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The authors of Ref. 1 have presented an interesting and useful method for computing internal flows with shock waves using a modified potential method. It is the purpose of this Note to add to the understanding of the limits of potential theory at transonic speeds by attempting to clarify some of the statements made in the subject paper, using asymptotic solutions derived for internal flows.

The statement that a potential solution may not exist at all in internal flows with a prescribed back pressure, and that when one does, the location of the shock wave is not unique, should be interpreted in the light of the order of the approximation one desires. Thus, as shown in Refs. 2 and 3 for steady flows and in Refs. 4-6 for unsteady flows, it is possible, in transonic internal flows, to locate the shock wave uniquely using a potential solution valid through third order. That is, if \( \left| \Delta P \right|/\Delta x = O(\epsilon) \), say, then the (nondimensional) jump in entropy across the shock wave is \( O(\epsilon^2) \). However, the Crocco equation shows that vorticity depends on the gradient in entropy normal to the streamlines, which is of still higher order, and so a potential exists at least through \( O(\epsilon^2) \). It turns out that only second-order terms are necessary to locate the shock wave in steady and unsteady flow; thus, the shock is located by setting the back pressure to second order. This result may or may not be helpful in formulating numerical solutions to internal flows. In any event, it points out a reason for the difficulties found in determining the location of the shock wave by setting the back pressure in transonic flow; very small changes in back pressure can cause large-amplitude excursions in the shock position, and so truncation errors can be very important, as can the method of imposing the boundary condition at the duct exit.

The previous remarks also apply in interpreting the description of the solution envelopes given in Fig. 3 of Ref. 1. Thus, when a shock wave occurs in the diverging part of a channel, a jump takes place from the supersonic solution to a subsonic solution, which may be close to but is not the same as the one that passes through sonic velocity at the throat. In fact, for every shock position, there is of course a separate and unique subsonic solution to which the solution jumps, depending on the back pressure. Again, for weak shock waves it should be emphasized that although the jump in entropy is \( O(\epsilon^2) \), the shock location may be found by setting back pressure using solutions valid to \( O(\epsilon^2) \); the entropy jump need not be found in order to locate the shock wave.

This does not mean that one cannot find the shock position using the jump entropy, of course, but only that it is not necessary to do so. As shown in Ref. 2, one finds the same result using either condition.

The general ideas developed in Ref. 2 have been used to find solutions for transonic flow through a lightly loaded cascade, and a simple analytical expression for the unique incidence angle was given for the case of supersonic incoming velocity. Although only the flow ahead of the cascade was considered in detail for this case, the solutions for the flow regions between the blades should follow those found for channels closely enough that the results mentioned above concerning shock location would certainly hold there as well.
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