Wall Jet Similarity from Impingement of Planar Underexpanded Jets

Patrick Fillingham and Igor V Novosselov

1Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA
2Institute for Nano-Engineered System, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

ABSTRACT

In this work the velocity profiles and wall shear stress in the wall jet region of two-dimensional planar underexpanded impinging jets are predicted based upon nozzle parameters (stand-off height, jet hydraulic diameter, and nozzle pressure ratio). Computational fluid dynamics is used to calculate the flow field of impinging jets with height-to-diameter ratios of 15 to 30 and nozzle pressure ratio range of 1.2 to 3.0. The wall jet from these impinging jets is found to be an incomplete self-similar flow with the same triple-layer structure as the traditional wall jets. The effects of compressibility on the wall jet were found to be insignificant for wall jets with Mach numbers of less than 0.8. Power law relationships with source dependent coefficients are developed to describe local wall jet variables. These power laws describe maximum velocity, friction velocity, maximum velocity wall distance, and half-maximum velocity wall distance as a function of streamwise location. Normalization by momentum, rather than characteristic length or source velocity, is found to be beneficial for describing similarity. Source dependent coefficients are determined as a function of nozzle parameters using the conjugate gradient method. These power law relationships allow for the mapping of wall shear stress on the impingement surface over a range of nozzle parameters.

I. INTRODUCTION

Impinging jets have been studied extensively; their characterization is useful in multiple biological, chemical, and engineering applications. These studies often focus on heat and mass transfer [1-4]. This work analyzes the properties of the wall jet originating from the impingement of underexpanded planar jets, with applications to surface cleaning and non-contact micro-particle sampling. Previous studies of underexpanded jets have generally been motivated by the flow dynamics and acoustics of a short takeoff and vertical landing aircraft [5-7]; however, the wall jet region has not been studied extensively. Additionally, previous studies did not address the wall jet behavior in planar (high aspect ratio rectangular) geometries. In some respects, the analysis of these planar jets is less complicated if a 2D approximation is used; this is especially important in an oblique impingement scenario. The main advantages of underexpanded planar jets are as follows: (i) when compared to axisymmetric jets (because of this comparison we will be using the hydraulic diameter, which is equal to twice the slot width, to characterize planar jets), planar jets are superior at providing and sustaining wall jet velocity, thus they produce higher wall shear stress further from impingement, and (ii) planar jets cover a larger area for cooling application, particle sampling, and surface cleaning. Isentropic nozzle relations allow for straightforward calculations of fluid properties at the exit of underexpanded jets, which is convenient for use in numerical simulations as boundary or initial conditions and interpretation of experimental studies.

For the characterization of aerodynamic particle resuspension, it is useful to characterize the wall shear stress resulting from jet impingement. Measuring wall shear stress is challenging; for example, Young et al. [8] used oil-film interferometry to measure the shear stress from an impinging supersonic jet. Their
experiment has shown promise, but oil-film interferometry is limited in its precision. Tu & Wood [9] conducted a comprehensive study of wall shear stress developed from subsonic impinging jets using Preston and Stanton tube measurements; however, their results were affected by the measurement apparatus, thus their conclusions cannot be extrapolated for compressible jets. Smedley et al. [10] and Phares et al. [11] investigated the removal of microspheres from impinging jets and used theoretical shear stress profiles, adhesion forces, and particle removal rates to infer the wall shear stress along the plate. Shear stress was found to be directly related to particle forces, but the study did not account for compressibility and turbulent effects and particle adhesion force in the aerodynamic removal scenario requires multiple assumptions related to particle and surface properties. Velocity measurements near the wall can be used to elucidate the values of shear stress. Loureiro demonstrated how Laser Doppler Anemometry (LDA) could be used to measure velocity within 50 micrometers of the wall; however, the boundary layers with the necessary wall shear stress to remove particles in the viscous sublayer may only be 20 micrometers thick [12]. Keedy et al. [13], using Birch’s [14] model for underexpanded jets, also illustrated that organic particles could only be removed with high-pressure, axisymmetric jets at low standoff distances. There is a scarcity of reliable wall shear stress data in the scientific literature, especially for compressible and planar impinging jets, which suggests that numerical and analytical modeling may provide insights into the wall jet behavior.

