⁸Ericsson, L. E., and Beyers, M. E., "Ground Facility Interference Effects on Slender Vehicle Unsteady Aerodynamics," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1996, pp. 117–124.

⁹Ericsson, L. E., and Beyers, M. E., "Requirements for Subscale Simulation of Delta Wing Vortex Characteristics," International Council of the Aeronautical Sciences, 2000-3.10.3, Harrowgate, U.K., Aug. 2000.

Comment on "Moving-Wall Effect on Unsteady Boundary Layer"

Lars E. Ericsson*

Mountain View, California 94040

and

Martin E. Beyers†

Institute for Aerospace Research,
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R6, Canada

N Ref. 1 an elegant analysis is presented which demonstrates the-oretically that the moving-wall effect influences the separation of the boundary layer on a stalling airfoil in the manner described in the discussion of Fig. 14 in Ref. 2. That is, the moving-wall effect will amplify the accelerated-flow effect on a pitching airfoil but counteract it on an airfoil describing a plunging motion.³ It would be of significant interest if the authors were to extend their theoretical analysis to the one-degree-of-freedom three-dimensional flow on a coning body of revolution illustrated by Fig. 6 in Ref. 4. As has been demonstrated analytically,⁵ the self-induced coning of a body of revolution⁶ is generated by a flow mechanism fundamentally the same as that giving rise to dynamic lift overshoot on an oscillating airfoil. This is important in view of the fundamental role that this flow phenomenon plays on a combat aircraft maneuvering at high angles of attack.^{7,8}

References

¹Dumitrescu, H., and Cardos, V., "Moving-Wall Effect on Unsteady Boundary Layers," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 2000, pp. 341–

²Ericsson, L. E., "Moving Wall Effects in Unsteady Flow," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 25, No. 11, 1988, pp. 977–990.

³Ericsson, L. E., "Moving Wall Effect in Relation to Other Dynamic Stall Flow Mechanisms," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 31, No. 6, 1994,pp. 1303–1309. ⁴Ericsson, L. E., and Beyers, M. E., "Universality of the Moving-Wall

Effect," Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2000, pp. 508–513.

⁵Ericsson, L. E., "Prediction of Slender Body Coning Characteristics," Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1991, pp. 43–49.

⁶Yoshinaga, T., Tate, A., and Inoue, K., "Coning Motion of Slender Bodies at High Angles of Attack in Low Speed Flow," AIAA Paper 81-1899, Aug. 1981.

⁷Ericsson, L. E., and Beyers, M. E., "Wind-Tunnel Aerodynamics in Rotary Tests of Combat Aircraft Models," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 35, No. 4, 1998, pp. 521–528.

⁸Ericsson, L. E., and Beyers, M. E., "Nonlinear Rate and Amplitude Effects on a Generic Combat Aircraft Model," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2000, pp. 207–213.

Received 5 August 2000; accepted for publication 24 February 2002. Copyright © 2002 by Lars E. Ericsson and Martin E. Beyers. Published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., with permission. Copies of this paper may be made for personal or internal use, on condition that the copier pay the \$10.00 per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; include the code 0021-866902 \$10.00 in correspondence with the CCC.

Reply by S. Tavoularis to M. E. Beyers and L. E. Ericsson

S. Tavoularis*
University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada

BECAME aware of Ref. 1² of the comment, only after publication of my Note.³ I also cited it in a subsequent publication.¹ Unfortunately, I was unaware of it while I was rederiving independently the geometrical expressions in my Note and neither were the wind-tunnel professionals that I consulted with nor the *Journal of Aircraft* editor and reviewers. I apologize to the *Journal of Aircraft* readers for the redundancy.

The expressions in Refs. 2 and 3 are purely geometrical and exact and, of course, cannot be expected to apply under conditions of significant interference. Even so, they seem to apply fairly well to steady-flow model tests in a high-speed wind-tunnel facility, as clearly demonstrated in Ref. 1. Moreover, such expressions were never meant to be used in unsteady flows, and I am rather surprised that the authors of the comment feel the need to publish such a statement. In unsteady wind-tunnel testing, like in any unsteady flow configuration, it is not only the facility effects that must be accounted for but the history of flow development as well.

References

¹Tavoularis, S., Marineau-Mes, S., Woronko, A., and Lee, B. H. K., "Tail Buffet of the F/A-18 at High Incidence with Sideslip and Roll, Part 1," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2001, pp. 10–16.

²Lamont, P. J., and Kennaugh, A., "Total Incidence Plane Aerodynamics: The Key to Understanding High Incidence Flight Dynamics?," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 28, No. 7, 1991, pp. 431–435.

³Tavoularis, S., "Equivalence Between Sideslip and Roll in Wind Tunnel Testing," *Journal of Aircraft*, Vol. 36, No. 5, 1999, pp. 895, 896.

^{*}Engineering Consultant. Fellow AIAA.

[†]Principal Research Officer, Applied Aerodynamics Laboratory. Senior Member AIAA

Received 13 March 2002; accepted for publication 13 March 2002. Copyright © 2002 by S. Tavoularis. Published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., with permission. Copies of this paper may be made for personal or internal use, on condition that the copier pay the \$10.00 per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923; include the code 0021-8669.02 \$10.00 in correspondence with the CCC.

^{*}Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering.