( \Sigma \) are vectors normal and tangential to the probe surface.

We will assume that the highly conducting probe's walls are electrically insulated from the fluid inside the probe, to avoid a further source of error. (East (1964))

\subsection*{4.2.2. The general problem and some special cases.}

In order to use the probe as a Pitot tube we have to calculate the pressure at the point \( 0 \), \( \tilde{\rho}_\infty \), either relative to the pressure far from the pitot or, if a pressure gradient exists in the free stream, relative to the pressure at \( 0 \) in the absence of the probe. \( \tilde{\rho}_\infty \).

However, we first deduce an important symmetry condition relating to the general flow over a symmetric body, subject to the boundary conditions (4.2.4) and (4.2.7).

If we consider the governing equations written in terms of \( \tilde{\xi} \) and \( \tilde{\eta} \) so that:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\tilde{\xi} \cdot \nabla) \tilde{\xi} &= -\nabla \tilde{p} + N \kappa \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{\xi} \times \nabla \tilde{\xi}}{\kappa} \right), \\
\nabla \tilde{\xi} &= 0, \\
\nabla \tilde{\eta} &= \frac{\partial \tilde{\eta}}{\partial \tilde{y}} + \frac{1}{k} \frac{\partial \tilde{\xi}^2}{\partial \tilde{y}}, \\
\nabla \tilde{\eta} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

Then we see that if \( \tilde{\xi} = -\tilde{\eta} \) the equations and boundary conditions are
consistent with the following result:

$$[u', v', w', b_x', b_y', b_z'] = [u, -w, w, -b_x, b_y, -b_z],$$

where the prime refers to the value of the variable at the same value of $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{y}$, but at $\tilde{z} = -\tilde{z}$. If $\tilde{x} = \tilde{z}$ we have:

$$[u', v', w', b_x', b_y', b_z'] = [u, v, w, b_x, b_y, b_z],$$

where the prime now refers to the value of the variable at the same value of $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{y}$, but at $\tilde{z} = -\tilde{z}$. Thence we conclude that for the symmetric probes we consider, on the line $y = z = 0$,

$$u = v = w = \frac{\partial b_y}{\partial \tilde{z}} = \frac{\partial b_z}{\partial \tilde{z}} = 0, \quad 4.2.9.$$  

whatever the value of the magnetic field.

We now integrate (4.2.2a) from $\tilde{x} = -L$ to $\tilde{x} = 0$ along the line $y = z = 0$, where $L (\gg \alpha / \delta)$ is such that $\left[ \phi (x = -L) = \phi \right]$, where $\phi = (\nabla \phi, \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi)$. Then, using (4.2.2c) and (4.2.2d) the result of our symmetry condition (4.2.9) we have:

$$\tilde{P}_o - \tilde{P}_{z = -L} = -\frac{u_{\infty}}{2} + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\tilde{x} = 0}^{\tilde{x} = 0} \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \tilde{z}^2} - \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \tilde{y}^2} \right) d\tilde{x}$$

$$+ \int_{\tilde{x} = -L}^{\tilde{x} = 0} \int_{\tilde{z} = -\delta}^{\tilde{z} = \delta} \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \tilde{y}^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \tilde{z}^2} \right) d\tilde{y}. \quad 4.2.10.$$  

In this equation we have ignored the error due to the velocity not being zero at the aperture in the probe at $x = 0$, which is generally considered negligible. Now, when $R > 100$, even though the probe is used in a shear flow it has been shown experimentally that the error due to the viscous term is negligible ($< 1\%$), (Rosenhead, 1964). (This assumes, of course, that the probe is not used in shear flows whose characteristic length is much less than $d$, though it may be of the same order). If $\partial^2 u / \partial \tilde{z}^2 = \tilde{u}_{\infty} B_0$, so that $\partial^2 \tilde{P}_o / \partial \tilde{x}^2 = 0$, we are interested in calculating $\Delta \tilde{P}$, where

$$\Delta \tilde{P} = \tilde{P}_o - \tilde{P}_0. \quad 4.2.11.$$  

Using (4.2.5) and assuming $R > 100$, we have

$$\Delta \tilde{P} = \frac{\tilde{u}_{\infty}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{N} \int_{\tilde{x} = -\infty}^{\tilde{x} = 0} \left( \frac{2}{\delta^2} (\tilde{P} - \tilde{P}_o) + (\tilde{u}_{\infty} - \tilde{u}) \right) d\tilde{y}. \quad 4.2.12.$$  
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In order to calculate the extra electromagnetic term, (the error), in general we need to solve the set of equations (4.2.2), using the boundary conditions (4.2.4) and (4.2.7). (We could concentrate solely on \( \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \), \( \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \) and \( \tilde{\mathbf{J}} \), but with less physical insight). However such a task is in general beyond us at the present time, so we concentrate on certain simplified situations.

(i) \( N \ll 1 \).

In many instances the value of \( N \) is low enough for us to make the approximation that \( N \ll 1 \) and that \( \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 \), \( \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_0 \), \( \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_0 \) etc., may be expanded as a series in ascending powers of \( N \), e.g.

\[
\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_0 = (u, v) = (u_0, v_0, w_0) + N(u, v, w) + N^2(u, v, w) + \cdots \quad \text{Equation 4.2.13.}
\]

This approximation has often been used to examine the flow over bodies with various types of magnetic field and has been shown by Ludford to have certain singularities associated with it (Ludford, 1963). However, if we confine ourselves to examining the first order approximation only we avoid such difficulties. We will ignore boundary layer effects since \( R > 1 \) and \( N \ll 1 \), which means that we must reconsider the boundary conditions (4.2.7).

Using the expansion (4.2.11) and matching powers of \( N \):

\[
\Delta \mathbf{p}_0 = \frac{U_0^2}{\mathbf{B}_0^2}
\]

and

\[
\Delta \mathbf{p}_1 = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left[ (u_0 - u) - \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{D}}}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} - \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{B}}}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \right) \right] \mathcal{Z}, \quad \text{Equation 4.2.14.}
\]

where \( u_0 \) is found from the potential flow solution over the pitot, and \( \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{D}}}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \) is calculated from

\[
\nabla^2 \tilde{u}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{K}} \cdot \nabla \tilde{u}_0 = 0, \quad \text{Equation 4.2.15.}
\]

since \( \tilde{u}_0 \) is irrotational. The boundary conditions on \( \tilde{u}_0 \) are:

In the free stream: \( \nabla \tilde{u}_0 = \left( \mathbf{0}, \quad 0, \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{D}}}{\partial \mathbf{Z}} \right) \)

outside the probe boundary layer:

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) \ (\nabla \tilde{u}_0 + \tilde{\mathbf{K}} \times \tilde{u}_0) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{E}} &= 0, \\
(b) \ \nabla \tilde{u}_0 \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{E}} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

Since there is no general solution to (4.2.15) subject to the boundary conditions (4.2.16), we cannot write down a more easily calculable
expression that is \((4.2.14)\). However, there are two special cases where we can:

a) \(N \ll 1, \nabla \Phi_{\infty} = 0\), highly conducting.

In this case, if \(\nabla \Phi_{\infty} = 0\), the only solution to \((4.2.15)\) subject to the boundary condition in the highly conducting probe i.e. \((4.2.16b)\) is:

\[ \nabla \Phi = 0, \]

whence it follows that \((4.2.12)\) becomes simply:

\[ \Delta \hat{p}_1 = \int_{x=0}^{x=-L} (u_{\infty} - u_0) \, dx. \]

Knowing the potential solution, \(u_0\), enables us to calculate \(\Delta \hat{p}_1\) directly. Note that in this case there is a static pressure gradient in the free stream and that to find \(\Delta \hat{p}_1\) one would normally make two measurements of \(\hat{p}_0 - \hat{p}_{x=-L}\) and \(\hat{p}_{x=-L} - \hat{p}_0\), the first with the probe and the other in its absence. (In this situation \(\partial \hat{p}/\partial y \approx \partial \hat{p}/\partial x = 0\) and we are assuming that static pressure can be measured error free at the boundary of the flow, e.g., pressure tappings on the wall of a duct).

b) \(N \ll 1, a \ll b\).

When the pitot tubes shape is such that \(a \ll b\), then near the centre of the probe the flow will be such that \(\partial \hat{p}/\partial y \approx \partial \hat{p}/\partial x\). Then it follows from the fact that \(\nabla E = 0\) that

\[ \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial y} \approx \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial x} \approx 0, \]

so that we can regard \(E_x\) as approximately constant in the flow round the pitot. Then \((4.2.14)\) becomes:

\[ \Delta \hat{p}_1 = \int_{x=0}^{x=-L} (u_{\infty} - u_0) \, dx, \]

so that, in this case, knowing \(u_0\), enables us to calculate \(\Delta \hat{p}_1\).

Ostensibly this result is the same whatever the conductivity of the probe, but clearly if \(E_x = 0\) in the probe, unless the probe short circuits the external flow, our result is not valid and therefore the conductivity of the probe determines the ratio of \(a\) to \(b\) for the approximation to be valid. The application of the result \((4.2.18)\) to a particular probe

* Lecocq (1964) appeared to be groping for this result, but his analysis contains so many obscurities as to be unintelligible.
should be made with care.

As an example we now evaluate \( \Delta p \), for uniform flow over a two-dimensional probe with a square end. Using the potential flow solution of Milne Thompson (1962, pp 273-275), we find that

\[
\Delta p = \frac{u_\infty \alpha}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r},
\]

so that

\[
\rho_0 - \rho'_0 = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{C} u_\infty^2 \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma B_0^2 \alpha}{\tau \rho u_\infty} \right).
\]

It is important to realize also that the degree to which the flow is two dimensional depends on the value of \( N \).

(ii) \( a \gg b \)

When the pitot tubes shape is such that \( a \gg b \), then we can assume that \( \partial / \partial y \ll \partial / \partial z \) in the centre of the probe, so that

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{\gamma}}{\partial y} \approx \frac{\partial \tilde{\gamma}}{\partial y} = 0,
\]

and therefore the flow over the pitot tube is unaffected by the magnetic field (Shercliff, 1965). Then we can express the non-dimensional force \((-N \tilde{j}_z, 0, N \tilde{j}_x)\) as \((-\partial \tilde{b}_y / \partial \tilde{x}, 0, -\partial \tilde{b}_y / \partial \tilde{z})\) so that

\[
\tilde{b}_x = 0 - \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_x}{2} = \frac{u_\infty^2}{2} - N \tilde{b}_y |_{\tilde{x}=0} + N \tilde{b}_y |_{\tilde{x}=-L}.
\]

Now in the free stream \( \partial \tilde{b}_y / \partial \tilde{x} = \partial \tilde{b}_y / \partial \tilde{z} = -\partial \phi / \partial \tilde{z} + u_\infty \), and by definition \( \tilde{b}_y |_{\tilde{x}=-L} = |\tilde{b}_y|_{\tilde{x}=-L} \), so that

\[
\Delta \tilde{b} = \frac{u_\infty}{2} + N \left( \tilde{b}_y |_{\tilde{x}=0} - \tilde{b}_y |_{\tilde{x}=0} \right).
\]

Now it also follows from (4.2.20) that (4.2.23) becomes:

\[
\nabla^2 \tilde{b} = \nabla \times \tilde{b} = 0
\]

whence we can calculate \( \tilde{b}_y \), given the boundary conditions. We will again consider two special cases for which simple solutions exist.

a) \( a \gg b, \tilde{j}_x = 0 \)

If \( \tilde{j}_x = 0 \), \( \nabla \times \tilde{b} = 0 \) whence, using (4.2.23) and the boundary conditions on the probe (4.2.7), i.e. actually on the probe not at the edge of the boundary layer, it follows that \( \nabla \times \tilde{b} = 0 \) everywhere. Therefore (4.2.22) becomes:

\[
\Delta \tilde{p} = \frac{u_\infty}{2} + N \left( \tilde{b}_y |_{\tilde{x}=0} - \tilde{b}_y |_{\tilde{x}=0} \right).
\]

This result may be compared with example 4.13 in Shercliff's book where he finds the error for flow round a circular cylinder to be \( \pi \) times as great as this.

---
\[ \Delta \tilde{\rho} = \frac{u_\infty}{c} \]

This important result is valid for all values of \( N \); again its limitation is that we do not know, except by more detailed calculation, what the ratio \( b/a \) needs to be for this result to be accurate. (The conductivity of the probe does not affect this result).

b) \( a \gg b \), \( a \gg c \), probe used as Pitot-static tube.

If now we consider the probe to be supported at \( y = \pm \infty \), its length \( c \) being comparable with \( b \), and if we also use the probe as a pitot-static tube, then we can show that such a probe is error free whatever the value of \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \) and \( N \), provided it is non-conducting. (This result has already been given by Lecocq, 1964).

Let the probe be constructed as shown in figure 4.2, with a static pressure tapping \((S)\) on the flat face at \( \tilde{z} = \ell \), so that \( \tilde{P}_S = \tilde{P}(\tilde{z} = \ell, \xi = -\infty) = \infty \)

Now if the probe is non-conducting the boundary condition \((4.2.7)\) leads to \( \partial b_y/\partial \tilde{z} = \infty \) along the surface of the probe whence the value of \( b_y \) at \( \infty \) is the same as that at \( S \). From the conditions at infinity it follows that

\[ \tilde{P}(\tilde{z} = \ell, \xi = -\infty) \tilde{P}(\tilde{z} = -\infty, \xi = 0) = \tilde{P}_S \tilde{p}_{\infty} \xi = -\ell - \tilde{b}_y \tilde{x} = \ell \]

and thence from \((4.2.21)\) that

\[ \Delta \tilde{p} = \tilde{b}_y \tilde{x} \]

This result may be extended to compressible flows in that the electromagnetic error term is still zero. The use of a conventional pitot-static tube may incur large errors in such flows due to the Hall effect and therefore this result may be of some practical use in those circumstances, (Hunt, 1966c).

c) \( a \gg b \), \( a \gg c \).

We examine a simple but unrealistic kind of pitot tube in order to calculate the error if \( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \). We consider a non-conducting probe which is a circular cylinder of diameter non-dimensional \( \tilde{a} \), whose centre is at \( \tilde{z} = \tilde{a}/2 \), \( \tilde{y} = 0 \), \( \tilde{z} = 0 \). Then to find the error, we have to solve \((4.2.23)\) with boundary conditions:

Free stream: \( \tilde{b}_y \tilde{p}_{\infty} = \tilde{R}_{\infty} (\tilde{z} = 0) \)\) on the probe \( \partial \tilde{b}_y / \partial \tilde{z} = 0 \).
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(a) $j_{x\infty} = 0$ (3-D view of non-conducting probe.)

(b) $j_{x\infty} = (0, 0, j_{z\infty})$ (Section thru non-conducting probe)

(c) $j_{x\infty} = 0$ (Sections through highly conducting probe)

Fig 4.3 Current streamlines round Pitot tubes.
Then the solution for $b_y$ along the line $\tilde{y} = \tilde{z} = 0$ is:

$$b_y = j_z \cdot \left( \frac{\tilde{z}^2 + \tilde{\tilde{j}}}{\tilde{z}^2 + \tilde{\varphi}^2} \right) R_m,$$

and thence from (4.2.22) it follows that

$$\Delta\tilde{p} = \frac{u_{\infty}}{2} = N_j_z \tilde{\varphi}^2 / 2, \quad 4.2.25.$$

which shows how in some circumstances the error can be negative.

4.2.3. A physical discussion of pitot tube errors.

In this section we consider the physical reasons for the MHD error in pitot tubes, where possible comparing our conclusions with the analysis of §4.2.2.

We examine two limiting situations for simplicity.

(i) $u_{\infty} = \partial \varphi / \partial z$

In this case $j_{z,\infty} = 0$, but, owing to the fact that $u$ has to reduce to zero at the probe tip and that $\partial \varphi / \partial z$ does not decrease proportionally, currents are induced in the vicinity of the probe. If the probe is non-conducting then the currents flow in the $-z$ direction in front of the probe and return in the regions where the fluid moves faster (fig. 4.3a). If the probe is conducting then the electric field induces currents in the $-z$ direction through the probe. Some of these currents return near the probe tip (as in fig. 4.3b). Thus in the former case we expect that near the tip $j_{z,\infty} B_0 > 0$, and in the latter case $j_{z,\infty} B_0 < 0$. In (4.2.18) we showed that $\Delta\rho > 0$ when $a \ll b$ which agrees with our conclusion for a non-conducting probe. We noted in §4.2.2 that (4.2.18) is not a good approximation for a finite probe which was highly conducting in agreement with our physical reasoning which is also supported by the results of East (1964) who found experimentally that the error term was negative when the circular probe he used was highly conducting.

(ii) $\nabla \varphi_{\infty} = 0$

In this case $j_{z,\infty} = \sigma u_{\infty} B_0$ and $\partial \rho / \partial x = -\sigma u_{\infty} B_0 \varphi_{\infty}$ so that near the probe tip where $u$ decreases, $j_z$ decreases and $\Delta \rho / \partial x$ becomes less than its free stream value. Then, due to this effect, although the pressure at the probe tip may be less than the pressure far from the probe upstream, the pressure is greater than at the point $x = y = z = 0$ if no probe were
present, as demonstrated by (4.2.17).

When \( \mathbf{J}_\infty \neq \mathbf{0} \) there is another effect, namely that caused by the obstruction of the free stream current by the pitot tube. We showed in §4.2.2 how this can lead to an increase in \( \mathbf{J}_\infty \) in front of the pitot so that \( \mathbf{J}_\infty \mathbf{B}_\infty - \mathbf{J}_\infty \mathbf{B}_\infty \) and therefore the error may be negative. Fig. 4.3(c).

Finally, we have to mention that, though the velocity distribution is altered as the magnetic field is increased, the only affect of this is to alter the term \( \mathbf{N} \int_\Sigma \mathbf{J}_\infty \mathbf{J}_\infty \mathbf{d} \mathbf{\Sigma} \) and not the dynamic pressure term, \( \mathbf{u}_\infty^2 \), on account of the general result (4.2.9) of §4.2.2.

4.2.4. Conclusion.

The most significant result of our analysis of §4.2.2 is that, if we design a probe for which \( a \gg b \), then if \( \mathbf{J}_\infty = \mathbf{0} \) we can use it as an error free pitot tube and if \( \mathbf{J}_\infty \neq \mathbf{0} \) we can use it as an error free pitot static tube. Therefore we expect that the shape of a pitot tube will have a significant effect on its behaviour when a magnetic field is present. It is important to note that one cannot imply from our results that the greater the ratio \( a/b \) the less the error because the velocity near the end of a conventional circular pitot tube increases as \( (1-r^{-3}) \) compared to a more two-dimensionally shaped pitot where it increases as \( (1-r^{-2}) \). Therefore, in the former case \( \int (u_\infty - u) \mathbf{d} \Sigma \) may be less than in the latter. Clearly the fact that no currents are induced as \( a/b \to \infty \) finally reduces the probe error to zero when \( \mathbf{J}_\infty = \mathbf{0} \), but for finite values of \( a/b \) it is an open question as to which effect dominates.

While increasing the ratio \( a/b \) lead to a reduction in probe error, clearly such a flattened tube is unpractical for examining Hartmann boundary layers but is very suitable for those on walls parallel to \( z \). Thus increasing \( a/b \) is not always possible.

It would seem that using conducting pitot tubes can lead to negative errors while non-conducting tubes have positive errors. However, any attempt to find that value of conductivity, \( \sigma_p \), which leads to zero MHD error would be useless, since the error would only be zero in one or two situations. It is unlikely that a value of \( \sigma_p \) exists which gives no error in all circumstances.
We note that if the probe error is thought to be appreciable in a given MHD flow, then $\frac{\Delta \rho}{\rho}$ should be plotted against $u_\infty^2$ and if the resulting curve is not linear, then some MHD error is present. We use this principle in the experiments described in chapters 7 and 8 to detect and measure the MHD error term.

We have not investigated the effects of a magnetic field on the behaviour of a pitot tube in a shear flow, but since for two-dimensional shear flow round a cylinder there is no effect on $u$ along the line $y=z=0$, it would appear that the MHD error term is not greatly affected. However, this problem needs further investigation.

4.3. Electric potential probes.

4.3.1. On the use of such probes.

Electric potential probes were first used by Lecocq (1964) to measure the turbulent flow through a square duct. He was interested in comparing the results from those probes with those from pitot tubes and therefore had to convert his potential readings to velocities. From Ohm's Law, (2.2.3), and (2.2.8):

$$\nabla^2 \phi = B_0 (\nabla \times u),$$

which may be integrated to find $u_z$ in a fully developed duct flow:

$$u_z(x, y) = \frac{1}{B_0} \int_b^x \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} \right) dx,$$

where the duct's walls are at $x = \pm b$, $y = \pm a$, and the magnetic field is in the y-direction. Using this equation one should be able, in such a high velocity flow as Lecocq's, to deduce the value of $u_z$ in the boundary layers on the walls parallel to the magnetic field, and in the central region, but not in the boundary layers on the walls perpendicular to the field which entails measuring $\phi$ very accurately in the corners which cannot easily be done. Therefore we begin this section by noting that electric potential probes are most suitable for measuring electric potential, $\phi$, but if they are to be used to calculate the velocity then it is important to realise this involves even greater errors than those in measuring $\phi$.  
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4.3.2. The general problem and some special cases.

We shall consider a probe whose external shape is similar to that of the pitot tube (figure 4.2). The difference is that we measure electric potential at \( r, \theta = z = 0 \) instead of pressure. Since the probe has to transmit its information of the potential at \( 0 \) to an instrument outside the fluid there has to be an electrically isolated region inside the probe, along its length, which may be an electric wire or simply the conducting fluid. (For a practical example of the type of probe used see figure 7.2.) Since this information transmitting region the probe needs to be supported, (an electric wire being too weak), the probe has walls which may be electrically conducting or non-conducting. Thus the probe-fluid boundary conditions are the same as those for a pitot probe, i.e. (4.2.7). As regards the free stream boundary conditions they are the same as (4.2.4) only we now consider that \( \partial \phi_j / \partial z \) may be functions of \( y \) and \( z \).

Using the same notation as in §4.2.2, the \( x \)-component of Ohm's law may be written:

\[
\int_{\omega} = - \partial \phi / \partial x - \vec{V}
\]

Now if \( \phi \) is to be measured in a flow determined by the free stream conditions (4.3.4) then we need to calculate \( \Delta \phi \), where

\[
\Delta \phi = \tilde{\phi}_0 - \tilde{\phi} \quad x = 0
\]

\[
\Delta \phi = \int_{-L}^{0} \vec{V} d \vec{x} - \int_{0}^{L} \vec{V} d \vec{x}
\]

As in §4.2.2, we examine various special cases which can analyse in greater detail.

(i) Uniform free-stream flow and electric field.

If the probe is symmetric about \( y = 0 \) and \( z = 0 \) and if \( \partial \phi_j / \partial y = 0 \) and \( \partial \phi_j / \partial z \) uniform then we can use the result (4.2.9), which showed that on the line \( \vec{y} = \vec{z} = 0 \), \( u = w = b y = b z = 0 \), to deduce from (4.3.4) that

\[
\Delta \phi = 0
\]

This result was first proved by Lecocq, but for a restricted situation.

Our result only assumes uniformity of the free stream conditions and of the probe shape, the value of \( N \) being arbitrary. (If \( \partial \phi_j / \partial y = 0 \) and \( \partial \phi_j / \partial z = 0 \), then (4.3.5) holds. But if \( \partial \phi_j / \partial y = 0 \) and \( \partial \phi_j / \partial z = 0 \), then (4.3.5) does not.)
(ii) \( a \gg b \). Non-uniform free stream flow.

In this and the next special case we consider the situation found in boundary layers parallel to the magnetic field in MHD duct flows and in the curious 'free' shear layers analysed in chapter 3, where, when \( M \gg 1 \),

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = u_\infty(z)
\]

\( k.3.6. \)

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y}, \text{and } \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} \text{ are } O(M^{-1}) \text{ and may be ignored, when } M \gg 1. \]

We now attempt to estimate the probe error when the probe size is comparable with the distance, \( S \), in which \( U_\infty \) varies, since such situations arose in our experiments.

We make the assumption that \( a \gg b \), so that \( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \ll \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \) and (4.2.8) becomes \( \nabla^2 \tilde{\phi} = 0 \). Then, since we assume that \( u_\infty = 0 \), whether the probe is conducting or non-conducting, it follows that \( \tilde{J} = 0 \). Hence (4.3.4) becomes

\[
\Delta \phi = -\int \tilde{J} \tilde{w} \, d\tilde{x}
\]

If we consider as an example a probe which is a circular cylinder with its axis \( \tilde{x} = 0 \), \( \tilde{z} = 0 \) and radius \( b/2 \), and if we assume that \( \partial u_\infty / \partial z \) is a constant, then, using the standard result for an unconstrained shear flow over a cylinder, we find that

\[
\Delta \phi = \left( \frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial z} \right) (a^2/4).
\]

Thus for a general shape of probe we expect that

\[
\Delta \phi = 0 \left[ \left( \frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial z} \right) a^2 \right],
\]

or, in normal variables, \( \Delta \phi = 0 \left[ a B_0 \left( \frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial z} \right) \right] \).

In general of course \( \omega \) is less in a three-dimensional flow than a two-dimensional flow so that the estimate (4.3.8) will tend to be high.

(iii) \( a \gg b \). Boundary layer flow-probe on the wall.

When the probe is on the wall, \( \tilde{z} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \), in a boundary layer flow, \( u_\infty \tilde{z} \left( \frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial z} \right) \) where \( \frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial z} \) is a constant, then, of course, \( u_\infty \tilde{z} \) is positive in contrast to the unrestrained shear flow where it is negative. For a two-dimensional probe square ended probe of width by considering the continuity of flow we easily deduce that

\[
\Delta \phi = -a^2 \left( \frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial z} \right) / 8,
\]

so that for a general flow we expect that

\[
\Delta \phi = -0 \left[ B_0 \left( \frac{\partial u_\infty}{\partial z} \right) a \right].
\]
4.3.3. Physical discussion and conclusion.

We mention here briefly the physical reasons for the errors which may be made in using electric potential probes. The first point to be made about such a probe is that it is like a static pressure probe in that, unlike a pitot tube, it does not necessarily have to disturb the flow to perform its function. It does have to disturb the flow, however, in transmitting the information of the potential at a point to a measuring instrument outside the flow and the errors are incurred by the disturbance to the flow of the 'information transmitting region' of the probe.

If an electric potential probe is used in a fluid in which there is no flow but only electric currents, an error may be caused by the obstruction of these currents. We have shown in §4.3.2 that this effect only affects \( \phi_{x=0} \) if the currents are non-uniform or are parallel to the \( x \)-axis of the probe, (in our notation of fig.4.1). In general the error in \( \phi_{x=0} \) is easily seen to be \( \mathcal{O} \left[ \left| j_x \right| d \right] / \sigma \) \( \mathcal{O} \).

The second cause of error is due to the disturbance of the flow velocity. In fact, as we showed in §4.3.2, this only affects \( \phi_{x=0} \) if the flow is non-uniform.

We may conclude our examination of these probes by saying that for most situations the powerful symmetry condition (4.3.5) ensures no probe error. But, if some non-uniformity of the flow or current exists, we can estimate the direction and the magnitude of the error. Finally we note that we have only considered a symmetric probe, whereas in fact most probes are supported downstream of their tip by a stem which only exists in one direction (fig.7.3). This may be the cause of error, e.g. it could short circuit the flow, but if it is far enough downstream should have negligible effect on the probe reading.
5. On the stability of incompressible flows in magnetohydrodynamics.

5.1. Introduction.

5.1.1. Summary.

The third part of this dissertation has three main aspects.

The first is an examination of the effect of a uniform magnetic field, $\mathbf{B}_0 = (B_0 \cos \phi, 0, B_0 \sin \phi)$ on the stability of parallel shear flows described by:

$$ \mathbf{u} = (u_0(y), 0, 0) $$

The main result of our examination is that a magnetic field can never completely stabilize a parallel flow, i.e. stabilize it for all values of the Reynolds number.

The second is a new physical interpretation for the stability of MHD flows, thereby explaining some of the effects found in this dissertation as well as those found previously by others.

The third aspect is a demonstration how the results of investigating the stability of parallel flows can be used to examine the stability of the boundary layers found in the MHD flow in rectangular ducts, and the shear layers found in our study of electrically driven flows in part two.

5.1.2. Purposes.

Since still very little is known about the stability of viscous incompressible flows when there is no magnetic field present, it might be thought bold to attempt to understand the stability of MHD flows. However, in a few simple cases of rotating flows, the theory has been found adequate to predict the effect of a magnetic field on the onset of secondary flow, (Chandrasekhar, 1961), though there have been no experiments to confirm the theoretical predictions for the onset of instability in parallel shear flows.

Despite the lack of experimental confirmation of the existing theory in parallel shear flows, we intend to develop it further; first, though, correcting some erroneous conclusions of previous workers. The reason for our interest in these flows is that we want to know, firstly,
how, if at all, the magnetic field stabilizes the various flows which it induces in rectangular ducts, as shown in part one, or in electrically driven flows, as in part two. Our second reason is that it is of some practical importance to understand the stability of the flows which are found in experiments used for examining very hot gases, e.g., in thermonuclear fusion research, where jets of highly conducting gas are injected along the magnetic field lines in the area where the magnetic field contains the plasma, as in the 'cusp' geometry, or where the gas is ejected along the field lines, as in the 'theta pinch' (Taylor and Weirson, 1965).

5.1.3. Contents.

The major part of this chapter consists of the paper 'On the stability of parallel flows with parallel magnetic fields', Hunt (1965a) which is an examination into the effects of a uniform parallel magnetic field on the stability of plane parallel flows of fluids with finite viscosity and conductivity, uniform properties, and no free surfaces. We prove that, when a uniform magnetic field is parallel to the flow and sufficiently large, the wave number vector of the most unstable disturbance is not, in general, parallel to the flow, i.e., it is a three-dimensional disturbance. Our result invalidates the conclusion of Michael (1953) and Stuart (1954) who asserted that the wave number vector of the most unstable disturbance was parallel to the flow, i.e., a two-dimensional disturbance. Using this erroneous assumption, Stuart (1954), Velikhov (1959), and Tarasov (1960), examined the stability of plane Poiseuille flow with a parallel magnetic field. Drazin (1960) has examined some general aspects of the stabilizing influence of a parallel magnetic field on a plane parallel flow, also considering only two-dimensional disturbances. Wooler (1961) has examined the stability of a plane parallel flow when \( R_m \ll 1 \) and when the magnetic field lies in the plane of the flow but is not parallel to it. He found that three-dimensional disturbances can be the most unstable; however, he did not point out that, even when the magnetic field is parallel to the flow, three-dimensional disturbances can still be the most unstable. For all values of \( R_m \) we show how results obtained for two-dimensional disturbances can be modified to take into account three-dimensional disturbances.
and thence draw some general conclusions about the stabilizing influence
of a parallel magnetic field on a plane parallel flow. In particular
we prove that a parallel magnetic field can never completely stabilize a
flow, i.e. stabilize it for all values of the Reynolds number. (Our
conclusions have recently been used by Abbé (1966) to investigate the stability of ducts.
In our paper we also discuss the stability of MHD flows from a new point of view so as to demonstrate that the effect of a magnetic
field on small disturbances in an MHD flow is different from that in a
static situation; usual discussions make no differentiation between
these two situations. We first examine the currents induced by a
disturbance, pointing out the important difference between electro-
magnetic and mechanical disturbances, and then examine the electromagnetic
\[ \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} \] force. By considering the rotationality of the \[ \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} \] force we
find under what conditions the magnetic field affects the forces acting
on the disturbance. We particularly concentrate on the importance of
the relative directions of the mean flow, the magnetic field, and the
line along which the disturbance travels.

In §5.2 we examine the same situation as Wooler (1961), reaching
the same conclusion when \( R_m \ll 1 \). We extend his analysis to include the
case of \( R_m \) being arbitrary and then show that the stabilizing effect of
a magnetic field which is not parallel to the flow is less than one which
is parallel.

In §5.3, we discuss the stability of the boundary layers found in
our examination of MHD flows in rectangular ducts in chapter 2, and the
layers found in our examination of electrically driven flows in chapter 3.
We conclude that the magnetic field has no effect on the disturbances
which determine the onset of instability of these layers and therefore
that the oscillatory velocity profiles found in Hunt (1965) and §3.2, are
extremely unstable.

Finally we present an Appendix in which we expand on the derivation
of the equations in §3.2 of Hunt (1965a).

5.2. Parallel flows with coplanar but non-parallel magnetic fields.

We now consider the stability of plane parallel flows \( \mathbf{u} = (u(y), 0, 0) \)
with magnetic fields which lie in the plane of the
Fig 5.1. Notation of analysis of §5.2.
flow but are not parallel to it, \( B_0 = (B_0 \cos \phi, 0, B_0 \sin \phi) \), (see figure 5.1). Wooler (1961) has deduced the equations of a disturbance travelling at an angle \( \Theta \) to the main flow. Using the same notation as in §3 of Hunt (1965a) the equations are

\[
(U-c)(\psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi) - \psi U^{''} = \frac{B_0 \cos(\Theta - \phi)}{\rho U \cos \Theta} \left( \psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi \right)
= -\frac{i}{\lambda R} \left( \psi^{''} - 2\lambda^2 \psi^{'} + \lambda^4 \psi \right)
\]

and

\[
(U-c)\psi - \frac{B_0 \cos(\Theta - \phi)}{U \cos \Theta} = -\frac{i}{\lambda R} \left( \psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi \right)
\]

When \( R_m \ll 1 \) these equations may be written as

\[
(U-c)(\psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi) - \psi U^{''} + i \lambda \overline{q} \psi = -\frac{i}{\lambda R} \left( \psi^{''} - 2\lambda^2 \psi^{'} + \lambda^4 \psi \right)
\]

where

\[
\overline{q} = \frac{\sigma B_0}{\rho U \cos \Theta} \cos^2(\Theta - \phi) = q_0 \cos^2(\Theta - \phi)
\]

for the same reasons as given in §3.2 of our stability paper.

When \( R_m \) is arbitrary the equations may be rewritten in terms of

\[
\left[(U-c)^2 - A^2 - \frac{i}{\lambda R} U^{''}\right](\psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi) + 2(U-c)^{'} U^{'} (U-c)^{''} \psi^{'}
\]

\[
= -i \left[ \frac{(\psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi)}{\lambda R_m} \right] + \frac{(U+c)(\psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi)}{\lambda^2 R_m} + \frac{(\psi^{''} - \lambda^2 \psi)}{\lambda^2 R R_m}
\]

where

\[
A = \frac{B_0 \cos^2(\Theta - \phi)}{\rho U \cos \Theta}
\]

We first consider the case where \( R_m \ll 1 \), then it follows from (5.2.4) that, given \( \psi > \phi > 0 \), \( \overline{q} \) is least when \( \Theta \leq 0 \) (in particular \( \overline{q} = 0 \) when \( \phi = \pi/2 \)) and for given \( \Theta < 0 \) and \( q_0 \), \( \overline{q} \) is less than its value when \( \Theta = 0 \), since

\[
q_0 \cos^2(\Theta - \phi) < q_0 \cos \Theta \text{ if } \frac{\pi}{2} > \Theta > 0
\]

and \( \Theta < 0 \).
Then, if we assume that $R_{\text{crit}}$ increases as $q$ increases, the lowest value of $R_{\text{crit}}$ for given $q$, when $\Phi > 0$ will occur when $\Theta = 0$ and from the previous result it follows that this value of $R_{\text{crit}}$ is less than the lowest value of $R_{\text{crit}}$ for the same value of $q$ when $\Phi = 0$.