The planar wall jet has been studied extensively; these studies are based on a flow developing from a point of attachment to a wall, not accounting for impingement, and the flow relation to the momentum source. Thus, it is unclear if the previous results related to wall jet similarity formulations would hold for the impinging jet scenario. The wall jet resulting from axisymmetric impinging jets has been studied experimentally [15, 16]; the analysis shows that the wall jet developed downstream of impingement does demonstrate self-similar behavior. We present a parametric study that characterizes the velocity profile and wall shear stress of the wall jet resulting from impingement of planar underexpanded jets.

FIG. 1. Schematic of an impinging jet and the resulting wall jet. $h$ - standoff height, $d$ - jet hydraulic diameter, $y_{1/2}$ - location of half maximum velocity, $u_m$ - maximum wall jet velocity, and $u_\tau$ - wall jet friction velocity.
A. Wall Jet Theory

For mapping of flow properties near the surface and wall shear stress, it is useful to examine the wall jet portion of the flow from a similarity perspective. Similarity variables are obtained by normalizing by x-dependent variables; \( y_m \) - wall normal location of maximum velocity, \( y_{1/2} \) - wall normal location of half-maximum velocity in the outer layer, \( u_m \) - maximum wall jet velocity, and \( u_\tau \) - wall jet friction velocity. The planar turbulent wall jet has consistently been shown to have incomplete similarity, which is to say that a non-dimensional similarity solution cannot describe the velocity profile of the wall jet without Reynolds number or scale dependence. Thus, one must separate the wall jet into three regions: a self-similar wall layer where viscous forces are dominant, a self-similar outer layer which behaves analogously to a free jet, and an overlap layer with source dependence where the velocity is closest to the maximum. A triple-layered incomplete similarity is achieved by matching the self-similar outer and wall regions with the overlap layer. Source dependence has been studied for true wall jets but is not defined for the wall jets resulting from impinging jets.

The equation of motion for the wall jet is defined as:

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \rho u \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} - \tau \right]
\]

\( u \rightarrow 0 \) as \( y \rightarrow \infty \); \( u = v = 0 \) at \( y = 0 \).

As first proposed by Glauert [17], the equations of motion are assumed to be solved by outer and inner self-similar equations. The outer region becomes:

\[
u = u_m(x)f_i(\eta) \quad \eta = \frac{y}{y_{1/2}(x)}.
\]

George et al. [18] demonstrated that the classical “law of the wall” coordinates for turbulent boundary layers can be used for turbulent wall jets:

\[
u = u_\tau(x)f_i(y^+) \quad y^+ = \frac{y u_\tau(x)}{v}.
\]

Then, the inner and outer regions must be rectified in what has traditionally been called the overlap region. George et al. [18] concluded that the overlap velocity profile could be accurately described in both inner and outer similarity coordinates, but Gertsen [19] demonstrated that the velocity in this overlap region can be more accurately described in the form of a defect law:

\[
u = u_m(x) - u_\tau(x)f'(\eta_m) \quad \eta_m = \frac{y}{y_m(x)}.
\]

The solutions to these similarity equations have been determined separately by George [18] and Gertsen [19]. In this work, we examine the x-dependent variables, which can be used to describe the rest of the flow field when determined. Thus, we are interested in developing relations for \( y_{1/2}, y_m, u_m, \) and \( u_\tau \). For each of these variables, we will assume a power law relation in \( x \) [20] with source dependent coefficients:

\[
y_{1/2} \sim \beta_1 x^{\alpha_1}, \quad y_m \sim \beta_2 x^{\alpha_2}, \quad u_m \sim y_{1/2}^{\alpha_3}, \quad u_\tau \sim \beta_4 x^{\alpha_4}.
\]

To determine the power law exponents, one must determine proper scaling through dimensional analysis. In the description of the planar impinging jet, we consider seven parameters: \( x \sim L \), the streamwise distance from the impingement point; \( y \sim L \), the distance from the impingement surface; \( h \sim L \), the standoff height of
the jet; \(d \sim L\), the jet hydraulic diameter; \(\rho \sim M L^{-3}\), the fluid density; \(\nu \sim L^2 T^{-1}\), the kinematic viscosity; and \(U_0 \sim L^3 T^{-1}\), the velocity at the jet exit. \(L, M, T\) and \(\nu\) are the units of length, mass, and time, respectively. Using these variables for dimensional analysis yields the following non-dimensional groups:

\[
\Pi_1 = \frac{h}{d}, \Pi_2 = \frac{x}{h}, \Pi_3 = \frac{y}{h}, \Pi_4 = \frac{U_0 d}{v}.
\]

