FEDSM-ICNMM2010-3\$, **

DYNAMICS OF PIPES CONVEYING FLUID WITH NON-UNIFORM TURBULENT AND LAMINAR VELOCITY PROFILES

Aren M. Hellum * Ranjan Mukherjee Department of Mechanical Engineering Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48825 Email: hellumar@msu.edu

Andrew J. Hull Advanced Acoustic Systems Division Autonomous and Defensive Systems Department Naval Undersea Warfare Center Newport, RI 02841 email: andrew.hull@navy.mil

Abstract

Previous analytical work on stability of fluid-conveying pipes assumed a uniform velocity profile for the conveyed fluid. In real fluid flows, the presence of viscosity leads to a sheared region near the wall. Earlier studies correctly note that viscous forces do not affect the dynamics of the system since these forces are balanced by pressure drop in the conveyed fluid. Although viscous shear has not been ignored in these studies, a uniform velocity profile assumes that the sheared region is infinitely thin. Prior analysis was extended to account for a fully developed nonuniform profile such as would be encountered in real fluid flows. A modified, highly tractable equation of motion was derived, which includes a single additional parameter to account for the true momentum of the fluid. This empirical parameter was determined by numerical analysis over the Reynolds number range of interest. The stability of cantilever pipes conveying fluid with two types of non-uniform velocity profile was assessed. In the first case, the profile was a function of Reynolds number and transition to turbulence occurred before the onset of flutter instability. This case had stability properties similar to the uniform velocity case except in specific narrow regions of the parameter space. The second case required that the Reynolds number be such that the flow was always laminar. For this case, lower fluid velocity was required to achieve instability, and the oscillation frequency at instability was considerably lower over much of the parameter space, compared to the uniform case.

1 Introduction

The study of the dynamics of fluid-conveying pipes can be traced to Bourrieres [4], who carried out theoretical and experimental investigations of instability of a cantilevered pipe conveying fluid. The problem was revisited by Ashley and Haviland [1] a decade later, following observations of vibration in the Trans-Arabian pipeline. A large volume of research has been done since then by Paidoussis and co-workers, and his review paper [14] provides an excellent introduction to the topic. A review of the literature of fluid-conveying pipes indicates that all standard formulations of the problem have been investigated. The pinned-pinned boundary condition was studied by Feodoseev [5] and Housner [9] and the cantilever problem was investigated by Bourrieres [4] and Gregory and Paidoussis [6]. Other researchers extended the analysis to include Timoshenko beam models [13], non-linear formulations [2], [8], [10], external flows [7], unsteady flows [12], and many other effects.

The assumption of plug flow is ubiquitous in analytical treatments of the problem. Under this assumption, the velocity profile is uniform across the cross-section of the pipe. This assumption may be justified for a given system with the observation that at high Reynolds number, the velocity profile is nearly uniform over the central region of the cross-section, with only a thin, highly sheared annular region near the pipe wall. The plug flow assumption is less valid at low Reynolds numbers, particularly if the flow is laminar. For a given working fluid and a pipe with given dimensions and material properties, the Reynolds number uniquely

1

^{*}Address all correspondence to this author.

defines a value for the relevant non-dimensional velocity, but this is not true in the general case. In this paper we have generalized the results of previous work to account for non-uniform flow, both in the cases of non-ideal turbulent flow and laminar flow.

This paper is organized as follows. The equation of motion of a pipe conveying fluid with a uniform velocity profile (plug flow) is presented in Section 2 as background material. The derivation of plug flow is extended to a non-uniform velocity profile in Section 3. A triple plug flow model is first studied and then extended to N-plug flow which can be used to model an arbitrary velocity profile for large values of N. The resulting equation for the non-uniform flow differs from the standard equation for uniform flow by a single constant; it is highly tractable, requiring no more effort to solve than the standard equation. This constant, a momentum correction factor¹, is determined in Section 4. The uniform and non-uniform flow equations for a cantilever pipe are solved in Section 4 and the results are compared in Section 5 for both laminar and turbulent flow. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 6.

