

## The Neumann-Kelvin and Neumann-Michell linear flow models

Chi Yang<sup>1,2</sup> (cyang@gmu.edu), Francis Noblesse<sup>3</sup> (francis.noblesse@navy.mil)

<sup>1</sup> School of Computational Sciences, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030, U.S.A.

<sup>2</sup> Cheung Kong Scholar, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China

<sup>3</sup> NSWCCD, 9500 MacArthur Blvd, West Bethesda, MD 20817, U.S.A.

Steady free-surface potential flow about a ship that advances, with constant speed  $U$ , in a large body of calm water of effectively infinite depth is considered. An alternative linear model, called Neumann-Michel model, to the classical Neumann-Kelvin model, is defined. The Neumann-Michel linear model accounts for dominant nonlinear free-surface effects.

### Generic potential-flow representations

Nondimensional coordinates, flow velocity, and velocity potential are defined in terms of a reference length  $L$ , velocity  $U$ , and potential  $UL$ . Hereafter,  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})$  stands for a point inside a 3D flow region, and  $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, z)$  represents a point of the boundary surface  $\Sigma$  of the flow region. The flow-field point  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  and the boundary point  $\mathbf{x}$  are associated with a Green function  $G(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}; \mathbf{x})$  used to formulate boundary-integral flow representations. The flow potential at a flow-field point  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  or a boundary point  $\mathbf{x}$  is identified as  $\tilde{\phi}$  or  $\phi$ , respectively. Furthermore,  $d\mathcal{A}$  stands for the differential element of area at a point  $\mathbf{x}$  of the boundary surface  $\Sigma$ ,  $\mathbf{n}$  is a unit vector that points inside the flow region and is normal to  $\Sigma$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $\nabla = (\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z)$ .

The potential  $\tilde{\phi} = \phi(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$  at a field point  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  within a 3D flow region bounded by a closed boundary surface  $\Sigma$  is defined in terms of the boundary values of the potential  $\phi$  and its normal derivative  $\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi$  by the classical Green boundary-integral representation

$$\tilde{\phi} = \int_{\Sigma} d\mathcal{A} (G \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi - \phi \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla G) \quad (1)$$

The representation (1) defines the potential  $\tilde{\phi}$  in terms of boundary distributions of sources (with strength  $\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi$ ) and normal dipoles (strength  $\phi$ ), and involves a Green function  $G$  and the first derivatives of  $G$ . The boundary-integral representation (1) holds for a field point  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  inside the flow region, strictly outside  $\Sigma$ . This restriction stems from the well-known property that the potential defined by the dipole distribution in (1) is not continuous at  $\Sigma$ . Indeed,  $\tilde{\phi}$  on the left of (1) becomes  $\tilde{\phi}/2$  at a point  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  of the boundary surface  $\Sigma$  (if  $\Sigma$  is smooth at  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ ). The boundary-surface integral on the right of (1) is null for a point  $\tilde{\phi}$  located outside the flow region bounded by  $\Sigma$ .

An alternative to Green's classical potential representation (1), obtained in *Noblesse and Yang (2004)* via an integration by parts of the dipole distribution in (1), is

$$\tilde{\phi} = \int_{\Sigma} d\mathcal{A} [G \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi + \mathbf{G} \cdot (\mathbf{n} \times \nabla \phi)] \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{G}$  stands for a vector Green function associated with the scalar Green function  $G$  via the relation

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{G} = \nabla G \quad (3)$$

This relation implies that  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $G$  are comparable, i.e. that the behaviors of  $G$  and  $\mathbf{G}$  are comparable in both the nearfield and the farfield. In particular,  $\mathbf{G}$  is no more singular than  $G$  in the nearfield. Thus, the potential representation (2), which involves a Green function  $G$  and a related vector Green function  $\mathbf{G}$  that is comparable to (in particular, is no more singular than)  $G$  as already noted, is weakly singular in comparison to the classical representation (1), which involves  $\nabla G$ . The potential  $\tilde{\phi}$  defined by the weakly-singular representation (2) is continuous at the boundary surface  $\Sigma$ , whereas (1) does not define a potential  $\tilde{\phi}$  that is continuous at  $\Sigma$ . The relation (3) does not define a unique vector Green function  $\mathbf{G}$ . Indeed, if  $\mathbf{G}$  satisfies (3),  $\mathbf{G} + \nabla H$  also satisfies (3) for an arbitrary scalar function  $H$ . Nevertheless, the potential representation (2) defines a unique potential  $\tilde{\phi}$ ; see *Noblesse and Yang (2004)*. The vector Green function