Thus, as Wooler pointed out, for a sufficiently large value of the magnetic field the most unstable disturbances travel at an angle $|\Theta| > 0$ when the magnetic field is not aligned with the flow, i.e. $|\Phi| > 0$. Wooler did not realise, however, that the most unstable disturbances also tend to travel at an angle $|\Theta| > 0$ when $\Phi = 0$. Also we see that when $|\Phi| > 0$, the $q - R_{\text{crit}}$ curve will lie below the curve deduced for $\Phi = 0$. In other words a non-aligned magnetic field is less stabilizing than an aligned one, though we cannot find a simple construction in this case for determining the lowest value of $R_{\text{crit}}$.

When $R_m$ is arbitrary and we have to consider the higher order differential equation (5.2.5) the problem is more complicated. When $\Phi = 0$ the Alfvén number for the equivalent two-dimensional disturbance, $A = B_0 / \mu (U \overline{J} M \rho)$ is the same for all values of $\Theta$, whereas when $|\Phi| > 0$ the Alfvén number of the disturbance, $A = B_0 / (U \overline{J} M \rho)$ varies with $\Theta$.

Given $\Phi > 0$ and $\Theta < 0$, then $A > A$. Also, given $\Theta$, $R$ and $R_m$ are independent of $\Phi$. Then, if $R_{\text{crit}}$ increases as $A$ increases, for given $R_m$, given $\Theta = (\leq 0)$ and $R_m$, it follows that $R_{\text{crit}}$ and hence $R_{\text{crit}}$ are lower when $\Phi > 0$, since then $A < A$. In other words, if the effect of increasing the conductivity (or $R_m$) and the applied magnetic field (or $A$) is to stabilise the flow, then a magnetic field which is not aligned with the flow will have reduced stabilising influence. Clearly, if the effect of increasing the conductivity or the magnetic field is to destabilise the flow then we cannot predict whether an aligned or non-aligned field will have a more destabilising influence.

We can now generalise the results of §3.3. and 4 of Hunt (196a) and state that, when a magnetic field is coplanar with a parallel flow, in the sense we have defined, there is always some finite value of the Reynolds number for which the flow is unstable.

The other conclusion to be drawn from these equations is that when $\Phi = \Pi/2$ and $\Theta = 0$ the equation for $\Phi$ (5.2.1), has no electromagnetic
Therefore, in this case the velocity perturbation is unaffected by the magnetic field and since this particular disturbance is the most unstable when there is no magnetic field, it follows that the stability of the flow is unaffected by the magnetic field when it is perpendicular to it.

5.3. On the stability of MHD flow in rectangular ducts.

Using the results of §3 of Hunt (1965) and §3.2 we now examine some general aspects of the stability of MHD flows in rectangular ducts. The conclusions we reach have already been used in the detailed discussion of the duct flows in chapter 2 (§2.4.2).

When there is no applied magnetic field, the velocity in a rectangular duct varies across the duct in the x and y directions. (We use the notation of fig.24). Very little theory has yet been developed for examining the stability of flows which vary in more than one dimension and none for the stability of laminar flow in a rectangular duct.

When $B_0$ is such that $K \gg 1$, the problem is simpler since a uniform core flow develops in the centre and boundary layers form on the walls. Let us consider these boundary layers and the effect of the magnetic field on their stability, concentrating on the practical situations where $R_m \ll 1$.

**Boundary layers of the walls $\mathbb{B}$**. These boundary layers always have the same velocity profile whatever the various wall conductivities, the thickness of these layers being $O(M^{-1})$. In examining the stability of these layers we must consider the induced magnetic field, $B_z$, as well as the applied field, $B_0$. Although the induced field, $B_z$, has no effect on the mean flow it may influence the stability of the flow. It is easily seen that the maximum value of $B_z = 0 (R_m) B_0$, when $R_m \ll 1$.

Therefore before ignoring this term it is advisable to calculate the value of $q = \alpha B_0^2 \zeta / \nu_c$, where $\zeta$ is the boundary layer thickness and $\nu_c$ is the core velocity. Thus for the effects of $B_z$ on the stability of boundary layers on $\mathbb{B}$ to be negligible, it is necessary that $M R_m^2 / R \ll 1$. 
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The stability of these layers was first examined by Lock (1955) who assumed \( R_L \ll 1 \) and that \( B_z \) was negligible. He found that the magnetic field has a negligible effect compared to that of viscosity on the velocity perturbations, even though the interaction parameter, \( q_0 \), for the boundary layer, \( = O(H/R) \), is of the same order in \( H \) and \( R \) as the reciprocal of the local Reynolds number, also \( O(H/R) \). (In the case of the flows we examined where \( B_o \) was parallel to \( \bar{U} \), \( q_0 \) and \( R^{-1} \) were not related since \( B \) and \( \bar{U} \) could be varied separately.) Thus the magnetic field tends to make such boundary layers stable by affecting the mean velocity profile rather than the actual disturbances. Lock's conclusion was that the flow is unstable when \( R > 50,000 \).

**Boundary layers on the walls.** The velocity profile in the boundary layers on the walls depends on the conductivity of the various walls, but there is one property in common of all such boundary layers which is that their thickness is \( O(M/R^2) \). Therefore, though the velocity varies in the \( y \)-direction, in these layers \( \partial \bar{U} / \partial y \approx \partial U / \partial y \) and at any value of \( y \) we can consider the velocity profile to be a function of \( x \) only, i.e.

\[
\bar{U} = (0, 0, U(x)).
\]

If the induced field is to be negligible,

\[
M^{3/2} R_m / R \ll 1,
\]

where \( R_m \) is based on the core velocity and \( R \) is based on \( a \) and the maximum velocity in the boundary layer, and then we need only consider the effect of

\[
\vec{B}_0 = (0, B_0, 0).
\]

This combination of mean flow and magnetic field is the same as that mentioned in \( S_2 \) for \( \phi = \bar{U} / z \) when we showed that in this case the magnetic field has no effect on the most unstable disturbances, i.e. those travelling parallel to \( \bar{U} \). The physical reason for this was made clear in \( S_2 \) of Hunt (1965) where we showed that if the vorticity of a disturbance is parallel to \( B_0 \) it is unaffected. Therefore we can examine disturbances of the form:

\[
\bar{U} = (u(x)e_y) \left[ \left( \begin{array}{c} i(x + \beta l) \\ 0 \\ i(x + \beta l) \end{array} \right) \right], 0, \omega(x)e_y \left[ \left( \begin{array}{c} i(x + \beta l) \\ 0 \\ i(x + \beta l) \end{array} \right) \right]
\]

by the usual Orr-Sommerfeld equation, and conclude that the onset of instability is unaffected by the magnetic field. However, since it has been shown experimentally and theoretically that at large growth rates...
the disturbances growing most rapidly are often three-dimensional, it seems that the magnetic field must affect the ultimate transition to turbulence of the boundary layer flow.

Two-dimensional shear layers.

It is interesting to note that in the two-dimensional electrically driven flows examined in §3.2, the vorticity of the shear layers away from the walls is parallel to the magnetic field, \( \vec{B}_0 \) and consequently the most unstable disturbances, whose vorticity is parallel to that of the mean flow, are unaffected by \( \vec{B}_0 \). This shows that the flows predicted are likely to be highly unstable.

Appendix to chapter 5.

In this appendix we discuss the approximations made in deducing equation (3.5) from (3.4) in §3 of Hunt (1965a). This approximation which is the same as that made by Stuart (1954), has been criticised for its reasoning by both Hains (1965) and Tatsumi (1962), though they both agreed with Stuart's results. But simply, their objection was that, if

\[
\frac{|b|}{\vec{B}_0} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\omega|}{|\vec{u}|}\right)
\]

then the correct approximation for \( \psi \) in (3.4) when \( R_m \ll 1 \) is:

\[
\psi'' - \lambda^2 \psi = \mathcal{C} \frac{R_m}{\Lambda} \psi
\]

What this implies physically is that the oscillations in \( \vec{b} \) induced by an oscillating field outside the fluid are much larger than those induced by the velocity perturbations. However the oscillations thereby produced in \( \vec{b} \) are of such a high frequency that they cannot be amplified by the mean flow and are damped by viscosity. If \( \beta \) is low enough for

\[
\psi'' - \lambda^2 \psi = 0
\]

then there is no electromagnetic force term in (3.3) and therefore, when oscillations in \( \vec{b} \) occur of this magnitude they have no effects on the stability of the flow.

However, if \( \frac{|b|}{B_0} = \mathcal{O}[R_m] = \frac{|\omega|}{|\vec{u}|} \),

and if only the oscillations of wavelength \( \mathcal{O}[L] \) and frequency \( \mathcal{O}[\vec{u}/\ell] \),
are considered, (3.4) becomes:

\[- \frac{B_{0v}}{U} = -\frac{i}{\lambda R_m} (\psi'' - \lambda^2 \psi) \quad \text{3.2.5.} \]

This approximation must be justified, a posteriori, in any particular case using the values of \( \lambda \) and \( C \) found in the analysis, but in all known cases this approximation has been found to be valid for disturbances of interest.

6.1. Introduction.

6.1.1. Purpose of experiments.

The main object of the experiments described in chapters 7 and 8, was to investigate certain flows by means of direct measurements of velocity and electric potential (e.p.), using Pitot and e.p. probes. There were four main reasons for these investigations. The first was to confirm, at least qualitatively, the existence of some of the remarkable phenomena predicted by the theory of chapters 2 and 3, which occur when $M \gg 1$. The second was to see whether the results of the two probes could be correlated against each other. The third was to use the probes to measure the velocity and potential in some simple, well understood, MHD duct flows and compare the results with those calculated from external pressure measurements in order to calculate the probe errors induced by a magnetic field; we hoped, thereby, to confirm some of the ideas of chapter 4. The fourth reason was to show that the use of such probes can indicate how unstable and turbulent flows develop, in a way that external measurements cannot.

Although there are still some experiments which need doing, the study of MHD duct flows, turbulent and laminar, by means of external measurements of static pressure and electric potential has now provided virtually as much information as it can about the internal mechanics of the flow. Owing to the paucity of the theory of unstable and turbulent MHD duct flows, we can only extend our understanding by internal flow measurements. (For the latest review of the literature see Branover, et al (1966)). This was the reason for Branover & Ideluis (1962), Lecocq (1964), and Moreau (1966) using probes in mercury flows, and clearly many more workers will have to in the future. Therefore we hoped that an investigation into the use of such probes in known or approximately understood flows would enable future experimentalists to have greater confidence in the use of these probes.

6.1.2. Requirements of the apparatus.

The apparatus which was needed for our experiments had to have
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five main elements. We outline here the main requirements for each of these:

(i) The electro-magnet had to satisfy three criteria; the first was that the magnetic flux density, \( \mathbf{B}_0 \), and the gap between the pole pieces, \( 2a \), were great enough to satisfy the condition that \( M \gg 1 \), where \( M = \mathbf{B}_0 a (\sigma/\gamma)^{1/2} \), because we were interested in the curious flows which then occur; the second was that the gap be great enough for the boundary layers and shear layers which occur when \( \mathbf{M} \gg 1 \) to be investigated by probes, the smallest of which were about \( .025" \) in diameter; the third was that the length of the magnet, \( \mathbf{f} \), be great enough for laminar, and, if possible, turbulent, flows to become fully developed when \( \mathbf{M} \gg 1 \). The criterion for the development of laminar flows in a non-conducting pipe is that \( \mathbf{f} \gg \mathbf{a}R/\mathbf{M} \), where \( \mathbf{R} \) is the Reynolds number, \( \mathbf{s}_{\text{Re}} \)

(ii) A rectangular duct was needed in which we could investigate the flows analyzed in \( \mathbf{s}_{2.4} \) and, if possible, many other kinds of flow as well. The requirements of the duct we designed were these; firstly that its walls perpendicular to the magnetic field (\( \mathbf{B}_0 \)) should be such as to have no contact resistance with mercury and to have a very much lower resistance than that of the volume of mercury in the duct, i.e., \( \mathbf{l}_s \gg \mathbf{w}/\mathbf{a} \), where \( \mathbf{w} \) is the wall's conductivity and \( \mathbf{a} \) its thickness; secondly that \( \mathbf{w} < \mathbf{a} \) so that the distance in the fluid parallel to the magnetic field should be maximized; thirdly the walls of the duct parallel to the magnetic field (\( \mathbf{AA} \)) had to be non-conducting. We also hoped to design the duct so that the conductivity of its walls could be changed and that its walls could be removed to insert smaller ducts inside, to place bodies in the flow or to place grids in the flow for turbulence experiments, in other words design the duct as a flexible 'mercury-tunnel'.

(iii) A probe mechanism was needed to move the probes in the plane perpendicular to the axis of the duct, i.e. \( x-y \) plane.

(iv) A flow circuit was required to pump mercury through the duct
Fig 6.1 - I-B curve of electromagnet calibration.
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at rates varying from approximately .004 litres/sec to .05 litres/sec, these flow rates corresponding to Reynolds numbers of about 250 to about 3000, i.e. the range in which Alty found the duct flow, described in §2.1, unstable. Also a flow meter was required to measure these flow rates.

(v) **Instruments**: we needed a manometer to measure as low pressure differences as possible (\(\sim 0.020\) in Hg), consistent with a reasonable time to take a reading and with the fast flows to be measured would not all be completely steady. We also needed a sensitive potentiometer.

6.2. **The electromagnet.**

Having considered the requirements for the magnet and its cost, we ordered an electromagnet from Luntott Engineering. The magnet has an iron core and is energized by water-cooled copper coils which are wound so as to be flush with the pole faces of the magnet; the coils can take up to 60 volts at 1000 amps, D.C. The pole face area is 60" x 9" and the gap between the poles is 3".

We calibrated the magnet by measuring the flux density, \(B_0\), in the centre of the gap with a search coil and Cambridge fluxmeter, as a function of the potential across a shunt placed in series with the magnet. We measured the hysteresis affect on \(B_0\), but no discernible effect was found (fig. 6.1). We then measured the flux density near the edge of the pole faces to examine the uniformity of the field, finding that when \(B_0 = 0.7 \frac{\text{lb}}{\text{in}}\) the field was uniform to within \(\frac{1}{2}\%\) over a volume 60" x 3" x 3" but when \(B_0 = 1.2 \frac{\text{lb}}{\text{in}}\) the field was uniform to within \(\frac{1}{2}\%\) 8" in from the edges of the pole faces, 1", 2" in, and 5% over the 60" x 3" x 3" volume.

The cooling water rate required for the magnet is about 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) g.p.m. a pressure switch setting off an alarm if the flow dropped below this rate. The magnet pole faces tend to move together as the current is increased so spaces are needed to prevent this distortion; lengths of 1" brass rod were found to be sufficiently strong.

6.3. **The rectangular duct.**

To satisfy the requirements that \(d_A \gg 1, \omega \ll \alpha\), and that no contact
(a) Side view with copper side walls removed, showing section thru' bottom of duct at typical tapping (5) and stainless connectors.

(b) Plan view of duct with copper side walls.
Fig 6.2 (c) Section AA showing duct supported on light alloy channel.
resistance should be present in the walls (AA), the only suitable metal is copper. To satisfy the requirement that the walls (AA) be non-conducting, we could either have used metal walls and covered them with a non-conducting layer, e.g. sellotape, or used a non-conducting material such as 'Perspex'. The problem lay in sealing the duct. The first point to establish on a small scale duct was whether it was possible to construct a duct in which all 6 constituent parts, i.e. the 4 walls and the 2 end pieces for connecting the duct to the flow circuit, could be assembled without permanently joining any of them, e.g. by gluing or welding, but by bolting them together and mechanically sealing them e.g. by rubber sheets and '0' rings. All attempts at this, the ideal solution, failed, because leaks developed. There were then two remaining solutions; we could either make the 2 walls AA and the 2 end pieces out of one piece of copper, as Alty (1966) did, or we could weld or glue the pieces together, in either case sealing the hole thus formed with the walls AA. This solution was rejected, firstly because to machine a hole 60" x 3" x 2 1/4" out of a piece of copper 66" x 3" x 3" is wasteful and very difficult, and secondly because all our attempts at welding copper failed. (Gluing was out of the question because of the way in which mercury amalgamates with copper, (Alty, 1966)).

The second solution was either to make the walls AA and the end pieces out of one piece of copper or Perspex, or again to permanently join them. After our previous experience with welding copper, the simplest solution was to make the walls AA and the end pieces from Perspex and to glue them together. Then the walls BB would consist of 2 standard copper 1/4" strips bolted to each other through the Perspex, the seal being made by an '0' ring seated in a continuous groove cut into the side of the walls AA and the end-pieces. A small scale duct was constructed to this design, filled with mercury, and found not to leak. (This small scale duct was later used for the electrically driven flow experiments described in chapter 7, and is shown in fig.7.1).

We then designed a large scale duct, which is shown in figure 6.2. The Perspex part of the duct was made up from 6 separate pieces labelled 1a, 1b, 2, 3, 4a and 4b, the various parts being glued together as shown in the drawing. Great care was taken in the fabrication of the duct to
see that parts were glued together only after they had been stress relieved by annealing; also the various parts were always annealed after rough machining before the final machining was done. (Where Perspex was used in other parts of the flow circuit and not annealed before gluing, the joints sometimes tended to leak; where Perspex was machined, but not annealed, it tended to craze under stress).

The machining of such a long piece of Perspex was difficult because of the tight tolerances required, particularly on the 'O' ring groove, and also because of the considerable thermal expansion of Perspex. The 5\(\times\)\(\frac{1}{4}\) copper strips which were used for the walls AA were ground and polished to remove surface blemishes and enable a smooth amalgam to be formed. They were then drilled and tapped to take the Aluminium Bronze retaining bolts.

We now mention some further details of the design. Perhaps the most striking point about the duct to a fluid dynamicist is the fact that the flow entering the duct diverges rather than converges, so that the flow would not settle down by the time it reached the end of the duct. The reason for our design is that a magnetic field forces a flow to settle down in a shorter length and tends to suppress the eddying motion characteristic of rapidly diverging flows. Clearly, if flows are to be examined when the ratio \(M^2/R\) is very small then a new design will be required. The tappings were made along the centre line of the Perspex wall using the method of Alty (1966), and some were made along a line at right angles to the wall under the rear probe position. (The reasons for their positions will be given in chapters 7 and 8). These tappings could be used for either pressure or potential measurements. The very narrow, (\(0.062\) i.d., \(0.05\) o.d.), P.W.C. tubes which were glued into the tappings were joined to wider tubing about an inch downstream of the tapping in the cavity under the duct, this tubing in turn being joined to \(\frac{1}{8}\) i.d. tubing outside the duct; the method of jointing these tubes was again the same as that of Alty. Note the presence of two air bleeds at the extreme downstream end of the wide portion of the duct and in the plug used to block the hole A, which was not used in these experiments; they were used for expelling all the air from the duct when filling it and enabling the duct to be emptied.
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6.4. **The mechanism for moving the probes.**

The difficulties in designing a mechanism to move a probe in the plane perpendicular to the duct axis, the x-y plane, (see fig. 6.2) are caused by the fact that one can only move the probes via the top walls, (AA), because the magnet's pole pieces obstruct the walls BB, and also the necessity of avoiding leaks.

Two ingenious solutions to the problem have been found by Moreau (1963, 1966). In the first he made the top of his duct a continuous movable steel ribbon through which the probe projected, a volume above the duct being full of mercury enclosed by the ribbon and side walls. The main disadvantages of this method are its extravagance with mercury and the lack of really accurate positioning required for boundary layer traverses. His second solution was more economical of mercury but again not suitable for boundary layer work, which did not worry Moreau since he was investigating jets.

We adopted the method of Leccocq (1964) who had used his probe mechanism to investigate boundary layers (see figs. 6.3 and 7.1). The principle of his method was to move the probe in the y-direction by placing its stern, P, in a vertical hole drilled at a radius R in a circular cylinder, the spindle S, so that, by rotating S, whose axis is vertical, the probe stern moves in a circle, radius R, in the y-z plane.

The immediate advantage of this method is the ease with which the spindle and the probe may be sealed. There are three main disadvantages. The first is that the probe is moved in the z-direction as well as the y-direction; this does not matter, of course, in a fully developed duct flow, but does matter in our electrically driven flows described in chapter 7. The second is that, if the probe is fixed to the spindle, its orientation relative to the flow changes as the spindle is rotated; to overcome this difficulty the probe must be free to rotate in S and its orientation must be fixed by some other means. The third disadvantage is that for our type of duct design, the spindle cannot be as wide as the duct so that the probes cannot be pointing straight into the flow and touch the walls BB.

The final design we adopted is shown in figure 6.3. In order to keep the probe pointing straight into the flow when examining duct flows,
we used Lecocq's method, which entails clamping the probe to a crank bar, B. The crank bar B is constrained to be parallel to the duct's axis as each point on it traverses a circle, radius R, by means of 2 cranks C, which rest on the Perspex block which supports the whole mechanism. Placed on the crank is a micrometer screw to provide the vertical movement of the probe. Then the exact position of the probe should be determined by the readings of the micrometer scale, N, and of the angular scale, A, attached to the spindle. However, there are some errors in this system which have to be corrected, the first being caused by the slight 'slop' in the joints between C and B which makes the position of B to a limited extent, (~2°), indeterminate when the cranks are in line, i.e. 'top dead centre'. (Lecocq's apparatus did not, apparently, suffer from this defect because roller and ball bearings were used throughout rather than the simple fitting joints we used). The other fault of the system is caused by the 'O' ring seal, s, which, if tight enough to be effective, can cause twisting of the probe stem so that, even if B is parallel to the axis, the probe tip may not be. In order to avoid the first of these faults we attached a vertical plate, W, to the probe mechanism block. This plate is accurately parallel to the duct axis so that, by ensuring B to be parallel to this plate, we could ensure the probe to be correctly aligned.

The plate, W, was also used in conjunction with the 'dummy probe', D, an attachment to the probe stem which gives the position of the probe in the y-z plane; by measuring the distance between D and W we could check on the movement of the probe in the y-direction and by taking into account the value of A we could calculate the movement in the z-direction; we used the latter method in the experiments on electrically driven flows, as described in chapter 7. The distance moved in the z-direction could be checked further by measuring the distance between D and a set square clamped to the plate. We used the plate W in the duct flow experiments for clamping on a 'dummy duct', the purpose of which was to indicate when the probe was near the walls BB and also to enable us to measure accurately the probe's position in the y-direction by using slip gauges between the dummy duct wall and D. (see fig. 6.3a). These extra measurements still did not eliminate the cause of error due
to the probe's twist. However we found when using the probe that this error was too small for measurement.

An incidental advantage of our design of the probe mechanism was that to change the probe we could lift the whole perspex block off the duct after simply undoing the retaining nuts, $N$ (fig. 7.1). In Lecocq's duct, the supporting block was an integral part of the duct so that the spindle $S$ had to be withdrawn, and the cranks removed, which was far more complicated.

Further details on the use of the probe mechanism is left to chapters 7 and 8.

6.5. The flow circuit and its components.

Before describing the flow circuit as a whole we first describe its main components, the pump and the flow meter.

6.5.1. Pump.

The main considerations in choosing a pump was that it should not leak when used with mercury, and be fairly steady in its operation. The Orbital Lobe pump used by Alty (1968) could not deliver a sufficiently high flow rate, while the electromagnetic pump which Shercliff (1956) used was not very steady and tended to heat the mercury; the problem of using a conventional centrifugal pump seemed to be that of avoiding leaks. In the end we chose to buy a Watson-Marlow Flow Inducer, for what now appears to be very inadequate reasons. The pump operates by rotating a disc about its central axis; perpendicular to the disc face are rigidly fixed three equally spaced spindles, on which are mounted freely revolving rollers. As the disc rotates the rollers squeeze a pipe placed between them and the fixed track, which is concentric with the disc axis. (See fig. 6.6). Thus the pump's motion is that of direct displacement and in consequence is necessarily pulsating. However no leaks occur (provided the pipe does not burst), the speed of the flow can be changed, and, very important, the flow can be reversed by the flick of a switch.

It soon transpired that we would need to operate the pump at much higher pressures, up to 43 p.s.i. or 78" Hg, than its makers recommend, 20 p.s.i. Therefore we had to investigate the limitations of the pump's
Fig. 6.4. Flow meter calibration rig. (Not to scale)
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performance in these more extreme conditions. We have found that, while
the stated maximum flow rate of the pump used with a \( \frac{\pi}{4} \)" diameter pipe at
nominal head is .15 litres/sec, the maximum flow rate at about 60"
difference in head is about .06 litres/sec. (It slightly depends on
the tubing used). The other limitation, which was more serious from our
point of view, was that the working life the tubing decreases very sharply
at these higher pressures, so that an elastic P.V.C. pipe of \( \frac{\pi}{4} \)" diameter
sprang a leak after 30 minutes of running at 43 p.s.i. as compared to the
quoted lifetime of 30 hours at pressures less than 20 p.s.i. By trying
out various different tubing we found that reinforced rubber tubing was
best, e.g., Dunlop, Neoprene, 3 wrap reinforced tubing Type 420B, but even
then had to be changed after 5 hours intermittent running, at these
pressures.

6.5.2. Electromagnetic flowmeter.

To measure the rather low flowrates in our experiments we decided
to use an electromagnetic flowmeter and designed the first one similar
to that of Shercliff (1955, fig.19), the main difference being that we
used a Swift-Levick permanent magnet, which has a greater field strength (about 1000 gauss) than that of Shercliff's magnetron magnet. The flow-
meter was calibrated in a slightly different way from that of Alty (1966)
and Shercliff (1955), in that we recorded the time taken for a given
volume to be filled at a given flowrate rather than the weight of mercury
passed in a given time at a given flowrate. The apparatus used is shown
schematically in fig.6.4. The header tank was similar to that of
Shercliff, except that the pipe inside the tank had a 'rose' on its end
to make the bubbles smaller and flow smoother. The weigh tank had two
openings, at the top and the bottom; the 'Perspex' tube inside the tank
had three insulated stainless steel wires, \( x, y, z \), leading down its
exterior which were bent horizontally through the tube wall and bared
inside the tube at the points \( X, Y, Z \). The process of calibration
consisted, after first filling the weigh tank (w.t) with mercury, of
opening the on-off cock A and pumping the mercury into the header tank
(h.t), the air vent, \( V \), being open. Then the air vent, \( V \), and A were
closed, the adjustable cock, \( C \), was varied appropriately and the cock B
was opened. Then the mercury filled the w.t. and when the mercury level
Fig 6.5. Mark II Flowmeter
reached Z, the wires x and y became connected which triggered off a relay to either start an electric counter or light an electric bulb. In general two readings of the potentiometer were taken before the level reached Z, when the wires z, y, and x were connected which stopped the counter or extinguished the bulb. We found that the flickering contact made at Y and Z led to the timing of the electric bulb by a stop watch being more accurate than using the counter. With the shortest time measured being 4 seconds we found that the variation in the measured flow rate, i.e. \( P \times S \), where \( P \) was the mean potentiometer reading and \( S \) the number of seconds the light was on, was about \( 0.5\% \). To measure the volume used, we put the w.t on some scales and, as we filled it by hand, measured the increase in weight while the light was on. (The tank was out of the circuit, being disconnected at the top and to the left of the clock, A). The error in weighing was about \( 0.1\% \) so that our final calibration,

\[
Q/V = (3.42 \times 10^{-3}) \text{ (litres/sec)/mV}
\]

was accurate to \( 0.6\% \); in the formula \( Q \) is the volume flowrate in litres/sec and \( V \) is the potentiometer reading in m Volts.

To avoid the complication of screening the flowmeter from the field of the main electromagnet, we decided to place the flowmeter immediately under the header tank (see §6.5.3 and fig.6.6) and therefore sufficiently far from the magnet to cause no error. However, we found that this caused bubbles of air to appear in the diverging part of the flowmeter where it changes section from a slit \( 0.035\)" wide to a \( 1\)" diameter tube. (The \( 1\)" section then decreases to the \( \frac{1}{2}\)" tubing). This phenomenon which only occurred at flow rates above \( 0.03 \) litres/sec led to bubbles near the flowmeter electrodes and erratic readings from the flowmeter. We then had to make a new flowmeter (Mark II) for these higher flowrates, shown in fig.6.5, in which the transition from the wider gap (\( 0.120\)") to the \( \frac{1}{2}\)" tubing was carefully made by filing. Even this flowmeter suffers from the same entrainment defect, but fortunately at flowrates above \( 0.05 \) litres/sec.

6.5.3. The flow circuit.

We now describe the flow circuit used for the experiments in the
main duct and the calibration duct which are described in chapter 8. The principles of the circuit are the same as that used by Alty (1966), Lecocq (1964), and Moreau (1963), in that the pump is separated in the circuit from the experimental duct by two weirs (see figure 6.6); the mercury is pumped from the lower weir tank (L.w.t) to the upper weir tank (U.w.t), where a constant height of mercury is maintained by the mercury falling over the weir and returning to the downstream side of the L.w.t. via the overflow pipe. That which does not overflow returns to the L.w.t. via the flowmeter and the experimental duct. The main differences between our circuit and Alty’s are: a) the larger scale of the circuit resulting from the higher flow rates and larger magnet used, b) the flowmeter being far from the magnet, as already mentioned, and c) the addition of an extra pipe for draining off the main duct. This extra pipe was used in the following way: first the tap (5) was closed and the taps (3) and (8) were opened, (the taps (1), and (4), and (7), being already open, (2) and (6) being closed); then the pump was started in the reverse direction to empty the contents of the L.w.t. and the duct into the reservoir tanks, the air vent on the duct being opened to speed the process. The purpose of this fast draining process was to enable us to lift off the probe block and change the probes quickly. The way in which the rest of the circuit was used in the experiments will be described in chapter 8.

It is worth commenting on some of the details of the flow circuit. \( \frac{3}{8} \) bore \( \frac{1}{8} \) wall, flexible, industrial, P.V.C. tubing was used throughout the circuit, except in the pump, and was found quite satisfactory for the high pressures involved, (up to 43 p.s.i.). (Elastic P.V.C. tubing is liable to fracture at these pressures). In order to ease the removal of various parts of the circuit we needed easily detachable joints in the tubing. These were made of stainless steel to the same design as those of Alty (1966). In all the joints between the tubing and the various weir tanks, taps, etc, stainless steel connectors were used, which were made on the same principle as those on the main duct, jubilee clips being used to seal the connectors to the duct, tank, etc. Another example of their use is given in figure 6.7 where the on-off tap used in the circuit is shown. These taps are made by Le Bas for pressures up to 200 p.s.i.
in circuits with rigid plastic tubing; however, when modified for use with flexible tubing by means of the stainless steel connectors shown in fig. 6.7, we found that these taps did not leak and, because of their positive action, their resistance to the flow was always the same when in the on position. (The importance of this characteristic will be more apparent in chapter 8). To provide a variable resistance to the flow we first tried the method used by Alty, namely a micrometer screw adjustment of a bung in the outlet of the u.w.t, but it turned out to be unsatisfactory owing to the air being entrained in the flow round the bung which in turned to bubbles in the flowmeter immediately below the u.w.t. We therefore used a Le Bas throttle valve below the flowmeter, as shown in figure 6.6, the valve being modified with stainless steel connectors in the same way as with the on-off taps.

6.6. Instruments.

6.6.1. Manometer.

To measure pressure differences we used a manometer similar to that built by Alty (1966), though allowing the mercury to stand with a free surface in the tubes connected to the tappings so that the existence of a pressure drop (if great enough) or the existence of bubbles in a tapping lead could be observed by the difference in height of the free surfaces. Although, theoretically the manometer could measure pressures accurately to within „001” meths, in fact it was rarely possible to do so for the many reasons described in chapters 7 and 8. One aspect of the design which has not been considered before is the electrical contact between the tappings in the manometer. In some situations if such a contact exists the fact that the two tappings or the tapping and the probe are at different potentials can lead to circulating currents which affect the measured pressure difference. Therefore we examined whether the pinchcocks used in the manometer, when closed, electrically isolated the mercury either side of the cock as well as eliminating any flow through it. We found that, if the cocks are tightened up well and placed centrally in the pinchcock, they do in fact isolate the mercury either side of them. In the manometer we could either use meths over mercury, as Alty (1966) did or air over meths over mercury as Shercliff (1955); in general we used the latter method.
6.6.2. **Potentiometer.**

We used a Pye potentiometer to measure steady voltages, across the shunt in the electro-magnet circuit, between the electrodes in the electrically driven flows of chapter 7, between the e.p. probe and tappings in the walls of the ducts and across the flowmeter. The potentiometer used with a galvanometer can measure up to $1 \mu V$, and it is sometimes possible to estimate up to $\frac{1}{2} \mu V$ if the voltage is steady. When the voltage was rather unsteady we tried to use the galvanometer direct since it is calibrated, but we found that the resistance of the circuit was too great for accuracy.
7. Experiments on electrically driven flows.

7.1. Introduction.

There were two main reasons for investigating electrically driven flows as well as pressure driven flows; the first being that we had analysed these kinds of flow and found some interesting results, (described in chapter 3), which we thought would be worth while investigating experimentally; the second being that we could use these simple flows induced by current passing between two circular electrodes to test the probes and probe mechanism while the rest of the flow circuit was being constructed.

Before considering the experiments we first describe our apparatus, showing how we used the probe mechanism to examine these flows. We then apply some of the results of our analysis on the use of probes in chapter 4 to predict some of the likely errors in these experiments and in considering the best design of probe. (Many of the theoretical concepts described in chapter 4 were developed after these experiments were completed, so that our probes might well have been better designed).

In §7.3, we describe the experiments on the flow induced between finite circular electrodes. First the flows were examined to see how low the current needed to be for no secondary flows to occur, so that our results could be compared with the theory of §3.3.3. Then we measured the variation of the resistance between the electrodes with the Hartmann number, $M$, successfully showing that the resistance varies linearly with $M^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ when $M \gg 1$, and that, as $M \to \infty$, the resistance tends to the value predicted in §3.3.3. We used electric potential probes to investigate the curious layers joining the edges of the electrodes and were able to demonstrate that the thickness of these layers in which large potential gradients occurred is $O(M^{-\frac{1}{2}})$. To verify the existence of the velocity in these layers we traversed them with a pitot tube and examined the variation of the velocity with the current. Finally we compare the results of the two kinds of probe to draw conclusions as to the errors of the probes and the nature of the flows.
(a) Section of first apparatus.