Narashima et al. [21] demonstrated that scaling \(x\) and \(y\) by the momentum flux of the source is effective when writing power laws for the velocity in wall jets, while George et al. [18] defines the momentum flux as \(M_0 = U_0^2 d/2\). For underexpanded jets one must consider the changes in density by defining the momentum flux as \(J = \rho_0 U_0^2 d/2\). This normalization yields the following non-dimensional versions of \(x, y, u_T\), and \(u_m\):

\[
X = \frac{J x}{\rho_\infty u_\infty}, \quad Y_{1/2} = \frac{J y_{1/2}}{\rho_\infty u_\infty}, \quad Y_m = \frac{J y_m}{\rho_\infty u_\infty}, \quad U_T = \frac{u_T u_\infty}{J}, \quad U_m = \frac{u_m u_\infty}{J}.
\]

It is important to note that this procedure does not account for all of the source dependence. To account for the incomplete self-similarity of wall jets, one must consider a Reynolds number associated with the jet width. To capture the physics of underexpanded jets, the nozzle pressure ratio (NPR) and standoff height to jet hydraulic diameter ratio considered:

\[
Re_n = \frac{U_0 d}{\nu_\infty}, \quad \text{NPR} = \frac{P_0}{P_\infty}.
\]

Wygnanski et al. [22] established that \(Y_{1/2}, Y_m, U_T\), and \(U_m\) can be expressed as power laws of the form:

\[
Y_{1/2} = \beta_1 X^{\alpha_1}, \quad Y_m = \beta_2 X^{\alpha_2}, \quad U_m = \beta_3 Y_{1/2}^{\alpha_3}, \quad U_T = \beta_4 X^{\alpha_4}.
\]

If the exponents and source dependent coefficients of the expressions above can be determined, the entire wall jet flow-field resulting from underexpanded jet impingement as a function of the nozzle Reynolds number, height to jet width ratio, and NPR can be defined.

**B. Compressibility in the Wall Jet Region**

While underexpanded impinging jets provide high wall shear stress, which is desirable for aerodynamic particle resuspension, flow in the wall jet region is compressible and has the potential to introduce complications in similarity formulations. The effects of density fluctuations on turbulence have been shown by Morkovin [23] to be negligible for compressible jets for \(Ma < 1.5\). The range of cases in this work is limited to subsonic wall jets (\(Ma < 0.8\)), so the turbulent properties are not likely to be affected by compressibility. However, mean density effects may still be important. Ahlman et al. [24] found, through a direct numerical simulation (DNS) study, that mean density effects were only significant in the wall normal direction by comparing Reynolds and Favre averaged velocity profiles for the outer layer and comparing traditional wall coordinates with semi-local [25] and Van Driest [26] scaling. When examining velocity profiles, it was also found that mean density effects were minimal. Plotting profiles in Van Driest and semi-local scaling did not yield a noticeable improvement in similarity analysis, as shown in SI. For this reason, the effects of compressibility on wall jet similarity are not considered for the range of Mach numbers presented in this work. It is likely that this assumption is not valid for transonic and supersonic wall jets.
II. COMPUTATIONAL STUDY

A. Computational Method

In the absence of experimental data or DNS on the wall jet developed from compressible impinging jets available in the literature, steady-state CFD numerical simulations were used to compute the flow properties. While Shukkla et al. [27] found LES and DES to be effective, these methods would be too computationally and time intensive for a broad parametric study as is conducted in this work. Numerical simulations for this work were performed using ANSYS FLUENT 17.2. The pressure-velocity coupled algorithm known as the QUICK (Quadratic Upstream Interpolation for Convective Kinematics) scheme [28] was used to solve the steady-state Favre-Averaged Navier-Stokes equations:

\[
\frac{\partial (\bar{\rho} \bar{u}_i)}{\partial x_i} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial (\bar{\rho} \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j)}{\partial x_i} = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial (\rho u_i'' u_j'')}{\partial x_j}
\]

\[
= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( \bar{u}_i (\tau_{ij} - \rho u_i'' u_j'') - \bar{q} - \rho u_j'' h'' + \tau_{ij} u_i'' - \frac{1}{2} \rho u_j'' u_i'' \right).
\]

