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The equations of gas dynamics of two dimensional isoenergetic and isentropic flows, expressed by contour integrals, have the form

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\oint f(y, w, \theta) d x-\varphi(y, w, \theta) d y=0  \tag{1}\\
\oint F(y, w, \theta) d x-\Phi(y, w, \theta) d y=0 & \binom{w=w(x, y)}{\theta=\theta(x, y)}
\end{array}
$$

where $x$, $y$ are the Cartesian coordinates in the plane of the flow under consideration; $w$. $\theta$ are respectively the modulus of the velocity and the angle of inclination of the velocity to the $x$-axis. The integration is carried out along the arbitrary closed contour $L$. The first of equations (1) can be looked upon as the equation of motion projected on the $x$-axis. the second as an equation of continuity.

In differential form equations (1) have the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}=0, \quad \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}=0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

One of the possible formulations of the problems concerning the search for bodies with minimum wave drag (or for nozzles with maximum thrust) is the following. The points $a$ and $b$ and the characteristic curve ae of the inflowing stream are given (see figure). The control contour ahb is introduced, where $h b$ is the characteristic curve of equations (2), arriving at the point $b$. Equations (1) allow one to register the magnitude of the resistance $X$ and the zero mass flux of gas $\Psi$
 through the contour $a b$ in the form

$$
\begin{gather*}
\chi=\int_{a}^{h} f d x-\varphi d y+\int_{h}^{b} f d x-\varphi d y  \tag{3}\\
\Psi=0=\int_{a}^{h} F d x-\Phi d y+\int_{h}^{b} F d x-\Phi d y \tag{4}
\end{gather*}
$$

For the solution of a problem it is necessary to find a function $w$ on $h b$, which has an extreme of the function (3) under conditions (4) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
X \equiv x_{b}-x_{a}=\int_{a}^{h} d x+\int_{h}^{b} d x \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

taking into account the continuity of functions $w$ and $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ at the point $h$ and the equations of the characteristic curve, of which the first gives the relation between $d x$ and $d y$, while the second is the so-called compatibility condition.

Such a formulation of the variational problems takes into account all relations on $h b$ and is used in [1-3].

Rao [4] proposed another approach to the formulation of these problems. An arbitrary line is at first chosen as the closing line gb of the control contour $a g b$, but the relation between $w$ and $v$ on $g b$ is not taken into account. This relation is specified by the following circumstances. Let the functions $w$ and $\theta$ on $g b$ be found by some means, for example by solution of the variational problem. Then the solution of the problems of Cauchy for equations (2) with initial values on $g b$ defines a solution in the triangle $g^{\prime} b$. Thus, generally speaking, the located characteristic curve $g^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ does not coincide with the segment $g h$ of the given characteristic curve ae. For this reason the formulation of the problem [4] is incomplete. Disregard of one of the relations in the general case leads to incorrect results. However, a full formulation of the problem is made difficult in a given case by the fact that the relation between $w$ and $\theta$ on $g b$ is unknown in an explicit form.

The adduced considerations are obvious, but the appearance of later papers [5,6], in which great attention is given to the method of Rao but the incorrectness of the formulation of the problem goes unnoticed, gives rise to the possibility of mistakes during the formulation of new problems. It should be mentioned that the basis of the method of Rao in [5] affects only the achievement of the conditions of compatibility on the located line $g b$ with the characteristic direction.

We shall show that the correct end result in [4] was to a certain extent obtained accidentally. It is possible to rewrite equations (2)
in the form

$$
\begin{align*}
& \varphi_{w} w_{x}+\varphi_{\theta} \theta_{x}+f_{w} w_{y}+f_{\theta} \theta_{y}+f_{y}=0 \\
& \Phi_{w} w_{x}+\Phi_{\theta} \theta_{x}+F_{w} w_{y}+F_{\theta} \vartheta_{y}+F_{y}=0 \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

where the partial derivatives are noted by indices. The equations of the characteristic curves of system (6) are determined by the equality

$$
\left|\begin{array}{cc}
\Phi_{w} \tau-f_{w} & \varphi_{\theta} \tau-f_{\theta}  \tag{7}\\
\Phi_{w} \tau-F_{w} & \Phi_{\theta} \tau-F_{\theta}
\end{array}\right|=0 \quad\left(\tau=\frac{d y}{d x}\right)
$$

In the formulation [4] the variational problem is reduced to a search for the functions $w$ and $\theta$ on $g b$, which yield an absolute extremum of the functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
I=\int_{a}^{g}\left[\lambda_{1}(f-\varphi \tau)+\lambda_{2}(F-\Phi \tau)+\lambda_{3}\right] d x+\int_{g}^{b}\left[\lambda_{1}(f-\varphi \tau)+\lambda_{2}(F-\Phi \tau)+\lambda_{3}\right] d x \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \lambda_{3}$ are constant Lagrange multipliers. The integral along $a g$ is a function of the upper boundary. Making a variation, we obtain, in particular, the equations of Fuler on $g b$ or on part of this line

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{1}\left(f_{w}-\varphi_{w} \tau\right)+\lambda_{2}\left(F_{w}-\Phi_{w} \tau\right)=0, \quad \lambda_{1}\left(f_{\theta}-\varphi_{\theta} \tau\right)+\lambda_{2}\left(F_{\theta}-\Phi_{\theta} \tau\right)=0 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The multipliers $\lambda_{1}$ and $\lambda_{2}$, generally speaking, are not equal to zero, therefore the condition of compatibility of equations (9) coincides with the equality (7) and unexpectedly gives an equation for determining the quantity $T=d y / d x$.

Let us now examine the variational problem, in which the condition (5) is replaced by a condition of a more general form, not connected with equations (1)

$$
P=\int_{a}^{g} U(y, w, \boldsymbol{\vartheta}) d x-V(y, w, \boldsymbol{\vartheta}) d y+\int_{g}^{b} U(y, v, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d x-V(y, w, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d y
$$

In this case the functional of type (8) is expressed in the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{J} & =\int_{a}^{g}\left[\lambda_{1}(f-\varphi \tau)+\lambda_{2}(F-\Phi \tau)+\lambda_{3}(U-V \tau)\right] d x+ \\
& +\int_{g}^{b}\left[\lambda_{1}(f-\varphi \tau)+\lambda_{2}(F-\Phi \tau)+\lambda_{3}(U-V \tau)\right] d x
\end{aligned}
$$

The equations of Euler on the line gb or on part of it have the form

$$
\begin{gathered}
\lambda_{1}\left(f_{w}-\varphi_{w} \tau\right)+\lambda_{2}\left(F_{w}-\Phi_{w} \tau\right)+\lambda_{3}\left(U_{w}-V_{w} \tau\right)=0 \\
\lambda_{1}\left(f_{\theta}-\varphi_{\theta} \tau\right)+\lambda_{2}\left(F_{\theta}-\Phi_{\vartheta} \tau\right)+\lambda_{3}\left(U_{\theta}-V_{\theta} \tau\right)=0
\end{gathered}
$$

and do not determine $T$. If the characteristic line is not chosen as $g b$ then the latter equations, as already mentioned, give results which contradict the data given along the characteristic curve ae.

Let us imagine at last, ideally, that in the formulation of an original problem the relation between $w$ and $\theta$ on $g b$ is learned. In this case the expression under the integral along $g b$ in the equality (8) will have an additional component. The corresponding equations of Euler cease to be homogeneous relative to $\lambda_{1}$ and $\lambda_{2}$. It turns out that the additional limitation on $T$ of type ( 7 ) in this case reveals no contradiction with the full formulation of the problem. This result can also be applied to the case of non-isentropic currents.
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