2 Background - Uniform Velocity Profile

Consider the fluid-conveying pipe in Fig.1 where U denotes the fluid velocity (constant) relative to the pipe. Assuming an Euler-Bernoulli beam model of the pipe, its equation of motion (see (Paidoussis, 1998) for details) can be written as follows

$$EI\frac{\partial^4 y}{\partial x^4} + MU^2\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} + 2MU\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x\partial t} + (M+m)\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} = 0, \quad (1)$$

where E and I are the Young's modulus of elasticity and area moment of inertia of the cross-section of the pipe; and M and m are the fluid mass and pipe mass per unit length. The above equation can be obtained by showing that the rate of change of linear momentum of a fluid element is given by the expression [11]

$$\frac{d\vec{L}}{dt} = M \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right]^2 y dx \hat{j}, \qquad (2)$$

and from the equations of motion of a fluid element and its corresponding pipe element (see Fig.2) in the x and y directions



FIGURE 1. A fluid-conveying pipe and a magnified view of a small length element



FIGURE 2. Free-body diagram of (a) a fluid element and (b) its corresponding pipe element

$$-A\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - qS - F\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = 0, \qquad (3)$$

$$F - A\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(p\frac{\partial y}{\partial x}\right) - qS\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = M\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right]^2 y, \qquad (4)$$

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + qS + F\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} - Q\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} = 0,$$
 (5)

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} - F + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (T \frac{\partial y}{\partial x}) + qS \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = m \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2}.$$
 (6)

In Eqs.(3) through (6), A denotes the cross-sectional area of the pipe, S denotes its internal surface area per unit length, p denotes the fluid pressure, q denotes the shear stress in the fluid, and F denotes the force per unit length normal to the wall. For the pipe element, Q, \mathbb{M} and T denote the traverse shear force, bending moment, and tension, respectively.

3 Non-Uniform Velocity Profile

3.1 Triple plug flow model

The triple plug flow model assumes three concentric volumes of fluid being conveyed through the pipe; the crosssectional area of these volumes are shown in Fig.3. The flow velocity is different for the three volumes but is assumed to be

¹The momentum correction factor has appeared in the fluid mechanics literature earlier [3].

constant within each volume. The triple plug flow is not physically realizable but its analysis provides the framework for investigation of a general velocity profile. Note that the fluid volume at the center (marked 1 in Fig.3) has a single fluid-fluid interface; the volume in the middle (marked 2 in Fig.3) has two fluid-fluid interfaces; and the outermost fluid volume (marked 3 in Fig.3) has one fluid-fluid and one fluid-pipe interface. The analysis for a general velocity profile will require us to introduce more volumes with two fluid-fluid interfaces, similar to volume 2. It is for this reason that three "plugs" are required; using fewer does not give rise to volumes with two fluid-fluid interfaces, and using more creates redundant elements.



FIGURE 3. A cross-sectional view of the three fluid volumes of a triple plug flow.

To extend the analysis of plug flow in section 2 to triple plug flow, we denote the cross-sectional areas of volumes 1, 2, and 3 as A_1 , A_2 and A_3 respectively; their flow velocities as U_1 , U_2 and U_3 respectively; and their mass per unit length as M_1 , M_2 and M_3 respectively. F_{12} , F_{23} and F_{3p} denote the radial force per unit length between fluid volumes 1 and 2, fluid volumes 2 and 3, and fluid volume 3 and the pipe, respectively. The shear force at these interfaces are denoted by q_{12} , q_{23} and q_{3p} respectively, and the surface area per unit length of these interfaces are denoted by S_{12} , S_{23} and S_{3p} respectively. The dynamics of the fluid volumes 1, 2 and 3 can now be replicated from Eqs.(3) and (4), and that of the pipe from Eqs.(5) and (6), as follows