(b) Section of second apparatus.
Fig 7.1 (c) Section BB
7.2. The experimental apparatus

7.2.1. The duct and the electrodes.

Our experiments on electrically driven flows using mercury as the conducting fluid were performed in the rectangular duct which had originally been constructed as a prototype for the main 66'' duct, described in §6.3, and which was then modified for examining electrically driven flows (see figure 7.1). For the first set of experiments two Perspex blocks, \( \frac{1}{2}'' \) thick, were made with copper discs \( \frac{3}{8}'' \) in diameter \((\approx 2b)\) and \( \frac{1}{4}'' \) thick, let into them, the surfaces of the copper discs being flush with those of the Perspex blocks (fig. 7.1a). The blocks were placed either side of the duct with a gap of \( 1.47'' \) \((\approx 2a)\) between them, so that \( \ell = b/a = 0.512 \). (The copper walls of the duct were isolated from its interior by rubber sheets to avoid any short circuits.) Each disc had two wires connected to it, one to supply the current and the other to measure the electric potential of the disc. A fifth wire was placed in one of the tubes leading out of the duct, its purpose being to measure the potential mid-way between the discs.

We found that with this first apparatus the layers emanating from the disc edges were not sufficiently thick compared to the width of the probe and also, since we were interested in examining the flow at a different value of \( \ell \), we made a second set of experiments in which one of the Perspex blocks and the insulation on one of the duct’s copper walls were removed so that we were effectively examining only one half of the space between two discs. The distance from the disc to the copper face was \( 1.97'' \) \((\approx a)\) and thus \( \ell = b/a = 0.190 \) as shown in fig. 7.1b. In this case we attached two wires to the plate to measure potential and transmit the current.

With the duct placed in the electro-magnet in the first apparatus the maximum value of the Hartmann number, \( M \), based on \( a \) was about 600 and in the second about 1600. In order that the flows developed were similar to those described in the asymptotic theory of §3.3.3, two conditions had to be satisfied by the apparatus. Knowing the maximum of \( M \) attainable we can now state these conditions. The first was that any error in the alignment of the two discs had to be very much less than the
thickness of the regions (1), i.e. the layers emanating from the disc edges, which are \(0(M^{-1/2}) = 0.030\). We can confidently say this condition was satisfied by the two discs; with the one disc of the second apparatus this condition did not apply. The second condition was that the thickness of region (1) should be very much less than the radius of the electrodes, which required that 
\[
b \gg aM^{-1/2} \quad \text{or} \quad \ell M^{1/2} \gg 1.
\]
The maximum values of \(\ell M^{1/2}\) attainable in the two apparatus were 13 and 7.7, respectively, which shows that the first apparatus met the conditions of the theory better than the second. (We did not use larger electrodes for fear of the regions (1) touching the top and bottom walls of the duct).

7.2.2. Probe mechanism.

When describing in §6.4 the design of our mechanism for moving probes in a duct where the flow was fully developed, we mentioned that we could also use the mechanism for examining electrically driven flow. To examine the flow between two circular electrodes placed in non-conducting planes opposite each other with a magnetic field parallel to the line joining their centres, we only needed to examine the flow in one plane, \(\Theta = \text{constant}\), (to use the notation of fig.3.7), because, for low enough velocities, the flow is axisymmetric. Since we wanted to use the mechanism and the probes designed for examining duct flows with the minimum number of alterations, we chose to examine the flows in the plane \(\Theta = \pi/2\). As a result of this decision we mounted the mechanism on the duct as shown in figure 7.1.c.

The method of moving the probe in the plane \(\Theta = \pi/2\), using the notation of fig.7.1, may be understood by referring to figure 7.1a, where the locus of the probe stem is shown in the \(r-z\) plane \(\Theta = 0\).

To move the probe tip in the \(\Theta = \pi/2\) plane, we could not keep the angle \(\phi\) between the probe and the duct axis, \((\phi = 0, \Theta = 0)\) constant; but, by specifying the distance, \(z\), we could calculate the angle \(\alpha\) at which the probe spindle, \(S\), should be set in order for the probe tip to lie in the \(\Theta = \pi/2\) plane. To set the probe we first turned \(S\) to the appropriate value of \(\phi\) and then twisted the probe on its own axis until the distance between the dummy probe and the dummy duct in the \(z\)-direction was the same as that required between the probe tip and the
elettroo.e, the dummy duct being made so that its wall was vertically above
the electrode. As a consequence of this method of moving the probes,
being \( \frac{3}{4}\) in from their tip to the centre line of their stem, the probes
were only able to face into the flow when \( z = 1, J = 1 \) and, in the first
apparatus at \( z = 0.5, J = 1 \), and in the second at \( z = 0.25, J = 0.25 \).
Therefore, without making new probes of differing lengths, the pitot
tubes could only be used near these values of \( z \), such a probe being
accurate to \( 1\% \) if it faces into the flow to within \( 10^\circ \). However, the
electric probes could be used at all values of \( z \), since they do not
critically depend on pointing into the flow, or being at right angles to
the current path. But, if \( \theta \) is the angle between the line joining the
probe's tip to the axis of its stem and the duct's axis, (see fig. 7.1a,
b), it is clear from our analysis of chapter 4 that the probe errors are
reduced if \( \theta \) is kept to a minimum. When the probe tip was on the
duct's centre line, \( \theta \) took its maximum value, about \( 45^\circ \).

7.2.3. Electric potential probes.

We mention here a few of the considerations which led to the
design of the e.p. probe we used in the experiments, bearing in mind
the analysis of chapter 4. On the one hand such a probe needs to be as
small as possible when used in flows such as those where the gradients
of velocity and electric potential are large, for the reasons given in
chapter 4, the probe size also needed to be minimised to reduce the size
of the vortices shed by the probe which, being carried round,
would tend to affect the potential at the probe tip. On the other hand
the probe must be sufficiently rigid for its position to be determinate,
particularly since in this experiment the probe would not always be
facing into the flow; also the conducting region inside the probe must
have a sufficient diameter for its resistance to be reasonably low and
this wire has to be insulated from the probe's exterior if made of metal.

The fact that the strongest small diameter tubing easily available
is made of stainless steel determined our choice of the material for the
probe's exterior. The main alternative was Pyrex tubing which Lecoq
used; this suffers from the disadvantage of being brittle and therefore
easily broken if the probe was inadvertently pushed against the wall and
also it is less easily bent to the required shape than stainless steel.
(a) Pilot tube

(b) Electric Potential probe

Fig 7.2 Pilot and electric potential probe
However the advantage of Pyrex tubing is that it does not require insulation from the conducting material inside the probe. We could either choose to have mercury inside the probe as our conducting region or we could use an electric wire. The advantage of the wire is that it can be made to protrude from the end of the probe and thus present a small area to the flow. We chose to use Palladium and Platinum wires, the thermoelectric potential of these wires being close to that of mercury; we did not try out the method of Lecoq (1964) who used Platinum wires coated with sodium, which, apparently, reduced the thermoelectric potential difference between the wire and the mercury to zero.

The final design is shown in fig. 7.2(a). Note the two diameters of stainless steel tubing used; the use of flexible plastic tubing as the insulator between the steel tubing and the wire, and the coating of the exterior of the probe with a thin layer of non-conducting Perspex cement.

We now consider the various regions of the flow between the discs, as described theoretically in §3.3, in order to predict the kind of errors to be expected.

Region (1)

In this region the current density is uniform and the velocity is zero so that, if the probe is at right angles to the current, i.e. \( \phi = 0 \), from our symmetry result of §4.3, no error would be induced. However, as we have explained, the probe could always be at right angles to the plane \( \Theta = \pi/2 \), so that we could expect some error due to blocking the currents. Then the error in \( \phi \) compared to \( \Delta \phi \), the potential of the disc is easily seen to be \( O(d/a) \), where \( d \) is the probe diameter. (There is another possible source of error caused by a local velocity, \( \mathcal{U} \), induced by the displaced currents; then the \( \mathcal{E} \) x \( \mathcal{B} \) electric field could affect \( \phi \), the measured value of \( \phi \), but in the region (1) \( \mathcal{B} \) is parallel to \( \mathcal{E} \), and it may be seen that no error can result from \( \mathcal{E} \) x \( \mathcal{B} \).)

Region (1)

In this region, where severe velocity and potential gradients exist and the approximate relation

\[-\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} + v \cdot \mathcal{E} \cdot \mathcal{B}_0 = 0\]

7.2.1.
holds true we can use the result (4.3.8) to estimate the order of magnitude of the error between \( \phi \) and \( \phi_m \). Changing the notation of (4.3.2) we have:

\[
\phi_m \approx \phi + k \frac{d^2 B_0 \partial U_e/\partial r}{\partial r^2}. \tag{7.2.2}
\]

where from (4.3.2) we can assume \( k \) to be a positive constant of order unity. (In our analysis we assumed \( R_d \rightarrow 1 \) where \( R \) is the Reynolds number based on the probe diameter, and that the flow was independent of \( R_d \). However if \( R_d \) is low enough the flow is dependent on \( R_d \) and then \( k \) in (7.2.2) becomes a function of \( U_e \).) For the purpose of this approximate argument we also assume that the probe is pointing into the flow, i.e., \( z \approx 0 \), otherwise the error in (7.2.2) might be proportional to \( U_e \) as well as \( dU_e/dr \).

Using (7.2.1), (7.2.2) becomes,

\[
\phi_m \approx \phi + k \frac{d^2 \phi}{\partial r^2}. \tag{7.2.3}
\]

Two main results stem from this. If we consider a very simplified expression to represent the fall of \( \phi \) through the regions (1), say \( \phi = \frac{1}{r} \operatorname{erf} (\tilde{c}') \) where \( \tilde{c}' = \frac{(r-b)}{a M^2} \), then we can first see that \( \partial \phi_m/\partial r \) has two maxima one for \( \tilde{c}' < 0 \) and one for \( \tilde{c}' > 0 \), and secondly that if \( k \) is low enough, the maximum value of \( \partial \phi_m/\partial r \) is less than that of \( \partial \phi_m/\partial \tilde{c}' \).

As is obvious if (7.2.3) is written in terms of \( \tilde{c}' \), i.e.,

\[
\phi_m = \phi + k \frac{d^2 M}{\partial \tilde{c}'^2}, \tag{7.2.4}
\]

the condition for the error term to be negligible is that \( \frac{d^2 M}{\partial \tilde{c}'^2} \ll 1 \). From (7.2.4) we also see that, if \( R_d \rightarrow \infty \), \( \phi_m \ll \phi \) or \( I \), the current passing between the electrodes, whereas, if the flow over the probe is sensitive to variations in \( R_d \), \( \phi_m \) would not be proportional to \( \phi \) or \( I \). If the error term is appreciable, it follows that, even if \( \phi \) is a function of \( \tilde{c}' \) at a particular value of \( \tilde{r} \), \( \phi_m \) is not. Since the potential measured by a probe is the mean of the potential across the face of its tip, a circle of .025" in diameter, to calculate the error we had to average \( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial r^2} \) or \( \frac{dU_e}{\partial r} \) across the probe face.

Finally we note that we could either calculate \( \phi \) purely from \( \phi_m \) by integrating (7.2.4) or we could use the results of the pitot tube readings \( U_e \) as well as the readings of \( \phi_m \) to calculate \( \phi \) from (7.2.2).
7.2.4. Pitot tubes.

The considerations leading to the design of the pitot tube were very similar to those leading to the design of the e.p. probe, the only difference being that the probe should not have too small an internal diameter because of the need to reduce the time for taking a reading of pressure. Again we used various sizes of stainless steel non-magnetic tubing for the probe, each tube fitting inside the other. The tube was coated with Perspex cement in order to minimise the effects of the probe on the electric fields; however this was not really necessary as the contact resistance of stainless steel is so large as to render it effectively non-conducting. The final design of pitot tube is shown in figure 7.2.2(b).

From the theory of chapter 4 and the experimental results of East we expected that the MHD probe errors could be calculated from the formula:

\[ p_0 = p_s + \frac{1}{2} \rho \frac{R}{u_0^2} (1 + \alpha \frac{L}{R} \frac{B_0^2 a}{\rho} u_0) \]

where \( p_0 \) and \( p_s \) are the total and static pressure respectively. It turned out that \( N = \frac{\sigma B_0^2 a}{\rho u_0} \) was about unity so that higher order terms in the expansion should have been used. However, the results of East gave \( \alpha = 0.39 \) and our own results of chapter 8 gave \( \alpha \approx 0.4 \) for values of \( N \) of 0(1), so we assumed \( \alpha = 0.4 \) in our calculations of velocity.

The other source of error to be expected was caused by measuring velocity in a shear flow the length scale of which was comparable with the diameter of the pitot tube. However we show in §8.2 that using a pitot tube to measure the velocity of a plane Poiseuille flow in a duct, the width of which is only four times that of the tube, leads to negligible errors over the central half, but appreciable errors (\( \sim 50\% \)) when the probe touches the wall. Therefore in a free shear flow such as this we do not expect errors in velocity greater than 10\% due to this effect.

We decided to measure the velocity induced in the region (1) by means of a pitot tube only, the pressure in the pitot tube being measured relative to the pressure at a tapping in the wall of the duct, \( p_w \). The static pressure was not measured in the layer, even though there was a small static pressure gradient through the layer due to the rotating flow. However we were able to calculate this pressure gradient using the equation
Fig. 73: Potential between the discs, $\bar{\Phi}$, against current, $I$, at various $M$. 
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\[ \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} = \frac{\rho v_\theta^2}{\gamma}. \]

Leaving the error in \( p_0 \) for the moment, we have the usual relation between \( p_0 \) and \( p_s \), the total and static pressures, i.e.

\[ p_0 = p_s + \frac{1}{2} \rho v_\theta^2. \]

Eliminating \( p_s \) from (7.2.6) and (7.2.7) we have:

\[ \frac{\partial p_0}{\partial r} = + \frac{\rho v_\theta^2}{\gamma} + \frac{\rho}{2} \frac{\partial v_\theta^2}{\partial r}, \]

whence:

\[ v_\theta^2 = \frac{2}{\rho r^2} \int_0^r \left( r^2 \frac{\partial p_0}{\partial r} \right) \, dr. \]

Thus, by only measuring \( p_0 \), we could calculate \( v_\theta \). Since the static pressure effect is \( O(\epsilon^2) (\ll 1) \), we could approximately allow for the MHD error, which was greater than the static pressure effect, by using successive approximations to calculate \( v_\theta \), viz

\[ v_\theta_n = \left( \frac{\rho}{r^2} \int_0^r \left( r^2 \frac{\partial p_0}{\partial r} \right) \, dr \right) / \left( 1 + \frac{4\sigma B_0^2 \rho}{\rho v_\theta^2} \right). \]

(We needed to use two iterations at the most in our calculations).

7.3. Experimental results.

7.3.1. Electric potential measurements.

Since the aim of the experiments was to reproduce conditions examined in the theory of §3.3.3 we first had to establish that a laminar flow regime existed in which the secondary flow was negligible. It is clear from the equations of motion that when the secondary flow occurs, i.e. a flow occurs with a radial component of velocity driven by the radial pressure gradient, \( (\rho v_\theta^2/n) \), the relationship between \( \Delta \phi \), the mean potential between the discs, and \( I \), the total current flowing between the discs, would become non-linear. Thus, by measuring \( \Delta \phi \) against \( I \) at a given value of \( M \), we were able to find out how low the current \( I \) needed to be for us to achieve the required flow. Fig.(73) shows the \( \Delta \phi - I \) curves for the two apparatus at various values of \( M \). (For the second apparatus we have doubled the potential between the discs and the
Note that, in the range of \( I \) considered, \( \Delta \phi \propto I \) when \( M = 0 \) and that, when \( M \neq 0 \), the curve of \( \Delta \phi \) against \( I \) is a straight line for \( I \) sufficiently low, but as \( I \) increases the curve ceases to be a straight line indicating the onset of secondary flow. There are two curves for the first apparatus (two discs, \( l = 512 \)) taken at \( M = 588 \) and \( M = 204 \). Note that the value of \( I \) at which the flow becomes unstable is higher when \( M \) is higher, thus indicating that an increased magnetic field tends to suppress the secondary flow. This may be explained by the fact that, since the velocity, \( v_\theta \), is proportional to \( (IM^2) \), the ratio of inertial forces inducing the secondary flow to the viscous forces restraining, being proportional to \( v_\theta \), decreases as \( M \) increases for a given value of \( I \). However a more detailed discussion of the onset of secondary flow is impossible without knowing the form of the secondary flow distribution, which at the present time is obscure.

We continued this investigation of the onset of secondary flow by examining the relation between the difference in potential between that measured by the electric potential probe and that on the line \( z = 0 \), and the current \( I \), the second apparatus (one-disc) being used. The probe was placed at a radius of 1.275 and a value of \( \int = -0.95 \), i.e. in the region \( (1) \), so that any secondary flow effects could be markedly demonstrated. As is shown in fig.7.4 the curve becomes non-linear at a much lower value of \( I \) for the same value of \( M \) than in the \( \Delta \phi - I \) curve for the second apparatus, shown in fig.7.3. There may be three explanations for this; the first is that the \( \Delta \phi - I \) curve is simply curving away from the straight line curve gradually and there is no definite point at which the curve ceases to be linear; the second is that the probe itself induces a local secondary flow which has no appreciable effect on the \( \Delta \phi - I \) curve; the third is that the errors in the probe created this non-linearity as predicted in \( \S 7.2.2 \). However, since the Reynolds number of the probe, \( R \), was greater than 100 for the values of \( I \) considered, and since the velocity distribution round the probe does not vary greatly with the Reynolds number in this range, it seems unlikely that this non-linearity is due to the probe error. Also, when the secondary flow occurs the radial velocity will tend to thicken the region \( (1) \). For a given value of \( I \), this reduces the current density in region \( (4) \) and thence reduces \( \Delta \phi \).
Fig 7.5 Variation of resistance between the electrodes with M.
\( \frac{R}{R_\infty} \) against \( \frac{1}{(LM)^2} \)

\( l = 0.190 \)
\( l = 0.512 \)
as we see in fig. 7.3. However as the region (1) thickens, the potential gradients fall and therefore if the probe position is at a radius greater than that of the disc \( | \Phi | \) rises and where less, falls. This explains why, when the \( \phi - I \) curves in fig. 7.4 become non-linear, \( | \Phi | \) rises. The last and most practical point to notice in these figs. 7.3 and 7.4 is that the values of \( \phi \) and \( \Delta \phi \) in the regime are always below 100 \( \mu V \) and often below 10 \( \mu V \) in the regions (1). Since the potentiometer only measured to 1 \( \mu V \) it follows that the random errors to be expected are sometimes as much as 10%.

Having found the values of \( I \) below which it was necessary to operate to avoid secondary flow, we then measured the variation of \( R = \Delta \phi \) with \( M_0 \) for the two apparatus. We showed theoretically in \( \S 3.3.3 \) that whatever the distribution of current density across the electrodes, as \( M \rightarrow \infty \),

\[
R \rightarrow R \propto \left( \frac{2 \mu_0}{\pi \sigma b^2} \right).
\]

We also demonstrated physically why we could expect \( R/R_0 \) to be a linear function of \( \left( \frac{1}{M^2} \right)^{-1} \) when \( M \gg 1 \). Therefore, in presenting our experimental results in fig. 7.5 we plotted \( R/R_0 \) against \( \left( \frac{1}{M^2} \right)^{-1} \) for the two electrode configurations in which \( 1 = .512 \) and .190 respectively. We draw three main conclusions from these two sets of results. The first is that \( R/R_0 \) is indeed a linear function of \( M^{-2} \). The second is that, to within 2%, i.e., well within the experimental error, \( R/R_0 = 1.00 \) when the lines of \( R/R_\infty \) against \( \left( \frac{1}{M^2} \right)^{-1} \) are extrapolated to the point where \( M = \infty \), and the third is that the slopes of the two lines are different being within 60% and 20% of the value of the slope found theoretically by assuming a constant current distribution across the electrodes (see \( \S 3.3.3 \)). We take up this point in \( \S 7.3.3 \) after discussing the detailed results of the probes.

Having demonstrated that some of the external characteristics of the behaviour were approximately as predicted theoretically, we then examined the internal flow structure. In our theoretical discussion of \( \S 3.3.3 \) we first postulated the existence of various separate regions and then made various deductions about them some of which we have been able to verify experimentally. In the central region between the electrodes, region (4), we concluded that when \( M \gg 1 \) the velocity is zero and that
Fig. 7.6 Variation of potential, \((-\phi) 0.1/6^2 I/a\), along the centre line of the electrodes when \(M > 1\) and \(M = 0\)
Fig. 7. Graph of potential \( \phi \) against axial wall x, when \( \theta = \omega \).

- \( f = +0.968, l = 0.512 \)
- \( f = +0.991, l = 0.190 \)
- \( f = +0.900, l = 0.512 \)
the current density and electric field is uniform, provided the current density is uniform on the electrodes in this region, as, for example, on perfectly conducting electrodes. In Fig. 7.6 we have plotted \((-\phi)\sigma \sigma \phi I / \alpha I\) against \(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sigma \sigma \phi I / \alpha I\), where \(\phi\) is the value of \(\phi\) on the disc when \(M = \infty\) at the same value of \(I\). This figure shows that, when \(M = 0\), the current density \(j\) is lower at \(f = 0\) than at \(f = 1\) because of the spreading of the current lines, and that when \(M > 1\) the curves become straight lines indicating that the current distribution is uniform in this region and that therefore the spreading is eliminated. The slopes of the two straight lines are different because the \(R/R_\infty\) against \(1/(\ell M^2)\) curves have different slopes; however, when \(M \to \infty\), the lines should merge, cutting the ordinate at \((\phi) \sigma \sigma \phi I / \alpha I = 1.0\). We should note that the potential measurements in this region were only likely to be in error to order \((d/\alpha)\), i.e. less than \(4\%\), due to MHD effects, (87.2.2), but the random errors were about \(5\%\).

We now consider the results of the radial traverses of the electric probes in the region (1). Fig. 7.7 shows the results of a potential traverse when \(M = 0\), which acts as a reference with which to compare those when \(M > 1\). We then made three sets of measurements of \(\phi\) in the first apparatus, i.e. the two discs, when \(f = \sigma.294\) and \(M = 175, 330\) and 610. (The notation we use is the same as that of Fig. 3.8, \(I\) being positive when parallel to the magnetic field). In Fig. 7.8(a) we have plotted the results in the form of one graph of \((\phi) \sigma \sigma \phi I / \alpha I\) against \((r-b)/\alpha M^2\), \((\phi) \sigma \sigma \phi I / \alpha I\), in order to show firstly that the thickness of the region (1) is unquestionably of order \((aM^{-3})\) and secondly to show that the distribution of \(\phi\) and therefore \(U^{-1}T\) is similar for different values of \(M\) in these layers. We have drawn the best line through the experimental points, because they show only a small systematic departure from this line. We could perhaps say that the best line through the points for \(M = 175\) would have a greater slope than the curve drawn, which would be expected from (7.2.4). However, considering the randomness of many of the errors involved, the curves do not indicate any large scale departure from similarity except where \((r-b)/(aM^{-3}) < -3\), when the values of \((-\phi)\) are lower for the lower values of \(M\). This result is to be
(a) $\frac{(-\phi)\sigma \pi b^2}{Ia}$ against $\frac{(r-b)M^2}{a}$, $l = .502$, $\int = +.706$

- $M = 175$
- $M = 330$
- $M = 610$
Fig. 7.8(c) $\frac{f}{a\pi l} \times 10^2$ against $l$ for $f_{1} = 0$, assuming constant current density on electrodes (§3.3).
expected since in the central region, \((\text{a})\), as we have already noted,
\[-\Phi \propto \frac{1}{a \Phi} \text{ varies linearly with } M^{\frac{1}{2}}, \text{(-\Phi) increasing as } M \text{ increases.}\]

The results shown in fig. 7.8(b) were taken in the second apparatus i.e., the disc and wall, and were plotted in the same way as those in fig. 7.8(a). In this case we have some results taken with the probe just touching the wall or very close to it, \(\int < 0.43\), there being no detectable difference due to moving the probe very slightly near the wall.

The most interesting point about these results is that near the edge of the disc \((-\Phi)\) and, what is more, the distance in which this drop occurs is \(O(M^{\frac{1}{2}})\). Therefore, the potential on the electrodes cannot be considered as resembling that on perfectly conducting electrodes, the question of whether it resembles that on electrodes emitting current at a constant density is settled by reference to fig. 7.8(c) where we compare the experimental points with the potential profile produced by such an electrode. The discrepancy for \(r < b\) clearly shows why the assumption of a constant current density is erroneous, but the comparatively good agreement for \(r > b\) indicates, perhaps, that in this region the profile is less sensitive to the current distribution on the electrode. Note that if the electrodes were perfectly conducting, the probe would have recorded a constant potential across the electrode, at least to \(O(a/b)\). The second point to notice is that the profiles of \(\Phi\) for all the values of \(\Phi\), examined in figs. 7.8(a) and 7.8(b) are functions of \((r-b)/(aM^{\frac{1}{2}})\), and therefore it follows from our argument in §3.3.3 that the current distribution on the electrodes near their edges was a function of \((r-b)/(aM^{\frac{1}{2}})\).

It is interesting that the thickness of the layers are approximately the same in all cases, being about \(6 \text{ aM}^{\frac{1}{2}}\). This may indicate why the profiles are not completely similar and why the slopes of the two curves of \(R/R_\infty\) against \((M M^{\frac{1}{2}})\) are different in fig. 7.5, since \(S \sim 6aM^{\frac{1}{2}}\) the ratio of the thickness of the layers to the radius of the electrodes is \(S/b = 6(M M^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}\). For the maximum value of \(M\) in the first apparatus \(S/b = .46\) and in the second apparatus \(S/b = .78\). Therefore the approximation we made in §3.3 that \(\partial S/\partial P \gg \frac{1}{P}\) is not really justifiable in analysing our experimental situation, and consequently we do not expect that the curves of \(R/R_\infty\) against \((M M^{\frac{1}{2}})\) to be identical for the two apparatus. Neither do we expect the \(\Phi\) profiles
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to be the same, even if they had been measured at the same value of $f$.

7.3.2. Pitot tube measurements.

As with the electric potential probes, when we began to use the pitot probe we first checked that we were measuring a velocity low enough to be in the required flow regime. With the pitot tube we also had to ensure that the measured velocity was high enough for $(p_o - p_s)$ to be proportional to the square of the velocity $U_0$. Since in the flow regime examined in §3.3, $U_0$ is proportional to $I$ and since it follows from (7.2.7) that $p_o$ is proportional to $U_0^2$, if the MHD error is negligible, we had to find the values of $I$ for which $\Delta p = p_o - p_w$, was proportional to $I^2$ where $p_w$ is the pressure at the tapping on the wall.

In fig. 7.9(a) we plot $\Delta p$ against $I^2$ when $r = 0$, $M = 1370$, and when $r = 1.33b$, $M = 855$, these and all subsequent readings being taken in the second apparatus, i.e. $l = 0.190$. Note that when $r = 0$, $\Delta p < 0$ since $U_0 = 0$ and the static pressure is below that outside the discs due to the radial pressure gradient. When $r = 1.33b$, $\Delta p > 0$ showing that in region (1) the rise in total pressure is greater than the fall in static pressure, which is, of course, to be expected. The interesting point about these two curves is how they show that the static pressure in the centre is less sensitive to the onset of secondary flow than the pressure recorded in the flow region (1). The other interesting fact we found when investigating the onset of the secondary flow was that, as the current was raised, initially the flow was steady, but when $I > 5$ amps a steady oscillation developed with a period of about 2 seconds, which was easily observable on the manometer by the rise and fall of the meniscus. This indicates that, as $I$ increases, an unsteady flow occurs rather than a stronger secondary flow, as in the experiments of Lehnert (1955).

Realising that the most critical region for examining the onset of secondary flow was region (1), we then measured $\Delta p$ at two values of $M$ when $r = (1.267)b$. The results, plotted in fig. 7.9(b), show firstly that the velocity decreases as $M$ increases for given $I$, as is to be expected from the theory of §3.3. Secondly they show that the onset of secondary flow is suppressed as $M$ increases, which is the same conclusion
Fig 7.10 The variation of velocity with radius in (1).

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{bl^2 M^2 \sqrt{\eta}}{I} \text{ against } \frac{(r-b)}{a M^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \]; \( M = 1365 \), \( I = 0.7A \)
that we reached in examining the electric potential measurements; thirdly to operate in the required regime we needed to measure pressures of the order of .030" mSs which are about as low as can be measured with any degree of repeatability. This meant we had to operate at high values of M, with the associated disadvantage of using the pitot tube when the thickness of region (1) was least. Fourthly we have to presume that though the MHD probe error for these values of I is \( \sim 0.5 \Delta p \) the random errors preclude any conclusion as to the exact linearity of the \( \Delta p - I^2 \) relation.

We measured the radial distribution of \( \Delta p \) at \( j = 0.99 \) and \( j = 0.97 \), at only one value of \( M, 1370 \), since we could not lower \( M \) enough to obtain appreciably different yet repeatable readings and at only one value of \( I, .7 \) amps. From the radial distribution of \( \Delta p \) we calculated \( \vec{U} \) using the relations (7.2.9). Since \( \Delta p \) is positive in region (1) and negative in (4) it is zero on the boundary between these two regions and consequently it is impossible to calculate the velocity there at all accurately. We have plotted \( \left[ \frac{(U \beta)}{b} l^2 M^{-1/2} \int_0 ^1 \eta / \xi \right] \) against \( (r - b) \alpha M^{-1/2} \) in fig. 7.10 so that if a suitable theory can be developed it may be compared with these results. We note that the velocity is greatest nearest the wall which is predictable since the jump in potential across the layer is greatest when \( \phi \) is greatest, i.e. near the disc. Also note that, as \( r \) decreases, \( \vec{U} \) decreases more sharply near the wall, which is to be expected since, if the wall is highly conducting, the current must leave the electrode at right angles, thus reducing the shear stress and consequently the velocity at the wall. We may note that the Hartmann boundary layer here was so thin, .001" thick, as to be negligible. We compared the values of \( \vec{U} \) against our only available theory, namely derived from the assumption of a constant current distribution on the electrodes to see whether the values obtained were of the right order and found that at \( j = -0.99 \), \( r = b \), the theoretical value at a current of .7 amperes was 3.09 cm/sec, whereas that found experimentally was 2.40 cm/sec: at \( j = -0.97 \), \( r = b \), the theoretical and experimental values were 2.85 and 2.65 respectively. Note that the experimental values are lower than the theoretical, which is to be expected since the maximum velocity induced by the theoretical current distribution
Figure 11. Comparison of the results of Pitot and electric potential probes for velocity

\( f = 0.993 \quad M = 1367 \)
occurs at \( r = b \), whereas the experimental maximum occurs at \( r > b \), which is to be expected with highly conducting electrodes.

### 7.3.3 Discussion.

Having calculated the velocity from the pitot tube readings, we can now compare these values found with those calculated from the electric potential distribution, using the relation:

\[ \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} + u_0 B_0 = 0 \]

Rewriting this in a non-dimensional form we have:

\[ -\frac{u_0 M_0 J_0}{I} = -\sigma^2 \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} \]

In fig. 7.11 we have plotted \( \sigma^2 \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} \) against \( r \) for the corrected readings of the e.p. and pitot probe. We see that a discrepancy of about 100\% exists between the two curves. We then calculated \( u_0 M_0 J_0 / I \) using the formula (7.2.9), (as we did for fig. 7.10), and thence calculated the mean value of \( k d^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} \left[ M_0 u_0 J_0 / I \right] \) across the probe face in order to use the correction formula (7.2.2) for \( \Phi \) (with \( k = \frac{1}{4} \) be the value for the two-dimensional probe examined in §4.3). We note that though \( d^2 \Phi / a^2 \ll 1 \), since \( d^2 u_0 / \partial r^2 \phi \) was so great the correction was large enough to reduce the difference in the maxima to about 30\%. We also note that the maximum of the uncorrected curve of the potential gradient is at a lower value of \( r \) than the velocity maximum and that, with the correction applied, the maximum moves to a higher value of \( r \). We note that this displacement is approximately equal to the diameter of the probe. See fig. 7.11. This effect was predicted in §7.2.2 for an 'erf' potential profile, which we saw in fig. 7.8(c) resembles our experimental curve. (We may note that the criterion for the e.p. probe error to be negligible, i.e. \( d^2 \Phi / a^2 \ll 1 \), was not satisfied; \( d^2 \Phi / a^2 = 0.105 \).

The main reason for the difference in these two corrected curves is probably that the experimental situation did not sufficiently satisfy the condition that \( d/\partial r \gg 1/r \) and that therefore the radial currents were
sufficiently large to make (3.3.24) a poor approximation.

In conclusion we believe that these experiments have convincingly demonstrated the following qualitative flow phenomena predicted by Moffatt (1964) and further discussed in chapter 3.

(i) The 'channelling' of current between the two circular electrodes.

(ii) The existence of thin layers joining the disc edges of the circular electrodes. We have observed that in these layers a velocity is induced, which, when $M \gg 1$, decreases as $M$ increases and that these layers become thinner as $M$ increases.

(iii) The dependence on the magnetic field of the potential distribution across the electrodes, due to the finite conductivity of the electrodes.

The main quantitative results are:

(i) That when $M \gg 1$, the resistance between the two discs $R = \Delta \phi / I$ was found to vary with $M$ according to the formula

$$\frac{R}{R_\infty} = 1 - \frac{k}{M^{1/2}},$$

where $k$ is a constant depending on the geometry of the electrodes. This result was predicted on analytical and physical grounds in §3.3.3.

(ii) The potential, $\phi$, in the regions (i) was found to vary with the radius $r$ at a given value of $\int \phi$ according to the formula:

$$\frac{\phi}{\frac{I \alpha}{b}} = P \left( \frac{r - b}{\alpha M^{-1/2}} \right)$$

The function $P$ varies with the disc geometry and the value of $\int \phi$; it is independent of $M$ when $M \gg 1$. We conclude from this that the thickness of the region (i) was $O(M^{-1/2}).$

(iii) From the previous result, using the theory of §3.3.3 we conclude that the current distribution on the electrodes was a function of $\left[ (r - b)(\alpha M^{-1/2}) \right]$ near the edge of the discs. In the centre of the discs the current distribution was constant.

(iv) The value of $k$ (see result (i)), for the second apparatus ($\ell = 0.190$), was 1.22, whereas that calculated assuming a constant current distribution is 1.064; a difference of 20%. The values of $U_0$ obtained from pitot tube readings at $r = b$ were within 25% of values calculated from the same theory. The distribution of $\phi$ for $r < b$ did not compare well...
with the theoretical profile, but did agree to within 15% for $r > b$. Most noticeable though was that the shape of the two curves was very similar, indicating perhaps that the potential profiles for $r > b$ are not very sensitive to the current distribution on the electrode. Therefore we conclude that the constant current distribution theory provides a rough estimate for the values to be expected experimentally, particularly for $r > b$.

(v) The calculations of velocity in the region (1) deduced from Pitot probe measurements were between 100% and 40% higher than those made from electric probe measurements, when no corrections were applied for MHD probe errors. After applying such corrections we found that the difference between the two sets of measurements were reduced to between 30% and 15%; also the value of $r$ at the maximum of the e.p. readings became closer to that of the pitot readings. Thus we concluded that our error corrections were of some value, particularly that to the e.p. probe which has never been used before. However, the large discrepancy remaining between the results demonstrates how little we understand the probes. (Some of the discrepancy may be due to the flows not satisfying the conditions of the asymptotic theory, by which we compared the results of the probes).
8. **Experiments in rectangular ducts.**

8.1. **Introduction**

8.1.1. **Aims.**

The aims of our experiments in rectangular ducts were twofold.

