[3] Pulliam, T. H. and Steger, J. L., "Implicit Finite-Difference Simulations of Three-Dimensional Compressible Flow," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 18, Feb. 1980, pp. 159-167.

[4] Baldwin, B. S. and Lomax, H., "Thin-Layer Approximation and Algebraic Model for Separated Turbulent Flows," AIAA Paper 78-257, Jan. 1978.

[5] Beam, R. M. and Warming, R. F., "An Implicit Factored Scheme for the Compressible Navier-Stokes Equations," *AIAA Journal*, Vol. 16, April 1978, pp. 393-402.

[6] Lasinski, T. A., Andrews, A. E, Sorenson, R. E., Chaussee, D. S., Pulliam, T. H., and Kutler, P., "Computation of the Steady Viscous Flow over a Tri-Element Augmentor Wing Airfoil," AIAA Paper 82-021, Jan. 1982.

[7] Peyret, R. and Viviand, H,., "Computation of Viscous Compressible Flows Based on the Navier-Stokes Equations," AGARD AG-212, 1975.

[8] Kutler, P., Pedelty, J. A., and Pulliam, T. H., "Supersonic Flow Over Three-Dimensional Ablated Nosetips Using an Unsteady Implicit Numerical Procedure," AIAA Paper 80-063, Jan. 1980.

[9] Kutler, P., Chakravarthy, S. R., and Lombard, C. K., "Supersonic Flow Over Ablated Nosetips Using an Unsteady Implicit Numerical Procedure," AIAA Paper 78-213, Jan. 1978.

Errata: "A Theoretical and Experimental Investigation of a Transonic Projectile Flowfield"

Charles J. Nietubicz
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory/AMCCOM
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland
George R. Inger
West Virginia University, West Virginia
and
James E. Danberg
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware
[AIAA **22**, pp. 35-41 (1984)]

THE words "schlieren photo" should be replaced with "spark shadowgraph" in paragraph 1.

The figures have been incorrectly labeled. The figure captions should read:

Received Jan 8, 1984.

Fig. 1 Spark shadowgraph of projectile at $M = 0.98$.

Fig. 2 Physical grid for Navier-Stokes computations. a) Full grid, b) expanded grid.

Fig. 3 Triple deck model of shock/boundary-layer interaction.

Fig. 4 Boattail model configuration.

Fig. 5 Afterbody of wind tunnel model showing probe support mechanism.

Fig. 6 Comparison of Navier-Stokes, composite, and experimental surface pressure coefficients; $M = 0.94$.

Fig. 7 Velocity profiles at $X/D = 5.05$, 5.36, and 5.61 for $M = 0.94$.

Fig. 8 Comparison of displacement thickness: Navier-Stokes, composite, and experiment; $M = 0.94$.

Fig. 9 Comparison of Navier-Stokes, composite, and experimental surface pressure coefficients; $M = 0.97$.

Fig. 10 Velocity profiles at $X/D = 5.05$, 5.36, 5.49, and 5.61 for $M = 0.97$.

Fig. 11 Boattail shock formation from computed Mach number contours and schlieren photo.

Fig. 12 Comparison of skin friction coefficient between Navier-Stokes and composite solution, $M = 0.97$.