Volume 1:

$$-A_1 \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - q_{12} S_{12} - F_{12} \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = 0,$$
(7)

$$F_{12} - pA_1 \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} - q_{12}S_{12} \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = M_1 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right]^2 y, \quad (8)$$

Volume 2:

$$-A_{2}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - q_{23}S_{23} + q_{12}S_{12} - (F_{23} - F_{12})\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$(F_{23} - F_{12}) - pA_{2}\frac{\partial^{2} y}{\partial x^{2}} - (q_{23}S_{23} - q_{12}S_{12})\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} =$$

$$M_{2}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U_{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right]^{2}y, \quad (10)$$

Volume 3:

$$-A_{3}\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - q_{3p}S_{3p} + q_{23}S_{23} - (F_{3p} - F_{23})\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$F_{3p} - F_{23}) - pA_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} - (q_{3p}s_{3p} - q_{23}s_{23})\frac{\partial}{\partial x} = M_3 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right]^2 y,$$
(12)

Pipe: $\frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + q_{3p}S_{3p} + F_{3p}\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} - Q\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} = 0, \quad (13)$ $\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} - F_{3p} + T\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} + q_{3p}S_{3p}\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = m\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2}. \quad (14)$

The summation of equations in the *x* direction, namely Eqs.(7), (9), (11) and (13), gives

$$-(A_1 + A_2 + A_3)\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} = 0.$$
 (15)

Note that $(A_1+A_2+A_3) = A$, where *A* is the inner cross-sectional area of the pipe. For $A \neq A(x)$, we have from Eq.(15)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}(T - pA) = 0, \tag{16}$$

which is the same as that of plug flow (Paidoussis, 1998). The summation of equations in the *y* direction, namely Eqs.(8), (10), (12) and (14), gives

$$-pA\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} + T\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} = \sum_{n=1}^3 M_n \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U_n \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right]^2 y + m\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2}.$$
(17)

Copyright © 2010 by ASME

Following the derivation of plug flow [11] and substituting (T - pA) = 0 and $Q = -EI(\partial^3 y / \partial x^3)$ into Eq.(17) we get

$$EI\frac{\partial^4 y}{\partial x^4} + \left(\sum_{n=1}^3 M_n U_n^2\right) \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} + 2\left(\sum_{n=1}^3 M_n U_n\right) \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x \partial t} + \left(m + \sum_{n=1}^3 M_n\right) \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} = 0.$$
 (18)

3.2 N-plug flow model

It is simple to envision the analysis of the preceding section with more volumes. The additional volumes, similar to Volume 2 of triple plug flow in that they possess two fluid-fluid interfaces, do not complicate the analysis since all interfacial terms are cancelled. Thus Eq.(18) can be rewritten as

$$EI\frac{\partial^4 y}{\partial x^4} + \left(\sum_{n=1}^N M_n U_n^2\right) \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} + 2\left(\sum_{n=1}^N M_n U_n\right) \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x \partial t} + \left(m + \sum_{n=1}^N M_n\right) \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} = 0,$$
(19)

where N is any integer greater than three. For very large values of N, the volumes have infinitesimal thickness and the summations in the coefficients of Eq.(19) can be replaced with integrals. If we define the average velocity of fluid as

$$\bar{U} = \frac{1}{A} \iint_{A} U(A) \, dA,\tag{20}$$

for a cylindrical pipe of radius R, we have

$$\bar{U} = \frac{2}{R^2} \int_0^R U(r) r dr.$$
(21)

The coefficients of the dynamical equation in Eq.(19) can now be expressed as

$$\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} M_n U_n^2\right) = \rho_f \iint_A U^2(A) dA = 2\pi \rho_f \int_0^R U^2(r) r dr = \mu M \bar{U}^2$$
$$2\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} M_n U_n\right) = 2\rho_f \iint_A U(A) dA = 2\rho_f A \bar{U} = 2M \bar{U}, \qquad (22)$$
$$\left(m + \sum_{n=1}^{N} M_n\right) = m + M,$$

where ρ_f is the density of the conveyed fluid, and μ is the nondimensional momentum correction factor. For a cylindrical pipe with a known fluid velocity profile U(r), μ has the expression

$$\mu = \frac{2}{R^2} \int_0^R \left[\frac{U(r)}{\bar{U}} \right]^2 r dr.$$
(23)