Firstly we wanted to use Pitot and electric potential probes in stable, laminar flows which are well understood in order to measure the errors caused by MHD effects, such as those discussed in chapter 4, and those caused by using the probes in regions where the probe size is comparable with the distance in which large changes in velocity or potential occur.

Secondly we wanted to use our probes to investigate the flow in a duct whose walls perpendicular to the magnetic field (BB) are highly conducting and whose walls parallel to the magnetic field (AA) are non-conducting, i.e. that flow examined in §2.4 and in our paper, Hunt (1965). In particular we wanted to confirm the existence of the salient features of the flows found in our analysis and to investigate the manner in which these flows become unstable.

8.1.2. **Previous work**

We mentioned the work of East (1964), Moreau (1966) and Lecocq (1966) on Pitot tubes in chapter 4. Other experiments with Pitot tubes in magnetic fields have been performed by Sachs (1965) and Bramover & Lielausis (1961) on measuring velocity profiles of turbulent flows in narrow rectangular channels. As far as we are aware there have been no experiments to measure velocity profiles of **laminar MHD flows**, for the very good reason that such a task is difficult and, of course, one's measurements can be compared with the theory. Therefore the work described in this chapter is the first attempt into this field. Furthermore we describe the results of electric probe measurements and, where possible, compare these results with those of the Pitot tubes. (Although Lecocq used both types of probe he did not compare the results of the two probes).
Alty (1966) has already examined experimentally the duct flow we analysed, Hunt (1965), by means of pressure and potential measurements on the walls of the duct, his results agreed very well with the theory as described in §2.5.3. However, as the Reynolds number, \( R \), of his flows increased the flow ceases to be laminar and exhibited certain interesting effects; these effects could not be examined further by external measurements, but only by probe measurements. Thus the work of §8.4 is a continuation of Alty's work.
8.13. Summary

In § 8.2 we describe experiments to examine the flow in a narrow, .116" x 2\frac{2}{3}" duct with non-conducting walls using two Pitot tubes, one with a circular tip of diameter .028" and the other with an oval tip (.012" x .062"). The Pitot tubes were supported in the thin duct from a wider circular duct, 1" in diameter. The main conclusions we drew were:

(a) At the junction between such a thin duct and a wide duct, the exit effects are very much stronger, i.e. affect the flow further upstream, the greater the magnetic field applied perpendicular to the thin duct. As a result we were only able to use the Pitot tubes at zero or low values of \( M \), the Hartmann number based on the half width of the duct.

(b) When \( M = 0 \), Pitot tubes even up to \( \frac{1}{2} \) of the duct width can measure the velocity to within 7\%, the experimental error in our case, when probe is more than one diameter or thickness away from the wall.

(c) When \( M = 2.36 \) and \( M = 5.03 \) we measured the velocity profile across the duct and found that the agreement between the theoretical curve and experimental results was about 7\% when \( M = 2.36 \) for the wide probe and better than this for the narrow probe. The results at \( M = 5.03 \) were poor on account of the greater exit effects. These are the first measurements known to us of the velocity profile in laminar Hartmann flow.

In § 8.3 we describe experiments on the flow in a .6" x 3.01" duct, 32" long, made of non-conducting material, and placed inside the 66" duct described in chapter 6. We first investigated the MHD error on three kinds of Pitot tube for values of \( N = \frac{\mu B}{\rho U_o} \) up to about 3. The flow in this duct was less steady than in the \( \frac{1}{3} \)" duct, but despite the random errors in the manometer readings, two main conclusions emerged. First the Pitot error did not increase linearly with \( U_o \) or as the square of \( B_o \) as predicted by the formula

\[
P_o = P_s + \frac{1}{2} \rho \frac{U_o^2}{\mu} \left( 1 + \alpha N \right)
\]

where \( P_o \) and \( P_s \) are the dynamic and static pressures. This was to be expected since \( N < 1 \) was not satisfied, the requirement for the theoretical validity of (8.1.1); however it was interesting that the error was
less than that predicted by (8.1.1) as \( N \) increased. Secondly, using \( \alpha \) as a crude measure of the probe error, we found that if \( N \) was based on the length \( D_p = 4 \times (\text{cross-section area}/\text{perimeter}) \) of the probe tip, \( \alpha \) was greatest (\( \sim 1.0 \)) for a flattened tube in which the width parallel to the magnetic field, \( a_p \), was 0.012" and the width perpendicular to the magnetic field, \( b_p \), was 0.062"; it was smaller for a circular tube (\( \alpha \approx 4 \)) and least (\( \alpha \approx 2 \)) for a flattened tube in which \( a_p = 0.073", b_p = 0.024" \). This effect was a qualitative confirmation of the result predicted in §4.2.

We also used electric probes in this duct. We first measured the electric field in the core, finding good agreement with the theoretical value for laminar flow (\( < 1.5\% \)) when \( M = 140, 247 \) but poorer agreement (\( \sim 7\% \)) at \( M = 34.8 \). In the boundary layer on the walls parallel to the magnetic field (AA) the experimental measurements differed markedly from the theoretical values, by about 50% for \( M = 247 \). However the difference decreased as \( M \) increased, indicating that as \( M \to \infty \) the agreement with the asymptotic theory would improve.

In §8.4 we describe experiments in our main 66" duct, whose walls perpendicular to the magnetic field, BB, are highly conducting and walls AA are non-conducting, the dimensions being 2.486" x 3.010". We only examined the flow at \( R < 1000 \) and \( M = 94.3 \). Our measurements of static pressure, \( \Delta P \), showed that the flow ceased to be laminar at \( R \leq 70 \) and for \( R > 500 \) settled into a well defined second regime in which \( \Delta P \propto R \) and \( \Delta P/R \) was about 2.6 times its laminar flow value. The flow was very unsteady for \( 500 > R > 70 \). Measurements of velocity in the boundary layer on the walls BB were below the values predicted by the laminar theory (Hunt, 1965), yet the velocity profile exhibited qualitatively the main features of the theoretical laminar flow, namely a large velocity close to the wall, a negative velocity in the outer part of the boundary layer and a core velocity less than the maximum velocity in the core. The electric potential measurements taken relative to the wall AA were also below the theoretical, both in the core and the boundary layer; however they indicated clearly the width of the boundary layer and the important fact that \( E = 0 \) in the core in the second flow regime. Comparing these results of static pressure, Pitot pressure, and the potential measured by the e.p. probe we were able to provide an order of
magnitude explanation for the curious second flow regime, in which secondary flows are likely to occur.

These experiments and those of chapter 7 have shown that, despite their limitations which need thorough prior investigation, Pitot and e.p. probes enable us to investigate flows not amenable to theoretical analysis and increase our understanding of those flows. We cannot, yet, place great confidence in the deductions made from their measurements. Clearly further work is necessary.

These experiments have also shown that the main 66" duct can be used for investigating other duct flows as well as that examined in §6.4, thus indicating its versatility. The other important fact proved by these experiments is that it does not leak!
Chapter 8

8.2. \( \frac{1}{3} '' \times \frac{2}{3} '' \) duct; non-conducting walls.

8.2.1. Apparatus.

The purpose of our first experiment on the use of probes in rectangular ducts was mainly to examine the errors caused by using a Pitot tube in a shear flow. We found that most text books on this subject merely recommended using Pitot tubes whose diameters were much less than the distance in which the velocity changed appreciably or else gave a very crude factor for measuring the displacement effect e.g. Rosenhead (1963) p.620. In air or water flow, if the velocity profile is required very near the wall, hotwire anemometers, Preston tubes, or heat transfer measurements may be used; all such measurements would be very complicated and uncertain in MHD flows.

Duct. As a result of these considerations we designed a rectangular duct with dimensions \( \frac{1}{3} '' (=2a) \) and \( \frac{2}{3} '' (=2b) \), in section, to be used with Pitot tubes of diameter (d) up to \( 0.028 '' \), i.e. \( d < \frac{4d}{a} \). In order to avoid blocking the channel with the stem of the Pitot we decided to increase the duct width downstream of the Pitot tip. The duct, as constructed, is shown in fig.8.1. It was made up from various pieces of 'Perspex' being glued and bolted together. Its length was sufficient to enable us to measure fully developed flows and a settling chamber was constructed upstream of the slot. To reduce any unsteadiness, this gap was filled with a nylon washing-up scrubber. The pressure tappings were constructed by the same method as those of the 6'' duct described in chapter 6.

Probes. The Pitot tubes were constructed to point sufficiently far upstream into the narrow portion of the duct (the slot) as to avoid any effects caused by the duct widening and the blocking of the flow by the probe stem. The first Pitot was constructed so that its tip would be protruding \( 1/4 '' \) (\( \approx 4a \)) into the slot, since we believed that with or without a magnetic field the exit effect would be negligible this far into the flow. (How wrong we were is shown in 8.2.2.). This was constructed in a similar way to that described in 8.2.3, namely by the fitting together of different stainless steel tubes; the tube at its tip being \( 0.028 '' \) o.d., \( 0.0155 '' \) i.d. (See fig.8.2a). The second Pitot had a
Fig 8.2 Pitot tubes used in duct I
different tip, being a .042" o.d. tube which was drilled out until its i.d. was .036" and then flattened until its external width was .012", (see fig.8.2b). We used the Pitot uninsulated and insulated, but found no difference in their behaviour.

**Probe mechanism.** The probe mechanism was not used in quite the same way as described in §6.4. Instead of using the cranks to maintain the crank-bar B (see fig.8.1a) parallel to the duct axis, we removed the cranks and fixed the crank-bar rigidly to the spindle, S, by means of a dowel, D. Then turning S moved the dummy probe across the duct, but altered its orientation, \( \gamma \), relative to the duct axis; since \( \gamma < 2^\circ \) for this thin duct the effect of varying \( \gamma \) on the Pitot was negligible. The spindle S was turned by pushing the crank-bar B with a screw adjustment attached to the probe block; see fig.8.1(b).

With this design of duct, it was very difficult fitting the probe mechanism and probe onto the duct. To do this the studs, T, retaining the probe block had to be removed and the probe block very gingerly manoeuvred onto the duct to avoid knocking the probe; (the probe was fitted in the probe mechanism outside the duct). To ensure correct alignment of the dummy duct and that the probe had not been knocked, we removed the end piece, E, and looked into the duct.

The details of the duct measurements and the various conversion factors for calculations of the experimental results are given in table 8.1.

8.2.2. **Static pressure measurements.**

Since this was the first experiment in which we had used the flow circuit described in §6.5, we ought to mention the procedure involved. Because the static pressure reading on the manometer between any two tappings or between a tapping and the Pitot when there was no flow, (the zero reading), tended to vary it was necessary to take this zero reading as often as possible, otherwise interpolating over a long time between two zero readings led to large errors in calculating the pressure differences. (In the electrically driven flows this did not create any problem as the flow was started by turning a switch). A typical series
Fig. 8.3 Pressure drop ($\Delta P_{46}$) near the end of the duct against flow rate $Q$. 

$\Delta P_{46}$ in inches of water
of readings would be taken in the following way. We assume the flow
circuit has been filled such that there is mercury either side of the
weir in the lower weir tank and that all the taps have been closed.
(We refer to fig.6.6).
(1) Take zero reading on manometer.
(2) Open taps (4), (5) and (7). This does not lead to a flow from
the upper weir tank u.w.t. to the l.w.t. since the pump seals the flow
when it is stationary.
(3) Turn on pump at desired flow rate. This makes the mercury
circulate between the l.w.t. and u.w.t., returning via the overflow pipe.
(4) Open tap (1) and regulate throttle valve. Flow now starts through
the duct, settling down very quickly. We ensure that the pump is
operating fast enough for there to be some flow through the overflow pipe.
(5) Take manometer reading.
(6) Take potentiometer readings of voltage across the flowmeter and the
shunt in the magnet supply circuit.
(7) Re-check manometer reading.
(8) Take one or two more readings at differing flow rates, by
regulating the throttle valve and the pump.
(9) Turn off tap (1). This stops the flow in the duct.
(10) Turn off pump. There may be some leakage back through the pump
so we also close (?) 
(11) Take zero reading on manometer.

The first measurements we made in this duct were static pressure
readings between tappings (4) and (6), $\Delta P_{h6}$. (See fig.8.1c), the Pitot
being in position in the duct and $M = 0$. Our results, which are plotted
in fig.8.3, showed that $\Delta P_{h6}$ was proportional to $Q$ only when $Q < 7$ cc/
sec. This surprised us since the flow was fully developed and we could
not believe that the effect of the Pitot tube was so great. However, in
the linear regime we calculated the mean value of $\Delta P_{h6}/Q$, (see table 8.2),
and found that it differed from the theoretical value for plane Poiseuille
flow by 1.5% with a standard deviation, s.d., of 2%. At these very low
flow rates our pressure differences were difficult to measure and this
was the cause of the randomness of the readings. (The more readings we
took the more consistent the mean value).
Pressure in "Hg (relative to tapping (6))
(Multiply by 10 for points at M = 4.6)

Distance along duct in inches (-z). Tapping number in brackets.
Fig 8.5 Variation of pressure drop ($\Delta P_{14}$) with flow rate ($Q$) near the end of the duct when $M \gg 1$. 
That the cause of the non-linearity was an exit or Pitot effect is shown better by fig. 8.4 where the pressure differences between variousappings along the duct are plotted. When \( Q = 6 \) cc/sec, the pressure gradient is the same as that of plane Poiseuille flow near the exit but not at the entrance; it is interesting to note that the theoretical (i.e.)

\[ \text{entry length} = \frac{Ra}{20} = 1.4'' \]

when \( Q = 6 \) cc/sec, whereas we find that the 1.4'' from the end of the duct \( \frac{dp}{dz} \) is 80% greater than its final value. When \( Q = 8.55 \) cc/sec, we see how the pressure gradient is least in the centre of the duct, thus confirming our hypothesis.

We then measured \( \Delta P_u \) as a function of \( Q \) (fig. 8.5) when \( M = 23.8 \) and \( M = 4.6,0 \) and found, to our surprise, that the \( \Delta P_u - Q \) relation was not linear for the same values of \( Q \) as the \( \Delta P_h - Q \) relation was linear. The entry length, of course, in this situation was much less; the obvious conclusion was that the exit length was greater.

Again the \( \Delta P - z \) curve confirms this view. We see in fig. 8.4 that when \( M = 4.6,0 \), \( \frac{dp}{dz} \) agrees with the theoretical value for fully developed flow when \( (-z) > \frac{h}{2} \), but diverges from this value very sharply as \( (-z) \rightarrow 0 \). We believe that the explanation of this effect is quite simple and should have been foreseen.

If, when \( M \gg 1 \), the flow had changed suddenly from that of conventional Hartmann flow in the narrow part of the duct to uniform flow in the wide part, it would have meant that the current in the slot would have returned from \( x = b \) to \( x = -b \) via the high resistance Hartmann layers on the walls. Instead of doing this the current near the end of the slot could return via the low resistance path of the wide part of the duct where \( v_z \) and \( E_x \) are much lower. Thus, the wide part of the duct effectively short circuited the Hartmann flow at the exit of the slot causing \( -\text{j}_x \) in the core to be greater and producing a component of current \( -\text{j}_z \) for \( x > 0 \) and \( +\text{j}_z \) for \( x < 0 \). Clearly the effect of the short circuiting would be greatest when \( M \) was greatest, and would diminish towards the entrance of the slot, i.e. \( (-z) \) increasing. (We refer to this hypothesis later).
Fig. 8.6: Graph of Pitot pressure (inches of water) vs. mass velocity (c./sec.) of melts. Flow rate, $Q$, when $M = 0$ and probe is in center of the duct.
$\circ - \text{circular Pitot } 0.28'' \text{ o.d}$

$x - \text{Flattened Pitot, thickness } 0.012''$

**Theoretical curves: plane Poiseuille flow.**

**External & Internal diameters of circular Pitot (to scale)**

**External & Internal width of flattened Pitot**

Fig 8.7. Measured velocity profiles in $8'' \times 2.5''$ duct when $M=0$. (Circular & flattened Pitot tubes.)
\( \circ \) - circular Pitot, \( 0.28'' \) o.d.

\( \times \) - Flattened Pitot, thickness \( 0.012'' \).

- **Theoretical curve:** plane Poiseuille flow.

- **External diameters** of circular Pitot (to scale).

- **External & internal width** of flattened Pitot.

*Fig. 8.7. Measured velocity profiles in \( 8'' \times 2.58'' \) duct when \( M = 0 \). (Circular & flattened Pitot tubes.)*
8.2.3. Pitot tube measurements

We first measured the pressure difference between tapping (1) and the Pitot tube, \( \Delta \rho_i \), when \( M = 0 \) at \( y = x = 0, z = -L \). We noticed that the lag in the Pitot reading was much greater than that of the static pressure so that, since the flow over the weirs was not very steady, these readings were more prone to random error than those between two static pressure tappings.

We measured \( \Delta \rho_i \) as a function of \( Q^2 \), since if the flow was fully developed \( \Delta \rho_i \propto Q^2 \). Our results, which are plotted in fig.8.6, show that \( \Delta \rho_i \propto Q^2 \) for \( Q < \sim 7 \) cc/sec and for \( Q \) greater than this \( \Delta \rho_i \) falls below the theoretical line. Whether this was due to the velocity profile changing or due to some static pressure gradient is uncertain. (We did not have time to investigate further). In table 8.3, we have calculated the mean value of \( \Delta \rho_i /Q^2 \) and \( \sqrt{\Delta \rho_i} /Q \), for \( Q < 7 \) cc/sec, comparing them to the values for plane Poiseuille flow. We again found that the agreement was well within the standard deviation, so that we could assume that the mean of a few measurements of \( \Delta \rho_i \) would be accurate to within these limits.

We then measured \( \Delta \rho_i \) against \( Q \) at various values of \( y \). (\( \leq \epsilon^d \)) for \( Q < 7 \) cc/sec and thence calculated \( v_x /Q \). From our results, which are plotted in fig.8.7, we draw two tentative conclusions: first, the blocking effects of the Pitot are negligible, and second, that to within the experimental error the Pitot may be relied upon to measure velocity near a wall provided it is further than one diameter from the wall. To test these ideas, particularly the second, we then constructed a second Pitot, already described in 8.2.1. After measuring \( \Delta \rho_i \) against \( Q \), (table 8.4) and finding a similar order of agreement as with the first Pitot, we measured the velocity at points across the duct. (fig.8.7). The measured velocities again follow the theoretical curve, differing by less than the experimental error for \( \epsilon^c \), which confirm our conclusion mentioned above. The reason why the points all fall below the theoretical curve in the second case as compared to falling above in the first is obscure. Despite the possible random errors, it certainly seems a significant difference.
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Fig 8.8. Graph showing negative pressure registered by Pitot when $M \gg 1$. 

\[ B_0 = 1.18 \text{ wb/m}^2 \quad \text{for} \quad x = 0, z = -\frac{1}{4} " \]

\[ B_0 = 0.615 \text{ wb/m}^2 \quad \text{for} \quad x = 0.5", z = -\frac{1}{4} " \]

\[ B_0 = 0.66 \text{ wb/m}^2 \quad \text{for} \quad x = 0, z = -\frac{1}{2} " \]

\[ \Delta P_{ip} \text{ in inches of water} \]
Fig 8.9 Measured velocity profiles when $M = 2.36, 5.03$

Circular Pitot tube
Fig 8.16 Measured velocity profile when $M=2.36$ — flattened Pitot tube.
Since the exit effects were worse for the static pressure measurements when $M > 1$ than when $M = 0$, we expected a similar effect when using Pitot tubes. This was, indeed, the case as is shown by fig.8.8 where $\Delta P_p$ is plotted against $Q$. We see first that $\Delta P_p$ is negative and second that $\Delta P_p$ varies approximately as $B_o^2 Q$ at the same value of $x$ and $z$. This result would confirm our hypothesis that near exit of the slot when $M > 1$, large currents circulate in the $x$-$z$ plane, since the presence of $j_z$ leads to a vertical pressure gradient $(-j_z B_0)$ which would produce a negative pressure in the Pitot. To further test this idea, we measured $\Delta P_p$ at $x = 0.5''$ and found, as would be expected on our hypothesis, that $(-\Delta P_p)$ was reduced. That the effect diminishes as $(-z)$ increases is verified by the measurements of $\Delta P_p$ taken by the thin Pitot at $z = 1.2''$; we see that $(-\Delta P_p)$ is reduced. After first using an uninsulated Pitot, we coated the Pitot with non-conducting Perspex cement, but found no difference. We note that the MHD errors of chapter 4 would lead to a positive $\Delta P_p$ and so diminish the negative pressure.

We then decided to measure two velocity profiles at $M = 2.36$ and $M = 5.03$, using the fact that $\Delta P_p \propto 170 B_o^2 Q$, where $B_o$ is measured in wb/m$^2$, $Q$ in litres/sec, and $\Delta P_p$ in inches of mercury. We found that, at these low values of $M$, $\Delta P_p$ was approximately proportional to $Q^2$ so that we could compare our results with the theoretical Hartmann flow profile. Our results, (fig.8.9), show how even at these low values of $M$ the correction factors are appreciable and how unreliable the results are, inconsequence. However, the results for $M = 2.36$ when $a = y > d$ agree with the theoretical to within the experimental error and certainly demonstrated the flattening of the velocity profile.

Our results with the thin probe are better, fig.8.10 and three out of the four points (each taken from a graph of $\Delta P_p$ against $Q^2$) for $a = y > d$ agree very closely. Poor as the results of figs.8.9 and 8.10 are, they are the first measurements, we know, of velocity profiles in Hartmann flow.
3.3. 6" x 3" duct: non-conducting walls.

3.3.1. Apparatus

The main purpose of the experiments in this duct was to investigate the Pitot and e.p. probe errors when the interaction parameter base on the probe diameter, \( N \), was \( O(1) \), since the experiments which had been designed for this purpose in the \( \frac{1}{8} \) duct failed when \( M \gg 1 \). We needed a duct with non-conducting walls, (so that \( E \rightarrow 0 \) in the core), sufficiently narrow for reasonably accurate readings of Pitot pressure at attainable flowrates, and yet wide enough for the probe not to block the flow.

Duct. We decided to make a duct \( 6\)" x \( 3.01\)" in section and place it inside the main \( 66\)" duct so that we could use the probe mechanism easily. The internal duct, which was made of 'Perspex', is shown in fig.8.17. Its length was \( 32\frac{1}{2} \)" with a rounded entry; the probe mechanism was '9' from the end to avoid any exit effects which would be smaller with this duct anyway. The internal duct fitted into the main duct sufficiently snugly for the leakage between its walls and those of the main duct to be negligible. Even with the little leakage there was, we felt that short circuits could only be eliminated by covering the copper walls of the duct with sellotape. The only questionable feature of its design were the 'spacers', shown in section in fig.8.17(b), which were needed to keep the two walls apart. According to the entry length calculations of Shercliff (1956), the effects of 'spacers' near the probes would be negligible at high field strengths.

We might mention that the successful construction and use of this inner duct demonstrated the versatility of the \( 66\)" duct.

Probes. One of the aims of these experiments was to see if the shape of a probe affected its MHD error in order to verify, at least qualitatively, our theoretical conclusions of 34.2. We had already constructed a circular and a flattened Pitot, whose dimension parallel to the magnetic field, \( a_P (= 0.012") \) was very much less than that perpendicular, \( b_P (= 0.062") \), so now we constructed one with \( a_P = 0.073" \) and \( b_P = 0.024" \) (fig.8.12a); the reason we increased its size was to reduce the lag of the Pitot reading.
(a) Pilot tube flattened so that $a_p \gg b_p$

Note flattened tip and that tip is bent for boundary layer traverses.

(b) Electric potential probe

Fig 8.12 Pilot and e.p. probes used in duct II
relative to the static pressure reading, which was even more important in this duct where the flow was considerably less steady than in the 1/8

As an electric potential probe we used one already constructed for the 1/8" duct. We used it in preference to that constructed for the electrically driven flows because the flow at its tip would be less affected by the stem in this design. (Fig. 8.12b).

8.3.2. Static pressure measurements.

We first made static pressure measurements, when $M \approx 135$, between tappings (4) and (5). We found that measurements of $\Delta p_{st}$ were not the same as those of $(-\Delta p_{st})$. (The notation refers to the way in which the pressure tappings are connected to the manometer, either tapping (4) or (5) could be connected to the micrometer side of the manometer, if (4), we measure $\Delta p_{st}$ and if (5), $\Delta p_{st}$). Whether this was caused by the manometer or some spurious connection we are not sure. However the results were repeatable and the mean of $\Delta p_{st}$ and $(-\Delta p_{st})$ was found to agree closely with the theoretical value, as shown in table 8.6.

We found the flow in this duct more unstable than in the 1/4" duct; though the flow was laminar the pressure was all the time oscillating. This may partly have been caused by the fact that there was little constriction between the duct and the 1.4. where the flow over the weir was not steady, so that through the flowrate, as measured the flowmeter, was very steady, the static pressure level in the duct was fluctuating. On account of the different lag in the leads necessarily led to random errors.

8.3.3. Pitot tube measurements.

The first readings were made with the circular Pitot used in the 1/8" duct (still insulated). The pitot tip was 3.5" upstream of the pressure tapping so that, in calculating the velocity, we had to allow for the static pressure drop, $\Delta p$. We first measured $\Delta p_{st}$ against $V$, the flowmeter reading, when $M = 135$. The results are tabulated in Table 8.7(a); the difference, $\Delta$, between the theoretical value of $\Delta p_0 = \Delta p_{st} + \Delta p$,
Fig 8.13 Variation of Pitot tube error with flow rate

when $M = 253$ and 137
\[ \Delta \rho \approx \frac{\nu^2}{20} \times C_{\text{mfl}}/C_{\text{mfl}p}, \]  
\[ \nu_{\text{mfl}}^2 \]  
being calculated from \( Q \) and \( \rho \), and \( \Delta \rho_{\text{mfl}} \).

Since \( \Delta \rho_{\text{mfl}} \) was subject to random errors of at least \( \pm 0.01 \mu \), \( \Delta \) was subject to the same errors and since \( |\Delta| < |\Delta \rho_{\text{mfl}}| \) the percentage errors are large. This explains why the values of \( \alpha = \frac{\Delta}{\Delta \rho_{\text{mfl}} \times N} \) have so much scatter. It is interesting that the mean value of \( \alpha = 0.38 \) albeit with a standard deviation of \( \pm 0.39 \), whereas East (1964) found \( \alpha = 0.39 \) for a similar Pitot tube. Also note that the mean value of \( N = 0.8 \), so that the basic assumption that \( N \ll 1 \) was not satisfied. Owing to the scatter of the results we cannot tell if \( \Delta \sim Q + C \rho \), or \( \Delta \sim Q + C \rho + C \rho^2 \), as would be the case higher order terms in \( N \) were appreciable.

We then used the Pitot, already described in fig. 7.2, to see if the Pitot lag was reduced by such a design of tube. There was only a small improvement. We used the tube to measure \( \Delta \rho_{\text{mfl}} \) against \( V \) when \( N = 1/2 \) and found that the mean value of \( \alpha = 0.59 \), but since \( \alpha \) noticeably decreased as \( V \) increased the result has little meaning (See table 8.7(b)). Clearly, in this case the higher order terms were appreciable.

We used the thin Pitot tube which had been used already in the \( \frac{1}{8} \) duct, (fig. 6.2(b)), to see if its MHD error would be greater than that of the circular Pitot. The measurements of \( \Delta \rho_{\text{mfl}} \) were even more subject to random error on account of the longer lag of this tube. The results, tabulated in table 8.6 and plotted in fig. 8.13, show the variation of \( \Delta \) and \( \alpha \) with \( V \) for \( N = 0.127 \) and for \( N = 2.53 \). We see, firstly that the general increase of \( \Delta \) with \( V \) is more discernible when \( N = 0.127 \) than when \( N = 2.53 \). In, the latter case, the points do not really indicate any pattern at all on account of the random errors. We have hesitantly drawn on fig. 8.13 a line which might represent the variation of \( \Delta \) caused by the second and higher order terms in the expansion in \( N \) of the pitot error. However, if we merely regard \( \alpha \) as a crude measure of the pitot error these results demonstrate one important fact, namely that the MHD error is greater with this kind of probe. If \( N \) is based on \( D_p = l \times (\text{area})/(\text{perimeter}) \) of the probe tip (i.e., \( l \times \text{hydraulic mean diameter} \)) then \( \alpha \) is somewhere between 3 and 4 times greater for this probe than for a circular probe. It is puzzling that the error we find is 5 times greater than that predicted by the theory of \( \frac{3}{2} \). We have no explanation for this.
Encouraged by this confirmation of our theoretical prediction of $S_{\alpha 2}$ we then examined the MHD error in a Pitot tube for which $a_p > b_p$ shown in fig. 8.12(a). The results are tabulated in table 8.9 whence we see that $\alpha$ is not appreciably below that of a circular tube, when $N$ is based on $D_p$. The tube used had a ratio of $a_p/b_p$ of 3 compared to the ratio of $b_p/a_p$ in the former Pitot tube of $\frac{S_{\alpha 2}}{S_{\alpha 1}}$. It would be interesting to investigate in more detail this ratio affects the MHD error.

8.3.4. Electric potential measurements.

Before describing our measurements we first note that we could not form an adequate loop of wire in the magnet gap to compensate for the flux linked by the circuit between the lead to the tapping (5) and the electric probe so that our reading of potential was subject to oscillations caused by small variations in the magnetic field. (We could not, using the 66" duct which just fitted into the magnet, use the method of Shercliff (1955) which would have entailed having the tapping lead leave the magnet gap in the same plane perpendicular to the pole faces as the probe).

As a reference for the probe potential we measured the difference between the electric potential of the probe, $\phi_p$, and that of tapping (5), $\phi_5$. $\phi_{p5}$ = $\phi_p - \phi_5$. We have to confess that we were not measuring the potential at (5) but at (5'), a fact only discovered after the apparatus had been dismantled. Therefore we refer to $\Delta \phi_{p5}$. In the boundary layer traverses we measured $\phi_p$ relative to $\phi_4$, the potential tapping of tapping (4). Then we refer to $\Delta \phi_{p4}$. Since we could not find any difference between $\Delta \phi_{p5}$ and $\Delta \phi_{p4}$ we only refer to $\Delta \phi$.

We first examined the variation of $\Delta \phi$ with $Q$ and found that over the flow rates and magnetic field strengths available $\Delta \phi \propto Q$. In the core we measured the difference in $\Delta \phi / V$ measured at $x = 0.03$ and $x = 0.753$ for values of $N = 1.1, 1.4$ and $2.7$ and found satisfactory agreement with the theory of laminar flow in a rectangular duct, using Shercliff's (1953) theory. Clearly no systematic MHD error was discernible from these results which, of course, was to be expected from the
Fig 8.15  Variation of potential drop in boundary layer with $M^{-1}$
Fig 8.16 Potential profiles in boundary layer
symmetry arguments of \( S_{43} \). (Table 8.10).

It was when we compared the actual value of \( \Delta \phi/V \) with the theory that curious discrepancies occurred. In fig. 8.14, we have plotted \( \Delta \phi/V M^{1/2} \) against \( X = (b-x)/a M^{-1/2} \). (It may be deduced from the theory of Shercliff (1953) that to \( O(M^{-1}) \), in the boundary layer on the walls parallel to the magnetic field \( A \), \( \Delta \phi/V M^{-1/2} \) = \( f(X) \). Whence, in our flow, \( \Delta \phi/V M^{1/2} = f(X) \), since \( \Delta \phi/V \) is measured relative to the mid point of the wall \( A \). It also follows that if \( \Delta \phi \) is the value of \( \Delta \phi \) on the wall, \( x = b \), if the electric field in the boundary layer were the same as that in the core, then \( \Delta \phi/V M^{-1/2} \) = 0.003 mV/mV in our duct. Fig. 8.14 shows how the slopes of all the lines for the core flow are the same and equal to that of the theoretical line. (We have used the data taken at \( x = 0.003 \) and \( x = 753 \) to calculate some of the lines). However the intercepts on the ordinate, \( I \), of the various lines differ, all falling below the theoretical value. To see whether, as \( M \rightarrow \infty \), the value of \( I \) tends to the theoretical value we drew fig. 8.15. It shows, very roughly, that we can expect \( I \) to be between 2.5 and 3.2 as \( M \rightarrow \infty \). However with the theoretical error only of \( O(M^{-1}) \) it is hard to see why such a discrepancy exists when \( M = 247 \).

Little further insight into this curious result was afforded by the traverse of the e.p. probe in the boundary layer, fig. 8.16. (We measured \( \Delta \phi/V \) here to avoid blocking effects). These readings were very difficult to take since \( \Delta \phi/V \) was very low and the random errors proportionately large. We note that in our plot the points should, if they were to agree with the results of the asymptotic theory, all fall on the same curve. Clearly they do not. The errors in this experiment cannot be ascribed to the probe itself as in the electrically driven flows on account of the relatively small size of the probe. They may be due to the flow not being as fully developed as it should be, e.g. the \( /e \) entry length criterion when \( M \gg 1 \) of Shercliff (1956) was only just satisfied when \( M = 12 \). Of one thing we feel sure, that these discrepancies cannot be explained by the fact that we were measuring relative to (5) or (4) rather than (5). We regret there was not more time to spend on these experiments. They ought to be repeated.
Fig 8.17 E.p. probe for 25" x 3" duct III
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Fig 8.18 Static pressure drop in 2½" x 3" duct; M = 9.43
8.4. 2½" x 3" duct; conducting and non-conducting walls.

8.4.1. Apparatus.

In this experiment we hoped to use our probes to examine the curious flows predicted by our theory of §2.4 and Hunt (1965) and continue the investigation of Alty (1966) into the instability of the flows. As was intended in the design we could use the main 66" duct for this purpose with the copper walls exposed to the mercury. (See fig. 6.1). To reduce the copper-mercury contact resistance we left the duct full of mercury for 3 days.

The only new probe used in these experiments was an electric potential probe which was designed to minimise the effect on the flow near the tapping (5), the Probe is shown in fig. 8.17.

The basic data of the apparatus are presented in table 8.11.

8.4.2. Static pressure measurements.

We first measured the static pressure between tappings (4) and (5), \( \Delta P_{54} \), as a function of \( Q \) when \( M = 943 \). We assumed that the flow was fully developed since the entry length, given by \( a R/M^2 \) was much less than the duct width. Also Alty (1966) had shown that for higher values of \( R \) and lower values of \( M \) the flow was fully developed in a very short distance. Our results, along with the theoretical line, are plotted in fig. 8.18.

In taking the readings it was noticeable that the flow was very much less steady when \( R < 500 \) than for \( R > 500 \), when the readings were very reproducible. This would seem to relate to the curious kink in the graph when \( R < 500 \). It is pertinent to note that Alty found that his \( \Delta P \) against \( R \) curve touched the theoretical laminar flow curve at \( R \geq 1000 \), gradually moving away from it as \( R \) increased. The difference may be caused by the fact that our curve was taken at \( M = 943 \), as compared to Alty's value of 228; however we showed in §2.4.3 that the critical Reynolds number is theoretically independent of \( M \) as \( M \to \infty \), so this is an unlikely explanation. A more plausible one is that his flow circuit produced a more smoother flow than ours thus causing a smoother and later transition to the second flow regime we seem to find,
Fig. 8.19 Velocity profiles in the boundary layer at $x = b$ ($M = 94$)

- $\theta$ = 12 $cc/sec$  
- $\theta$ = 18.7 $cc/sec$  
- $\theta$ = 10.4 $cc/sec$  

Equations:

$\frac{d\theta}{dx} = \frac{M}{\rho}$
arguing by analogy with non-MHD flows.

