Low-yield experiments with chemical explosives detonated at low altitude have revealed unusual Mach stem structures. Existing codes employed to simulate these phenomena have been unable to resolve them satisfactorily. During the year beginning 1 June 1979, personnel of the Laboratory for Computational Physics have been working under a contract with the Defense Nuclear Agency to develop software for performing these calculations.
20. Abstract (continued)

For this purpose, we have employed the method of Flux-Corrected Transport (FCT), developed at the Naval Research Laboratory by J.P. Boris and D.L. Book.
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TWO-DIMENSIONAL FCT MODEL OF
LOW-ALTITUDE NUCLEAR EFFECTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Low-yield experiments with chemical explosives detonated at low altitude have revealed unusual Mach stem structures. Existing codes employed to simulate these phenomena have been unable to resolve them satisfactorily. During the year beginning 1 June 1979, personnel of the Laboratory for Computational Physics have been working under a contract with the Defense Nuclear Agency to develop software for performing these calculations. For this purpose we have employed the method of Flux-Corrected Transport (FCT), developed at NRL by J. P. Boris and D. L. Book. 1-4

The thrust of the program during the first year has been toward testing the various alternative forms of FCT which have been developed, with a view to designing an optimum code (or codes) for solving airblast problems. The principal features we have tried to investigate and evaluate are (1) adaptive regridding; (2) multidimensional (i.e., not time-split) flux limiting; 5 (3) the use of ZIP differencing in calculating fluxes; 6 (4) the use of spatially higher-order (6th-order, 8th-order, etc.) difference schemes as a basis for designing the FCT routine. We concluded that (1) and (2) are definitely efficacious; (1) indeed is indispensable for some problems. We found strong indications that (3) is ineffective on the problems studied, while we have thus far not tested (4) and have only indirect evidence in favor of using high-order methods. In this report we will discuss only calculations related to testing (1) and (2).

The plan for FY-80 listed four milestones: (1) Implement adaptive rezone in Cartesian coordinates; (2) Apply code to model test problem (plane shock Manuscript submitted August 26, 1980
above ramp); (3) Convert code to cylindrical coordinates; (4) Apply code to model test problem (0.5 ton HE at 5 m height).

All of these have been carried out and are described below. In addition, we have implemented a vectorized real-air equation-of-state routine, permitting us to estimate the importance of real gas effects on airblast calculations.

Section II of this report describes the code development work we have performed [items (1) and (3) in the above list]. Section III describes our shock-on-wedge calculations [item (2)]. Section IV describes our work on height-of-burst studies; however, the parameters employed in the test cases differ from those specified above. The text of a paper describing some of the results obtained in this program, presented at the Seventh International Conference on Numerical Methods in Hydrodynamics held during 25-27 June in Stanford, is included as an appendix to the report.

Work is continuing during the remainder of the fiscal year to extend and refine the results reported here.
II. CODE MODIFICATION AND DEVELOPMENT

A. Leapfrog -- Trapezoidal Code

A 2D Cartesian leapfrog-trapezoidal code written under DNA support by Zalesak for ionospheric striation studies was used as the starting point in developing a reflecting shock code. This was done by disabling certain features (magnetic fields, gravitational potential) specific to the original problem, and writing initialization and boundary condition routines appropriate to the shock problem.

In its present form the code solves the ideal fluid equations on a fixed uniform mesh, using an unsplit 2D FCT transport routine. This routine can embody either a leapfrog or a trapezoidal finite-difference scheme. The former is (linearly) reversible and time-centered and has unit linear amplification, but is subject to weak (grid-separation) instability. This is corrected by calling the trapezoidal scheme at intervals (typically every five timesteps) to "merge" the separating solutions.

A perfectly reflecting boundary condition applied at the bottom of the mesh represents the wedge surface; the incident shock front makes an angle $\theta_w$ with the vertical, equal to the wedge angle. On the other boundary cells, values of the density $\rho$, pressure $p$, and velocity $v$ are assigned their values in the ambient gas ahead or behind the incident shock, depending on where they are located with respect to the known shock position at that time.

Results of the calculations (arrays of the fluid quantities) are dumped on magnetic tape at intervals of ten timesteps. Graphics (contour plots, time histories of sensors at fixed locations, etc.) are obtained by postprocessing the data tape.
B. **FAST2D**

FAST2D is a two-dimensional timesplit FCT fluid code developed by Boris for reactive flow and hydrodynamic stability calculations. For the present task it was utilized in a configuration very similar to that of the Leapfrog-Trapezoidal code. Initial and boundary conditions were applied in identical fashion.