While no closure model will perfectly capture all of the flow characteristics of impinging jets, it has been found that the mean flow, which is the main interest of this study, can calculated with high accuracy. Jaramillo et al. [29] demonstrated that \( k - \omega \) models can accurately represented the mean flow field of a planar impinging jet when compared to their DNS. As demonstrated by Alvi et al. [30] and discussed by Fillingham et al. [31], the \( k - \omega \) shear stress transport (SST) turbulence model [32] was found to be optimal for modeling compressible impinging jets while resolving the boundary layer. Shukkla et al. [33] also found \( k - \omega \) SST to be superior to other closure models when considering planar impinging jets. The SST model uses \( k - \epsilon \) away from the wall in the free stream and free jet portions of the flow while using \( k - \omega \) near the wall where it is more accurate.

Figure 2 shows the computational domain. The inlet boundary condition is defined as the exit of an isentropic nozzle where the flow is choked; thus, the boundary is defined by a total pressure and a static pressure where the total pressure is necessarily (for an ideal diatomic gas) 1.893 times the static pressure. The walls are modeled as isothermal, no-slip boundaries. The outlets are defined as atmospheric pressure outlets. The outlets are located at 50 jet hydraulic diameters (100 jet slot widths) from the jet axis. This corresponds to a minimum of 1.5 times the impingement height.
The mesh contains ~600,000 quadrilateral elements. The mesh is structured throughout the domain and highly resolved in the impinging jet and wall jet regions. At the impingement surface, the first node is at a constant distance from the wall and is placed within a $y^+$ value of 1 at the maximum shear stress location, ensuring that the viscous sublayer is resolved for the entirety of the domain. The x-direction spacing is set to avoid any elements with an aspect ratio above 50:1 in the boundary layer. A mesh independence study was performed by doubling the number of elements, demonstrating that further mesh refinement did not affect the results (see SI for comparison.). Table I shows the matrix of conditions for which computations were conducted. The range of conditions is chosen based on the wall shear stress required for microparticle resuspension [12, 13]. All cases result in subsonic wall jet. For a supersonic wall jet, a separate characterization is necessary.

### TABLE I. Summary of CFD Cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h/d$</th>
<th>$d$ (mm)</th>
<th>NPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15, 17.5, 25, 30</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>1.2, 1.6, 2.0, 2.4, 2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Evaluation of the CFD Approach

To evaluate the 2D assumption, a 3D simulation of the jet with an aspect ratio of 30 to 1 was performed. The same numerical scheme and turbulence model was used. The 3D domain includes ~12 million elements with the first node in the wall-normal direction at $y^+ = 1$. FIG. 3 shows that the centerline profile of wall shear stress from the 3D simulation alligns well with the 2D simulations.

![FIG. 3. Comparison of wall shear stress as a function of distance from impingement location for 2D and 3D simulations: $h = 30$ mm, $d = 1$ mm, and $NPR = 2.0$ from the 2D simulation and centerline profile from the 3D simulation.](image)

When using a turbulence closure model is important to validate any CFD against experimental or DNS results. As no reliable experimental or DNS data on compressible planar impinging jets exists for direct comparison, in order to validate this method we have taken a multi-step approach. First, the modeling
approach has been previously used to study axisymmetric impinging jets. In this study we have shown excellent agreement of the shape and number of shock structures of the impinging jet from the CFD with experimental observations using Schlieren photography [31]. This provides confidence in the accuracy of the supersonic portion of the impinging jet. Second we extend the numerical method evaluation by experimentally determining the normal pressure on the impingement surface using pressure sensitive paint (PSP). PSP utilizes the emission spectra of a luminophore by relating the emission intensity at specific wavelengths to the partial pressure of oxygen at the surface. Images were taken at wind-on and wind-off conditions, and the intensity ratio of the images relate to pressure. Binary FIB PSP and a PSP-CCD camera from Innovative Scientific Solutions Incorporated (ISSI) (Dayton, OH, USA) were used. The calibration curve measurements for the PSP were provided by ISSI as well. For more information on this experimental setup see SI. Evaluation of the numerical model was performed using oblique planar jet impingement against the PSP measurements. Oblique impingement results in an uphill shift in the impingement point from the geometric center [34]. Figure 4 shows the CFD pressure profiles overlayed on the PSP measurements. The CFD simulations show agreement in shape and magnitude with PSP measurements of the pressure profile, allowing for confidence in the accuracy of the CFD in the impingement region.