Thus our readings indicate that the minimum critical Reynolds number for \( N = 943 \) is \( < 70 \) and that for \( R > 500 \), a stable, but not laminar second flow regime is set up. (This second flow regime, if fully developed, cannot be laminar because there is only one laminar, fully developed flow as shown by our uniqueness theorem of §2.3). We also note that this second flow regime is still basically laminar because \( \Delta P \) is proportional to \( Q \) and not \( Q^2 \). We refer to this again in §3.4.5.

### 3.4.3. Pitot tube measurements.

We used the flat Pitot tube (\( a_p = .073" , \ b_p = .024" \)) of fig. 8.12(a) to investigate the boundary layer on the lower non-conducting wall parallel to the magnetic field at \( y = 0 \). Realising that the flow would be rather unstable we attempted to measure \( \Delta P_p \) within a small range of \( Q \) so as to plot \( \frac{\Delta P}{Q} \) at one or two particular values of \( Q \). It was exceedingly difficult taking the readings on account of the unsteadiness of the flow and the lag between the Pitot and static reading. Our results are tabulated in table 8.12 and plotted in fig. 8.19. Note, firstly that we computed \( v_z \) by using the result of §8.3 in taking \( \alpha \) to be \( \alpha_o \) when \( N \) was based on \( b_p \). Second, we assumed the pressure to be constant across the duct. Thirdly, since the Pitot was placed \( \frac{4}{2} " \) downstream of the tapping (5) we used the static pressure drop measurements to calculate \( \Delta P_p \), the static pressure drop between (5) and the probe. Fourthly, where the velocity was clearly negative and the readings even more unsteady, we have plotted the apparent values of \( -v_z \) on fig. 8.19, merely to indicate the presence of such backflow.

The results of these readings indicate; first, that the existence of the general features of the flow predicted by our theory was confirmed; a large velocity close to the wall in the boundary, a negative velocity and a core velocity less than the maximum boundary layer velocity; second, that the form of the velocity profile varied as \( Q \) varied, the lower value of \( Q \) leading to values of \( v_z/Q \) closer to the theoretical near
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Fig 8.20 Variation of potential with flow rate in 2\(\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3''\) duct; \(M = 943\)
Fig 8.21. Potential profile in boundary layer at $x = b$.

$M = 943$
the wall: third, that the velocity shear at the wall was apparently greater when the flow was unstable; this effect would be expected from the static pressure measurements, but the readings here are uncertain because the probe was so close to the wall; fourth, that the apparent values of velocity in the core were between 50 and 70 times as great as the theoretical value for laminar flow. (More about this later).

8.4.4. Potential probe measurements.

We only had time to measure the potential on the line \( y = 0 \), and we only measured the potential relative to the tapping (5) after assuming that the potential between the probe and the copper wall was negligible when \( x = y = 0 \). Note that the probe was vertically above the tapping (5). We measured \( \Delta \phi_{fp} \) as a function of \( Q \) at various values of \( x \), for \( M = 943 \), the results being plotted in fig.8.20. These measurements were all prone to the same difficulty in taking them as those of \( 8.3.4 \), namely the probe-tapping circuit linked flux and consequently \( \Delta \phi_{fp} \) was subject to random fluctuations. Over and above these fluctuations we could discern a noticeable difference between the steadiness of the readings, being much steadier in the core \( (x < 1.35) \) than in the boundary layer.

The main results of fig.8.20 are these. (i) The relation between \( \Delta \phi_{fp} \) and \( Q \) is linear in the core for \( R < 1000 \), the highest value measured. (ii) The electric field in the core is zero since all the points fall on the same \( \Delta \phi_{fp} - Q \) curve. (iii) In the boundary layer \( \Delta \phi_{fp} \) is only proportional to \( Q \) if \( Q \) is sufficiently low. It was difficult to determine how low owing to the randomness of the readings.

Taking the best straight lines through those points which might reasonably be estimated to be in the linear regime, at the various values of \( x \) we plotted \( \Delta \phi_{fp}/Q \) against \( X = (b-x)/(aM^2) \) in order to compare the theoretical laminar profile with the experimental one. First, we notice that the experimental curve falls below the theoretical for all values of \( X \) and second we note that the experimental curve does not have a maximum, unlike the theoretical curve, where it occurs because \( v \rightarrow 0 \) at this point in the laminar theory.

We may observe from the fact that \( E_x = 0 \) in the core, that the
copper walls had a negligible resistance and therefore the conditions of the flow were as intended.

8.4.4. Discussion

Our aim here is to provide a plausible explanation for the differences between the results for $\Delta P_q$ (henceafter $\Delta P$), $v_e/Q$, and $\Delta f_{2p}/Q$ and those predicted by the laminar theory. We start from the incontroversible fact that $E_x = E_y = 0$ in the core in both the situations, hereinafter denoted by the suffixes 2 and 1 respectively; furthermore, the velocity is uniform in the core in both cases and therefore, $\Delta P/\Delta z = -\sigma v_2^2 B_o^2$ and

$$\frac{\Delta P_2}{\Delta P_1} = \frac{(U_{core2})}{(U_{core1})}.$$ 8.4.1.

Now we see from fig. 8.18 that $\Delta P_3 \approx 2.6 \Delta P_1$, whence

$$(U_{core2}) \approx 2.6 (U_{core1}).$$ 8.4.2.

But in fig 8.19 we see that

$$(U_{core2}) \approx 5.0 (U_{core1}).$$ 8.4.3.

Thus some discrepancy needs to be explained.

We see from the Pitot and e.p. probe traverses in the boundary layers that the turbulent boundary layer thickness is greater than the laminar. Therefore we can still make the approximation in the boundary layer:

$$- \frac{d\phi}{dx} - v_e B_o = 0.$$ 8.4.4.

with an error of order $(U_e / U_{core})$, the suffixes referring to the core and boundary layer respectively. From (8.4.4) it follows that

$$\Delta \Phi = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v_e d (U_e - U_{core}) B_o Q_{b, l},$$

where $Q_{b, l}$ is the volume flow rate in the boundary layer. Now in laminar flow (Hunt, 1965), $Q = Q_{b, l} + Q_c$ where $Q_c \approx 3 \frac{33}{3} Q_{b, l}$. Now in our flow we found that

$$\frac{(\Delta \Phi)}{Q_{b, l}} \approx \frac{7}{3} \frac{(\Delta \Phi)}{Q_{b, l}} \times \frac{(Q_{b, l})}{Q_{c}} \approx \frac{(Q_{b, l})}{Q_{c}} \times (1 + \frac{3 \times 3}{4})$$

for our duct when $M = 943$. Thus:

$$\frac{(Q_{b, l})}{(Q_{c})} = \frac{(U_{core})}{(U_{e})} \approx 3.3$$ 8.4.5.
which is in better agreement with (8.4.2) than 15 (8.4.3).

We believe that the explanation for (8.4.3) is that a pressure gradient \( \frac{dp}{dx} < 0 \) exists in the centre of the duct near the wall \( x = b \). This pressure gradient may be caused by turbulent secondary flow which impells fluid from places where the shearing stress is greatest and towards places where it is least, to paraphrase R. and P. (1972), p. 149; such a flow would induce a velocity \( v_x(> 0) \) and thus a pressure gradient \( \frac{dp}{dx} < 0 \); Q.E.D.

This apparently convincing argument has two main flaws: (1) Why is \( \Delta p_a \) proportional to \( Q \) in the second flow regime, if this regime is dominated by secondary flows? (2) Is the reason for the discrepancy between Alty's results and our's simply due to the greater unsteadiness of our flow? or does the value of \( M \) matter? We have to leave these questions unanswered.

We note that it follows from (8.4.4) that we can calculate \( v_x \) in the boundary from the potential profile. In fig. 8.19 we have plotted 3 points by measuring the slope of the \( \frac{\Delta p}{Q} \) against \( x \) curve of fig. 8.21. The agreement between these values and those measured by the Pitot tube is quite good (\( \sim 5\% \)) near the wall but is poor as \( x \) increases.

We conclude by observing that these measurements of static pressure, dynamic head and electric potential, taken together can be correlated and they show how the use of Pitot and s.e.p. probes enables us to increase our understanding of very complex, unsteady flows.

Summaries of the work described in this thesis are to be found at the beginning of each chapter. In this chapter we mention some possible lines for further research which arise out of our work and some improvements which might be made on our experimental apparatus.

The most important development of the theoretical work on MHD duct flows described in chapter 2 should be the extension of the analysis to compressible flows. We believe that such a development is not only possible, but of practical use. The reasons for our belief were set out in Hunt (1966,b); however the outline calculations of that paper will obviously have to be worked out in greater detail before these calculations are taken seriously by the designers of MHD generators. There are still some interesting aspects of laminar duct flows to be analysed, e.g. the boundary layers on the walls parallel to the magnetic field in the diverging ducts considered in §2.7., or the flow in a duct with a sudden change in cross sectional area, (not the sudden change in the rate of change we examined).

Clearly the theory of Pitot and electric potential probes of chapter 4 is very inadequate. The theory will only advance when we understand the flow over bodies placed in various kinds of flow with the magnetic fields at various orientations. This aspect of MHD theory has been pooh-poohed in the past (by Professor Shercliff in particular) as being entirely academic; the study of Pitot tubes is definitely not academic and therefore this practical application may stimulate further theoretical work on the MHD flow over bodies. Also, with the advent of the use of MHD probes, we can now investigate the flow over bodies in ducts experimentally, e.g. Tseinüber et al, (1963), which should provide another stimulus to this theory and, most important, a check on it.

As regards the possible uses of MHD probes, the number of flows which we cannot analyse and which need investigating are limitless. However, it is more important to concentrate on flows about which we have some theoretical understanding. One such is the onset of turbulence.
in narrow channels; this type of flow has mainly been examined by external pressure measurements, and upon these a huge body of semi-empirical theory is built. This theory badly needs verification by internal probe measurements. Also, this particular flow is technologically the most important and, we feel, the one where most effort should be concentrated.

Our flow circuit is subject to many serious defects which must be eliminated if more accurate measurements are to be made. First, our choice of pump was disastrous; the flow it produced was not smooth and the trouble caused by the wearing down of the pipes in it produced more spilling of mercury than ever a small leak from a centrifugal pump would cause. Having seen the flow circuits of Moreau and Lecocq, we feel sure that, if a circuit with two free surfaces is to be used, a centrifugal pump is quite satisfactory. However, from the published accounts of the flow rigs at Riga, it is not clear whether the Russians, who use closed circuits with electromagnetic pumps, achieve more or less steady flows than those using centrifugal pumps. This point must be resolved before any satisfactory measurements are to be made on the onset of instability in MHD flows. Another point to be resolved concerns the best design of weirs for use with mercury. The one we designed seemed to induce an unsteady flow over them, perhaps because they were circular in shape. Some experiments should be done to find that design of weir which uses the least amount of mercury and yet produces a steady flow over it.
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Table 8.1. Basic data for \( \frac{7}{8}'' \times \frac{2}{8}'' \) dust (T).

Cross-section dimensions: \( 2a = 0.116'' \), \( 2b = 2.375'' \).

Properties of mercury (NKS units):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>Density ( \rho ) (in ( \text{g/cm}^3 ))</th>
<th>Velocity ( \nu ) (in ( \text{m/s} ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 15^\circ )</td>
<td>( 13.56 \times 10^3 )</td>
<td>( 2.08 \times 10^3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 25^\circ )</td>
<td>( 13.5 \times 10^3 )</td>
<td>( 2.52 \times 10^3 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Density of meths, \( \rho_M \):

\( \rho_M = 820 \times 10^3 \text{ g/m}^3 \), \( \rho_M = 812 \times 10^3 \text{ g/m}^3 \)

(This data is also used in tables 8.5 and 8.11)

Reynolds number, \( R = \frac{(\frac{Q}{\omega}) \rho \nu}{\eta} = 73 \) Q at \( 20^\circ \text{C} \).

(Q is the flow rate in cc/sec).

Hartmann number, \( M = B_0 \rho (\sigma/\eta) \frac{h}{L} = B_0 \times 38.7 \) at \( 20^\circ \text{C} \).

Flowmeter calibration, \( Q = 3.42 \times V \) \( (B_0 \text{ in wb/m}^2) \).

(Q in cc/sec; \( V \) is the flow meter reading in mVolts).

Pressure gradients in fully developed laminar flow:

\( M = 0, \quad \frac{dp}{dz} = \frac{-3\rho \nu}{4a^3 b} \) (ignore effects of walls at \( x = \pm b \))

whence \( dh/dz = -1.47Q \) (Q in litres/sec, \( dh/dz \) in inches of meths per inch of duct, \( h \) being manometer reading. We omit subsequent calculations of \( dh/dz \), since they follow from this one).

\( M \neq 0; \quad \frac{dp}{dz} = -\frac{M Q \nu}{4a^3 b (\tanh M - 1/M)} \)

Velocity profiles in fully developed laminar flow:

\( M = 0, \quad \nu_z = \frac{3Q}{8\omega} \left( 1 - \frac{y^2}{a^2} \right) \)

whence \( \sqrt{\Delta P_r} / Q = 0.484 \left( 1 - \frac{y^2}{a^2} \right) \)

(Q in cc/sec, \( \Delta P_r \) in inches of meths).

\( M \neq 0, \quad \nu_z = \frac{Q}{4a^3 b} M \left( \frac{1 - \cosh (My/a)}{1 - \cosh M} \right) \frac{1}{M - \tanh M} \)

\(~157~\)
### Table 8.2. Static pressure drop in duct I when $M = 0$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Q$ (c.c./sec)</th>
<th>$\Delta \rho_{ip}/Q$ (inches of meths/cc/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean $= 3.59$  
Standard deviation (s.d.) $= .28$

Theoretical Value $= 3.64$

### Table 8.3. Pitot tube readings in duct I when $M = 0$; circular tip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Q$ (c.c./sec)</th>
<th>$\Delta \rho_{ip}/Q^2$ &quot;meths&quot;/(c.c/sec)^2</th>
<th>$\sqrt{\Delta \rho_{ip}/Q}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>$3.18 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$5.64 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>$4.47$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>$4.53$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>$5.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>$5.14$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>$5.16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>$4.60$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>$4.78$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>$4.87$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean $= 2.42 \times 10^{-3}$  
S.d. $= .35 \times 10^{-3}$

(i.e., 14.5% of mean)  
(i.e., 6.1% of mean)

Theoretical Value $= 2.34 \times 10^{-3}$  
$4.84 \times 10^{-2}$

Note: (1) $Q < 7$ c.c./sec so that flow is in linear regime.  
(2) the square root of the mean value of $\Delta \rho_{ip}/Q^2$ is $4.92$ and so very close to the mean value of $\sqrt{\Delta \rho_{ip}/Q}$.  
Thus to calculate $\sqrt{\Delta \rho_{ip}/Q}$, we can calculate $\Delta \rho_{ip}/Q^2$ and then take its square root - a much simpler process.
Table 8.4. Pitot tube readings in duct I when M = 0: flat ended tip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q (c.c/sec)</th>
<th>ΔPp/Q &quot;millimeter (c.c/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.26 x 10^{-3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean value = 2.37,

s.d. = .14 (6% of mean)

Theoretical Value = 2.34.

Table 8.5. Basic data for .6" x .3" duct (II).

Cross-section dimensions: 2a = .600", 2b = 3.010".

Distance between probe and duct entry = 22"

Calibration of flowmeter (Mark II). Q = 13V;
(Q in c.c/sec, V in mV).

Maximum flowrate: .06 litres/sec.

Reynolds number, R, = 57.2Q

Hartmann number, M = B x 213.3 (at 20°C),

Theoretical pressure gradient for laminar, fully developed flow:

\[ M = 0 \quad \frac{dh}{dz} = -6.64 \times 10^{-6} Q \]

\[ M \gg 1 \quad \frac{\Delta P}{2} = \frac{M Q}{4a^3 b} \left( 1 - \frac{852 a}{6 M^2 c} - \frac{1}{M} + \right)^{-1}, \]

\[ \frac{dh}{dz} = \frac{2.885 \times 10^{-5} VM}{(1 - 184 M^{-1} - M^{-1})}, \]

using the result of Shercliff (1953).

Entry length (1) when M >> 1:

\[ l = aR/M. \quad (Shercliff \ (1956)). \]

Hence, since l = 20", R/M ≤ 62 for fully developed flow in our duct.

Pitot tube measurements in the core when M >> 1:
\[ \Delta P_s = \Delta P_0 (1 + \alpha N) + \Delta P = \Delta + \Delta P_0 (\alpha N) \]

where \( \Delta = \Delta P_0 + \Delta P \), \( \Delta P_0 = \frac{1}{2} \rho U_c^2 = \frac{1}{2} \rho \frac{d^2}{d t^2} \left( 4ae - (1 - 184 M^{-1/2} - M^{-1}) \right)^2 \)

\[ N = \frac{\sigma b^2 (d, \alpha_p, b_p)}{\rho U_c}, \text{ (used for Pitot tubes with circular tips, and the smallest value of } \alpha_p \text{ or } b_p \text{ is used for flattened tips.)} \]

\( \alpha \) is an arbitrary constant to be measured, and

\[ \Delta P_s = - \frac{\Delta z_{0p} \gamma M \alpha}{4a^3 \beta (1 - 184 M^{-1/2} - M^{-1})} \]

where \( \Delta z_{0p} \) is the axial distance between the tapping (5) and the Pitot tip measured in the +z direction.

Electric potential probe measurements:

If \( \Delta \phi \) is the potential difference between the probe tip and the tapping (5) at \( y = 0, x = b = 1.505 \text{in} \), then in the core when \( M > 1 \), the laminar flow theory is that

\[ \frac{\Delta \phi}{\Delta x} = U_c \frac{B_0 (1 - M^{-1})}{4a^3 \beta (1 - 184 M^{-1/2} - M^{-1})} \]

whence

\[ \Delta \phi = 2.62 \times 10^{-4} B_0 \Delta x \frac{U_c}{V} (1 - 184 M^{-1/2} + O(M^{-1/2})) \]

In the boundary layer on the wall at \( x = b \),

\[ \frac{\partial (\Delta \phi)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial (\Delta \phi)}{\partial x} = B_0 (U_c - U)(1 + O(M^{-1})) \]

where \( \Delta \phi_c \) is the core value of \( \Delta \phi \). Using the result of Shercliff (1953),

\[ (\Delta \phi_c)_{y=0} = \frac{6.4 \times 10^{-5} B_0 M^{-1/2} V}{(1 - 184 M^{-1/2})} \]

Table 8.6. Static pressure drop in duct II when \( M < 135 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( V )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( \frac{\Delta P_s / V}{\text{in brackets}} )</th>
<th>( V )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( -\Delta P_s / V )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.99 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.66 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8.6 (cont).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>M ((-\Delta P_{\text{eff}}/MV))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean \(2.95 \times 10^{-4}\) at \(16^\circ\text{C}\) with temp. correction. \(3.12 \times 10^{-4}\) at \(20^\circ\text{C}\) with temp. correction. \(3.57 \times 10^{-4}\) at \(20^\circ\text{C}\). Average of both \(3.35 \times 10^{-4}\) at \(20^\circ\text{C}\). Theoretical value \(3.32 \times 10^{-4}\).

Table 8.7. Pitot tube errors in duct II. (circular tips).

(a) tip dimensions: .028\text{"} o.d., .0155\text{"} i.d. (fig. 8.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>V (\text{in V})</th>
<th>(\Delta P_{\text{eff}}) (\text{in feet}^2)</th>
<th>(\Delta P_{\text{C}})</th>
<th>(\Delta P_{\text{r}})</th>
<th>(\Delta)</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.0130</td>
<td>.0050</td>
<td>-.0061</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.0198</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.0223</td>
<td>.0070</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.0227</td>
<td>.0069</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.0304</td>
<td>.0082</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.0308</td>
<td>.0083</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.0304</td>
<td>.0082</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.0377</td>
<td>.0091</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.0450</td>
<td>.0098</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean value of \(\alpha\), \(\bar{\alpha} = .38\), s.d. = .4

Mean value of \(N = .82\)

(b) tip dimensions: .034\text{"} o.d., .020\text{"} i.d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>V (\text{in V})</th>
<th>(\Delta P_{\text{eff}}) (\text{in feet}^2)</th>
<th>(\Delta P_{\text{C}})</th>
<th>(\Delta P_{\text{r}})</th>
<th>(\Delta)</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.0145</td>
<td>.0105</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.0258</td>
<td>.0141</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.0428</td>
<td>.0181</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.0428</td>
<td>.0181</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\bar{\alpha} = .49\)
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Table 8.8. Pitot tube errors in duct II. (flattened tip, $a_t \ll b_p$).

(a) external tip dimensions $0.12^\prime \times 0.062^\prime$ (fig. 7.2b); $M \approx 137$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
<th>$\Delta P_{t-t}$</th>
<th>$\Delta P_{t-o}$</th>
<th>$\Delta P_{o-o}$</th>
<th>$\Delta \rho$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{\alpha} = 2.0$

s.d. = 1.6

If $N$ is based on $D_p$ ($= 4 \times$ area/perimeter of tip cross section), the mean value of $\alpha$, $\bar{\alpha}_{D_p} = 1.2$.

(b) same Pitot tube: $M \approx 251$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
<th>$\Delta P_{t-t}$</th>
<th>$\Delta P_{t-o}$</th>
<th>$\Delta P_{o-o}$</th>
<th>$\Delta \rho$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.0233</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.0398</td>
<td>0.0186</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.0607</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{\alpha} = 1.6$

s.d. = 0.25
Table 8.9. Pitot tube error in duct \( III \) (flattened tip, \( a_p \gg b_p \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( V )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_p )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_o )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_b )</th>
<th>( \Delta )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.0280</td>
<td>0.0145</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>0.0181</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.0190</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.0585</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With \( N \) based on \( b_p \), \( \alpha = 0.40 \)

With \( N \) based on \( b_p \), \( \alpha_{b_p} = 0.24 \)

Table 8.10. Electric potential measurements in core flow of duct \( III \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( x ) inches</th>
<th>( B_0 ) wb/m²</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( \Delta \Phi / V ) mV/V</th>
<th>( (\Delta \Phi / V)_{x=0} )</th>
<th>Theoretical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>( 780 \pm 0.006 )</td>
<td>( 377 \pm 0.012 )</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>( 271 \pm 0.01 )</td>
<td>( 130 \pm 0.003 )</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>( 478 \pm 0.001 )</td>
<td>( 227 \pm 0.003 )</td>
<td>2305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>( 478 \pm 0.001 )</td>
<td>( 227 \pm 0.003 )</td>
<td>2305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) the values of \( \Delta \Phi / V \) are mean values deriving from several readings of \( \Delta \Phi \) at various values of \( V \).

(2) The probe used is that shown in Fig. 8.12(a).

Table 8.11. Basic data of \( 2\frac{1}{8}'' \times 3'' \) duct (III)

Cross-section dimensions: \( 2a = 2.486'' \), \( 2b = 3.010'' \).

Positions of tappings relative to (5) in \( +z \) direction: (1) \( -4.6'' \); (2) \( -4.4.5'' \); (3) \( -23'' \); (4) \( -11.25'' \); (5) 0; (6) 7''.

Reynolds number, \( R = 1930 \times V = 148.5 \) Q; where Q is in c.c/sec.

and \( V \) is in \( mV \).

Hartmann number, \( N = 820 B_0 \), where \( B_0 \) is in \( wb/m^2 \).

Flowmeter calibration; \( Q = 13.0 \) V.
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Pressure gradient in fully developed laminar flow (Hunt, 1965):

\[
\frac{\partial P}{\partial z} = -\frac{\eta}{4\alpha_b} \left( \frac{1}{6\alpha_b} + \frac{1}{M^2} + \ldots \right)
\]

whence

\[
\frac{dh}{dz} = \frac{0.7 \times 10^{-2} \cdot V \cdot M^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(1 + 4 \cdot 0.2^2 / M^2)}
\]

The theoretical velocity and potential profiles in the boundary layer at \( x = b \) may be found from (Hunt, 1965). In the core the potential relative to tapping (5) \( (x = b, y = 0) \) is theoretically:

\[
\Delta \phi = \frac{1.49 \times 10^{-3} \cdot B_0 \cdot V}{(1 + 4 \cdot 0.2^2 / M^2)}
\]

To calculate \( U_2 \) from \( \Delta P_{sp} \) we use the experimental value of \( dh/dz \) to find \( \Delta P_s \) and the value of \( \alpha_l \) for the MHD correction factor of the flattened Pitot tube from the table 8.9., i.e. \( \Delta \phi \), so that

\[
\Delta P_{sp} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho \cdot U_2^2 \left( 1 + \alpha_l \cdot \frac{\rho_2^2 \cdot B_0}{\rho \cdot U_2} \right) + \Delta P_s
\]

Hence we calculate \( U_2 \). Note that \( \Delta P_s < 0 \) since the probe tip in this case is \( 750^\circ \) downstream of tapping (5).

Table 3.12. Pitot readings in duct III; \( M = 943 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( V_1 / \text{m/s} )</th>
<th>( V_2 / \text{m/s} )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_{sp} )</th>
<th>( \Delta P_s )</th>
<th>( \Delta \phi )</th>
<th>( \Delta \phi_{sp} )</th>
<th>( \Delta \phi_{sp} / \Delta \phi )</th>
<th>( \Delta \phi_{sp} / \Delta \phi )</th>
<th>( \Delta \phi_{sp} / \Delta \phi )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_i$</td>
<td>$A_{\theta_1}$</td>
<td>$A_{\theta_2}$</td>
<td>$\Delta A_{\theta}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Magnetohydrodynamic flow in rectangular ducts
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The paper presents an analysis of laminar motion of a conducting liquid in a rectangular duct under a uniform transverse magnetic field. The effects of the varying conducting walls are investigated. Exact solutions are obtained in cases, (i) perfectly conducting walls perpendicular to the field and thin of arbitrary conductivity parallel to the field, and (ii) non-conducting walls to the field and thin walls of arbitrary conductivity perpendicular to field.

Boundary layers on the walls parallel to the field are studied in case (i) and found that at high Hartmann number ($M$), large positive and negative values of order $M^2$ are induced, where $U$ is the velocity of the core. It is noted that contrary to previous assumptions the magnetic field may in cases have a destabilizing effect on flow in ducts.

Introduction

The design of magnetohydrodynamic generators, pumps and accelerators demands an understanding of the flows of conducting fluids in rectangular ducts with finitely conducting walls under transverse magnetic fields. At the same time even the case of uniformly conducting incompressible laminar with no variation in the flow direction has not been fully analyzed. In this paper we confine ourselves to problems of this type alone. The main characteristics of such flows that need to be known are:

1. Volumetric flow rate $q$ through the duct for given pressure gradient and magnetic field;
2. Potential difference between electrodes placed in the walls;

Two exact solutions have been found for incompressible laminar flows in rectangular ducts with transverse magnetic fields:

1. Rectangular ducts with perfectly conducting walls (Chang & Lundgren 1961);
2. Rectangular ducts with non-conducting walls and the field perpendicular to side (Shercliff 1953);
3. Rectangular ducts with perfectly conducting walls (Chang & Lundgren 1961);
4. Rectangular ducts with non-conducting walls (e.g. Gold 1962 and Fabri & Crock 1960).

Approximate methods have been developed for the physically interesting...
case of flows at high Hartmann number, \( M \). For a rectangular duct with non-conducting walls Shercliff (1953) developed an approximate method for analyzing the boundary layers on the walls parallel to the field and hence deduced and the potential distributions round the walls. By ignoring the reduction in flow rate due to the boundary layers, he then found a first approximation for a duct of any cross-section, which was later extended to the case of ducts with thin walls of any conductivity by Chang & Lundgren (1961). Sakao (1962) used a variational method to find a second-order approximation for \( q \) in circular pipes.

In finding the overall features of the flow at high \( M \), approximate methods are often best since the exact solutions are in the form of infinite series whose rate of convergence decreases for higher values of \( M \). It is possible, however, to compare the expressions for \( q \) at high \( M \) obtained by the two methods. The only case hitherto of the approximate expression for \( q \) at high \( M \) differing with the result derived from the exact solution is that of flow in a rectangular duct with non-conducting walls (Williams 1963). In the same paper, using some lengthy mathematical derivations, Williams deduced an expression for \( q \) at high \( M \) from Chang & Lundgren’s result for flow in a rectangular channel with perfectly conducting walls.

The asymptotic form of the exact solution for circular pipe flow at high \( M \) provides an expression for \( q \) which differs from Shercliff’s (1962a) and Sakao (1962) approximate expressions by a term due to the velocity defect in the boundary layers.

No satisfactory approximate or exact solutions exist for the most important practical case of a rectangular duct with conducting walls parallel to the field and non-conducting walls perpendicular to the field. Some observations on this problem have been made by Shercliff (1962b, page 16) and by Bruginski (1969). Gribben (1961, 1962) has attempted an exact analysis using a Green’s function method but his result is incomplete. We have not been able to solve the problem but we have obtained exactly two other classes of problem of flow in a rectangular duct, in which the duct has (1) perfectly conducting walls at right angles to the field and thin walls of arbitrary conductivity parallel to the field, and (2) non-conducting walls parallel to the field and thin walls of arbitrary conductivity perpendicular to the field. These exact solutions are in the form of infinite series whose rate of convergence increases for higher values of \( M \). In this paper we examine the asymptotic form of these solutions at high \( M \) and draw some interesting physical conclusions, the main one being that a magnetic field may have a destabilizing influence on the flow in a duct.

2. Formulation of the problem

We consider the steady flow of an incompressible conducting fluid driven by a pressure gradient along a rectangular duct under an imposed transverse magnetic field. We assume that the walls of the duct are thin and infinitely conducting. We postulate no secondary flow and no variation in duct cross-section or magnetic field. Consequently all conditions except pressure are constant along the duct.

![Figure 1. Cross-section of a rectangular duct with magnetic field in y-direction.](image)

The walls \( AB \) at \( s = \pm h \) and \( BB \) at \( y = \pm b \).

The equations are usually rewritten to give two coupled second-order partial differential equations in \( H_y \) and \( V \):

\[
0 = \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 H_y}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 H_y}{\partial y^2} (5)
\]

\[
0 = \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 B_y}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2} (6)
\]

and \( H_y \) are normalized in terms of \( \partial H_y/\partial z \), \( \sigma \), and \( \xi \). (5) and (6) become

\[
\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} + 2 \frac{\partial^2 H_y}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial^2 H_y}{\partial y^2} = -1
\]

(7)

\[
\frac{\partial^2 H_y}{\partial z^2} + 2 \frac{\partial^2 H_y}{\partial y^2} + M \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2} = 0
\]

(8)

\[
V = v_0 \left( \frac{\partial H_y}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y}; \quad H_y = H(\theta) \left( \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial z};
\]

\[
M = \alpha B_w(\sigma)|\xi|; \quad \xi = z/a; \quad y = y/a.
\]
Also let

\[ \Phi = \phi(\theta) \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \theta} \right) e^\psi \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = b/a. \]

We follow Shercliff (1956) in the specification of boundary conditions on \( \partial \Omega \) at a thin bounding wall. If \( \partial H/\partial n \) is the normalised inward normal gradient of \( \partial \Omega \) at the wall, the condition satisfied by \( H \) at the wall is

\[ \partial H/\partial n = \sigma_\Omega H/\partial \nu, \]

where \( \sigma_\Omega \) is the conductivity of the wall and \( w \) is its thickness (w \( \ll a \)). If \( \nu \equiv \sigma_\Omega w \), the boundary condition for \( H \) is

\[ \partial H/\partial \nu = H/\partial n. \]

The boundary condition on \( V \), of course, is that it should vanish at the walls.

In [3] and [4] we consider the following two cases, defined with reference to figure 1:

- **Case I** rectangular duct with walls \( BB \) perfectly conducting and walls \( AA \) of arbitrary conductivity;
- **Case II** rectangular duct with walls \( AA \) non-conducting and walls \( BB \) of arbitrary conductivity.

### 3. Case I

In this case walls \( BB \) are perfectly conducting, \( d_B = \infty \), and walls \( AA \) have arbitrary conductivity \( d_A \). The boundary conditions on \( V \) and \( H \) are:

at \( \nu = \pm 1 \), \( V = 0 \) and \( \partial H/\partial \nu = 0 \),

and at \( \xi = \pm 1 \), \( V = 0 \) and \( \partial H/\partial \nu = \mp H/\partial A \).

We can satisfy the boundary conditions on \( \nu = \pm 1 \) by expressing \( V \) and \( H \) as Fourier series in \( \nu \), with the coefficients functions of \( \xi \):

\[ V = \sum_{\nu=0}^\infty a_{\nu}(\xi) \cos \nu \pi \nu; \quad H = \sum_{\nu=0}^\infty b_{\nu}(\xi) \sin \nu \pi \nu; \quad 1 = \sum_{\nu=0}^\infty a_{\nu} \cos \nu \pi \nu, \]

where \( a_{\nu} = (j+\frac{1}{2})a \) and \( a_{\nu} = 2(1-j)/\nu \). Substituting these expansions for \( V \) and \( H \) into (7) and (8) leads to two ordinary differential equations for \( a_{\nu} \) and \( b_{\nu} \):

\[
\frac{d}{d\xi} \left( \frac{d^2 a_{\nu}}{d\xi^2} + \frac{M}{\nu^2} a_{\nu} - b_{\nu} \right) = 0, \quad \frac{d}{d\xi} \left( \frac{d^2 b_{\nu}}{d\xi^2} + \frac{M}{\nu^2} b_{\nu} + a_{\nu} \right) = 0,
\]

and

\[ a_{\nu} = \frac{\alpha_{\nu}}{\nu^2 + M} \left( 1 \right), \quad b_{\nu} = \frac{\beta_{\nu}}{\nu^2 + M} \left( 1 \right), \]

where \( \alpha_{\nu} = \frac{\nu}{\nu+1} \) and \( \beta_{\nu} = \frac{\nu}{\nu+1} \). Substituting these expressions into the Hartmann layer conditions gives:

\[
Q = \sum_{\nu=0}^\infty \frac{1}{\nu^2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \right) \frac{1}{\nu^2 + M} \right) \left( 1 \right) \left( 1 \right) - \frac{1}{\nu^2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \right) \frac{1}{\nu^2 + M} \right) \left( 1 \right) \left( 1 \right).
\]

We note that the terms independent of \( \xi \) in the expressions for \( V \) and \( H \) are the same as the expansions of the Hartmann solution and also that, as \( d_A \to \infty \), the solutions become identical to those obtained for rectangular ducts with perfectly conducting walls by Uflyand (1961) and Chang & Lundgren (1961).