$$\mathbf{G} = (G_y^z, -G_x^z, 0) \quad (4)$$

is used here. In (4), a subscript or superscript attached to  $G$  means differentiation or integration.

The potential representation

$$\tilde{\phi} = \int_{\Sigma} dA \{ G \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi + P \mathbf{G} \cdot (\mathbf{n} \times \nabla \phi) - \phi \mathbf{n} \cdot [(1-P) \nabla G + \mathbf{G} \times \nabla P] \} \quad (5)$$

where  $P = P(\mathbf{x}; \tilde{\mathbf{x}})$  stands for a function of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ , is a composite of the classical Green representation (1) and the related weakly-singular representation (2), which correspond to the special cases  $P = 0$  and  $P = 1$ , respectively, and thus can be regarded as special cases of the more general family of potential representations (5). For a weight function  $P$  chosen so that  $P \rightarrow 1$  fast enough in the nearfield, the integrands of the boundary-surface integrals in the potential representations (5) and (2) are asymptotically equivalent in the nearfield, and the potential  $\tilde{\phi}$  defined by these weakly-singular representations is continuous at  $\Sigma$ . Similarly, the integrands of the boundary-surface integrals in the representations (5) and (1) are asymptotically equivalent in the farfield if  $P \rightarrow 0$  sufficiently rapidly in the farfield.

### Application to steady linear potential flow about a ship

The generic potential-flow representation (5) is now applied to steady flow about a ship that advances at constant speed  $\mathcal{U}$  in calm water. The  $z$  axis is vertical and points upward, and the mean free surface is taken as the plane  $z = 0$ . The  $x$  axis is chosen along the path of the ship and points toward the ship bow. The reference length  $L$  and velocity  $U$  used to nondimensionalize coordinates and the velocity potential may be chosen as the ship length and  $U = \sqrt{gL}$ , where  $g$  is the acceleration of gravity. An alternative reference velocity is  $U = \mathcal{U}$ . The closed boundary surface  $\Sigma$  in the boundary-integral representation (5) consists of

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_B \cup \Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_{\infty} \quad (6)$$

where  $\Sigma_B$  stands for the mean wetted hull-surface of the ship or (more generally) a control surface that encloses the ship hull,  $\Sigma_0$  is the portion of the mean free-surface plane  $z = 0$  located outside the ‘‘body’’ surface  $\Sigma_B$ , and  $\Sigma_{\infty}$  is a farfield surface (e.g. the lower half of a sphere) that closes the flow domain. As already noted, the unit vector  $\mathbf{n} = (n^x, n^y, n^z)$  normal to the boundary surface  $\Sigma$  points into the flow domain. Thus,  $\mathbf{n} = (0, 0, -1)$  at the free surface  $\Sigma_0$ .

The Green function  $G$  is presumed to vanish sufficiently rapidly in the farfield to nullify the contribution of the farfield boundary surface  $\Sigma_{\infty}$ , which may be taken as a half sphere of radius  $a$ , as  $a \rightarrow \infty$ . The flow representation (5), with the boundary surface (6), then yields

$$\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{\phi}_B + \tilde{\phi}_0 \quad (7)$$

where  $\tilde{\phi}_B$  stands for the ‘‘body component’’ given by (5) with  $\Sigma$  taken as the ship-hull surface  $\Sigma_B$ , and the ‘‘free-surface component’’  $\Sigma_0$  is defined by (5) and (4) as

$$\tilde{\phi}_0 = - \int_{\Sigma_0} dx dy [ G \phi_z - (1-P) G_z \phi - G_x^z (P\phi)_x - G_y^z (P\phi)_y ] \quad (8)$$

The free surface  $\Sigma_0$  is unbounded in (8).