The FAST2D chemistry routines were omitted, but the dynamic rezone capability was retained in most of the calculations. The latter exploits the improved resolution obtainable by fine-gridding the portion of the mesh containing the most important or most intransigent part of the calculation—in this case, the region in which the Mach stem(s) and triple point(s) are located (Fig. 1). Coarse gridding, which reduces the core and running-time requirements, provides adequate resolution on the less sensitive remainder of the mesh.

The most important feature of the rezone is its ability to track the critical region. This means that the calculation is effectively carried out in the reference frame of the leading Mach stem. In calculations with glancing incident shocks, where the opening angle $\alpha$ is as small as one or two degrees, the triple point must move a long way (several hundred cells on a uniform mesh) before it is far enough above the wedge (5-10 cells) to be resolved satisfactorily. With the dynamic rezone, only $\sim 150$ cells need to be used in the calculation.

C. **Real-Air Equation of State**

A routine provided by A. Kuhl (RDA) which calculates the effective ratio of specific heats (adiabatic index) $\gamma$ in a variety of situations of interest for airblast problems has been converted to run on the NRL TI/ASC. In its original form this routine accepts values of specific internal energy $\varepsilon$ and density $\rho$.
and returns \( \gamma \), temperature \( T \) and pressure \( p \) according to four prescriptions:

1. a table lookup for dry real air, valid from room temperature to \( \sim 10^7 \) K and from millitorr to kilobar pressures;
2. a polynomial fit to these data;
3. an analogous formula for detonation products from the high explosive Atlas Aquanel; and
4. the values appropriate to an ideal gas (constant \( \gamma \)).

The NRL version is vectorized; it accepts arrays of values of \( \epsilon \) and \( \rho \) and returns corresponding arrays of \( \gamma \), \( T \), and \( p \). The resulting code runs approximately two orders of magnitude faster in mode (1) than the original version, and has been used with both the Leapfrog–Trapezoidal and FAST2D codes to calculate the "real air" cases described below.
III. SHOCK-ON-WEDGE CALCULATIONS

This section briefly describes the results of the principal calculations we have performed on shocks reflecting from wedges. The runs reported here (summarized in Table 1) are discussed in three categories: small wedge angles, large (i.e., $\geq 45^\circ$) wedge angles, and runs carried out for the purpose of comparing two codes or models. The types of Mach reflection to be expected can be found from Fig. 2, which divides the parameter space into seven distinct regions.

A. Small Wedge Angles

For small wedge angles (i.e., glancing incident shocks), the opening angle $\alpha$ is $\sim 10^\circ$ and resolution of the Mach shock region presents no great difficulty. The Leapfrog-Trapezoidal code was used to perform two calculations of this sort (filled circles in Fig. 2), both with an ideal-gas EoS. The wedge angles were $\theta_w = 26.56^\circ$ and $\theta_w = 20^\circ$; the Mach numbers were $M = 8.06$ and $M = 6.9$, respectively; and the adiabatic index $\gamma$ was set equal to 1.35, roughly the average of the real-air values over the range of physical temperatures and pressures encountered in these calculations.

Results are shown in Figs. 3 - 6. Figure 3a displays calculated density contours after 1000 timesteps for an incident shock $I$ arriving from the right with $\theta_w = 20^\circ$, and $M = 6.9$, a case for which complex Mach reflection results (Cf. Fig. 2). The incident shock $I$, the Mach stem $M_1$, the slip or contact surface $CS$, and $R$ and $R'$, the shocks reflecting from the wedge and the first Mach stem, respectively, are marked. The fanlike lines labeled $M_2$ have been added where the density is steepening up, suggesting the system is close to developing a second Mach shock. The contour levels are identical with those chosen by Ben-Dor in processing his interferogram data (Fig. 4a).
Figure 3b displays calculated density contours after 800 timesteps for the case with \( \theta_w = 26.56^\circ \) and \( M = 8.06 \). The structure obtained is characteristic of double Mach reflection. The incident shock \( I \), the Mach stems \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \), the contact surface \( CS \), and \( R \) and \( R' \) are marked.

By comparing Figs. 3a and 4a, we see that not only the shape of the reflected wave fronts, but also the calculated contour levels interior to them are in excellent quantitative agreement with their measured counterparts. Figure 4b displays the calculated density and pressure profiles along the wedge for this case, showing the steep jump at the position of the Mach stem \( M_1 \) and the locations of the two maxima.

In Fig. 5 the pressure calculated on the wedge is plotted and compared with Ben-Dor's experimental data. The discrepancies are concentrated in the two pressure peaks, both of which lie substantially above the measurements. There are two explanations for this: (1) at high temperatures, the effective value of \( \gamma \) in real air drops (see Section IIIC), reducing the pressure jump across a shock; and (2) Ben-Dor's data were apparently less well resolved than the numerical results (or possibly the peaks were eroded in the course of his data reduction).