![Normal Pressure Profiles](image.png)

**FIG. 4.** Normal pressure profiles from CFD (red) and pressure sensitive paint (blue) experiments for h = 30 mm, d = 1 mm, NPR = 1.0 with the impinging angle of 30 degrees (left) and 15 degrees (right).

Comparing the CFD with Schlieren photography and pressure sensitive paint measurements allows for confidence in the model in the impingement region of the flow field but does not prove accuracy in the wall jet region. In order to address this the model was used to replicate DNS of a planar impinging jet conducted by Jaramillo et al. This work only provides a wall jet velocity profile up to a downstream location of 8 jet widths, however, so the DNS of a classical wall jet conducted by Naqavi et al. [35] was replicated using the model for this work to ensure the wall jet development was modeled accurately. Figure 5 plots the velocity profile from Jaramillo et al. [29] as well as the development of the wall jet thickness, \(y_{1/2}\), the maximum velocity, \(U_m\), and the wall shear stress, \(\tau\) from Naqavi et al. [35] As shown in Figure 5 the 2D, \(k - \omega\) SST model used in this work accurately replicated the flow field showing excellent agreement for both replications. The combination of these validation studies and the validation using pressure sensitive paint and Schlieren photography allows for confidence in the ability for the CFD model used in this work to accurately capture the nature of a turbulent planar wall jet.
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Wall Jet Velocity Profiles

Velocity profiles from the numerical simulations are examined to determine the self-similarity of the wall jet region. Traditionally, the planar wall jet has been considered self-similar in coordinates
presented in Eq. 2. Wygnanski [22] observed that normalization by \( y_{1/2} \) and \( u_m \) appears to yield similarity for the entire velocity profile; however, it was later demonstrated [18] that normalization by \( y_{1/2} \) and \( u_m \) only yields similarity in the outer region \( (y > y_{1/2}) \) of the jet. The velocity profile for the outer region is identical to that of a free jet and thus can be described by:

\[
f'_o = 1 - (\tanh k \eta)^2
\]

\[
k = \text{atanh} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

Figure 6 illustrates the self-similarity in the outer region for three different geometries and NPRs, comparing the CFD simulations to the analytical solution in Eq. 12. The self-similarity develops downstream of the impingement point for \( x/h > 0.2 \).

To examine similarity in the overlap layer, the coordinates described by Eq. 4 are used in a defect relation given by Eq. 13. Gertsen [19] developed an analytical expression for the velocity profile:

\[
f' = \frac{1}{0.41} \left( -\ln \eta_m - \frac{5}{6} + \frac{3}{2} \eta_m^2 - \frac{2}{3} \eta_m^3 \right).
\]

In Figure 7, velocity profiles are plotted in defect coordinates for two geometries and two NPRs alongside Eq. 13. The overlap layer similarity takes longer to develop \( (x/h > 0.4) \) than the inner and outer layers.
FIG. 7. Velocity profiles plotted in defect coordinates for four different cases against the theoretical profile (Eq.13). Profiles demonstrate similarity independent of the geometry and nozzle pressure ratio.

When examining the velocity profile plotted in defect coordinates (FIG. 6), it appears that similarity extends to the wall layer; however, the analytical expression for the velocity profile derived from the equations of motion does not apply for \( y^+ < 30 \). To obtain similarity in the viscous wall layer, the velocity profiles are plotted in the traditional “law of the wall” coordinates. Figure 8 plots the wall layer for the same cases as Figures 6 and 7.

