agreement with this data. In Ref. 1, however, the discrepancy is empirically corrected by inserting a square root of the Prandtl number in R. If this dependence is correct, it can be verified for a monotonic gas (which is free of rotational and vibrational relaxation effects) by using, for instance, a mixture of He and Ar. (Reference 1 shows data for both He and Ar but, unfortunately, not for a binary mixture.) Table 2 shows the Prandtl number for such a mixture computed by formulas contained in Ref. 6. The change in Prandtl number with mole fraction appears to be adequate for the proposed verification.

## Acknowledgment

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy.

### References

<sup>1</sup>Tang, S. P. and Fenn, J. B., "Exerimental Determination of the Discharge Coefficients for Critical Flow Through an Axisymmetric Nozzle," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 16, Jan. 1978, pp. 41-46.

<sup>2</sup>Tang, S., "Discharge Coefficients for Critical Flow Nozzles and Their Dependence on Reynolds Numbers," Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton Univ., 1969.

<sup>3</sup>Coles, D., "The Laminar Boundary Layer Near a Sonic Throat," 1957 Proceedings of the Heat Transfer and Fluid Mechanics Inst., Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif., 1957, pp. 119-137.

<sup>4</sup>Emanuel, G., "Discharge Coefficient of a Chemical Laser Nozzle," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 15, Jan. 1976, pp. 120-122.

<sup>5</sup>Kuluva, N. M. and Hosack, G. A., "Supersonic Nozzle Discharge Coefficients at Low Reynolds Numbers," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 9, Sept. 1971, pp. 1876-1879.

<sup>6</sup>Holmes, J. T. and Baerns, M. G., "Predicting Physical Properties of Gas Mixtures," *Chemical Engineering*, Vol. 72, May 1965, pp. 103-108.

## Reply by Authors to G. Emanuel

S.P. Tang\*

TRW Defense and Space Systems Group,

Redondo Beach, Calif.

and

J.B. Fenn†

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

E appreciate Emanuel's favorable remarks but we are puzzled at his attempt to compare directly the result of Coles for a two-dimensional planar nozzle with that of Tang for the axisymmetric case. Surely it would be even more remarkable if there were no discrepancy between the A values of his Eqs, (4) and (5). Nor should it be surprising that Eq. (5), which relates to the axisymmetric nozzle, agrees better with our experimental data than does Eq. (4), which relates to the two-dimensional planar nozzle. Our data were obtained with axisymmetric nozzles.

With respect to the derivation of Kuluva and Hosack, we note that the pressure-gradient parameter  $\beta$  was not incorporated in their analysis. Thus, they did not assume any particular value. Our choice of the  $\beta = \infty$  curve for comparison with the data stems from the fact that only for this case is a solution possible in closed form. Even more important, as pointed out in the paper, the actual nozzle

contours relate much more closely to  $\beta=\infty$  than to other values. As we also pointed out, the theoretical  $C_D$  for  $\beta=1$  is in much better agreement with the data than the  $C_D$  for  $\beta=\infty$ . Indeed, the agreement is even better than with the  $C_D$  values of Kuluva and Hosack, which, as Emanuel points out, do match the data better than our values of  $C_D$  for  $\beta=\infty$ . The point is that sheer consistency with experiment is not in itself a sufficient criterion for evaluating a theory. One can always force a better fit by empirical means of the kind used by Kuluva and Hosack in improving the fit to some of their data, or as we could in our case by arbitrarily picking the  $\beta$  value which gives the best fit. We felt that an empirical adjustment based on a modified Prandtl number was more defensible than choosing a  $\beta$  which was neither physically realistic nor analytically convenient.

In this connection, we find Emanuel's suggestion that measurements be made with mixtures of helium and argon in order to probe the true effect of Prandtl number interesting and constructive.

#### References

<sup>1</sup> Tang, S.P. and Fenn, J.B., "Experimental Determination of the Discharge Coefficients for Critical Flow Through an Axisymmetric Nozzle," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 16, Jan. 1978, pp. 41 – 46.

# Comment on "Unconstrained Variational Statements for Initial and Boundary-Value Problems"

C. V. Smith Jr.\*

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

HE first observation is a question of semantics directed to Simkins (and others—he is probably in good company) concerning the use of the word "variational." If a functional exists for which the vanishing of the first variation leads to a physical law, then there exists a variational principle. If a functional does not exist, then it is meaningless to speak of a variational statement. In reality, the formulation presented in Ref. 1 is nothing more than the method of weighted residuals with weighting functions expressed in terms of the trial functions of the approximation—that is, a generalized Galerkin formulation. For this procedure, if the approximation function is denoted by  $\bar{y}(t) = \sum a_n \phi_n(t)$ , then the weighting function is selected to be  $\psi(t) = \sum b_n \phi_n(t)$ . Next, if  $b_n$  is denoted by  $\delta a_n$ , it is possible to write  $\psi(t) = \delta \bar{y}(t)$ ; and the appearance of the symbol "δ" would appear to be the only justification for the term "variational statement." It is the contention of this writer that such a term is confusing, nonprecise, and really unnecessary. When there is no functional, and therefore nothing to vary, then be precise and identify the formulation as one of the methods of weighted residuals.

Much of Ref. 1 is involved with identification of the Lagrange multipliers through integration by parts. When doing this, there is an implication (certainly there is no explicit statement to the contrary) that the Lagrange multipliers so obtained are the only possible values. In other words, there appears to be an implication that it is necessary to eliminate the so-called redundant boundary terms through suitable definitions of the  $\delta\lambda$ . However, after, the procedure is identified as a method of weighted residuals, then it becomes

Received July 27, 1978. Copyright © American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., 1978. All rights reserved.

Index categories: Boundary Layers and Convective Heat Transfer-Laminar; Nozzle and Channel Flow.

<sup>\*</sup>Research Staff, Advanced Technology Division.

<sup>†</sup>Professor, Dept. of Engineering and Applied Science.

Received July 17, 1978. Copyright © American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc., 1978. All rights reserved.

Index category: Structural Dynamics.

<sup>\*</sup>Associate Professor, School of Aerospace Engineering.