Figure 6 shows an expanded view of the flow field in the neighborhood of the region where the contact surface approaches the wedge. Each line segment denotes the magnitude and direction of the velocity defined at the point it is directed away from. The velocities are viewed in the reference frame moving with the first Mach stem; \( M_2 \) and \( CS \) have the same meanings as before. The slip line has been extended by following the flow markers. The "jelly-roll" effect is very pronounced; two complete circuits can be
distinguished. The ability to resolve such structures is largely respon-
sible for the relative efficacy of FCT algorithms in solving this kind of
problem.

All of the calculations on reflections from small-angle wedges carried
out with the Leapfrog-Trapezoidal code utilized uniform mesh spacing with
\( \delta x = \delta y \). The meshes used extended up to 150 x 30 in size. Typical running
times for \( 10^3 \) cycles were \( \sim 270 \) s, i.e., \( \sim 60 \) \( \mu \)s per cell-cycle.

B. Large Wedge Angles

As the wedge angle increases (i.e., as the incident shock strikes the
reflecting surface more nearly normally), the opening angle \( \alpha \) decreases.
When it goes to zero, we have regular reflection (region RR of Fig. 2).
However, if \( \alpha \) is small but finite, then, as was explained in Section IIIB,
resolution of the Mach reflection region is impractical unless a regridding
algorithm is employed. The dynamic regridding procedure of FAST2D was used
for this purpose in two calculations: \( \theta_w = 44^\circ \), \( M = 5.074 \), and \( \theta_w = 46.5^\circ \),
\( M = 5.046 \), both with the real air EoS. These cases are indicated with open
circles in the double Mach reflection region of Fig. 2. Note that, in
contrast with the small-wedge-angle cases, they correspond to detached
reflection. Our boundary conditions are inconsistent with detachment, but
this should not affect the veracity of the calculated solution away from the
corner of the wedge.

Figure 7 shows pressure contours from four different times in the \( 44^\circ \)
calculations. We have used enough contours to show the coarse structure but
require a larger number to resolve the feature corresponding to CS in Fig. 3. Only the finely-gridded portion of the mesh is shown in the figure. Little detail can be discerned in frames (a) and (b). By frame (c), $M_1$ is distinguishable; in frame (d), $R, R', M_1, \text{ and } M_2$ are all well resolved. The contours in the first three frames, which were generated using an ideal-gas EoS, are sensibly identical with those at the corresponding times in the real-air EoS calculation used to obtain the last frame.

Figure 8 shows plots of the pressure loading on the wedge in orthographic projection at various times. The contours tend to sharpen up at later times as resolution improves; to this extent the expected self-similarity in the solution fails to materialize. In the final frame the leading Mach stem is about 10 cells high; to reach this stage it had to traverse the equivalent of 450 uniform grid points. Similar contours were produced in the $46.5^\circ$ calculations.

Because the $\theta_w = 44^\circ$ and $\theta_w = 46.5^\circ$ cases are so similar, we discuss only the latter. The computed value of $\alpha$ for $\theta_w = 46.5^\circ$ is approximately 2.5° for a real-air EoS (with $\gamma$ held constant at the value 1.35 we obtain $\alpha \approx 3.2^\circ$). Either value agrees with that measured to within the experimental error, $\sim 2^\circ$. In Fig. 9, we compare the calculated (using the real-air EoS) and measured values of the pressure at the surface of the wedge. The upper traces are pressure plots vs. positions at two times (the unit of time is arbitrarily designated to be $\mu$s, whereupon the distances in cm become determined). The lower traces are time histories at two stations used in the BRL experiments. (If the wave evolution adhered exactly to the approximate similarity description, spatial profiles and time histories would be completely equivalent).
The agreement in the shapes of the profile is striking. The values of the lower pressure peak, corresponding to the Mach stem \( M_1 \), are nearly identical. The calculated value of the second pressure peak is 11\% lower than the measured value, and thus is still within experimental uncertainty. The rise in the values of both peaks and the sharpening in detail from the first to the second plot probably has the same explanation in both cases, namely, improved resolution as the mach stem grows. That is, we believe that the experimental histories are at the limit of the resolution imposed by the finite size and time response of the pressure sensors, which play the same role as space and time truncation errors in the finite-difference approximation. Figure 10 shows the history of the peak pressure on the wedge, this time calculated for an ideal gas with \( \lambda = 1.35 \). The effect of improvement in resolution with increasing time is again apparent.