FIG. 8. Velocity profiles plotted in wall coordinates for four different cases against \( y^+ = u^+ \). Profiles demonstrate similarity independent of the geometry and nozzle pressure ratio.
Figures 7 and 8 show that an analytical expression that characterizes the “buffer” region (between the linear and log law portions of the wall layer) of the velocity profiles of the turbulent boundary layers does not exist. Plotting data in the established similarity coordinates shows that impinging jets produce wall jets in the same triple-layer structure demonstrated experimentally [36].

B. Power Laws

After confirming the similarity of the wall jet velocity profile, the similarity variables were analyzed in the form of source-dependent power laws on $x$. While the far field conditions do not affect the shape of the wall jet velocity profile, this is not the case for the $x$-dependence of wall jet variables and thus the exponents of the power laws to characterize these variables. The far field conditions have typically not been considered when analyzing wall jets, but as Gertsen [19] pointed out, his analysis is only valid in the absence of a perpendicular wall coincident with the source of the wall jet, while the analysis of George et al. [18] considers the wall jet to be emerging from a perpendicular wall. The analysis of an impinging jet should behave similarly to that of a wall jet emerging from a wall as there will be no flow across the jet centerline. The current experimental and computational work [37], [38] in the literature for a wall jet emerging from a wall has all been conducted in water tanks, however, meaning that it is more analogous to a confined impinging jet, not an unconfined jet as is presented in this study. This means that there is no available data in the literature for direct comparison of this study.

The characteristic length of wall jet velocity profiles has been debated in the scientific literature [17-19]. Generally, the distance from the wall in the outer region, where the velocity is half of the maximum ($y_{1/2}$), is used as the length scale. Though it was suggested that this choice is arbitrary, the use of $y_{1/2}$ has repeatedly [21, 22, 38] shown to be useful in characterizing the similarity of wall jet velocity profiles. It was also demonstrated that momentum normalized $y_{1/2}$ can be accurately described by a source dependent power law in the $x$-direction with a virtual origin. Figure 9 plots $Y_{1/2}$ against $X$ for all geometries with 1 mm jet hydraulic diameter and all NPRs. Simulations show that a virtual origin is necessary for similarity, which is consistent with the previous reports [18, 22]. While there is not an obvious physical choice for the virtual origin of a traditional wall jet, the standoff height is a logical choice for impinging jets. Here, we define the virtual origin location as $X_0 = -\frac{Jh}{\rho_\infty \mu_\infty}$. 

![Graph](image-url)
FIG. 9. Momentum normalized half velocity wall distance plotted against momentum normalized x-location for all height-to-diameter ratios colored by the nozzle pressure ratio.

Figure 10a demonstrates the effectiveness of using standoff height as a virtual origin. The similarity is nearly obtained, but an adjustment for source dependence based on nozzle pressure ratio improves the fit; \( \beta_1 \sim NPR^{0.15} \) yields a linear relationship as shown in Figure 10b.

![Figure 10a](image1.png)

![Figure 10b](image2.png)

FIG. 10. Momentum normalized \( Y_{1/2} \) plotted against the momentum normalized x-location with virtual origin at the jet nozzle location and analytical solution to Eq. 14: (a) without nozzle pressure source dependence adjustment; (b) with nozzle pressure source dependent adjustment.

George et al. [18] proposed that the dependence of \( y_{1/2} \) on \( x \) is necessarily non-linear but approaches linearity in the limit of Reynolds number approaching infinity; and for the experimental case examined found the exponent to be 0.97. Gertsen [19] suggested that a linear relationship is expected, but this determination is dependent on the absence of a wall perpendicular to the wall jet source. While Naqavi [35] found an exponent of 0.72, this is with a coflow, not a wall, and was fit only up to 40 jet widths and does not consider a virtual origin thus it overweight’s points closer to the jet origin where the flow has not fully developed. In the least squares sense, \( \alpha_1 \) was found to be 0.98 for this work. This leads to a final expression for \( Y_{1/2} \):

\[
Y_{1/2} = \beta_1 (X - X_0)^{0.98}
\]

\[
\beta_1 = 0.083 \cdot NPR^{0.15}.
\]  