If the Hartmann numbers are high, the fluid moves at a constant velocity, the velocity, in the centre of the duct with the velocity gradients confined to the Hartmann layers on the walls \( BB \). If the non-dimensional core velocity then \( \nu = 1/M^2 \) as \( M \to \infty \). The current density is also constant in the core. Hartmann layers are well understood, but the boundary layers on the walls are less well understood and need examination.

We consider the boundary layer on the wall \( \xi = -1 \) at high Hartmann number to make the following approximations:

\[
M \to \infty, \quad \beta_{\nu} \gamma_{\nu} \sim (\nu x_M) \left( 1 + O(1/M) \right) \sim \lambda_4, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_4 = (x_M)^4,
\]

\[ \gamma_{\nu} = \left[ \exp \left( 2(\nu x_M)^2 \right) \right] (1 + O(1/M)) \]

\[
\sim \left( (1 + A_\nu \lambda_4) Q_{\nu} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2}{\nu} \right),
\]

where

\[ K_j \sim \left( (1 + A_\nu \lambda_4) Q_{\nu} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2}{\nu} \right),
\]

and

\[ K_j \sim \left( (1 + A_\nu \lambda_4) Q_{\nu} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2}{\nu} \right).\]
For clarity we take the two cases of \(d_A = 0\) and \(d_A = \infty\) and consider the \(V, H\) and \(\Phi\) profiles in the boundary layer. If \(\xi = \xi + 1\) and \(\Phi = \Phi + 1\) at \(\eta = \pm 1\), then for \(d_A = 0\), as \(M \to \infty\),

\[
V = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^j \cos \sigma_j \eta}{M \sigma_j} [1 - \exp(-\lambda_6 \xi) \cos(\lambda_6 \xi) - M/\sigma_j \sin(\lambda_6 \xi)],
\]

(16)

\[
H = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^j \sin \sigma_j \eta}{M \sigma_j} [-(M/\sigma_j) + \exp(-\lambda_6 \xi) \cos(\lambda_6 \xi) + \sin(\lambda_6 \xi)],
\]

(17)

\[
\Phi = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^j \cos \sigma_j \eta}{2 \sigma_j M} [2\lambda_6 \exp(-\lambda_6 \xi) \sin(\lambda_6 \xi)],
\]

(18)

and for \(d_A = \infty\), as \(M \to \infty\),

\[
V = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^j \cos \sigma_j \eta}{M \sigma_j} [1 - \exp(-\lambda_6 \xi) \cos(\lambda_6 \xi) - \sin(\lambda_6 \xi)],
\]

(19)

\[
H = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^j \sin \sigma_j \eta}{M \sigma_j} [-(M/\sigma_j) + \exp(-\lambda_6 \xi) \cos(\lambda_6 \xi) + \sin(\lambda_6 \xi)],
\]

(20)

\[
\Phi = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{2(-1)^j \cos \sigma_j \eta}{2 \sigma_j M} [2\lambda_6 \exp(-\lambda_6 \xi) \sin(\lambda_6 \xi)].
\]

(21)

In contrast with the exact solutions for rectangular and circular pipes with non-conducting walls, the higher terms in these series decrease exponentially and therefore it is a good approximation to consider the first few terms only. Hence we see that the \(V, H,\) and \(\Phi\) boundary layer profiles approximate the form of exponentially damped sine waves, the thickness of the layers being \(O(M^{-1})\). In figures 2 and 3, velocity profiles when \(d_A = 0\) are plotted for various values of \(\eta\) at \(M = 100\) and for various values of \(M\) at \(\eta = 0\). In figure 4, the velocity profiles when \(d_A = \infty\) are plotted for various values of \(\eta\) at arbitrary \(M\), provided \(M \gg 1\). Here the abscissa \(M^{1/2}\) provides a universal plot, when \(M \gg 1\). Note that in all cases \(V/H = 1\) as \(\xi \to \infty\).

The dramatic effect on the flow of varying the conductivity of the walls \(AB\) is seen by comparing figures 3 and 4. When \(d_A = \infty\) (figure 4) the maximum velocity in the boundary layer is greater than the core velocity though of the same order; but when \(d_A = 0\) (figure 3), the maximum velocity is \(O(1)\), and the minimum velocity is negative provided \(M\) is high enough. We can deduce from (16) that the maximum velocity tends to \(0.25M\) as \(M \to \infty\) while the minimum velocity becomes locally negative for \(M > 89\) and tends to \(-0.011M\) as \(M \to \infty\). The physical reason for the effect on the flow of varying \(d_A\) when \(M \gg 1\) may be seen from equation (19) which shows that the form of the velocity profile depends on \(d_A\), and the ratio of the conductance of the wall to that of the boundary layer on the wall \(A\). Thus when \(d_A > 1\) the currents return to the walls \(BB\) through the walls \(AA\) and when \(d_A M < 1\) the currents return to the walls \(BB\) through the boundary layers on walls \(AA\). These effects are shown in figures 5a and b. In the first case the \(\text{J} \times \text{B}\) drag force remains almost as high in the
boundary layer as it is in the core and in the second case the $j \times B$ drag force decreases to zero at the walls, which explains why the velocities in the boundary layer are much less when $d_4 = \infty$ than when $d_4 = 0$. The reason for the large positive and negative velocities when $d_4 = 0$ is difficult to explain simply, but it appears that relative to its value in the core, the $j \times B$ force increases at the outer edge of the boundary layer, where the negative velocity occurs, before $d_4$ decreases near the wall, where the large positive velocities occur.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 4.** Case $I$; $d_4 = \infty$. Graph of $V/M^2$ against $\sqrt{M}^2$ in the boundary layer at $\xi = -1$ for various values of $M$, provided $M > 1$.

Figures 2 and 4 show how little variation in velocity there is in the $y$-direction as compared with the $x$-direction which is to be expected since the magnetic field tends to damp only the vorticity perpendicular to it.

Williams has worked out an asymptotic expansion for $Q$ when $d_4 = \infty$ as $M \to \infty$ in terms of $1/M$. It is possible to use a simpler method than he used to derive the same result and this method may also be used for any value of $d_4$. We consider the expression for $Q$ in equation (13) as $M \to \infty$ and make the same approximations as in equations (16) to (21). As $M \to \infty$, $M^2 \beta_i / \lambda_i \approx \beta_i / \lambda_i$, hence for low values of $\beta_i$ such that $\beta_i \approx \lambda_i \approx (\lambda_2, \lambda_1)$. Hence from equation (11) as $M \to \infty$, we have

$$Q \approx \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{8}{(\beta_i + M^2)} \left( N \lambda_i / \beta_i \right) \exp (2\beta_i l)$$

where $N = (1 - 1/M)/(2\lambda_i)$. In our case $\beta_i = 1/M$. Also, as $M \to \infty$, $\cosh 2\beta_i l \approx \sinh 2\beta_i l \approx \exp (2\beta_i l)$ with

$$\cosh 2\beta_i l \cos \beta_i l \approx \sinh 2\beta_i l \sim 2\beta_i l$$

Therefore from equation (13)

$$Q \approx \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{8}{(2\beta_i + M^2)} \left[ \frac{1}{2\lambda_i} \left( \frac{\exp (2\beta_i l)}{1 + d_4 \lambda_i} \right) - \frac{1}{(2\beta_i + M^2)} \frac{1}{2\lambda_i} \left( \frac{\exp (2\beta_i l)}{1 + d_4 \lambda_i} \right) \right]$$

This is the magnetic term in this expression represents the velocity flux due to Hartmann to the walls, the second term is the change due to the layers on the walls $AA$. Note that the form of the second term depends

$$O(M^{-1})$$

$O(M^{-1/2})$
Hence the mean velocity
\[ \bar{v}_z \sim \frac{-\partial \psi/\partial z}{\eta M^4} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{M^2} \frac{2aH}{5M^4} \right) \]

In the exact expression derived by Williams the coefficient of the third term is
2/43.

If \( d = 0 \),
\[ Q \sim \frac{4l}{M^4} \left( \frac{1}{M} + \frac{2}{5} \frac{64}{M^2} \right) \]
\[ \sim \frac{8}{M^4} \left( \frac{1}{5} + \frac{64}{M^2} \right) \]

Hence the mean velocity
\[ \bar{v}_z \sim \frac{-\partial \psi/\partial z}{\eta M^4} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{M^2} \frac{aH}{20} \frac{1}{M} \frac{1}{M^3} \right) \]

These results further demonstrate the interesting physical effects due to conducting walls. From (23) we see that the velocity deficiency in the boundary layers on \( A \), i.e.
\[ \int_{-1}^{+1} \int_{-1}^{+1} (V - V) dV d\xi, \]
is \( O(M^{-4}) \), when all the walls are perfectly conducting, i.e. \( d_e = \infty \). This is less than in the case of the rectangular duct with non-conducting walls which is \( O(M^{-4}) \) (Shercliff 1953). The reduced velocity deficiency is due to the velocity in the boundary layers showing an overshoot; relative to its value in the core the velocity first decreases, then increases above its value in the core, and finally decreases to zero at the wall. In fact there are an infinite number of fluctuations in the velocity profile between the overshoot, just referred to, and the core, so they are sufficiently small for us to ignore them (see figure 4). Note that both these cases the thickness of the boundary layers is \( O(M^{-4}) \).

When \( d_e = 0 \) the velocity 'deficiency', as defined above, is negative and we find that for a reasonably square duct \( (a/b > M^{-4}) \) most of the flow (equation 19) is in the boundary layers on \( A \). If the boundary layer has thickness \( O(M^{-4}) \) and the velocity in the boundary layer is \( O(M^{-4}) \) then the velocity flux through the boundary layer is \( O(M^{-4}) \) as compared with \( O(M^{-8}) \) for the velocity flux in the core. A practical consequence of this would be that, whereas the value of \( d_e \) for a given pressure gradient system of thin insulating baffle placed parallel to \( A \) at a distance \( O(a/M^{-4}) \) apart would promote a greater volume flow rate by creating more boundary layers. The explanation is that the dominant retarding force on the core flow is electromagnetic rather than viscous and the baffle reduces the currents and hence also the electromagnetic retarding force. Provided the baffles are at least \( O(a/M^{-4}) \) apart, the decrease in electromagnetic drag will be greater than the increase in viscous drag.

4. Case II

In this case walls \( A \), \( B \), \( C \), and \( D \) are non-conducting, \( d_e = 0 \), and walls \( RR \) have absolute conductivity, \( d_p \). The boundary conditions on \( V \) and \( H \) are
at \( y = \pm 1 \).
\[ V = 0, \quad \partial H/\partial y = \mp H(d_p) \]
and
at \( \xi = \pm 1 \).
\[ V = 0, \quad H = 0. \]
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satisfy the boundary conditions on \( \xi = \pm 1 \) by expressing \( V \) and \( H \) as series in \( \xi \), with coefficients functions of \( \psi \).

\[ V = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \psi \cos n\xi, \quad H = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n \psi \cos n\xi, \quad a_n = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi}{\xi + \pi} \frac{\sin \pi n}{\xi + \pi} \]

Putting these values for \( V \) and \( H \) into (7) and (8) again leads to two ordinary differential equations for \( r_e \) and \( h_e \).

\[ v_2 - a_2 v_2 + M h_2 = -a_2, \]
\[ b_2 - a_2 b_2 + M b_2 = 0. \]

Equations of these equations which satisfy the boundary conditions (25) (26)

\[ (1-t) \left( \frac{1}{M} - \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{2aH}{5M^4} \right) \]
\[ \left( \frac{1}{M} - \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{2aH}{5M^4} \right) \]


easily

\[ Q = \int_{-1}^{+1} \int_{-1}^{+1} V dV d\xi = \frac{8}{5} \frac{2}{M^4} \frac{1}{M} \frac{1}{M^3} \left( \frac{1}{M} + \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{64}{M^2} \right) \]
\[ \frac{2}{M^4} \frac{1}{M} \frac{1}{M^3} \left( \frac{1}{M} + \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{64}{M^2} \right) \]

From (26) we may see that \( V \) and \( Q \) depend on \( d_p M \), the ratio of the conduc-
tance of the walls $BB$ to that of the boundary layers on $BB$. Decreasing $d_A$, makes the current induced in the core return through the Hartmann layers $BB$ and hence reduces the electro-magnetic drag on the flow. This in turn dump out the sinusoidal form of the boundary layers on $AA$ and for some finite $d_A$ no negative velocities will be induced in these layers.

In examining the case when the walls are non-conducting, Shercliff first derived the exact solution for $(V + B)$, but found that this solution gave little information about the boundary layers at $\xi = \pm 1$ owing to the slow convergence of the series. Then by assuming that, in the boundary layers on $\xi = \pm 1$,

\[
\frac{\partial^2 (V + B)}{\partial \xi^2} \ll \frac{\partial^2 (V + B)}{\partial \eta^2},
\]

he found a self-similar solution for $(V + B)$. Hence he was able to work out the velocity deficiency in the boundary layer. Shercliff’s method is not applicable to cases other than $d_A = 0$ and $d_A = 0$; no other type of self-similar solution has yet been found.

5. Conclusion

Though this study is far from complete, it does indicate the need for further theoretical and experimental study of MHD flows in ducts with conducting walls. First, it is not difficult in a mercury experiment to raise $M$ to values greater than 100, and the effects predicted by the theory should be observable.

Secondly, the stability of the boundary layers on the walls $AA$ in the presence of excess velocity and reversed flow needs theoretical examination. The analysis of the steady-state duct flow problem does not depend on the value of the Reynolds number $R$ or the magnetic Reynolds number $R_m$, but the stability of such a flow depends on $R$, $R_m$, and $M$. If $R_m > 1$ the stability analysis depends only on $M$ and $M$. Lock (1955) has analyzed the stability of Hartmann flow and found that in realistic cases the magnetic field stabilizes the flow by its effect on the equilibrium velocity profile. This can be seen in the case of the ducts are all perfectly conducting ($d_A = 0$, $d_A = 0$) the velocity profile of the boundary layers also contains points of inflexion (figure 4). Hence raising $M$ reduces the Reynolds number at which these boundary layers become unstable. But in this case for $M > 1$ the velocity in the boundary layers on $AA$ is of the same order as the core velocity and since the boundary layers thickness is $O(M^{-1})$,

\[
R_{b,1} = O(M^{-1}) R.
\]

6. Conclusion

Finally, we consider an approximately square duct with $a/b = O(1)$. We see from the qualitative predictions about the stability of the flows studied above, based on our knowledge of the stability of boundary layers there is no magnetic field.

Let us examine the stability of the boundary layers on the walls $AA$ in a duct with perfectly conducting walls perpendicular to the field and insulated walls parallel to the field $(d_A = 0)$, where there is an increasing number of inflexion in the velocity profile which indicates that the higher $M$ the instability of the Reynolds number at which the flow in the boundary layers becomes unstable (figure 3). The degree to which the magnetic field is likely to be destabilizing depends also on the shape of the duct. If $d_A = M^{-1}$, a very thin duct with walls $AA$ much shorter than walls $BB$, the mean velocity in the duct closely approaches the core velocity and most of the flow is in the core. (For $a/b M = O(1)$ and $d_A = 0$ the whole Reynolds number at which the boundary layers on walls $AA$ become flow is in the boundary layers on $AA$ [§3].) Then the mean velocity in the boundary layers decreases as the Hartmann number increases. This may be contrasted
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This paper is an extension of an earlier paper by Hunt (1965) on laminar motion conducting liquid in a rectangular duct under a uniform transverse magnetic field. The effects of the duct having conducting walls are further explored; in this case the duct considered has perfectly conducting walls parallel to the flow and non-conducting walls perpendicular to the field. A solution is obtained by high Hartmann numbers by analysing the boundary layers on the walls. In this case the influence of the boundary layers is monotonically decreasing. Effect of an external electrical circuit is examined, although it is found that this does not influence the form of the velocity profiles.

Introduction

A fully-developed laminar flow of uniformly conducting and incompressible liquid through ducts under the action of a transverse magnetic field is attracting considerable interest at the present time, mainly for two reasons.

1. The magneto-hydrodynamic generators, pumps and accelerators are devices of considerable importance in which conducting fluids are passed through transverse magnetic fields. The analysis of the flow in these devices is formidable for one has to take into account the variable conductivity and density of the fluid, dissipated potential drop between the electrodes and the fluid and the fact that the flow is usually turbulent. In order to make progress in the understanding of the phenomena therefore, considerable simplification is necessary which may take the form of (a) an assumption of slug flow (Neuringer & Mityasky 1963); (b) a reduction of the problem to one-dimensional gas dynamics (Beeler 1958),(c) a two-dimensional analysis of the development of the laminar boundary layer on the walls of the duct (Kerrebrook 1961; Kerrebrook 1964); (d) a two-dimensional analysis of the flow downstream of the duct (Sutton & Carlson 1963). Judging from these papers, it seems that a solution of the above is not yet available. In the present paper, two-dimensional analysis of the flow variation across the duct is made with the assumption that it is laminar, fully developed and that there is no variation of fluid properties throughout the duct. These various idealisations are comple-

...
matory in that they each extract some of the basic physical ideas, and collectively it is hoped that they will prove useful in interpreting more complicated physical situations.

Secondly, this theory of duct flows can be tested in laboratory experiments with liquid metals. The uncertainty in the experimental results can be reduced to below 1%, and consequently these experiments provide critical tests for the theory, in marked contrast with the majority of magneto-fluid dynamic experiments.

Since most magnetohydrodynamic generators and pumps have a rectangular cross-section, we shall confine ourselves to examining rectangular ducts. Exact solutions have been obtained for laminar flows of uniformly conducting incompressible fluids through rectangular ducts with thin conducting walls under transverse magnetic fields by Chang & Lundgren (1961), Uflyand (1963) and Hunt (1965). Chang & Lundgren and Uflyand analysed the case in which all the walls were perfectly conducting. Hunt analysed (i) the case in which the walls perpendicular to the field (walls BB, in figure 1) were perfectly conducting and those parallel to the magnetic field (walls AA) were thin and of arbitrary conductivity, and (ii) the case in which the walls BB were thin and of arbitrary conductivity and the walls AA were non-conducting. Thus he included the previous author's analysis as a special case of (i). Hunt also examined the form of the solutions for large \( M \), where \( M \) is the Hartmann number, and found that the conductivity of the walls AA dramatically altered the form of the velocity profile in the boundary layers on walls AA and also the velocity flux through these layers. When the walls AA are non-conducting and the walls BB perfectly conducting, it is found that large positive and negative velocities of order \( MV \), are induced, where \( V \) is the velocity of the core. This fact indicates that the magnetic field may be stabilising the flow in certain types of duct. It is this effect of the conductivity of the walls on the flow which gives the problem its physical interest and suggests the need for solving the outstanding problems.

In ducts of most practical value the walls AA are conducting and the walls BB are non-conducting; this case is not included in any of those examined by Hunt and at present no complete analytical solution is available. Gurney (1961, 1962) has, however, reduced the problem to the solution of an integro-differential equation, whose kernel is the Green's function for the problem and involves double infinite series of Bessel functions. When the Hartmann number \( M \) is large, only the leading terms of this series need be retained and he was thereby able to solve the simpler equation. In order to determine the current and velocity distribution and the mass flux down the tube, however, further numerical work needs to be done. In this paper we approach the problem of the flow at high Hartmann numbers using a boundary-layer technique which has the advantage that the analysis is more transparent and it is easier to form a physical picture of the properties of the magnetic and velocity fields. Expressions are obtained for the leading terms in the expansion of the flow through the duct. We impose the sides \( y = \pm a \) (BB) are non-conducting, while the sides \( x = \pm b \) (AA) are perfectly conducting. It follows that the boundary conditions are:

\[
\begin{align*}
  v_x &= 0, \quad \partial E_y/\partial x = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad y = \pm a, \\
  v_y &= 0, \quad \partial E_x/\partial y = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad x = \pm b.
\end{align*}
\]
Thus on the walls $y = \pm a$, $H_i$ is independent of $x$ and consequently we can modify (2.6) to

$$v_x = 0, \quad H_i = H_{a_i} \quad \text{when} \quad y = a; \quad v_x = 0, \quad H_i = H_{b_i} \quad \text{when} \quad y = -a,$$

where $H_{a_i}, H_{b_i}$ are constants. The net current $I$ leaving and entering the walls per unit length of the duct is simply related to $H_{a_i}, H_{b_i}$:

$$I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} j \cdot dS_{x=a} = H_{a_i} - H_{b_i}.$$

The governing equations and boundary conditions may now be reduced to non-dimensional form by writing

$$\xi = x/a, \quad \eta = y/a, \quad M = aB_i/\sigma \bar{j},$$

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} + M \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} = 0,$$

$$v_x = \frac{a^2 P}{B_i} \epsilon(\xi, \eta), \quad H_i = \frac{1}{2}(H_{a_i} + H_{b_i}) + \frac{1}{2}(H_{a_i} - H_{b_i}) + aP(\sigma \bar{j})^2 b(\xi, \eta).$$

The equations satisfied by $v, h$ are

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial \eta} + M \frac{\partial v}{\partial \eta} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial \xi} + M \frac{\partial h}{\partial \eta} = 0,$$

subject to

$$v = 0, \quad h = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad \eta = \pm 1,$$

and

$$v = 0, \quad \partial h/\partial \eta = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad \xi = \pm \bar{a}/a = \pm 1.$$

We are particularly interested in the properties of the solution when $M$ is large and to find them we proceed by a heuristic argument, relying for justification.

---

**FIGURE 1.** Cross-section of a rectangular duct with the magnetic field in the $y$-direction. The walls $AD$ lie at $x = \pm b$ and $SR$ at $y = \pm a$.

---

**FIGURE 2.** Cross-section of the duct showing the various regions of flow when $M \gg 1$ (not to scale).

The secondary boundary layers, of thickness $O(M^{-1})$, near the walls $x = \pm b$ but excluding the regions distant $O(M^{-2})$ from the side walls $x = \pm a$. We call these boundary layers to emphasize their control of the flow in the core ($a$) and to distinguish them from ($e$).

---

2.1. **Core flow** ($a$)

This region extends over almost the whole duct and it follows that $\partial \xi, \partial \eta$ are odd and $v$ even in $\eta$. Anticipating that $v$ and $h$ are of the same order of magnitude we then have from (2.13) that

$$h = h_e = -\eta/M, \quad v = v_e = g(\xi)/M,$$
where \( g(\xi) \) is a function of \( \xi \) to be determined, and terms of order \( M^{-2} \) have been neglected.

2.2. The primary boundary layer (b) near \( \eta = 1 \)

The core solution (2.15) fails to satisfy the boundary conditions at the walls and, in particular at \( \eta = \pm 1 \). Consequently there must be boundary layers near the walls to make the necessary adjustments in \( v \) and \( h \) and, since they are \( M \) dependent, thin, in them

\[
\tilde{v} = v + v_p, \quad h = h_0 + h_p,
\]

and concentrating attention on the boundary layer near \( \eta = 1 \), \( v_p \) and \( h_p \) satisfy

\[
\frac{\partial^2 v_p}{\partial \eta^2} + M \frac{\partial v_p}{\partial \eta} + \frac{\partial^2 h_p}{\partial \eta^2} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 v_p}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial v_p}{\partial x} + M \frac{\partial h_p}{\partial x} = 0
\]

in virtue of (2.16) together with the boundary conditions

\[
v_p = \frac{1}{M} e^{-\xi^2 / 2}, \quad h_p = \frac{1}{M} e^{-\xi^2 / 2}, \quad v_p = 0, \quad h_p = 0
\]

on leaving the immediate neighbourhood of \( \eta = 1 \). A consistent solution of (2.19) satisfying (2.19) is only possible if

\[
g(\xi) = 1
\]

and then

\[
v_p = \frac{1}{M} e^{-\xi^2 / 2}, \quad h_p = \frac{1}{M} e^{-\xi^2 / 2}
\]

Thus the core velocity is determined by the condition for the existence of the primary boundary layer and, as anticipated in (2.15), is of the same order of magnitude as the induced magnetic field. Further the thickness of the primary boundary layer is \( O(M^{-2}) \), and the associated defect in velocity flux is

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial \eta} \bigg|_{\xi = 0} \approx 0.
\]

2.3. The secondary boundary layer (c) near \( \xi = c \)

The core solution is now fully known and does not satisfy the boundary conditions at \( \xi = \pm c \). Consequently there must be boundary layers near these walls to make the necessary adjustments in \( v \) and \( h \) and, since they are \( M \) dependent, thin, in them

\[
\tilde{v} = v + v_c, \quad h = h_c + h_r,
\]

and concentrating attention on the boundary layer near \( \xi = c \), \( v_c \) and \( h_r \) satisfy

\[
\frac{\partial^2 v_c}{\partial \xi^2} + M \frac{\partial v_c}{\partial \xi} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 h_r}{\partial \xi^2} + \frac{\partial h_r}{\partial \xi} + M \frac{\partial h_r}{\partial x} = 0
\]

The problem has been reduced to finding the value of \( a(\xi) \) which leads to constant electric potential on the walls \( AA \).

The equation (2.34) may be cast into a recognizable form by writing

\[
a(\xi) = 1 - A(\xi)(1 + \eta)^2
\]

Multiplying it by \((\xi - \eta)^{-4}\) and integrating from \(-1\) to \(\xi \) with respect to \(\eta\):

\[
A(\xi) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{\xi} A'(\eta) d\eta = \frac{2}{(\xi + 1)^2}
\]
This equation has a known solution (Rott & Cheng 1954) for a general right-hand side, which reduces in our case to

\[ a(\eta) = 1 - \frac{8(1 - \eta^2)\int_0^\infty \frac{a^2 ds}{n(1 + \eta)(1 + a^2 + \eta)(1 + a^2 + \eta^2 + 1)^2}}{\pi^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.37)

where \( \eta = (1 - \eta^2)/(1 + \eta) \). Thus \( a(\eta) \) may be expressed in terms of a hypergeometric function. In particular when \( \eta \approx 1, \eta^2 \) is small and

\[ a(\eta) = 1 - \frac{(1 - \eta^2)(-1)!}{\pi^2} + O(1 - \eta^2)^2. \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.38)

\( \eta \rightarrow 0 \) as \( \eta \rightarrow 0 \) and \( a(\eta) \) is of course an odd function of \( \eta \). Knowing \( a(\eta) \) we can calculate \( X, v, \) and \( h \) from (2.33) and (2.32).

In an earlier paper by one of us (Hunt 1965) it was shown that if the walls \( \xi = \pm e \) are non-conducting and the walls \( \eta = \pm 1 \) perfect conductors, then the velocity in the secondary boundary layers is an order of magnitude greater than the core velocity and contains an infinite number of reversals of sign. If all four walls are perfect conductors, then the velocity also oscillates an infinite number of times in the secondary boundary layer, although in this case there are no reversals of sign and the velocity is of the same order of magnitude as in the core.

It is of interest therefore to examine the nature of the boundary-layer flow in the present problem. At large distances in terms of \( (\xi - \xi)M^4 \) from the wall \( \xi = \xi \), the structure of the boundary layer in \( X \) is given by the behaviour of \( a(\eta) \) at \( \eta = 1 \). From (2.38) \( 1 - a(\eta^2)/(1 + \eta) \) as \( \eta \rightarrow 1 \), and hence, from the similarity solution of (2.31) satisfying

\[ X = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad \eta = 1, \quad X \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \xi \rightarrow -\infty, \quad X \sim (1 - \eta^2)^2 \quad \text{at} \quad \xi = \xi, \]

we find that when \( (\xi - \xi)M^4 \) is large

\[ X \sim (1 - \eta^2)^2 \frac{\exp \left( \frac{M(\xi - \xi)}{\xi - \xi} \right)}{\pi^2} \]

so that the number of oscillations in \( v \) is at most finite. A graph of \( v \) as a function of \( M(\xi - \xi) \) for \( \eta = 0 \) is given in figure 2 and shows that in fact \( v \) never changes sign. Lines of constant \( h \) are shown schematically in figure (5).

In order to calculate the overall velocity flux, we have to work out the flux deficits due to the boundary layers. Since \( h \) is an odd function of \( \eta \), the flux deficit due to the secondary boundary layer is given by

\[ - \int_{-1}^{1} dq \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{M^2} X dq = - \int_{-1}^{1} dq \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{M^2} X^2, \]

where

\[ \xi = (\xi - \xi)M^4. \]

From (2.31)

\[ - \int_{-1}^{1} dq \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{M^2} X = \frac{1}{M^2} \left( \int_{-1}^{1} [1 - a(\eta)] d\eta \right), \]

so that the flux deficit is

\[ \frac{2}{M^2(M^4)^2} \left[ \int_{-1}^{1} [1 - a(\eta)] d\eta \right] dq. \]

The flux deficit due to this boundary layer.

2.4. Primary boundary layer (\( \beta \)) near the corner \( \xi = e, \eta = 1 \)

\[ v = v_L + v_p + v_{opt}, \quad h = h_L + h_p + h_{opt}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.44)

\( v \) satisfies the governing differential equations provided we neglect terms \( v_{opt} \). The boundary conditions on the walls \( \xi = e \) and \( \eta = 1 \) are also satisfied, except in the vicinity of the boundary, where we neglect the exponential small terms and provided we exclude the boundary layer for \( \xi = e, \eta = 1 \). Specifically the conditions are satisfied when \( \xi = e \) and \( \eta = 1 - O(M^{-2}) \) and when \( \eta = 1 \) and \( \xi = e - O(M^{-1}) \), which are the second of these with which we are concerned here and which shall briefly described in the other in §2.5. If instead of (2.44) we write

\[ v = v_L + v_p + v_{opt}, \quad h = h_L + h_p + h_{opt}, \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.45)

then \( v_L, h_L, v_{opt}, h_{opt} \) satisfy the same differential equations as \( v, h \), then on the wall \( \xi = e \), we must have

\[ v_{opt} + v_p = 0, \quad h_{opt} + h_p = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.46)

The values of \( v_L, h_L, v_{opt}, h_{opt} \) on the wall \( \eta = 1 \) vary rapidly with \( e \), the scale is much larger than the scale of the boundary layer, \( O(M^{-4}) \) compared with \( \eta \), and hence we are justified in assuming that \( v_{opt}, h_{opt} \) satisfy the condition

\[ v_{opt} = -v_{opt}(\xi, 1)e^{-\xi^2}, \quad h_{opt} = -h_{opt}(\xi, 1)e^{-\xi^2}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.47)
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Substituting from (2.41) into (2.42) we obtain, after formal manipulation,

\[ \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} \frac{21}{(z + i)^i M^i}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.43)
It follows that a consistent solution is only possible if

\[ \psi_{1}(\xi, 1) + \psi_{2}(\xi, 1) = 0, \]

(2.9)
as assumed earlier in (2.27). The other condition in (2.27) follows from a parallel argument for the wall \( \eta = -1 \). It is noted that, if the wall \( \eta = 1 \) is a perfect conductor, \( \psi \) and \( \chi \) are zero there, and a parallel argument shows that the condition satisfied by \( \psi \) and \( \chi \) at \( \eta = 1 \) is then

\[ \psi(\xi, 1) = 0. \]

2.5. The corner \( \xi = 0, \eta = 1 \)
The assumptions leading to the primary boundary layer (d) and the secondary boundary layer (e) fail when both \( 1 - \xi \) and \( 1 - \eta \) are \( O(M^{-1}) \), i.e. in region (f).

No simplification in the governing equations is possible therefore in this region. However, its effect on the flux is small, being of the order of the maximum velocity multiplied by the area, i.e. \( O(M^{-1}) \), and consequently we have not attempted to elucidate its properties.

The leading terms in the asymptotic expansion for the flux of fluid through the tube when \( M \) is large may now be written down

\[ \int_{\text{duct}} \psi d\xi d\eta = a e^{i \phi} \left[ M^{-1} + O(M^{-2}) \right]. \]

The term \( O(M^{-1}) \) arises partly from the neglect of \( \partial \psi / \partial \xi \partial \psi / \partial \eta \) in the secondary boundary layer and partly from the deficit due to the primary boundary layer (d). In principle it can be calculated using the methods of this paper but we have not done so.

3. Practical Implications

In §2 it was shown that, whatever the value of \( \zeta \), the net current leaving any point entering the duct, the problem of calculating the velocity and current distributions could be reduced to the solution of two differential equations with a single set of boundary conditions. It follows that the velocity distribution is the same, though the magnitude of the velocity depends on the values of \( I \), \( R_1 \) and \( \psi / \xi \). It follows from (2.12) that the distribution of current density depends on \( \psi / \xi \) and \( B_\nu \). The magnitude \( j_x \) varies throughout the duct, but \( j_y \) is constant throughout the duct, but varies with \( \xi \) and is given by

\[ j_y = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{1}{2} |H_1 - H_2| \xi; & \\
& \text{the other} \end{array} \right. \]

\[ j_x = \frac{\sigma_0 |P| H_3}{\mu M^2} \frac{\psi}{\xi}, \]

where \( P = B_\nu |2 - \psi / \xi| \).

In §2 we also found the velocity and current distributions and a relation between \( Q, \psi / \xi, I \) and \( M \). In this section we use this information to examine the effect of electrically connecting the walls of the duct, \( AA \), for the various practical applications of the duct.

A type of duct whose walls \( BB \) are non-conducting and walls \( AA \) are conducting has many applications. Shercliff (1965) has recorded how the electric field in the case of a pump, flowmeter, generator or brake depends on the value of \( -B_\nu / H_3 \), \( H_3 \) being the electric field in the core and \( V_1 \), the open-circuit voltage; \( \psi_1 = \sqrt{1 - c(1/M)} \). If \( b = a \) and the effect of the walls \( AA \) is considered, a new parameter has to be defined. In interpreting experiments on generating equipment the following five parameters are of most interest:

\[ \Delta E = \frac{\psi_1}{a} \Delta \psi = \frac{\psi_1}{a} \Delta \psi, \]

(3.1)

and we are given three of these parameters and wish to find the others. The problem of finding these \( \Delta E, \Delta \psi, \Delta \psi / a, \) \( \psi_1, \Delta \psi / a \), etc., is the same as the problem found in the previous section.

The equation shows that the electric field in the duct is given by the flow of a d.c. electric circuit with a resistance \( R_1 = b/a \). The replacement of a d.c. electric circuit by an e.m.f. is the consequence of finding the resistance in the duct. By the same theorem any linear external circuit may be regarded as a resistance \( R_1 \) and an e.m.f. \( U_1 \). Hence, in the general case of this circuit, \( \psi_1, \Delta \psi, Q, M \) and \( I \) may be calculated from the following relations:

\[ \Delta \phi = - \frac{U_1 - R_1 I}{R_1} = U_1 - R_1 I, \]

\[ \Delta \psi = - \frac{I [B_\nu Q / a - b \mu M] + B_\nu Q / a}{I + R_1 I}, \]

\[ Q = f \left[ B_\nu / a - \Delta \psi / a \right], \]

(3.3)

We now examine the special cases.