It is worth noting that for a uniform velocity profile, $\mu = 1$. Using the algebraic simplifications in Eq.(22), Eq.(19) can be rewritten as follows

$$EI\frac{\partial^4 y}{\partial x^4} + \mu M\bar{U}^2\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} + 2M\bar{U}\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x\partial t} + (m+M)\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} = 0.$$
 (24)

Note the similarity of Eq.(24) with that of plug flow given by Eq.(1). All terms are essentially identical with the exception of the additional constant μ , which is a function of the velocity profile.

4 Analysis of a Cantilever Pipe4.1 Solution of the differential equation

We analyze the behavior of a fluid-conveying pipe for cantilever boundary conditions, namely

$$y(0,t) = 0, \quad y_x(0,t) = 0, \quad y_{xx}(L,t) = 0, \quad y_{xxx}(L,t) = 0,$$
(25)

where y_x , y_{xx} , and y_{xxx} are the first, second, and third partial derivatives of y with respect to x, respectively. The equation of motion is non-dimensionalized with the following change of variables

$$Y = \frac{y}{L}, \qquad X = \frac{x}{L}, \qquad T = t \,\Omega.$$

By introducing the non-dimensional velocity, mass fraction and frequency as follows

$$u = \left(\frac{M}{EI}\right)^{1/2} \overline{U}L, \qquad \beta = \frac{M}{m+M}, \qquad \omega = \left(\frac{M+m}{EI}\right)^{1/2} \Omega L^2,$$

and assuming a separable form for Y(X,T) such that

$$Y(X,T) = \phi(X) e^{-i\omega T}, \qquad (26)$$

it is possible to get the non-dimensional equation of motion and

Copyright © 2010 by ASME

boundary conditions

$$\frac{d^4\phi}{dX^4} + \mu u^2 \frac{d^2\phi}{dX^2} + 2\beta^{1/2} ui\omega \frac{d\phi}{dX} - \omega^2 \phi = 0,$$
(27)

$$\phi(0) = 0,$$
 $\phi_X(0) = 0,$ $\phi_{XX}(1) = 0,$ $\phi_{XXX}(1) = 0,$ (28)

where ϕ_X , ϕ_{XX} , and ϕ_{XXX} are the first, second, and third derivatives of ϕ , respectively. The solution of ϕ is assumed to be of the form $\phi(X) = Ae^{zX}$ and this yields the characteristic polynomial

$$z^{4} + \mu u^{2} z^{2} + 2\beta^{1/2} u i \omega z - \omega^{2} = 0.$$
 (29)

For specific values of μ , u and β , Eq.(29) provides four roots, z_n , n = 1, 2, 3, 4, where $z_n = z_n(\omega)$. The complete solution of $\phi(X)$ has the form

$$\phi(X) = A_1 e^{z_1 X} + A_2 e^{z_2 X} + A_3 e^{z_3 X} + A_4 e^{z_4 X}.$$
 (30)

The solution of Eq.(30) based on the boundary conditions in Eq.(28) yields the complete solution

$$Y(X,T) = \sum_{n=1}^{4} A_n e^{z_n X} e^{i\omega T} = \sum_{n=1}^{4} A_n \underbrace{e^{Re[z_n]X}}_{(i)} \underbrace{e^{i(Im[z_n]X + Re[\omega]T)}}_{(ii)} \underbrace{e^{-Im[\omega]T}}_{(iii)}.$$
 (31)

An inspection of the above equation indicates that Y(X,T) is a product of three exponential terms of which the first term is bounded since X is bounded and the second term is oscillatory since the exponent is imaginary. The third term can grow unbounded with time if $Im[\omega] < 0$ and this represents unstable dynamics of the pipe. The exact mode and velocity at which the fluid-conveying pipe becomes unstable depends on the fluid mass fraction β .