In characterizing maximum velocity in the wall jet, a power law based on a local length scale is more accurate than using a power law in \( x \) [18]. Intuitively, \( y_m(x) \) would be used as the length scale for characterizing \( u_m \), but as stated earlier, \( y_{1/2}(x) \) has shown a better correlation; it is also easier to measure, as shown experimentally by Eriksson et al. [38] and with DNS by Naqavi et al. [35]. George et al. [18] proposed that the decay exponent for \( u_m \) as a function of \( y_{1/2} \) is universal for wall jets. Figure 11 plots momentum normalized maximum velocity against \( y_{1/2} \) with and without pressure source adjustment. Our calculations, showing that the NPR is the only source adjustment needed to obtain similarity in the wall jet,
are consistent with the finding that a power law for maximum velocity based on the local length scale is universal.

After adjusting for nozzle pressure ratio, the power law for maximum velocity relation is:

$$U_m = \beta_3 Y_{1/2}^{-0.52}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

$$\beta_3 = 0.0051 \times NPR^{0.15}.$$  

The exponent for the decay of maximum velocity is -0.52, which is only slightly lower than the exponent in [18] of -0.527. The relationship between local length scale and maximum velocity is characteristic of traditional wall jets, and the fact that the relationships developed in this work are consistent with those found in the literature provides evidence that wall jets developed from impinging jets exhibit the same length scale dependence as simple wall jets, regardless of farfield conditions.

To use defect law coordinates, the maximum velocity location, $y_m$ as a function of $x$, must be characterized. Similarity of wall jets generally assumes the ratio, $\gamma = y_m / Y_{1/2}$, to be constant, but this is only strictly true as $x \to \infty$ [18, 19]. For impinging jets near the impingement point, this approach is not valid, thus a separate power law for $y_m$ is required. Figure 12a plots momentum normalized maximum velocity location against momentum normalized $Y_{1/2}$, showing that a virtual origin is not necessary. The source dependence as determined by least squares fitting is plotted in Figure 10b. The final expression for $y_m$ is:

$$Y_m = \beta_2 x^{0.49}$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

$$\beta_2 = 0.00027 \times NPR^{0.33} \times \frac{H}{d}^{0.48} \times Re_n^{0.85}.$$  

The exponent for $y_m$ in this work of 0.49 is lower than reported in the literature. Tang et al. [39] found the exponent to be 0.717 using LDA while Naqavi et al. [35] found the exponent to be 0.743 based
on the DNS calculations. It should be noted, however, that these cases were conducted in a water tank and with coflow in place of a perpendicular wall respectively. These far field conditions drastically alter the entrainment mechanism as flow will be primarily entrained horizontally as opposed to vertically as is the case with an unconfined impinging jet. The hypothesis is that the momentum from vertical entrainment prevents the overlap layer of the wall jet from spreading, thus reducing the growth of the location of the maximum velocity. In order to confirm this assumption, the CFD model was used to calculate the flow field of the wall jet studied by Naqavi et al. [35] with the jet emerging from a wall as opposed to a coflow. This simulation yielded the same power law exponent for maximum velocity location as that of the impinging jet case as shown in SI. Compressibility did not have an appreciable effect on the decay. Fitted cases for $Ma \sim 0.3$ and $Ma \sim 0.8$ had exponents of -0.50 and -0.48, respectively, which is a small difference compared to the exponent found through DNS simulations of a wall jet reported in the literature [35].

**FIG. 12.** Momentum normalized max velocity wall-distance plotted against momentum normalized x-location: (a) without nozzle pressure source dependence adjustment; (b) with nozzle pressure source dependent adjustment and fit (Eq. 16).

Friction laws are generally expressed as a friction coefficient, which is a function of a local Reynolds. When examining the data in this work, the friction coefficient power law works for $x/h > 1.0$. Using downstream data, a friction law has the best fit:

$$c_f = \left( \frac{U_t}{u_m} \right)^2 = 0.0029Re_l^{-0.19}$$ (17)

$$Re_l = \frac{u_m y_1/2}{\nu_{0.5}}$$

This formulation agrees with the existing literature [18, 38, 40]. These friction laws, however, are inconsistent across experimental and DNS data and are highly dependent on the momentum source; thus, for this work, friction velocity was characterized directly similarly to the analysis of maximum wall jet velocity.