3.1. Open-circuit case

In this case the duct is on open circuit, \( I = 0 \). In this case the duct is a flowmeter. It is found from (3.5) that

\[ Q = \left( \frac{B_\nu I}{2a} - \frac{\psi}{\xi} \right) \frac{\psi}{\xi} \left( \frac{1}{\mu M} \frac{\sigma_0}{\psi} \right) \frac{\psi}{\xi} \]

(3.6)

and has been noted many times before (see Shercliff 1962, p. 16).
Equation (3.3) becomes,

$$0 = 2M\frac{\partial I}{\partial s} + B_0 Q,$$

and hence (3.5) becomes

$$Q = \left( \frac{-B_0 Q \sigma}{4 \mu} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial s} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2} \left( 1 - \frac{b/\delta}{M} \frac{1}{M} \right).$$

It follows that

$$Q = \left( \frac{-\partial \psi/\partial s}{\mu \delta^2} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{0.956a}{b \delta^2} \frac{1}{M} \left( 1 + \frac{a}{b \delta^2} \right) \right].$$

and re-arranging

$$Q = \left( \frac{-\partial \psi/\partial s}{\mu \delta^2} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{M} - O(M^{-1}) \right].$$

Though the form of the \( Q - \partial \psi/\partial s \) relation is different in this case from the open circuit case, the velocity flux deficit due to the secondary boundary layer as a proportion of the flux through the core is the same, since the velocity distribution is unaffected by external connections. There is no term of order \( (M^{-1}) \) in the bracket, as one might expect, because the core velocity \( V_c \) is given by

$$V_c = \left( \frac{-\partial \psi/\partial s}{\mu \delta^2} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2}.\left( b \delta^2 - \frac{a}{b \delta^2} \right).$$

Thus the flow in the core is not the same as that for flow in a duct whose walls are all perfectly conducting. In that case

$$V_c = \left( \frac{-\partial \psi/\partial s}{\mu \delta^2} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2} \left( b \delta^2 - \frac{a}{b \delta^2} \right).$$

This difference is explained by the fact that in the latter case \( B_0 = 0 \) in the core whereas in the former case, even though \( \Delta \phi = 0 \), \( B_0 = 0 \) in the core because of the defect of \( v \times B \) in the secondary boundary layers.

3.3. Purely electrically driven case

When the pressure gradient is zero and the flow is electrically driven by a pump. Since \( \partial \psi/\partial s = 0 \), equation (3.3) becomes

$$Q = \left( \frac{B_0 I \sigma b_0}{\mu \delta^2} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2} \left( 1 - \frac{0.956a}{b \delta^2} \frac{1}{M} \right).$$

Combining this result with (3.2) leads to

$$Q = \left( \frac{2\Delta \phi}{I} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{M} - O(M^{-1}) \right] \frac{a}{b \delta^2}.$$

In the two previous cases either \( I \) or \( \Delta \phi \) is zero, whereas in this case we can obtain a useful relation between \( I \) and \( \Delta \phi \) by dividing (3.12) by (3.11),

$$\frac{\Delta \phi}{I} = -\frac{b \delta^2}{a \sigma} \left( \frac{0.956a}{b \delta^2} \frac{1}{M} - O(M^{-1}) \right).$$

Discussion

In §2, we explained the flow through ducts whose walls \( AA \) were perfectly conducting and walls \( BB \) were non-conducting. The flow was assumed to be laminarly, with uniform conducting, and fully developed; also the Hartmann number \( (M) \) was assumed to be large. In §3, we showed how the results of analysis could be used for ducts with various electrical connections between walls \( AA \). In this section we compare the previous results with those obtained for ducts of different types of duct and we show how some of the effects of the conductivity of walls on the flow may be interpreted physically.

If a duct whose walls \( AA \) are perfectly conducting and walls \( BB \) are non-conducting, we have been able to analyse the flow only for very large Hartmann number. For our purposes this is of no great disadvantage since a solution at high Hartmann number is sufficient to illustrate the essential physical features of the flow and also it is usual in liquid metal experiments to have \( M \) greater than 100. In this section we shall concentrate on flows with \( M > 1 \).

If \( M \) is sufficiently high, the conductivity of each of the walls \( BB \) is constant along the length, the value of the conductivity of each of the walls \( BB \) does not affect the form of the velocity profile away from the walls \( AA \). The velocity is constant in the narrow primary or Hartmann boundary layers on \( y = \pm \epsilon \). Howevever, the magnitude of the velocity in the core depends on the conductivity of walls \( BB \) as well as on the pressure gradient and any external electrical circuit connected between the walls \( AA \).

Though boundary layers are also found on the walls \( AA \) as \( M \to \infty \), their size changes considerably with the conductivity of the duct walls. It is these boundary layers which have been little understood hitherto. The main characteristics of these boundary layers are the velocity profile, its change with \( M \), and the current distribution and the velocity flux deficit, as defined in (2.40). It seems possible to provide convincing explanations for the shape of the velocity profile, its current distribution and velocity flux deficit and thence to explain the form of the velocity profile,

Let us now compare the flows in two types of rectangular duct:

(i) Perfectly conducting walls all round,

(ii) Walls \( AA \) perfectly conducting and walls \( BB \) non-conducting.

(iii) The velocity profiles in the secondary boundary layers have the form of damped sine waves and the velocity flux is given by

$$Q = \left( \frac{-\partial \psi/\partial s}{\mu \delta^2} \right) \frac{4a_b}{\mu \delta^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{M} - \frac{2.43a}{b \delta^2} \right].$$
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so that the flux deficit is \(O(M^{-1})\) times the flux in the core (see Hunt 1964); in case (ii) the velocity in the boundary layers monotonically decreases to zero at the wall, and the flux deficit is \(O(M^{-1})\) times the core velocity (see §4.2). These values of flux deficit were obtained by mathematical rather than physical arguments. To show that the difference in flux deficit between cases (i) and (ii) is explicable physically, we now give arguments by which the orders of magnitude of the flux deficits are estimated.

4.1. All the walls are perfectly conducting—case (i)

We consider the secondary boundary layer on the wall \(A\) at \(x = -b\) (see figure 4a). Let

\[
j_z = j_z + j_p + j_s, \\
v_y = v_y + v_p + v_s,
\]

where, as before, the suffixes \(c, p\) and \(s\) refer to the core, primary and secondary boundary layers, respectively.
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**Figure 4.** Cross-section of the duct when all the walls are perfectly conducting. (Not to scale). (a) Shows the actual current streamlines. (b) Shows the core, primary and secondary current streamlines.

Using the usual assumption that in the boundary layer on walls \(AA\)

\[
\frac{\partial j_z}{\partial x} \gg \frac{\partial j_y}{\partial y}, \quad \text{for} \quad (a - y) \gg aM^{-1},
\]
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But from (4.3), \( j_y^{(c)} + B_y v_y = 0 \). Then, using (4.10) and assuming that \( j_y \) is mainly positive so that \( \int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} j_y dy = O(\alpha) \),

\[
\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} v_x dy = O\left( \frac{\alpha B_y}{\alpha^2 B_y} \right),
\]

and

\[
\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} v_y dy = -O(v_x \alpha^2 \alpha).
\]

Hence the ratio of the flux deficit due to the secondary boundary layer to the flux in the core is \( O(\alpha^{-1}) \), in agreement with the exact analysis.

**4.2. Walls AA perfectly conducting and walls BB non-conducting—case (ii)**

The notation is the same as for case (i). We can then proceed to equation (4.5) as before. In this case the walls BB are non-conducting and consequently

\[
\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} j_y dy = 1
\]

is a constant for all values of \( \alpha \) (see figure 5).

Therefore all the secondary current \( j_y \) leaving the wall \( A \) will have to return at the corners via the region (d) on wall \( B \). If \( j_x = j_x^{(c)} \) in region (d), then, for condition (4.12) to be satisfied, \( j_x^{(c)} A = O(\alpha) \),

and hence

\[
\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} j_x dy = O(-M^2 j_x).
\]

We can deduce the value of \( j_x^{(c)} \) from the equation of motion in region (d):

\[
0 = -\delta p \frac{\partial v_x}{\partial x} + (j_x^{(c)} + j_x^{(s)}) B_x + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v_y + v_y^{s})
\]

The boundary conditions on \( v_x \) are (i) \( v_x^{(c)} = v_x = 0 \) in the main part of the secondary boundary layer, i.e. region (c), and (ii) \( v_x = 0 \) on \( y = \pm \alpha \). Since the thickness of this layer is \( O(\alpha^{-1}) \),

\[
\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} j_x^{(c)} dy = -O\left( \frac{\alpha B_y}{\alpha^2 B_y} \right)
\]

Hence, from (4.12),

\[
\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} j_x^{(c)} dy = -O\left( \frac{\alpha B_y}{\alpha^2 B_y} \right)
\]

But, from (4.5),

\[
\int_{-\alpha}^{\alpha} j_x^{(c)} dy = O\left( \frac{\alpha B_y}{\alpha^2 B_y} \right),
\]

and therefore

\[
\delta = O(\alpha^{-1} \alpha).
\]

Thus \( \int_{0}^{\alpha} j_x^{(c)} dx = 0 \) in this case, whereas \( \int_{0}^{\alpha} j_x^{(c)} dx = 0 \) in case (i). The consequences of these were discussed in §3.
Hence the flux deficit due to the secondary boundary layer is \( O(M^{-1}) \) times the flux in the core.

We see from these order-of-magnitude arguments that the form of the boundary layer on the walls \( AA \) is best explained in terms of the secondary currents induced in these layers, much in the same way as the Hartmann layer may be explained by the decrease in current in the boundary layer relative to that in the core. Both these types of boundary layer the current is less than its value in the core because of the reduced \( v \times B \) force, and consequently the electromagnetic \( j \times B \) force can decrease in the layer relative to its value in the core to the same extent that the viscous stress increases. If this were not so, the boundary layers would grow or diminish. A comparison of cases (i) and (ii) shows that the value of the secondary currents relative to the core current can differ by an order of magnitude.

In case (i), \( j_y = -O(M^{-1}) \). In case (ii), open circuit, \( j_y = 0 \). Hence, although \( j_y \) is a very small fraction of \( j_z \), it will lead to results which may over-estimate the rate of growth of boundary layers on the walls \( AA \).

Yet expressed as a fraction of \( v \), the values of \( j_y \) are of the same order in both cases, which would of course be unaltered.

The order-of-magnitude arguments also show how the conductivity of the boundary layer affects the secondary currents which in turn affect the velocity distribution in the duct. In case (i) when the walls \( BB \) are non-conducting, the secondary currents circulate in the duct and walls \( AA \); they leave the walls \( AA \) in region (c) and return through the Hartmann layer on walls \( BB \), region (d). This is similar to the way in which the core currents return through the Hartmann boundary layer, as shown in figure 5(c). In case (i), when the walls \( BB \) are perfect conductors, the secondary currents mainly return to the walls \( AA \) via the walls \( BB \). Owing to the helical nature of the boundary layer, this case, some currents circulate solely in the duct and walls \( BB \) (see figure 5(c)).

We are grateful to Prof. J. A. Shereifff for his helpful advice and criticism of the preparation of this paper. J. C. R. H. is able to publish this work by permission of the Central Electricity Generating Board.
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the stability of parallel flows with parallel magnetic fields
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The first part of the paper is a physical discussion of the way in which a magnetic field affects the stability of a fluid in motion. Particular emphasis is given to how the magnetic field affects the interaction of the disturbance with the mean motion.

The second part is an analysis of the stability of plane parallel flows of fluids with finite conductivity and conductivity under the action of uniform parallel magnetic fields. We show that, in general, three-dimensional disturbances are the most unstable, first disagreeing with the conclusions of Michael (1953) and Stuart (1954). We show how results obtained for two-dimensional disturbances can be used to calculate the most unstable three-dimensional disturbances and therefore we prove that a parallel magnetic field can never completely stabilise a parallel flow.

1. Introduction

The stability of a fluid system is determined by the rate of growth or decay of disturbances in any of its components, e.g. velocity, pressure, temperature, or magnetic field. Though there are exceptional cases, a perturbation of one component usually causes perturbations in the others, so that if one type of disturbance is unstable, in general all types are. Let us consider mechanical disturbances, as being common to all types of fluid systems. The forces which determine their rate of growth or decay may be considered as falling into two main groups which are distinct though interdependent. The first consists of the forces acting on the disturbance directly, e.g. viscous, electromagnetic, or surface tension, and the second consists of the forces due to the interaction of the disturbance with the fluid system, e.g. centrifugal forces in rotating flows. (This is merely putting into words the distinctions for the forces acting on a small disturbance which contain terms independent and dependent on values of the components of the undisturbed fluid system.) The effect of a magnetic field on the stability of various fluid systems is similar in the sense that the electromagnetic forces acting on the disturbances are similar but the forces due to the interaction of the disturbance and the fluid system are different in different fluid systems. Most explanations of the effect of a magnetic field on the stability of magnetohydrodynamic (m.h.d.) flows are similar to those of its effects on the stability of static situations, being given in terms of the fluid moving through or ‘freezing’ to the field lines (see, for example, Chandrasekhar 1961). This type of explanation does not demonstrate the essential differences between the effects of a magnetic field on the stability of dynamic and static situations and is especially weak in dynamic situations where it only shows how the magnetic field affects the first group of forces and not the second.

In §2 of this paper we discuss the stability of m.h.d. flows from a different physical point of view so as to demonstrate the effect of the magnetic field on the second group of forces as well as the first. We first examine the currents induced by a

† Seconded to School of Engineering Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry.
disturbance, pointing out the important difference between electromagnetic and mechanical disturbances, and then examine the electromagnetic \(j \times B\) term. Let this steady flow be perturbed such that the velocity vector is now \(U(x, y, z) + \epsilon u(x, y, z, t)\), and magnetic field \(\mathbf{B}(x, y, z, t)\). Let the vorticity vector be different in ways in which a small disturbance interacts with a mean flow and how the wavenumber of the most unstable disturbance is not \(\omega_j\) in general parallel to the flow, i.e., it is a three-dimensional disturbance. We now examine the stability of the mean flow \(U\) under the action of the magnetic field. We interpret this result physically using the concepts of §2. Our result invalidates the \(\mathbf{B}_0\) we examine the behaviour with time of the disturbances of the velocity, conclusion of Michael (1953) and Stuart (1954) who asserted that the wavenumber of the magnetic field, \(b\). We first consider the generation of electric currents and magnetic fields. Drazin (1960) examined the velocity of the mean flow \(U\) and a flow, i.e., a two-dimensional disturbance. Using this erroneous assumption, Stuart (1954). Velikhov (1956) examined the velocity of plane Poiseuille flow with a parallelist, \(\mathbf{b}\). We eliminate the mean values, Ohm’s law, i.e., (2-2), for the disturbance

\[
\mathbf{j} = \sigma (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}) + \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{b},
\]

(2-7)

magnetic field. Drazin (1960) has examined some general aspects of the stability of a parallel magnetic field on a plane parallel flow, also considering only the second-order term \(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{b}\). Taking the curl of (2-7) and using (2-4) to two-dimensional disturbances. Wooler (1961) has examined the stability of a plane parallel flow when \(R_m \ll 1\) and when the magnetic field lies in the plane of the flow, but is not parallel to it. He found that three-dimensional disturbances can be the most unstable; however, he did not point out that, even when the magnetic field is in the plane of the flow, three-dimensional disturbances can still be the most unstable. For all values of \(R_m\) we show how results obtained for two-dimensional disturbances \(\mathbf{b}_1\), which with the mean flow \(U\) induces extra currents, \(\mathbf{j}_1\). These can be modified to take into account three-dimensional disturbances \(\mathbf{j}_2\). Flow in such a direction that their own magnetic field, \(\mathbf{b}_2\), acts in the flow. We draw some general conclusions about the stabilizing influence of a parallel magnetic field \(\mathbf{b}_2\) induced by the law’s law, \(\mathbf{j}_2\) is modified by the growth of its own field on a plane parallel flow. In particular, we prove that a parallel magnetic field \(\mathbf{b}_2\), since \(\mathbf{j}_2\) is induced by the mean flow \(U\) and the combined induced current can never completely stabilize a flow, i.e., stabilize it for all values of the Reynolds number.

2. Physical aspects of the stability of M.H.D. flows

2-1. We shall only be interested in the stability of incompressible fluids with uniform conductivity, density and viscosity. Then the relevant equations of magnetohydrodynamics are

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} &= -\nabla P + \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B} + \gamma \nabla \mathbf{u}, \\
\mathbf{j} &= \sigma (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}), \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} &= -\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t}, \\
\mathbf{B} &= \mathbf{B}_0, \\
\mathbf{u} &= 0, \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} &= 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\mathbf{u}\) is velocity, \(P\) pressure, \(\mathbf{j}\) current density, \(\mathbf{B}\) magnetic flux density, \(\mathbf{E}\) electric field, \(\sigma\) magnetic permeability, \(\rho\) density, \(\gamma\) viscosity, and \(\epsilon\) conductivity; the latter four quantities are all constant.
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Therefore when \( R_m < 1 \), \( |B| \sim O(\sigma) \), \( U \), \( |B| \), and

\[ |B|/|\beta| \sim O(R_m). \]

Thus when \( R_m < 1 \), e.g. in a laboratory experiment with mercury, \( |B| = |\beta| \) and a good approximation, Ohm’s law becomes

\[ j = \sigma(E + b \times B_0). \]

This approximation, which can be justified by more refined arguments in particular problem, is used in all stability analyses when \( R_m < 1 \) (see §3). From equation (2·8) we can find out under what circumstances currents will be induced by a perturbation velocity, \( u \). If \( u \) and \( B_0 \) satisfy the condition

\[ \nabla \times (u \times B_0) = 0, \]

equation (2·8) becomes:

\[ \frac{\partial b}{\partial t} + (U \cdot \nabla) b = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} (b \cdot \nabla) U + \frac{1}{\rho \eta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \nabla \theta. \]

The disturbances in the velocity and in the magnetic field are coupled. A disturbance of one leads to a disturbance of the other and an m.h.d. flow can be unstable by either type of disturbance. Equation (2·13) is interesting in that it does not include the perturbation velocity \( u \), but only the mean velocity \( U \). It shows how a disturbance in the magnetic field, \( b \), can develop by its interaction with the mean velocity, \( U \), without being affected by \( u \), provided \( u \) satisfies (2·11).

For \( u \) and \( U \) not to induce any currents they must satisfy the condition

\[ \nabla \times (U \times b) = 0. \]

We now deduce three sets of conditions each of which is a sufficient condition for there to be no growth of \( b \) or \( j \).

(i) If conditions (2·11) and (2·13) are satisfied simultaneously equation (2·11) becomes

\[ \frac{\partial b}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{\rho \eta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \nabla \theta = 0, \]

which shows that any stray magnetic field will simply decay due to diffusion.

(ii) Consider the development of a small velocity \( u \) when condition (2·11) is satisfied and let us postulate that at some time \( t = 0 \), when the perturbation velocity \( u \) is generated there are no perturbation currents, \( j \), in the fluid or in the region surrounding the fluid. It follows from (2·3) and (2·6) that \( \nabla \theta = 0 \).

If, also, \( b = 0 \) as \( x, y, z \to \infty \) then \( b = 0 \) everywhere. Then from the form of the equation (2·12), whatever the distribution of \( U \) or the value of \( R_m \), the only solution for the equation when \( t > 0 \) is

\[ b = 0. \]

Hence if condition (2·11) is satisfied and if \( j = 0 \) when \( t = 0 \), for all \( t > 0 \),

\[ j = 0. \]

(iii) Most studies of the stability of m.h.d. flows use ‘normal modes’ analysis,

\[ u, b \sim \exp \{(ix + \sigma t)\}. \]
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depends on \( \mathbf{U} \) as well as \( \mathbf{u} \), (2-17) depends on the mean velocity, \( \mathbf{U} \), as well as the disturbance velocity, \( \mathbf{u} \). However, when \( R_a \ll 1 \), we have shown that

\[
\mathbf{j} = \sigma (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B}_0),
\]

so that one can then ignore the effects of \( \mathbf{b} \) and the mean flow, \( \mathbf{U} \).

In deducing (2-17) we assumed \( J_b = 0 \). If, however, \( R_a \gg 1 \) and a uniform magnetic field \( \mathbf{B}_0 \) is produced outside the region of flow and induces currents \( J_b \) by means of the mean flow \( \mathbf{U} \), the field due to \( J_b \) is very small compared to \( \mathbf{B}_0 \) (Shercliff, 1952), i.e. \( | \mathbf{B}_b | \ll | \mathbf{B}_0 | \), where

\[
\mathbf{B}_b = \mathbf{B}_0 + \mathbf{B}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad J_b = (1/\sigma) \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{B}_2.
\]

Then it follows that the terms on the right-hand side of (2-14), \( (\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{V}) J_b \mathbf{V} \), are much smaller than \( (\mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \mathbf{V}) J_b \). Thus if \( (\mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \mathbf{V}) J_b \cong 0 \) it may be a good approximation to say that the magnetic field has no effect on a disturbance except when \( J_b \cong 0 \), provided \( R_a \ll 1 \). Hence, this approximation would need careful investigation in any particular problem and would have to be justified, a posteriori.
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**Figure 1.** A typical disturbance travelling in the direction \( \mathbf{Oz} \). The effect of the magnetic field on the disturbance is seen by examining the change of flux linked by the fluid circuit \( ABCD \) and \( PQRS \) with the imposed magnetic fields \( \mathbf{B}_0 \) and \( \mathbf{B}_2 \). (The induced magnetic fields and currents are not shown.)

Let us now consider a particular example to demonstrate the physical meaning of the conditions we have derived for the magnetic field to affect a disturbance, (2-17) and (2-18). Consider a simple two-dimensional disturbance of the type

\[
\mathbf{u} = [u(y)] \exp [i(\alpha x - \beta t)], \quad [v(y)] \exp [i(\alpha x - \beta t)], \quad \{0,0\}.
\]

imposed on a mean flow in the \( x \) direction, as shown in figure 1. The disturbance moves in the \( Oz \) direction, and its amplitude varies in the \( Oy \) direction. If at a certain time, \( t \), a circuit drawn in the fluid lies on the points \( ABCD \). At a later time, \( t + \Delta t \), the particles on the circuit have reached \( A'B'C'D' \).

If \( \mathbf{B}_b = (\mathbf{B}_0, 0, 0) \) the flux linked by the fluid circuit has changed in the time \( \Delta t \) and consequently currents are induced in the \( x \) direction. The currents which are induced will affect the flow because \( j \) varies with \( x \) and hence \( \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}_0 \) is rotational.

\[
\text{curl} [\mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{B}_0] = \left( \frac{\partial j_x}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial j_y}{\partial x} \right) \mathbf{B}_0 + 0.
\]
difference between these two methods of energy transfer is that the former is long range and the latter short range, i.e., a small localized disturbance can exchange energy electromagnetically with a part of the mean flow some distance from it. When \( R_m \ll 1 \), \( |b| \ll |a| \) (equation (2·9)), and consequently the mean energy transfer between the disturbance and the mean flow is mechanical, as \( R_m \) increases \( |b| \) and \( |b| \) increase and the means of energy transfer between the main flow and the disturbance is as much electromagnetic as mechanical.

In the presence of a magnetic field some of the kinetic energy of a mechanical disturbance is converted to electrical and magnetic energy. This energy is locally dissipated as Joule heating and stored in electric and magnetic fields. The energy which is stored can be changed back into mechanical energy. This alteration between mechanical and electromagnetic energy provides the mechanism for a disturbance to propagate along the field lines as Alfvén waves. At the present time there is little physical understanding of how this mechanism affects the stability of flows, especially since the normal mode analysis does not reveal much about how a disturbance propagates. Velikov (1959) has shown that when \( R_m \to \infty \) and \( R \to \infty \), a magnetic field can stabilize all two-dimensional disturbances in a plasma parallel to it if

\[
A = \frac{R_m}{\sqrt{\rho U_m}} > 1,
\]

where \( U_m \) is the maximum velocity of the flow. He gave no physical explanation for his result.

Thus there are three factors which arise on considering the stability of flows in the presence of magnetic fields:

1. An anisotropic dissipative force acting on the disturbance alone.
2. A new, long range, mechanism for the interaction of the disturbance and the mean flow.
3. A mechanism for the propagation of the disturbance.

In general we expect the two latter effects to be unimportant when \( R_m \ll 1 \).

3. Stability of plane parallel flows with aligned magnetic fields—low magnetic Reynolds number

3·1. General equations

Consider a steady flow whose velocity is \( U(y) = (U_0(y), 0, 0) \) and an infinitesimal disturbance velocity

\[
u = (\psi(y) \exp[i(\alpha x + \gamma y - \beta z)], \psi(y) \exp[i(\alpha x + \gamma y - \beta z)], \psi(y) \exp[i(\alpha x + \gamma y - \beta z)]).
\]

There is an aligned magnetic field with flux density \( B_y = (B_{0y}, 0, 0) \) and an infinitesimal perturbation magnetic field,

\[
b = (\phi(y) \exp[i(\alpha x + \gamma y - \beta z)], \phi(y) \exp[i(\alpha x + \gamma y - \beta z)], \phi(y) \exp[i(\alpha x + \gamma y - \beta z)]).
\]

3·2. Three-dimensional disturbances

Equation (3·6) describes the motion of a disturbance travelling at an angle \( \theta \) to \( U \) and \( B_o \). Now the motion of such a disturbance can be described in terms of an equivalent one for which \( \theta = 0 \). Let \( x U = \lambda U_0 \) and \( \lambda = \cos \theta \) where \( \lambda \) is the nondimensional number for the equivalent disturbance.

Let

\[
\sigma B_0 l \rho U = q_x \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma B_0 l \cos \theta = q_y,
\]

where

\[
q_x = \sigma B_0 l q_x \cos \theta.
\]

Then (3·6) becomes

\[
(U - c)(v'' - \lambda yv) - \frac{i\sigma B_0 l v}{\rho U} = - (i/\lambda B_0)(v'' - 2\lambda v + \lambda y v).
\]

Equation (3·6) may not be the correct first order approximation if \( R_m \ll 1 \) if the perturbed magnetic field is externally applied rather than induced by velocity perturbations. But for low frequency oscillations of interest, the currents due to such a perturbation produce an irrotational \( j \times B \) force and hence do not affect the velocity perturbations.
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Assuming the existence of suitable boundary conditions for \( r \) which do not vary with the angle \( \theta \) of the disturbance, we now have an eigenvalue relation between the parameters in (3-7) of the form

\[
F(c, \lambda, \theta, \varrho_0, R) = 0.
\]

This relation is the same whatever the angle \( \theta \) chosen for the disturbance.

Equation (3-8) may be rewritten

\[
G(c, \lambda, \theta, \varrho_0, R) = 0.
\]

The main information we want to derive from relations (3-8) and (3-9) is the velocity of the fluid at which the flow becomes unstable, given the values of the applied magnetic field and the values of the fluid properties. In terms of the mathematical problem we want to know, given \( \varrho_0 \) or some other parameter involving \( \varrho_0 \), what is the lowest value of \( R \) and \( R_{\text{crit}} \) for which the flow becomes unstable, i.e., when \( c_t = 0 \). To do this we calculate \( R \) for various values of \( c_t, \lambda \) and \( \theta \) and look for a lowest value.

When \( \varrho_0 = 0 \) Squire (1933) showed that disturbances for which \( \theta > 0 \) (three-dimensional disturbances) become unstable at higher values of \( R \) than those in which \( \theta = 0 \) (two-dimensional disturbances). If the lowest value of \( R \) for which \( c_t = 0 \) is \( R_{\text{crit}} \), then for a disturbance at an angle \( \theta \),

\[
R_{\text{crit}} = R_{\text{crit}}(\cos \theta) = R_{\text{crit}}(0) \cos \theta,
\]

which is greater than \( R_{\text{crit}} \).

The lowest value of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) occurs when \( \theta = 0 \) and \( R_{\text{crit}} = R_{\text{crit}}(0) \). Hence the theorem is proved.

When \( \varrho_0 > 0 \) if the lowest value of \( R \) at which \( c_t = 0 \) for some value of \( \varrho_0 \) is \( R_{\text{crit}}(\varrho_0) \), then

\[
R_{\text{crit}} = R_{\text{crit}}(\varrho_0) \text{ and } \varrho_0 = \varrho_0(\cos \theta).
\]

If \( \theta = 0 \), \( R_{\text{crit}} = R_{\text{crit}}(0) \) and \( \varrho_0 = \varrho_0(0) \).

For the same value of \( \varrho_0 \), we have the same result as before that the most unstable disturbances occur when \( \theta = 0 \). But for given \( \varrho_0 \), i.e., a given flow and given magnetic field, as \( \theta \) increases, \( \varrho_0 \) decreases and, depending on the value of \( \theta \) and \( \varrho_0 \), this may lead to an increase or decrease in \( R_{\text{crit}} \). Hence it is, in general, incorrect to consider that the most unstable disturbances are those whose wavenumber vector is parallel to the flow and magnetic field, i.e., those for which \( \theta = 0 \). Michael (1932) and Stuart (1943) did not appreciate that the magnetic interaction term \( \varrho_0 \) varied with \( \theta \) for given \( R_b \) and \( U \) and erroneously concluded that Squire's theorem could not be extended to apply to flows with parallel magnetic fields.

Our result can easily be seen in physical terms. When there is no magnetic field, there are two competing effects, the viscous damping of the disturbance, and the inertial interaction between the Reynolds stresses and the velocity gradient of the mean flow. The latter effect, which provides the mechanism for the mean flow to feed energy into the disturbance decreases as \( \theta \) increases whereas the former is independent of \( \theta \). Hence the most unstable disturbances are those for which \( \theta = 0 \), for a given flow and magnetic field, parallel to the flow, \( B_b \) and \( R_b < 1 \), there is a decrease due to the magnetic field acting on the induced currents, \( j_1 \), as \( \theta \) increases to \( 360^\circ \). It was shown in \$2 that when \( R_b \ll 1 \), \( (B_b, V) u \rightarrow 0 \). However, the inertial terms also decrease as \( \theta 

3.3. General considerations for low \( R_b \) flows

It is a result of showing that Squire's theorem cannot be extended to plane parallel flows with a parallel magnetic field in \$3-2 that some general conclusions about the stabilising influence of a magnetic field can be drawn from the relation (3-8) we can deduce a relation between \( R_{\text{crit}} \) and \( \varrho_0 \) of the form

\[
R_{\text{crit}}(\varrho_0) = f(\varrho_0) = f(\varrho_0(\cos \theta)) \cos \theta,
\]

for \( \theta = 0 \) becomes

\[
R_{\text{crit}}(\varrho_0) = f(\varrho_0).
\]

F. Stuart (1954) has obtained relations of the type (3-14) in examining the stabilising influence of a parallel magnetic field on boundary layer flows and plane Poiseuille flow. They did not consider disturbances for \( \theta > 0 \), which gives the minimum value of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) for any given \( \varrho_0 \). (We assume \( \varrho_0 \) is positive, though it could equally be negative.)

If \( OP' \) is a tangent drawn from the origin \( O \) to the curve of \( f(x) \), \( OP' = \varrho_0 \) is the distance of \( OP' \).

Let \( \varrho_0 = \varrho_0(\cos \theta) \) and for some value of \( \theta \) choose \( x_0 \) such that \( x_0 = \cos \theta \). Thereafter \( \varrho_0 \) continues to decrease and \( c_t = 0 \), increasing or decreasing in \( R_{\text{crit}} \). Hence it is, in general, incorrect to consider that the most unstable disturbances are those whose wavenumber vector is parallel to the flow and magnetic field, i.e., those for which \( \theta = 0 \). Michael (1932) and Stuart (1943) did not appreciate that the magnetic interaction term \( \varrho_0 \) varied with \( \theta \) for given \( R_b \) and \( U \) and erroneously concluded that Squire's theorem could not be extended to apply to flows with parallel magnetic fields.

Our result can easily be seen in physical terms. When there is no magnetic field, there are two competing effects, the viscous damping of the disturbance, and the inertial interaction between the Reynolds stresses and the velocity gradient of the mean flow. The latter effect, which provides the mechanism for the mean flow to feed energy into the disturbance decreases as \( \theta \) increases whereas the former is independent of \( \theta \). Hence the most unstable disturbances are those for which \( \theta = 0 \), for a given flow and magnetic field, parallel to the flow, \( B_b \) and \( R_b < 1 \), there is a decrease due to the magnetic field acting on the induced currents, \( j_1 \), as \( \theta \) increases to \( 360^\circ \). It was shown in \$2 that when \( R_b \ll 1 \), \( (B_b, V) u \rightarrow 0 \). However, the inertial terms also decrease as \( \theta 
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The value of \( \theta \) for which \( R_{\text{crit}} \) is a minimum is given by

\[
\cos \theta = x'/x = x'/q_0
\]

(3.16)

Note that, as \( q_0 \to \infty, \theta \to \frac{1}{2} \pi \), since \( x' \) is fixed, and also \( \theta = 0 \) when \( q_0 = x' \).

Thus any relation between \( R_{\text{crit}} \) and \( q_0 \) calculated by considering disturbances for which \( \theta = 0 \) can be converted to one giving the minimum value of \( R_{\text{crit}, \text{min}} \) for given \( q_0 \) by drawing a tangent from the origin to the \( \theta = 0 \) curve. Then the curve of \( R_{\text{crit}, \text{min}} \) against \( q_0 \) follows the \( \theta = 0 \) curve from \( F_a \) to \( F' \) (see figure 1).

![Figure 2.](image)

**Figure 2.** \( F_aF'e \) is a typical curve of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) against \( q_0 \) for two-dimensional disturbances. Here \( q_0 = x \) and \( f(x) = R_{\text{crit}} \). The minimum value of \( R_{\text{crit}} \), taking into account these disturbances, is shown to lie on the curve \( F_aF' \) and then the line \( FKE \). The dashed line is a typical \( R_{\text{crit}} \) curve at a constant value of \( \theta > 0 \).

and for \( q_0 > x' \) it follows the tangent. The curve may also be described as the envelope of the curves of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) against \( q_0 \) at constant \( \theta \); a typical curve for \( \theta > 0 \) is shown in figure 2. Should it be possible to draw more than one tangent from the origin to the \( \theta = 0 \) curve, then the curve of \( R_{\text{crit}, \text{min}} \) against \( q_0 \) is a little more complicated to construct. Some general consequences follow from this method of constructing the curve.

First, we need only calculate the curve for \( \theta = 0 \) and for \( q_0 < x' \) to know the value of \( R_{\text{crit}, \text{min}} \) at all values of \( q_0 \).

Secondly, we can now prove that, whatever the value of \( q_0 \), there is some finite value of \( \theta \) for which the flow is unstable, provided there is some finite value of \( q_0 \) for which it is unstable when \( \theta = 0 \). If there is any flow which is completely stable for all two-dimensional disturbances when \( q_0 > Q \) then the curve of \( R_{\text{crit}} \), against \( q_0 \) for \( \theta = 0 \) will touch a line parallel to the ordinate and cutting the abscissa at \( q_0 = 0 \), e.g. the curve \( C \) in figure 3. Now it is possible to draw a tangent from the origin to any curve which cuts the ordinate and touches a line to the right of it and parallel to it. Then the curve of \( R_{\text{crit}, \text{min}} \), against \( q_0 \) becomes a straight line for some value of \( q_0 > q' \), \( q' < Q \), and hence for any value of \( q_0 \) there is some value of \( R \) for which the flow is unstable.
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Thirdly if the curve of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) against \( q_0 \) for two-dimensional disturbances is of the form of curve \( O \) in figure 3, then the curve of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) for which \( q_0 \) is a constant, \( q_0 = 0 \), and \( \theta = 0 \) are closed curves and when \( q_0 = Q \), the closed curve generates to a point. It follows that similar curves of \( \lambda \) against \( R \) when \( \theta > 0 \) are closed curves and that for a given value of \( \theta \), \( \theta_0 \), there is some value of \( q_0 \), \( q_0 = Q_1 \), which the curve of \( \lambda \) against \( R \) on which the \( q_0 = Q_1 \), \( q_0 = 0 \), and \( \theta = \theta_0 \), degenerates to a point. But, whatever the value of \( q_0 \), there is always some value of \( \theta < \frac{1}{2} \pi \), for which the \( \lambda - R \) curve has not degenerated to a point.