4.2 Determination of momentum correction factor

For laminar flow, the Poiseuille solution of Navier-Stokes equation holds [15] and the value of μ can be analytically determined to be equal to 4/3. For turbulent flow, the value of μ approaches unity as the value of Reynolds number approaches infinity. Numerical values of μ for turbulent flow were calculated based on Eq.(23) using velocity profiles generated by the

commercial software STAR-CCM². The literature [3] commonly cites a single value of μ for turbulent flow; the values cited are derived using assumptions that are better suited to high-Reynolds number turbulence. Since the modeling presented in Section 3.1 relaxes the assumption of high-Reynolds number turbulence, it is necessary to use a flow model with improved resolution near turbulent transition. Even with this improved resolution, knowledge of μ is required for more values of the Reynolds number than are feasible to simulate. To predict the value of μ for laminar, transition, and turbulent flow regimes, we use the following curve-fit:

$$\mu(\text{Re}) = \begin{cases} 4/3 & \text{Re} \le 2200\\ 3.647 - 0.001052 \times \text{Re} \ 2200 < \text{Re} < 2413\\ 1.04 + 167.2/\text{Re} & \text{Re} \ge 2413. \end{cases}$$
(32)



FIGURE 4. Plot of the momentum correction factor μ as a function of the Reynolds number. The data points obtained through simulation are shown by circles.

It can be seen from Fig.4 that the data points obtained from simulation matches well with the expression of μ in Eq.(32). The choice of 2200 < Re < 2413 to define the "transition region" is somewhat arbitrary, as might be the choice of using one single value for μ to represent a phenomenon as complex as turbulent transition. However, the authors note that for a given flow setup the range of velocities corresponding to transition flow is small, making the choice of the transition model relatively unimportant³.

From the expressions for the non-dimensional velocity and

²a product of CD-Adapco

 $^{^{3}\}mathrm{The}$ laminar to turbulent transition region can be seen in the Argand diagram in Fig.5.



FIGURE 5. (a) Locus of the first three roots of $\text{Det}(\mathbf{Z}) = 0$ for uniform (dashed line) and non-uniform (solid line) flow models with $\beta = 0.3$ (b) A magnified image of the second root loci in (a).

the Reynolds number, we get for a circular pipe

$$u = \left(\frac{M}{EI}\right)^{1/2} \bar{U}L, \quad \operatorname{Re} = \frac{\bar{U}D}{v} \quad \Rightarrow \quad u = vL\operatorname{Re}\sqrt{\frac{\pi\rho_f}{4EI}}.$$
(33)

Clearly, a value of u does not uniquely determine the Reynolds number. The geometric properties of the pipe (L, E, I) and density and kinematic viscosity of the working fluid (ρ_f, v) should be specified to determine the Reynolds number for a given u. Since the momentum correction factor μ is a function of the Reynolds number, it follows that the value of μ cannot be determined from the value of u alone.

5 Uniform and Non-Uniform Flow Model Comparison 5.1 Turbulent flow

The locus of the first three roots of $\text{Det}(\mathbf{Z}) = 0$ is shown in the Argand diagram in Fig.5(a) for $\beta = 0.308$ for both uniform and non-uniform flow models. Since the fluid-conveying pipe undergoes flutter instability in the second mode, a separate Argand diagram of the loci of the second root is shown in Fig.5(b). The root loci for the uniform flow model are a function of *u* alone (μ is implicitly assumed to be unity) but they are a function of both *u* and μ for the non-uniform flow model. As noted in Section 4.2, the value of μ is not uniquely defined in terms of *u*. Certain dimensional coefficients related to the working fluid and pipe geometry must be assumed to obtain this relationship. The non-uniform flow model assumes water to be the working fluid ($\rho_f = 1000 \text{ kg/m}^3$, $\nu = 1.0 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 s$) and the following parameters for the pipe:

$$E = 1.7 MPa, \quad I = 6.48 \times 10^{-10} m^4, \quad L = 0.5 m.$$
 (34)

It is acknowledged that the need to specify dimensional parameters is a limitation but this limitation is not significant. An inspection of Fig.4 reveals that μ is weakly related to the Reynolds number for turbulent flow and therefore dependence of μ on the dimensional parameters is not significant.