Figure 11 shows how well the double Mach reflection structure is resolved in the simulation. The pressure in bar is plotted along the trajectory pressure discontinuity (\( I, R', M_2 \), and the flow "stagnation" point on the boundary) in succession transversely. As can be seen, the pressure "discontinuities" are resolved equally well, within about 2 cells.

Movies have been made of the evolving density and pressure contours for the \( \theta_w = 26.56^\circ \) and \( \theta_w = 46.5^\circ \) cases, respectively, the various levels being identified by different colors. These movies (several frames from which are reproduced in Figs. 7 and 8) show graphically how the various features of the reflection structure sharpen up as sufficient resolution becomes available. They also show how efficiently the regridding algorithm moves to keep the reflection region in the finely gridded part of the mesh, tracking it smoothly without sudden or wide shifts.

The 46.5\(^\circ\) movie demonstrates the slow development of the Mach structure and permits us to trace the locations of the pressure peaks along the wedge surface. The 26.56\(^\circ\) movie uses Ben-Dor's density contours and clearly resolves
the Double Mach structure by permitting the structure to move twice as far along the wedge as in the above test calculations. This capability results directly from our use of the adaptive regridding algorithm.

C. Code Comparisons

A number of trial calculations were performed during the process of code development in order to test the boundary and initial conditions, EoS routine, etc. More critical test runs were carried out to compare the Leapfrog-Trapezoidal and FAST2D codes under identical conditions, and to determine the effect of using the real-air EoS instead of the ideal-gas EoS.

For the former test we started with the results obtained by the Leapfrog-Trapezoidal code for a Mach number $M = 8.06$ and wedge angle $\theta_w = 25.56^\circ$, using an ideal-gas EoS with $\gamma = 1.35$. Then we ran the same problem using FAST2D with a uniform mesh, disabling the regridding procedure and setting the timestep equal to those employed in the earlier run. Figure 12 shows the resulting density contours, along with those obtained experimentally by Ben-Dor.\textsuperscript{10} Comparisons of the results at identical time levels up to cycle 800 yielded the following conclusions:

(1) The two codes yielded qualitatively (and in most respects quantitatively) similar results.

(2) Slip lines were better resolved by the Leapfrog-Trapezoidal code.

(3) The pressure calculated by the latter at the location of the wedge showed a greater tendency to numerical fluctuations (Fig. 2). The first pressure peak, just behind the leading Mach stem, was slightly higher in this calculation.

(4) An anomalously low (less than ambient) pressure was produced at one point by FAST2D because of timesplitting. This, however, had no apparent effect on the rest of the grid, nor did any discernible adverse consequences of timesplitting appear elsewhere.
To determine the role played by the real-air EoS, we repeated the FAST2D runs described earlier (θ_w = 44°, M = 5.074, and θ_w = 46.5°, M = 5.046) with constant γ = 1.35. (In order to obtain the same pressure jumps across the initial shock, the Mach numbers had to be adjusted to M = 5.173 and M = 5.148, respectively). Agreement with the BRL data was still good. At 1000 steps both pressure peaks in the 46.5° case were too high in the ideal-gas calculation; the one at the Mach stem by ~10%, and that at the intersection of the slip surface with the wedge by ~11%. Similar results were observed in the 44° calculations. The penalty for using the real-air EoS in its optimized vector form is about a 20% increase in running time.
IV. RELATED CALCULATIONS

Several additional calculations were performed which bear closely on the airblast problem: a shock reflecting from a wedge in a reactive medium, and preliminary height-of-burst (HoB) calculations.

A. Reflecting Shock in a Reactive Medium

Under a Navy-supported program to study combustion hydrodynamics, LCP has developed a simple numerical treatment of combustion processes based on the induction time hypothesis. This model represents the chemistry through a composite process, in which reactants begin to combine into combustion products only after a finite "induction" time has elapsed. The rate at which the energy-releasing reactions proceed depends upon a single parameter, the induction time. This in turn is a function of the local thermodynamic variables.