Figure 13 demonstrates the effect of the source term adjustment. Momentum normalized friction velocity can be expressed as:
\[ U_\tau = \beta_4 X^{-0.3} \]  
\[ \beta_4 = 0.021 \cdot \frac{h^{22}}{d} \cdot NPR^{-0.07} \cdot Re_n^{-0.5}. \]

Note that it is difficult to obtain physical interpretations from the source dependent exponents, as there are insufficient analytical or experimental investigations into planar impinging jets. Further investigation is needed to interpret the source dependent exponents. To summarize, all regions of the wall jet have been characterized in the form of the power laws.

C. Wall Shear Stress

While compressibility does not have a significant effect on the power laws or similarity, the change in mean density is not negligible. For this reason, the wall shear stress cannot be characterized directly from friction velocity. Here, we formulate a power law for momentum normalized wall shear stress, \( \tau^* \): 
\[ \tau^* = \frac{\tau}{\rho_\infty \left( \frac{\mu_\infty}{\nu} \right)^2}. \]

Figure 14 plots momentum normalized wall shear stress against momentum normalized x with and without source dependence, demonstrating that a power law is appropriate for wall shear stress.
The momentum normalized wall shear stress plotted against momentum normalized x-location: (a) without nozzle pressure source dependence adjustment; (b) with nozzle pressure source dependent adjustment and fit (Eq. 14).

The source dependent power-law developed for momentum normalized wall shear stress is:

\[ \tau^* = \beta_5 X^{-0.61} \]  

\[ \beta_5 = 0.00059 \frac{h^{-0.45}}{d} \times NPR^{-1.18} \times Re_n^{-1.0}. \]

The power law developed in this work suggests a slower decay of wall shear stress than those in the literature for traditional wall jets. Wygnanski et al. [22] found the decay exponent to be \(-1.07\), while Naqavi et al. [35] found an exponent of \(-0.967\) via DNS. As stated earlier, these studies are both conducted without a wall coincident with the wall jet source. For a direct comparison to impinging jets the shear stress data from Tu and Wood [9] for an impinging jet, with height to jet width ratio of 20.6 and Reynolds number of 6300, was fitted with a power law with the exponent found in this work with excellent agreement as shown in Figure 15.
FIG. 15. Wall shear stress profile from Tu and Wood with height to jet width ratio of 20.6 and Reynolds number of 6300 with power law fit. Where $b_p$ is the halfwidth of the normal pressure profile.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have conducted a parametric computational study of planar underexpanded impinging jets and determined wall jet velocity profiles and wall shear stress. The 2D numerical simulations examine underexpanded impinging jets over a range of jet parameters (jet standoff distance, jet hydraulic diameter, and jet nozzle pressure ratio) and establish similarity variables. After showing similarity in the wall jet, power laws for the x-dependent variables were developed. The primary conclusion of this work are as follows:

- The wall jet developed from planar jet impingement does indeed have the same triple-layered structure as the classical wall jets; thus, x-dependent length scales and velocities ($y_{1/2}, y_m, u_\tau$ and $u_m$) were used to analyze wall jet properties.
- Compressibility effects do not significantly affect the similarity analysis; that is, density adjusted similarity coordinates do not yield improvement over traditional coordinates for wall jets with $Ma < 0.8$.
- While the mean density effects are insignificant for power law formulation, the change in mean density is non-negligible.
- Normalization by momentum, as opposed to length scales, was effective in reducing source dependence in the power laws.
- Jet geometry and operating condition parameters (h, d, NPR) have a significant effect on the coefficients of the power laws, while the power law exponents are independent of these parameters.
- The entrainment mechanism has a significant effect on the power law exponents but not the shape of the wall jet velocity profile.
- The wall shear stress developed from planar impinging jets decays more slowly than from simple wall jets.
- The wall jet velocity profile from under expanded impinging jets can be mapped using power laws for $y_{1/2}, y_m, u_\tau$ and $u_m$, with only knowledge of the nozzle parameters.
- A power law was developed for normalized wall shear stress, allowing for the prediction of wall shear stress, within a maximum error of 8%, as a function of only jet hydraulic diameter, standoff height, NPR, and x-coordinate.
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