![Figure 3.](image)

**Figure 3.** The effect of three-dimensional disturbances is a hypothetical flow for which all two-dimensional disturbances are stable at \( q_0 > 0 \). Unstable for all disturbances; \( \Theta \), stable for two-dimensional disturbances, unstable for three-dimensional disturbances; \( \Theta \), stable for all disturbances.

Fourthly, Drazin (1965) has shown that a sufficient condition for stability can be stated for the flows we are considering. He only considered disturbances for which \( \lambda = 0 \) and obtained the result that if

\[
R < \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1}{q_0^2},
\]

(3.17)

where \( \pi \) is the maximum value of \( du/dy \), then the flow is stable. Now the curve \( R_{\text{crit}} \) is a straight line and no tangent can be drawn to it from the origin. Hence this relation is equally valid for disturbances for which \( \theta > 0 \). See figure 2.

Thus we can state an upper limit and a lower limit to the fact that a magnetic field can stabilize a flow, but we still cannot say whether a parallel magnetic field will lower the critical Reynolds number of a flow or not, though no instance of this has yet been found.

4. Arbitrary Magnetic Reynolds number

If \( R_m \) does not satisfy the condition for \( R_m \leq 1 \) we cannot simplify (3.4) to contain an equation for \( v \) only, i.e. (3.6). From (3.4) we have

\[
v = \frac{U}{R_m} \left( U - c \right) \theta + i \frac{1}{2 \alpha R_m} (\phi' - \lambda \theta').
\]
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Substituting the value of \( v \) into (3·3) we obtain an equation in \( \psi \), which is proportional to the induced field in the \( y \) direction:

\[
\left( U - \psi \right)^2 - A^2 = \frac{U^2}{\alpha R} \left( \psi^2 - \lambda^2 \psi \right) + 2U\left( U - \psi \right) \psi'
\]

\[
= -\left[ \lambda^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi^2} - \frac{\left( D^2 - \lambda^2 \right) \partial}{\partial \psi} + \frac{\left( U - \psi \right) \partial}{\partial \psi} \right] \psi + \frac{1}{R_m} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \psi}; \tag{4·1}
\]

where \( \psi \) is the Alfvén number \( A = \rho R m \sqrt{\mu_0} \). This equation describes the motion of a disturbance travelling at an angle \( \theta \) to \( U \), and \( R_m \); as in §3 the motion of such a three-dimensional disturbance can be described in terms of an equivalent two-dimensional one.

Let \( \lambda \psi \) and \( \lambda R_m \psi \), where \( \psi \) and \( R_m \) are the Reynolds number and magnetic Reynolds number for the equivalent disturbance.

Then

\[
\psi = R \cos \theta, \quad R_m = R \cos \theta.
\]

Equation (4·1) becomes

\[
\left( U - \psi \right)^2 - A^2 = -\frac{U^2}{\alpha R} \left( \psi^2 - \lambda^2 \psi \right) + 2U\left( U - \psi \right) \psi'
\]

\[
= -\left[ \lambda^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi^2} - \frac{\left( D^2 - \lambda^2 \right) \partial}{\partial \psi} + \frac{\left( U - \psi \right) \partial}{\partial \psi} \right] \psi + \frac{1}{R_m} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \psi}; \tag{4·2}
\]

Note that \( A \) is the same for any \( \theta \).

Assuming the existence of suitable boundary conditions for \( \psi \) which do not vary with the angle \( \theta \) of the disturbance, we once more have an eigenvalue relation between the parameters of (4·2) of the form

\[
\mathcal{F}(c, \lambda, \psi, R_m, R) = 0.
\]

Note that we have one more parameter than in (3·8). This relation is the same for all values of \( \theta \). Equation (4·3) may be rewritten:

\[
\mathcal{G}(c, \lambda, \psi, \theta, A, R_m, R) = 0.
\]

As in §3, we are interested in finding the value of \( R \) for which the function \( \mathcal{G} \) becomes unstable, i.e. \( c_1 = 0 \). We examine the role of disturbances for which \( \psi > 0 \).

For some value of \( A > 0 \) and \( R_m \ll 0 \), if the lowest value of \( R \) at which \( c_1 = 0 \)

\[
R_{\text{crit}} = R_{\text{crit}(A)} \quad \text{and} \quad R_m = R_{\text{m}(A)} \tag{4·4}
\]

and if \( \theta = 0 \), \( R_{\text{crit}} = 0 \), and \( R_m = R_{\text{crit}} \).

This result may be seen in terms of the concepts of §2. Consider a velocity disturbance, \( v \), which lies in the plane \( \Omega k \) where \( \Omega k \) is the direction of propagation of disturbances. Then, provided the disturbance does not change its form as it varies, \( \psi \) increases \( \times (u \times \mathbf{B}) \) and hence \( j_1 \) and \( j_2 \) decrease. Since \( j_1 \) lies in the plane \( \psi \), \( \times (u \times \mathbf{B}) \) and hence \( j_1 \) and \( j_2 \) decrease as \( \theta \) increases. Therefore the \( j_1 \times \mathbf{B} \), the angular momentum force, decreases with \( \theta \). Thus, as well as in the inertial interaction, the electromagnetic interaction between the disturbance and the mean flow also increases as \( \theta \) increases.

We can draw some general conclusions about the stabilizing influence of a magnetic field at arbitrary \( R_m \). From (4·3) we deduce a relation of the form

\[
R_{\text{crit}} = f(R_m, A),
\]

which may be rewritten

\[
R_{\text{crit}} = f(R_m, \cos \theta, A) \cos \theta. \tag{4·6}
\]

Tarasov (1956) has examined the stabilizing influence of a parallel magnetic field on a plane Poiseuille flow for arbitrary \( R_m \), by only considering disturbances for which \( \psi = 0 \). He obtained results for \( R_{\text{crit}} \) at various values of \( A \) and \( R_m \). The shape of a curve of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) against \( R_m \) for a constant value of \( A \), plotted from Tarasov's results, is similar to that of curve \( C \) in figure 3. Since \( A \) does not vary with \( \theta \), we may apply the argument of §3 to deduce the minimum value of \( R_{\text{crit}} \), when all values of \( \theta \) are considered. Then we find as before that for \( R_m \) greater than some value, the \( R_{\text{crit}} \)-\( R_m \) curve for constant \( A \) becomes a straight line, namely the tangent from the origin to the \( R_{\text{crit}} \)-\( R_m \) curve, i.e. the \( R_{\text{crit}} \)-\( R_m \) curve for constant \( A \) for three-dimensional disturbances.

This will be the ultimate form of the \( R_{\text{crit}} \)-\( R_m \) curve for constant \( A \) for all velocity profiles at all values of \( A \). It follows, therefore, that there is no parallel magnetic field which will completely stabilize a flow for finite values of \( R_m \). In other words, whatever the value of \( A \) or \( R_m \), there is always some value of \( R \) for which the flow is unstable.

By only considering disturbances for which \( \theta = 0 \), Tarasov erroneously concluded that there was always some value of \( A \) which could stabilize the flow.

Velikhov (1959) followed Michael (1951) in assuming that the most unstable disturbances occur for \( \theta = 0 \) and thence deduced a sufficient condition for a parallel magnetic field to stabilize a flow when \( R_m \rightarrow \infty \). If disturbances for which \( \theta > 0 \) are considered, the basis of his arguments has to be changed, e.g. if

\[
\theta = \frac{1}{2} \phi - \phi' \quad \text{and} \quad R_m = R_{\text{m}(A)} \tag{4·7}
\]

and if \( \phi' = 0 \), the dissipative terms in (4·2) could not be ignored. The dissipative terms can only be ignored if \( R_m \rightarrow \infty \) and \( R_{\text{crit}} \rightarrow \infty \). Then Velikhov's result, that if \( A > 1 \), all values are stabilized, is correct. In general, therefore, a careful examination is needed of the limiting processes \( R \rightarrow \infty \) or \( R_m \rightarrow \infty \) when three-dimensional disturbances are considered.

Conclusion

It was stated in §3 that the main purpose of the stability analysis was to find the lowest velocity at which the flow becomes unstable, given the value of the applied magnetic field and the values of the fluid properties. It is not very instructive,
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physically, to consider \( R_{\text{crit}} \) as a function of \( \psi_2 \) or as a function of \( A \) and \( R_e \) as in §4 since \( \psi_2 \), \( A \), and \( R_e \) are not independent variables if one considers \( R_e \) and \( U \) as the parameters to be varied in an experiment. We considered these particular non-dimensional parameters since they appear in the stability equations. From the graphs already shown one could plot other graphs of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) against \( M = R_e\sigma |\psi|/\psi \) for values of constant \( P_c = \gamma \sigma \rho \), say. This would be a simple operation since

\[
M = \sqrt{2 R_e \sigma |\psi|} = \sqrt{A R_e \sigma |\psi|},
\]

Replotting Stuart’s results in this way indicates that the form of the \( R_{\text{crit}}-M \) curve \( P \ll 1 \) is similar to that of the \( R_{\text{crit}}-\psi_2 \) curve for \( R_e \ll 1 \). (See figure 3.) It is easily proved that for sufficiently high values of \( M \) the \( R_{\text{crit}}-M \) curve becomes a straight line, which is tangent to the origin to the curve for a two-dimensional disturbance. It is interesting to note that when \( M = 50 \) the angle at which the most unstable disturbance travels to the direction of flow is 90°. Thus in an experiment with mercury the effect of three-dimensional disturbances will become apparent at values of the magnetic field of about 2000 G in a duct whose width is about 1 cm.

![Figure 4. \( R_{\text{crit}} \) against \( M = R_e\sigma |\psi|/\psi \) for plane Poiseuille flow when \( \psi_2 \ll 1 \), based on the theory of Stuart (1954).](image)

The only experimental work done on the stability of parallel flows with parallel magnetic fields has been done with flows in circular tubes (Globe 1961). There is no satisfactory theory for the onset of instability of such a flow with or without magnetic field.

In experiments on the stability of plane Poiseuille flows with no magnetic field it has not proved possible to obtain a critical Reynolds number in agreement with that predicted by linearized theory. It is likely to be equally difficult in experiments with a parallel magnetic field. There is more likelihood of success with experiments on the stability of boundary layers with parallel magnetic fields.

Though we have only discussed neutrally stable disturbances (\( \epsilon = 0 \)), growing disturbances also become three-dimensional as the magnetic field increases. The rate of growth of a disturbance depends on the dimensionless ‘amplification factor’ \( \beta = U \sigma \mu \). Michael (1961) showed that, if we regard \( U \) as the parameter to be varied so that \( R \ll U \), then

\[
\beta = \sqrt{2 R_e \sigma |\psi|} \sqrt{A R_e \sigma |\psi|},
\]

Note that the value of this expression is independent of \( \theta \).

Consider the case of \( R_e \ll 1 \); then a curve of \( R \) against \( R_e \) at constant values of \( R_e \) and \( \psi_2 \) is the same as that of an equivalent two-dimensional disturbance for which \( A \) is plotted against \( R \) at constant values of \( \alpha R_e \) and \( \psi \). If \( R_{\text{crit}} \) is the lowest value of \( R \) for a given \( \psi \) and \( \alpha R_e \), and we then plot \( R_{\text{crit}} \) against \( \psi \) for constant \( \psi_2 \), we can calculate the minimum value of \( R_{\text{crit}} \) for given \( \psi_2 \) and \( \alpha R_e \), using the construction of §3. Thus, as with the case of \( \epsilon = 0 \), when \( \psi \) becomes sufficiently large the curves become straight lines. In experimental terms this means that we must calculate the minimum velocity of the mean flow for a given amplification rate (or disturbance and given magnetic field).

Though we have only examined the stability of fluids with uniform properties under the action of a uniform magnetic field, by virtue of the physical reasons given in §2 it is likely that, in general, three-dimensional disturbances will be the most unstable in practical situations, m.h.d. generators for instance, where magnetic fields are applied to the flow of fluids with non-uniform properties. For an example of some of the other interesting kinds of instability which can occur under such circumstances see McCune (1965).
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At the present time we are unable to carry out a complete analysis of the fluid dynamics and electrodynamics of an M. H. D. generator. However, various aspects of the behaviour of an M. H. D. generator may be examined by the use of simplified models e.g.

(i) One-dimensional gas dynamics. (e.g. Louis et al., 1964).

(ii) The current distribution can be found if the velocity is assumed constant across the duct. (e.g. Vitalis, 1965).

(iii) The skin friction and heat transfer to the walls can be calculated by boundary layer analysis if the flow is assumed to be laminar. (Kerrebrock, 1961).

(iv) A complete description of the velocity and current distribution across the duct can be given if the flow is assumed to be uniform, laminar, incompressible and not-varying in the flow direction. (Bust & Stewartson, 1965).

Taken together, these and other models will enable us to describe most of the effects in an M. H. D. generator.

In this paper another simplification is considered in which the electromagnetic forces are assumed to be much larger than the inertial forces. The ratio of these two forces is measured by the parameter, \( \frac{\sigma E}{\mu u} \), where \( \sigma \) is the conductivity, \( B \) the magnetic field, \( u \) the width of the duct, \( \rho \) the density and \( U \) the mean velocity. Thus \( \sigma E / \mu u \). We also assume that the magnetic Reynolds number is very much less than one. In the largest experimental generators now being built \( \sigma E / \mu u \). Thus, though the results of this model are not immediately applicable, they should indicate the effects of increasing the magnetic field strength and the size of M. H. D. generators.
When \( S \gg 1 \), one can consider the duct to be divided into 2 regions:

(i) A core region where electromagnetic forces are balanced by the pressure gradient and where inertial as well as viscous forces are negligible.

(ii) Boundary layers on the walls where again inertial forces are negligible but where the viscous, electromagnetic and pressure forces are of the same order.

We show how it is then possible to calculate the core flow in diverging ducts and in ducts with non-uniform magnetic fields, with the Hall effect and compressibility included, and obtain approximate answers for these otherwise very difficult problems. We also demonstrate the simplifications in the analysis of the boundary layers which result from this approximation.
1. INTRODUCTION

At the present time we are unable to carry out a complete analysis of the fluid dynamics and electrodynamics of an M. R. D. Generator. However, various aspects of the behaviour of an M. R. D. Generator may be examined by the use of simplified models: the greater the simplification the more complete the description.

Laminar incompressible flow in a rectangular duct has been examined in [1] and laminar compressible boundary layer flow in [2] and [3] but most generator calculations use the method of one-dimensional gas dynamics, [4] and [5], which is based upon the assumptions that the variations of flow and fluid properties are small across the generator duct and that transverse velocities are small.

Calculations based on this approximation have proved satisfactory for inviscid flow regions outside boundary layers, e.g., in the entrance region of a duct or for fully developed turbulent flow in a duct. In the former case the effects of heat transfer and viscous friction are mainly felt in the boundary layers; they only affect the flow outside the boundary layers by varying the thickness of the boundary layers. In the latter case, though there are large velocity gradients at the wall, the wall effects are diffused right across the duct. The electromagnetic effects are considered by adding the electromagnetic \( J \times B \) body force to the momentum equation, and the work done by the electric field, \( \mathbf{E} \), to the energy equation. When the Hall effect and the problem of segmented electrodes are considered it is found that the current varies across the duct. In that case the current distribution is usually calculated by assuming the velocity is constant across the duct, e.g., [6] but ignoring the effects on the flow of \( J \times B \) varying across the duct. Thus these calculations are valid for highly turbulent flows in ducts with small changes in cross-sectional area and where the electromagnetic forces are small compared to the inertial forces.

In this paper we consider another model for flow in a W. R. D. generator duct in which we assume the electromagnetic body forces are very much larger than the inertial forces. Thus the ratio of these two forces is measured by the parameter \( \eta = \frac{B}{Ur} \), where \( \eta \) is the conductivity, \( B \) the magnetic flux density, \( r \) a characteristic duct width, \( \rho \) the density and \( U \) a characteristic velocity, the value of which is assumed to be typical for the central regions of the duct. We also assume the magnetic Reynolds number, \( Rm \), is very much less than one. Hence
\[
\frac{H^2/\rho e}{Re} = S^{2/3}; \quad Re = 1, \quad \text{where } Re \text{ is the Reynolds number and}
\]
\[
H = \text{Hartmann number,}
\]
\[
\text{where } S \text{ is the viscosity) in the Hartman number.}
\]

In the largest experimental generators now being built:

\[
H = 10^6, \quad Re = 5 \times 10^5 \quad \text{and hence } S = 2.
\]

The most important physical effect of raising \( S \) is the damping of the turbulence in the flow. Murgatroyd \( [9] \) showed that when \( Re/H < 255 \) the turbulence in a flat channel is damped out. However, for values of \( Re/H \) greater than 255 the turbulence is damped in the centre of the duct where the velocity gradients are small and as the magnetic field is further increased the last remaining turbulence is damped from the boundary layers. Thus, since in existing generators the turbulence is highly damped and the electromagnetic forces are of the same order or greater than the inertial forces, the basic assumptions of most existing generator calculations are not satisfied. Therefore, though the results of this model are not immediately applicable, they should indicate the effects of increasing the magnetic field strength and the size of M. H. D. generators, as well as demonstrating some of the defects of existing models.

When \( S \gg 1 \), one can consider the duct to be divided into 2 regions.

(i) A core region where electromagnetic forces are balanced by the pressure gradient and where inertial as well as viscous forces are negligible.

(ii) Boundary layers on the walls where again inertial forces are negligible but where the viscous, electromagnetic and pressure forces are of the same order. The thickness of the layers is assumed to be very much smaller than the duct width.

In many existing M. H. D. generators, the generator ducts have large changes in their cross-sectional area, but because the calculations are based on one-dimensional gas dynamics the effects of large transverse velocities caused by the area change are not considered. We show how flow in such ducts can be calculated exactly when \( S = 1 \). Another problem not suitable for solving by one-dimensional gas dynamics is that of calculating the effect of variations in the magnetic field both along and across the duct, whereas in our approximation a fairly simple method exists for this calculation.

By means of our boundary layer approximations we examine the effects of viscous friction and heat transfer at the wall when \( S \) increases. We conclude that owing to the damping of the turbulence which occurs when \( S \gg 1 \) and the formation of slowly growing boundary layers the effects on the core flow of the wall shear stress and heat transfer become progressively less as \( S \) increases.
In this section we consider the flow in the core and therefore we will ignore viscous forces. The governing equations for the steady flow of a conducting gas are taken to be:

**Momentum:**
\[ \varepsilon (\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{U} - \frac{1}{\rho} \tau + \frac{1}{\rho} \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B} = 0, \]  
(2.1)

**Continuity:**
\[ (\varepsilon \mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{U} = 0, \]  
(2.2)

**Energy:**
\[ e(\mathbf{U} \cdot \nabla)(\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{O}) \rho - \mathbf{v} - \rho \mathbf{U} \mathbf{v} \nabla T = 0, \]  
(2.3)

**Ohm's Law:**
\[ \mathbf{j} = \sigma (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{U} \times \mathbf{B}) - (\omega \mathbf{T} / \mathbf{B}) (\mathbf{I} \times \mathbf{B}) \]  
(2.4)

**Maxwell's Equations:**
\[ \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = 0, \]  
(2.5)
\[ \nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{J}, \]  
(2.6)
\[ \nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{J}. \]  
(2.7)

Where the symbols have their usual meaning. In this paper we consider the magnetic field to be produced by external coils and we assume that the magnetic Reynolds number, \( R_m \), is sufficiently small for us to ignore the field produced by the induced current. Let the imposed field be \( \mathbf{B}_0 \), then in the generator duct

\[ \mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{B}_0 - \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{B}_0 = 0. \]  
(2.8)

We now consider the equations when the magnetic field is uniform and \( \varepsilon \gg 1 \). Then, using the co-ordinate system of Fig. 1, equations (2.3) and (2.7) become:

\[ \begin{align*}
\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} & = -3 \epsilon \mathbf{j} \mathbf{a} - \frac{i_s \mathbf{a}}{2}, \\
\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} & = -3 \epsilon \mathbf{j} \mathbf{b}, \\
\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} & = -3 \epsilon \mathbf{j} \mathbf{c} + j_s \mathbf{a},
\end{align*} \]  
(2.9)

\[ e\left( \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B} \right) = \mathbf{E}_{\text{el}} + \mathbf{E}_{\text{R}} + \mathbf{E}_{\text{cond}} + \mathbf{E}_{\text{irr}} \]  
(2.10)

As is to be expected this approximation leads to our neglecting the inertial terms in (2.9) and (2.10). Hence taking the curl of (2.9) we have:

\[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} = \nabla \times \mathbf{J}. \]  
(2.11)

We now show by an order of magnitude argument that when \( S \gg 1 \) and the flow is compressible we can ignore the heat conduction terms in (2.10). From (2.10) we see that the characteristic distance in which \( \mathbf{p} \) changes in the \( x \)-direction is \( \mathbf{D} \) (see) and hence \( \mathbf{p} \) changes in a similar distance. Then...
Since \( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (k \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}) \approx 0 \) on the centre line and hence from (2.11),

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial y} = 0
\]

throughout the duct. Hence, from (2.7),

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial y} = 0,
\]

and Ex. Eq. 7, \( \boldsymbol{E} \) are all functions of \( x \) and \( \beta \) only. Then, since in our paper we can ignore the conduction terms in (2.10) we have

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \mu \frac{\partial E}{\partial y} + \eta \frac{\partial E}{\partial y} + u_y \frac{\partial E}{\partial y} \right) = 0.
\]

Since \( \partial^2 T / \partial y^2 = 0 \) \( \approx \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \) and by considering \( \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \) we can formally show that the solution:

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial u_y}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial E}{\partial y} = 0
\]

satisfies all the equations including (2.12). Also we can construct a solution to fit the boundary conditions which satisfies (2.13).

The consequence of the limiting solution (2.13) is that all fluid properties as well as the \( \psi \), velocity and electric field become functions of \( x \) and \( \beta \) only. In an incompressible flow this would not occur whatever the value of \( \eta \), because there is no coupling between the velocity and temperature, but in a compressible flow the fluid properties are coupled so that when \( \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{E} \approx 0 \) and \( \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} = 0 \) the coupling necessitates that all the other properties are also uniform in the \( y \)-direction.

If now we consider the flow in a segmented \( N, M, D \) generator in which the electrodes are connected so that \( \nabla = 0 \), then \( \beta = 0 \) and we can show by an order of magnitude argument in considering the boundary layers (say 3) that, if the duct width in the \( \beta \) direction is constant, \( u_y = \nabla u \) in the core, then \( \beta = 0 \) and equations (2.8) - (2.10) may be written:

\[
\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial x} = -u_x \beta_x (1 - \kappa),\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_y}{\partial x} = -u_x \beta_x^2 k (1 - \kappa),\]

\[
\frac{\partial \beta}{\partial y} = -u_y \beta_y^2 k (1 - \kappa),\]

(2.14)

(2.15)
where \( K = (-E_x / \partial_x B_y) \). Since \( U_x \) and \( \beta \) do not vary in the \( y \) or \( z \)-direction, \( U_2 \) and \( \beta \) are constant.

\[ (2.16) \]

where \( A(x) \) is the cross-sectional area. Thus we have arrived at a set of equations with a one-dimensional form, yet we can satisfy the boundary conditions on \( U_y \) in a duct with large variation of the duct width, for \( U_y \) may be calculated from (2.2) once \( U_x \) and \( \beta \) are found from (2.14) - (2.15). Since \( U_x \) satisfies (2.16), it is easily seen that \( U_y \) satisfies the condition that:

\[ U_y / \mu_1 = \frac{df}{dx} \text{ when } y = f(\xi). \]  

The properties of this set of equations has not yet been studied but some observations can be made at this time.

Firstly, if \( U_x \) is constant across the duct, the total velocity,

\[ (U_x^2 + U_y^2)^{1/2} \]

is clearly greatest near the walls in a diverging duct. This implies an increased drag on the walls and reduced tendency to separate.

Secondly, these equations become invalid where large gradients of velocity occur such as near shocks or near the exit of a duct.

Thirdly, if \( U_x \approx 0 \), large transverse pressure gradients exist and hence large changes in fluid properties across the duct. Then it is not possible to calculate the correct distribution near segmented electrodes in the manner of Vitalis [1] without considering the changes in velocity, conductivity and oil effect across the duct. To illustrate this, let us write \( j_x = B_0 / \mu_1 \), \( j_x = -B_0 \), \( \beta = \text{const.} \). Thus change the simple integral in equations (2.9, 10 and 2.9, 11) t.e.

\[ \int B_0 \beta \text{ const.} \]

Thus the pressure is constant along the current lines and large changes in fluid properties across the duct will occur.

Fourthly, the variables in these equations only depend on boundary conditions at values of \( x \) and \( y \). The conditions in the walls at \( y = f(\xi) \) affect the current in the boundary layers which in turn affects the current in the core. Thus we do not have a direct interaction between the walls and the core flow as in ordinary one-dimensional gas dynamics but an indirect electromagnetic interaction.

Fifthly, we can consider all the variables in the equations as the first term of an expansion in decreasing powers of \( S_1 \) where \( S_1 \) is the value of \( S \) at the entrance, e.g.

\[ U_x = U_{x0} + S_1^2 U_{x1} + S_2^2 U_{x2} + \ldots \]

Knowing \( U_{x0} \) from our primary approximation we can calculate the first approximation and then we can see the effect of the inertial terms. This approach has been used by Hunt and Leibovitch [6] to examine incompressible flow and found to be much simpler than expanding in ascending powers of \( S_1 \).

\[ \text{e.g. } (S_1/10)^2. \]

The main limitation in this analysis, as pointed out by Hunt, is that it is only valid when \( M^2 \ll 1. \)
Lastly, it is of interest to note that equations (2.14 - 2.16) are exactly the same as those for a frictionless constant velocity dust [2]. The differences in this approach and that of one-dimensional gas dynamics will appear most marked when the higher order approximations, as discussed in the preceding paragraph, are considered.

3. BOUNDARY LAYERS

As explained in §1, our aim in this section is to consider the boundary layers on the walls perpendicular to the magnetic fields when $\beta \gg 1$. We assume the walls to be electrically insulating and then the approximate equations written in terms of the boundary layer co-ordinates $\eta, \sigma$ and $\xi$ are:

\[\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \sigma} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = 0, \\
\frac{\partial p}{\partial \eta} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \sigma} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} (\rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}) = 0, \\
\frac{\partial p}{\partial \sigma} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} (\rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \sigma}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} (\rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}) = 0, \\
\frac{\partial p}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} (\rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} (\rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}) = 0.
\end{align*}\]

In this approach, the velocity and temperature variations are coupled and consequently the velocity and temperature boundary layer are identical.

If the wall is kept at a constant temperature while the core is at $T_c$, we can show that in (3.3) the convective terms are very much smaller than the conducting terms, particularly when $(1 - K) \ll 1$. In the core the convective terms are of the same order as the $\beta^2 E$ term and each greater than the conduction terms, but in the boundary layers $\beta^2 E$ is of order $\beta^2 E$ times its value in the core and the viscous dissipation term $\frac{1}{2} \rho u \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta}^2$ which is in $\beta^2 E$ times the value of $\beta^2 E$ in the core. Thus the flow is laminar in the boundary layers, since the convective terms are of the same order as in the core, most of the extra heat dissipation is too great for convection and is conducted away through the wall.
If there is no heat loss through the walls, the gas in the boundary layer heats up as it progresses, the heat being convected along. Clearly in this case our approximation is invalid.

The approximate equations may now be written in the following way, using the values of pressure gradient in the core and ignoring terms of $O(\delta^2)$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\partial U}{\partial z} \right] - \frac{d}{\partial x} \rho U = 0,$$  \tag{3.1}

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} \right] - \left( \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \right) \rho V = 0,$$  \tag{3.2}

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ \frac{\partial W}{\partial x} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{\partial W}{\partial y} \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ \frac{\partial W}{\partial z} \right] = 0,$$  \tag{3.3}

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) = 0.$$  \tag{3.4}

where the suffix 'core' refers to the value of the variable in the core. We can deduce simple results by integrating (3.1), (3.2) and (3.7) with respect to $x$ from $x = 0$ to $x = L$. We obtain

$$B_x \int_0^L \left( \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \right) \, dx = - \frac{1}{\rho} \rho \frac{dP}{dx} \bigg|_{x = 0} = - \frac{\partial x}{\partial x},$$  \tag{3.10}

where $\tau_x$ and $\tau_y$ are the components of skin friction in $x$ and $y$ directions. When $\delta \approx 1$, $\tau_x$ and $\tau_y$ become very much greater than their value in the core. In this special case

$$\tau_x = \int_0^L \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \, dx + \tau_y = \int_0^L \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \, dx = \frac{1}{\rho} \rho \frac{dP}{dx} \bigg|_{x = 0} = 0,$$

where $Q$ is the heat leaving the walls. From (3.10),

$$(E_x \tau_x - E_y \tau_y) / B_x = Q.$$  

Thus we have a relation between $T$ and $Q$ which is independent of the fluid properties but which is only valid when the generator is almost an open circuit.

Let us now consider the special case of $\mu \approx 0$ in the core in order to find the order of magnitude of the swirl velocity, $U_0$, induced by the Hall effect. We assume $U_0 \approx 0$ in the core and then show that this is true. From (3.1), in the core:

$$E_x \approx - \omega \tau \cos \phi \left( \frac{U_0^2}{2} - \frac{\delta_0}{2} \right) \approx - \omega \tau \cos \phi \left( U_0^2 - \frac{\delta_0}{2} \right).$$

Hence in the boundary layer, where $U_0$ is small near the wall:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial x} \right) \approx - \frac{\delta_0}{2} \omega \tau \cos \phi \approx - \frac{\delta_0}{2} \omega \tau \cos \phi \approx - \frac{\delta_0}{2} \omega \tau \cos \phi.$$

Substituting this approximate value for $\delta_0$ in (3.7) we have:
Thus the swirl velocity is of the same order as the core velocity in the boundary layer. But an equal quantity of gas must return in the opposite direction in the core and since the flow properties do not vary in the $y$-direction, we have:

$$U_{2, \text{core}} = -O\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta} \cdot U_{2, \text{boundary layer}}\right) = -O\left(U^2 \delta U_{2, \text{core}}\right)$$

Thus we can say that the swirl velocity $U_{1}$ is small in the core when $j_x = 0$. Since $U_{1} = -O\left(U_{2}\right)$ in the boundary layer it means that in this case $\tau_{1} = 0$.

Thus we now estimate the order of magnitude of $\tau_{1}$ and hence examine the effect on the core flow of the boundary layers.

$$\tau_{1} = O\left[\eta_{w} U_{2, \text{core}} / \delta\right] \approx O\left[\eta_{\text{core}} U_{2, \text{core}} / \delta\right],$$

where $\eta_{w}$ is the value of viscosity at the wall and if the wall is cooled $\eta_{w} \ll \eta_{\text{core}}$. Hence

$$\tau_{1} \approx O\left[U_{2, \text{core}} B_0 (\sigma \eta)^{1/2}\right],$$

where $\sigma$ and $\eta$ are taken at their core values. Then if the total current leaving the generator is 1, by adding the current in the boundary layers to that in the core we have:

$$I = \sigma U_{2, \text{core}} B_0 \left(1 - \zeta\right),$$

where $\zeta = I_{2, \text{core}} / I_{\text{total}}, B_0 = \sigma U_{2, \text{core}} B_0 \left[1 - \zeta - \zeta \sigma (\theta - \delta)\right]$.

Thus it is only when $(1 - \zeta) \approx (\eta^{-1})$ that the effect of the walls on the core flow is appreciable. Therefore, whatever the roughness or the heat input from the walls perpendicular to the field when $(1 - \zeta) \approx \eta^{-1}$, the core flow is unaffected. This is a very important result as it shows that even if the walls are very rough or have a large heat input at the wall over the duct, these effects have to be considered in the core.

### 5. NON-UNIFORM MAGNETIC FIELDS

A simple example of the effect of non-uniform magnetic fields is the flow in the core of a constant area duct when there is an axial magnetic field and the magnetic field is provided that the size of the roughness element is less than the thickness of the boundary layer.
field, \( B_o \), only varies in the \( y \) and \( z \) directions. Since \( B_{0z} \) satisfies (3.6) when \( B_{0y} = 0 \), we can write the components of \( B_o \) as:

\[
B_z = 0, \quad B_y = -\frac{2n}{3}, \quad B_z = \frac{2n}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}.
\]  

(4.1)

where \( \lambda \) satisfies, \( \nabla \times \lambda = 0 \).

and the momentum equations for our special case as:

\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial z} - \left( J_{y} B_{0z} - J_{z} B_{0y} \right) , \\
0 &= \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial y} - \lambda \frac{\partial B_{0z}}{\partial y} .
\end{align*}
\]  

(4.2)

(4.3)

(4.4)

Thence (3.3) becomes:

\[
\psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} \frac{\partial B_{0z}}{\partial y} = \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} = \psi \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} .
\]  

(4.5)

where \( \lambda = 0, \quad J_y = -\psi \frac{\partial B_{0z}}{\partial y}, \quad J_z = \psi \frac{\partial B_{0y}}{\partial y}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda = \psi \frac{\partial B_{0z}}{\partial y} .

The general solution to (3.6) may be written as:

\[
\psi = f(\psi) + \lambda \int \frac{d\lambda}{\psi(\lambda) / \partial y} ,
\]  

(4.6)

where the integral is a line integral taken along a line of constant \( \lambda \), i.e., a field line. In the case of a rectangular duct in which the magnetic field is symmetric about the centre line in both directions, the current distribution is symmetric and \( \psi = 0 \) at \( y = 0 \). Then (3.6) becomes:

\[
\psi = \frac{1}{\lambda} \int \left( \omega \cos \beta_0 \mu (\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}) \right) ,
\]  

(4.7)

As a very simple example consider a mainly uniform magnetic field in the \( y \) direction which has a small parabolic variation in the \( y \) and \( z \) directions. Then:

\[
\lambda = \left[ \frac{1}{b_y^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \frac{1}{b_z^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right] .
\]  

where \( b_y \gg b_z \). The solution for \( \psi \) to first order in \( b_y / b_z \) is:

\[
\psi = \frac{1}{b_y^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{b_z^2}{b_y^2} \right] \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} + \frac{b_y^2}{b_z^2} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} ,
\]  

(4.8)

(4.9)

Thence

\[
J_{x} = - \frac{P}{b_y^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{b_z^2}{b_y^2} \right] ,
\]  

and

\[
J_{y} = - \frac{2P}{b_z^2} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y} .
\]  

(4.10)

(4.11)

This method can be extended to more complicated situations. Also it enables us to find the velocity distributions in the core, though the boundary layer structure then has to be taken into account.
Fig. 1. Notation for the analysis of the core and boundary layer flows.