Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer Vol. 25, No. 11, pp. 1777–1778, 1982
Printed in Great Britain

0017–9310/82/111777–02 $3.00/0
Pergamon Press Ltd.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

COMMENTS ON 'MATHEMATICAL MODELLING OF BUOYANCY-INDUCED SMOKE FLOW IN ENCLOSURES'

I HAVE read the Paper of Markatos *et al.* [1] where a buoyancy affected $k \sim \varepsilon$ model of turbulence has been used for the prediction of buoyancy-induced flows in enclosures. Buoyancy affected $k \sim \varepsilon$ turbulence models have already been successfully used to calculate both vertical and horizontal shear layer flows [2, 3] but so far as I know this is one of the first attempts to predict recirculating flows with it.

The authors have introduced the influence of buoyancy only in the generation terms of the equations of k and ε, neglecting its influence in the expression of turbulent viscosity μ_t (equation (9) in ref. [1]), and in the constants σ_t (turbulent Prandtl number), σ_k and σ_ε. The authors however did not mention the value of σ_t used in their calculations.

For the introduction of buoyancy in the equation of k no further empirical information is necessary whereas its introduction in the ε-equation is a very sensible issue because the ε-equation without the buoyancy effect contains already two very sensitive empirical constants C_1 and C_2. The authors have also discussed this problem in details mentioning about the solution proposals but it is not clear to me exactly which approach has been finally used in their calculations.

It appears they have used the proposal of Rodi [4] which uses a single value of C_3 for use in the vertical and horizontal shear layers but requires different values of the buoyancy production of the lateral energy component G_{BL} (equation (18) in ref. [1]) which has a meaning only in the case of shear layer flows as has been used in refs. [2] and [3].

Thus the authors have either used the horizontal shear layer approach, $G_{BL} = 2 \cdot G_B$ with C_3 influence in it or vertical shear layer approach, $G_{BL} = 0$ for which the influence of C_3 automatically disappears.

In Fig. 10 it is thus not very clear what is indicated by the case $G_B = 0$, $C_3 = 1$, since for $G_B = 0$, $R_f = 0$ and the case is independent of C_3. Is it the case without buoyancy effect in the $k \sim \varepsilon$ model?

Institut für Kerntechnik,
Technische Universität Berlin,
Marchstraße 18,
1000 *Berlin* 10,
F.R.G.

M. SHAHEED HOSSAIN

REFERENCES

1. M. C. Markatos, M. R. Malin and G. Cox, Mathematical modelling of buoyancy-induced smoke flow in enclosures, *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer* **25**, 63–75 (1982).
2. M. S. Hossain, Mathematische Modellierung von turbulenten Auftriebsströmungen, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Karlsruhe (1980).
3. M. S. Hossain and W. Rodi, A turbulence model for buoyant flows and its application to vertical jets, in *Turbulent Buoyant Jets and Plumes* (edited by W. Rodi). Pergamon Press, Oxford (1982).
4. W. Rodi, *Turbulence Models and their Application in Hydraulics—A State of the Art Review.* International Association for Hydraulic Research, Delft, Netherlands (1980).

REPLY TO "COMMENTS ON 'MATHEMATICAL MODELLING OF BUOYANCY-INDUCED SMOKE FLOW IN ENCLOSURES'"

THE INFLUENCE of buoyancy on the ε equation is indeed controversial. It is by no means clear that the suggestion of Rodi for S_ε is correct [1]. Consider, for example, the two definitions [1]

$$R_f = -\frac{G_B}{G_k}, \tag{1}$$

$$R_f = \frac{-G_{BL}}{2(G_k + G_B)} \tag{2}$$

and the expression

$$S_\varepsilon = C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{k}(G_k + G_B)(1 + C_3 R_f). \tag{3}$$

Using definition (1) we have

$$S_\varepsilon = C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{k}\left[G_k + G_B(1 - C_3) - C_3 \frac{G_B^2}{G_k}\right]. \tag{4}$$

For vertical layers, $C_3 = 0$,

$$S_\varepsilon = C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{k}(G_k + G_B). \tag{5}$$

For horizontal layers, $C_3 = 1$,

$$S_\varepsilon = C \frac{\varepsilon}{k}\left(\frac{G_k^2 - G_B^2}{G_k}\right) \tag{6}$$

Using definition (2) we find that for vertical layers ($G_{BL} = 0$) equation (5) still holds, but for horizontal ($G_{BL} = 2G_B$) layers we have

$$S_\varepsilon = C_1 \frac{\varepsilon}{k}(G_k + G_B(1 - C_3)). \tag{7}$$

There is a fundamental difference between equations (6) and (7), depending on the sign of G_B. Thus equation (6) is always less than its value for the unmodified ($k \sim \varepsilon$) model, while