Let  $\pi^{\phi}$  and  $\pi^G$  stand for the functions

$$\pi^{\phi} = \phi_z + F^2 \phi_{xx} \quad \pi^G = G + F^2 G_{xx}^z \quad (9a)$$

where  $F = \mathcal{U}/\sqrt{gL}$  is the Froude number. The integrand of the free-surface integral (8) can be expressed as  $G \pi^{\phi} - A_0 + F^2 a_0$  where  $A_0$  and  $a_0$  are defined as

$$A_0 = (1-P) \pi_z^G \phi + (\pi_x^G)^z (P\phi)_x + (\pi_y^G)^z (P\phi)_y \quad (9b)$$

$$a_0 = [(1-P) G_x \phi - G \phi_x]_x + [G_{xy}^{zz} (P\phi)_y]_x - [G_{xy}^{zz} (P\phi)_x]_y$$

Here, the relation  $\nabla^2 G^{zz} = 0$  was used.

Stokes’ theorem then shows that (8) can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\phi}_0 = - \int_{\Sigma_0} dx dy (G \pi^{\phi} - A_0) - F^2 \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} [ t^y (1-P) G_x \phi + G_{xy}^{zz} \mathbf{t} \cdot \nabla (P\phi) - t^y G \phi_x ]$$

Here,  $\Gamma$  stands for the intersection curve between the body surface  $\Sigma_B$  and the free surface  $\Sigma_0$  (in the special case when  $\Sigma_B$  is taken as the mean wetted ship-hull surface, rather than a control surface that encloses the ship hull,  $\Gamma$  is the mean ship waterline),  $d\mathcal{L}$  is the differential element of arc length of  $\Gamma$ , and  $\mathbf{t} = (t^x, t^y, 0)$  is a unit vector tangent to  $\Gamma$  (oriented clockwise; looking down). Substitution of the foregoing expression for  $\tilde{\phi}_0$  into (7), with (5), then yields the boundary-integral representation

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\phi} = & \int_{\Sigma_B} dA \{ G \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi + P \mathbf{G} \cdot (\mathbf{n} \times \nabla \phi) - \phi \mathbf{n} \cdot [(1-P) \nabla G + \mathbf{G} \times \nabla P] \} \\ & - F^2 \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} [t^y (1-P) G_x \phi + G_{xy}^{zz} \mathbf{t} \cdot \nabla (P \phi) - \nu t^y G \phi_x] + \int_{\Sigma_0} dx dy (A_0 - G \pi^\phi)\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

where  $\pi^\phi$  and  $A_0$  are given by (9), and  $\nu = 1$ . The factor  $\nu$  is introduced here for later use.

The velocity component  $\phi_x$  in the line integral around  $\Gamma$  in (10) may be expressed in terms of the components of  $\nabla \phi$  along the three orthogonal unit vectors  $\mathbf{n}$ ,  $\mathbf{t}$  and  $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{t}$  as

$$\phi_x = n^x \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi + t^x \mathbf{t} \cdot \nabla \phi - n^z t^y \mathbf{d} \cdot \nabla \phi = n^x \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi + t^x \phi_t - n^z t^y \phi_d \quad (11)$$

This expression defines  $\phi_x$  in terms of the velocity component  $\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi$  normal to  $\Sigma_B$  and the components  $\phi_t$  and  $\phi_d$  along the unit vectors  $\mathbf{t}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$  tangent to  $\Sigma_B$ . If  $\Sigma_B$  intersects the free surface orthogonally, one has  $n^z = 0$  at  $\Gamma$  and the third component on the right of (11) is null. Substitution of (11) into (10) yields

$$\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{\psi} + \tilde{\chi} \quad \text{with} \quad (12a)$$

$$\tilde{\psi} = \int_{\Sigma_B} dA G \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi + \nu F^2 \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} G t^y n^x \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi \quad (12b)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\chi} = & \int_{\Sigma_B} dA \{ P \mathbf{G} \cdot (\mathbf{n} \times \nabla \phi) - \phi \mathbf{n} \cdot [(1-P) \nabla G + \mathbf{G} \times \nabla P] \} + \int_{\Sigma_0} dx dy (A_0 - G \pi^\phi) \\ & - F^2 \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} [t^y (1-P) G_x \phi + G_{xy}^{zz} (P \phi)_t - \nu t^x t^y G \phi_t + \nu n^z (t^y)^2 G \phi_d]\end{aligned}\quad (12c)$$