It can be seen from Fig.5 that the root loci for the uniform and non-uniform flow models are quite different though their μ values are quite similar⁴. A close look at the second root loci indicates that the uniform flow model predicts flutter instability of the pipe to occur for a critical velocity of $u_{cr} = 8.13$ with $\omega_{cr} =$ 23.06 whereas the non-uniform flow model predicts significantly lower values of $u_{cr} = 6.94$ (15% lower) and $\omega_{cr} = 14.46$ (37% lower). Clearly, the dynamics of the system are very sensitive to the value of μ in the neighborhood of $\beta = 0.3$. The values of u_{cr} and ω_{cr} are plotted in Fig.6 for different values of β . This figure indicates that the non-uniform flow model predicts significantly lower values of u_{cr} and ω_{cr} for β in the neighborhood of 0.7 as well. There is good agreement between the uniform and nonuniform turbulent flow models for values of β that are not in the neighborhood of 0.3 or 0.7.



FIGURE 6. Plot of (a) u_{cr} and (b) ω_{cr} for uniform (dashed line) and non-uniform (solid line) turbulent flow for different values of β .

5.2 Laminar flow

In prior work, the plug flow model implicitly made the assumption that $\mu = 1$. It is clear from Fig.4 that this assumption is reasonable only for high Reynolds number. The non-unique relationship between *u* and Re allows situations where this assumption is not reasonable. For example, inspection of Eq.(33) reveals that a sufficiently long pipe could have a large value for *u* at low Reynolds number. A sufficiently long fluid-conveying pipe could therefore undergo flutter instability with laminar flow,

⁴The value of μ is implicitly assumed to be unity for the uniform flow model whereas it has values in the neighborhood of 1.05 for the non-uniform flow model.

in which case $\mu = 4/3$. In the case of turbulent flow, the nearunity value of μ yields values of $u_{\rm cr}$ and $\omega_{\rm cr}$ which differ significantly from the uniform case only in certain thin regions of the β parameter space. Figure 7 is analogous to Fig.6, but assumes laminar flow and gives a very different result. The values of $u_{\rm cr}$ for laminar flow are quite different from that of uniform flow in all regions of the parameter space. The values of $\omega_{\rm cr}$ for laminar flow are similar to that of uniform flow over much of the range of β but there are certain regions where the predicted values are significantly different. Unlike the thin regions near $\beta = 0.3$ and $\beta = 0.7$ for turbulent flow (see Fig.6), the regions of large separation for laminar flow extend from approximately $\beta = 0.29$ to $\beta = 0.40$ and from $\beta = 0.69$ to $\beta = 0.93$.



FIGURE 7. Plot of (a) u_{cr} and (b) ω_{cr} for uniform (thin line) and laminar (thick line) flow for different values of β .

6 Concluding Remarks

The stability of cantilever pipes conveying fluid with a fully developed non-uniform velocity profile was assessed. The relevant equation of motion, derived herein, is tractable, requiring only the use of a single empirical parameter, μ , which accounts for the dependance of fluid momentum on the square of the fluid velocity. A sample method for the determination of μ is described. In previous analyses, which assumed a uniform velocity profile, this parameter was implicitly assumed to be unity. While this is a reasonable approximation at high Reynolds number, $\mu = 1$ is the minimum value possible, which is approached only in the limit of infinite Reynolds number. That is, the average momentum flux per unit mass for real fluid flows will always be greater than the uniform case, and the uniform profile assumption becomes monotonically less accurate as the Reynolds number decreases. This is particularly true in the case of laminar flow, where the value of μ reaches its maximum value. It was shown that the dependence of u, the non-dimensional velocity relevant to the stability of the pipe, is not uniquely dependent on the Reynolds number. Thus, a large value of *u* may be attained at a relatively low Reynolds number.

The stability characteristics of a sample pipe were assessed with our updated model. In this pipe, the fluid became turbulent at relatively low u with the effect that $\mu \approx 1.05$ when uapproached values necessary to achieve flutter instability. This proximity to the uniform model causes similarity between the predictions over much of the parameter space. However, there are significant differences in certain sensitive regions of the parameter space. A pipe with dimensions such that the conveyed fluid is laminar at the onset of flutter instability exhibited markedly different stability characteristics from the uniform case. Both the critical velocity and critical frequency were significantly different over large regions of the parameter space.

The authors believe that this updated model is a worthy addition to the body of literature on fluid-conveying pipes if for no reason other than its tractability. The equations of motion are no more difficult to solve than those of the uniform case for a known value of μ . While the accurate assessment of μ is nontrivial, it can be evaluated a priori for the entire range of flow velocities. Finally, the similarity of this model to the uniform flow model allows prior work to be updated easily. The predictions of instability of pinned-pinned and clamped-clamped pipes, and pipes with coaxially flowing external fluid may also be corrected with our model.

Acknowledgement

The support provided by the Office of Naval Research, ONR Grant Number N00014-08-1-0460, is gratefully acknowledged.

Note

This paper has been accepted in its current form for publication in the Journal of Fluids & Structures.

REFERENCES

- H. Ashley and G. Haviland. Bending vibrations of a pipeline containing fluid. *Journal of Applied Mechanics*, 17:229–232, 1950.
- [2] A.K. Bajaj, P.R. Sethna, and T.S. Lundgren. Hopf bifurcation phenomena in tubes carrying fluid. *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 39:213–230, 1980.
- [3] R. Benedict. *Fundamentals of Pipe Flow*. John Wiley and Sons, 1980.
- [4] F.-J. Bourrieres. Sur en phenomene d'oscillation auto entrenue en mecanique des fluides reels. *Publications Scientifiques et Techniques du Ministere de l'Air*, 147, 1939.
- [5] V.P. Feodoseev. Vibrations and stability of a pipe when liquid flows through it. *Inzhenernyi Sbornik*, 10:169–170, 1951.

- [6] R.W. Gregory and M.P. Paidoussis. Unstable oscillation of tubular cantilevers conveying fluid. i. theory. *Proceedings* of the Royal Society (London), 293:512–527, 1966.
- [7] M.J. Hannoyer and M.P. Paidoussis. Instabilities of tubular beams simultaneously subjected to internal and external axial flows. ASME Journal of Mechanical Design, 100:328– 336, 1978.
- [8] P.J. Holmes. Pipes supported at both ends cannot flutter. *Journal of Applied Mechanics*, 45:619–622, 1978.
- [9] G.W. Housner. Bending vibrations of a pipe line containing flowing fluid. *Journal of Applied Mechanics*, 19:205–208, 1952.
- [10] T.S. Lundgren, P.R. Sethna, and A.K. Bajaj. Stability boundaries for flow induced motions of tubes with an inclined terminal nozzle. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 64:553–571, 1979.
- [11] M.P. Paidoussis. Fluid-Structure Interactions: Slender Structures and Axial Flow, Volume 1. Academic Press, 1998.
- [12] M.P. Paidoussis and N.T Issid. Dynamic stability of pipes conveying fluid. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 33:267– 294, 1974.
- [13] M.P. Paidoussis and B.E. Laithier. Dynamics of timoshenko beams conveying fluid. *Journal of Mechanical Engineering Science*, 18:210–220, 1976.
- [14] M.P. Paidoussis and G.X. Li. Pipes conveying fluid: A model dynamical problem. *Journal of Fluids and Structures*, 7:137–204, 1993.
- [15] M. Potter and J. F. Foss. *Fluid Mechanics*. Great Lakes Press, 1982.