The potential  $\tilde{\psi}$  is defined in terms of the velocity component  $\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi$  normal to  $\Sigma_B$ , and  $\tilde{\chi}$  is defined in terms of the potential  $\phi$  at  $\Sigma_B$  and the derivatives  $\mathbf{n} \times \nabla \phi$ ,  $\phi_t$  and  $\phi_d$  of  $\phi$  along directions tangent to  $\Sigma_B$ .

### The Neumann-Kelvin and Neumann-Michell linear models

The typical case of a surface-piercing ship, with the ‘‘body’’ surface  $\Sigma_B$  in the flow representation (12) taken as the ship-hull surface (rather than a control surface that encloses the ship), is now considered. The potential representation (10) can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{\psi}_B + \tilde{\chi}' \quad \text{with} \quad (13a)$$

$$\tilde{\psi}_B = \int_{\Sigma_B} dA G \mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla \phi = \int_{\Sigma_B} dA G n^x \quad (13b)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\chi}' = & \int_{\Sigma_B} dA \{ P \mathbf{G} \cdot (\mathbf{n} \times \nabla \phi) - \phi \mathbf{n} \cdot [(1-P) \nabla G + \mathbf{G} \times \nabla P] \} \\ & - F^2 \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} [t^y (1-P) G_x \phi + G_{xy}^{zz} (P \phi)_t - \nu t^y G \phi_x] + \int_{\Sigma_0} dx dy (A_0 - G \pi^\phi)\end{aligned}\quad (13c)$$

In (13b), the ship-hull boundary condition was used.

The flow representation (13) follows from the generic potential-flow representation (5), applied to steady flow about a ship with the flow region taken as the mean flow region, bounded by the mean free surface and the mean wetted ship-hull surface. The generic potential-flow representation (5) can also be applied to the true flow region, bounded by the deformed free surface and the actual wetted ship-hull surface. In this nonlinear approach, integration over the ship-hull surface  $\Sigma_B$  in (13b) and (13c) must be performed up to the free surface, approximately defined by  $z = F^2 \phi_x$ , instead of the mean free-surface plane  $z = 0$ . Thus, expression (13b) approximately becomes

$$\tilde{\psi}_B \approx \int_{\Sigma_B} dA G n^x + \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} \int_0^{F^2 \phi_x} \frac{dz G n^x}{\sqrt{1 - (n^z)^2}} = \int_{\Sigma_B} dA G n^x - F^2 \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} t^y G \phi_x \quad (14)$$

Here, the relation  $n^x = -t^y \sqrt{1 - (n^z)^2}$  was used. The line integral around the ship waterline  $\Gamma$  in (14) and the term  $\nu t^y G \phi_x$  (with  $\nu = 1$ ) in (13c) cancel out. The correction (14) for nonlinear free-surface effects then yields  $\nu = 0$  in (13c).

The potential  $\tilde{\chi}'$  defined by (13c) yields additional corrections for nonlinear free-surface effects. However, these corrections are  $O(\|\nabla\phi\|^2)$ , whereas the correction (14) to the potential  $\tilde{\psi}$  is  $O(\|\nabla\phi\|)$ , i.e. is in fact linear. This significant difference stems from the Neumann-Kelvin approximation, for which  $n^x$  is not presumed to be small, and the related property (considered below) that the potential  $\tilde{\psi}_B$  dominates the potential  $\tilde{\chi}'$  in (13a). Thus, a simple correction, which accounts for dominant nonlinear free-surface effects, to the potential representations (13) or (12) is obtained by setting  $\nu = 0$  in these representations. The correction (14) provides a modification of the classical Neumann-Kelvin linear model, which corresponds to  $\nu = 1$ , of steady flow about a ship. The linear flow model associated with  $\nu = 0$  in the potential representation (12) is called Neumann-Michell model here.

### Slender-ship approximations

It the boundary condition  $\mathbf{n} \cdot \nabla\phi = n^x$  at the ship hull  $\Sigma_B$  is used in (12b) and the potential  $\tilde{\chi}$  defined by (12c) – which involves the (a priori) unknown potential  $\phi$  and its tangential derivatives – is ignored, expression (12a) yields the approximation  $\tilde{\phi} \approx \tilde{\psi}$  with

$$\tilde{\psi} = \int_{\Sigma_B} dA G n^x + \nu F^2 \int_{\Gamma} d\mathcal{L} G t^y (n^x)^2 \quad (15)$$

This expression, with  $\nu = 1$ , is the slender-ship approximation given in *Noblesse (1983)*. If one sets  $\nu = 0$  in (15), one obtains the potential  $\tilde{\psi}_B$  given by (13b). The slender-ship potential (15), with  $\nu = 1$  or  $\nu = 0$ , has been found to provide useful practical approximations, notably for hull-form optimization; e.g. *Percival et al. (2001)* and *Yang et al. (2002)*. The correction (14) for nonlinear free-surface effects and expression (11) yield the approximation (15) with  $\nu = -1$ . The approximations associated with  $\nu = 0$  or  $\nu = -1$  in (15) correspond to distributions of sources, with strength  $n^x$ , over the ship hull up to the mean free surface  $z = 0$  or the (linear approximation to the) free surface  $z = F^2\phi_x$ , i.e. over the mean wetted ship hull or the “actual” wetted ship hull, respectively.

Numerical calculations reported in *Koch and Noblesse (1979)* and elsewhere show that the slender-ship approximation  $\nu = 1$  is in better agreement with experimental measurements than the approximation  $\nu = 0$  at low Froude numbers, whereas the reverse may hold at high Froude numbers; the transition Froude number is approximately equal to 0.31 and 0.32 for the two hull forms considered in *Koch and Noblesse (1979)*. This finding suggests that the usual Neumann-Kelvin model and the Neumann-Michell model might be preferable at low or high speeds, respectively, although results based on the slender-ship approximation (15) do not necessarily apply to the solution of the boundary-integral representation (12).

### Concluding remarks

It can also be shown that, if  $\nu = 1$ , numerical cancellations occur between the surface integral over  $\Sigma_B$  and the line integral around  $\Gamma$  in (15); cancellations also occur within the integrand of the line integral around  $\Gamma$  in (12c). These numerical cancellations do not occur for  $\nu = 0$ .

This theoretical result, and the previously-noted significant numerical differences among the slender-ship approximations that correspond to  $\nu = 1$  and  $\nu = 0$ , indicate that the usual Neumann-Kelvin linear flow model and the related Neumann-Michell model are appreciably different. The relative merits of these alternative linear flow models can only be established via comparison of experimental measurements and numerical solutions of the boundary-integral representation (12) with  $\nu = 1$  (Neumann-Kelvin model) and  $\nu = 0$  (Neumann-Michell model).

### References

- Koch P. and Noblesse F. (1979) “Wave resistance of the Wigley and Inui hull forms predicted by two simple slender-ship wave-resistance formulas”, *Workshop on Ship Wave-Resistance Computations*, DTNSRDC, pp.339–353
- Noblesse F. (1983) “A slender-ship theory of wave resistance”, *J. Ship Research*, 27:13-33
- Noblesse F. and Yang C. (2004) “Weakly-singular boundary-integral representations of free-surface flows about ships or offshore structures”, *J. Ship Research*, 48:31-44
- Percival S., Hendrix D., Noblesse F. (2001) “Hydrodynamic Optimization of Ship Hull Forms”, *Applied Ocean Research*, 23:337-355
- Yang C., Soto O., Löhner R., Noblesse F. (2002) “Hydrodynamic Optimization of a Trimaran”, *Ship Technology Research*, 49:70-92