As part of the LCP Combustion Hydrodynamics project, we have applied the induction time hypothesis model to study shock reflections in reactive gases (stoichiometric mixtures of $\text{H}_2$ in air or oxygen) at low pressure (0.1 atm). Figure 13 shows the time development of a detonation initiated by a weak reflecting shock in an $\text{H}_2$-air mixture. The sequence of six pressure contour plots traces the evolution of a detonation wave initiated by complex Mach reflection at the surface of the wedge. The incident shock was chosen so that the pressure behind it is too low to cause detonation to take place within the time of the calculation. As with the calculations of Section III, we have used open boundary conditions at the sides and top of the system.
Figure 13a shows the pressure contours corresponding to an incident shock with $\theta_w = 25^\circ$ and $M = 4.0$ (giving rise to complex Mach reflection) which has just begun to reflect. The Mach stem is initially too small to be resolved. In frame b, the Mach stem becomes discernible, but as yet no apparent reaction has occurred. By frame (c) the material has begun to ignite at a position well behind the current location of the Mach stem. When the Mach stem passed that position the pressure increase heated the mixture sufficiently to cause ignition after a short induction time characteristic of the $H_2$ -- air mixture. In frames (d) and (e), at later times, the pressure at the Mach stem continues to grow, leading to shorter characteristic induction times for material between the Mach stem and the original ignition point. Thus, we see the ignited region accelerate along the wedge surface toward the Mach stem. Because more energy is being released as the burning continues, the boundary of the ignited region also accelerates in the direction of the reflected shock and Mach stem, as we see from the decrease in the separation of the pressure contours near both locations. A stable detonation pattern has not yet emerged, however. This is evident from the bending out of the Mach stem and the lower density of contours between the Mach stem and the reflected shock/detonation front.

A similar calculation has been carried out in which all four boundaries were made reflecting. This is seen to be subcritical, i.e., a stable detonation wave does not form. When the incident shock Mach number is increased to $M = 5.0$, however, a stable detonation wave does occur. As it evolves, an intricate pattern of multiple reflections from the boundaries develops. Color movies have been made of the pressure contours for both calculations, illustrating clearly the difference in the two physical situations.
These studies have led to the discovery of previously unreported pockets of unreacted gas which become folded in behind the oscillating cellular multidimensional structure which characterizes most real detonations. These pockets, which react eventually some time after the main shock and reaction zone have passed, ought to be experimentally observable. They also may prove to be the mechanism by which detonations sustain themselves at abrupt area changes and in free space where there are no walls to provide new cellular detonation centers.

B. Height-of-Burst Calculations

FAST2D is written in such a way as to permit switching from Cartesian to cylindrical geometry by changing a single input parameter. A sample HoB calculation was carried out by introducing a 1 kg explosive charge at a height of 7.5 cm approximately reproducing the conditions of the Mighty Mach experiments. The resulting blast wave is initially spherical (i.e., semicircular when projected on the r-Z half plane; see Fig. 14). By using vertically stretched cells at the top of the mesh, it is possible to prevent the blast wave from reflecting back into the ground reflection region until late in the development of the expanding shocked system.

Unlike the constant-strength incident shocks discussed previously, the pressure (or density, etc.) profile through the front varies temporally in two ways: it weakens due to spherical expansion, and it steepens and narrows because the subsequent rarefaction wave tends to catch up with the shock. A third effect contributes significantly to time variation in real airblasts produced by high explosives: the delayed combustion of the HE charge. This could be properly treated using a simple model like that based on the induction induction time hypothesis (Section IV A ), and a turbulent mixing model, coupled with an accurate EoS for the detonation products. The present calculation neglected the effect of the delayed energy release, which will be included in the future.
Because the incident wave structure differs in both space and time from that assumed in the shock-on-wedge problems, the reflected wave now looks very different (Fig. 15). The Mach stem $M_1$ is still visible, but the rarefaction wave prevents the formation of a second Mach shock and distorts the reflected wave and contact surface.

Finally, as an example of what can be done with the computational tools in hand, we performed a HoB calculation with a ground structure. The latter was a block having a front face sloping at $45^\circ$ (Fig. 14). Reflecting boundary conditions were employed on the structure, with the ramp modeled by a stair-step boundary. In addition to contour plots like those previously described, pressure histories were obtained at four locations along the ramp (Fig. 16). The traces on the left in Fig. 16 represent time histories of the maximum (as a function of horizontal position) pressures on the mesh at the elevations corresponding to sensors 1, 2, 3, 4, respectively, showing that these increase with elevation. It is interesting to note that the highest peak pressure on the structure was recorded at location 2, not at the bottom of the ramp.
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>MACH NO.</th>
<th>WEDGE ANGLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF SHOCK</th>
<th>E.O.S. $\gamma = $</th>
<th>REZONE</th>
<th># STEPS</th>
<th>EXPERIMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-T</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20°</td>
<td>CMR(A)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>BEN-DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-T</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>26.56°</td>
<td>DMR(A)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>BEN-DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST2D</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>26.56°</td>
<td>DMR(A)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>BEN-DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST2D</td>
<td>5.173</td>
<td>44°</td>
<td>DMR(D)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>BRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST2D</td>
<td>5.074</td>
<td>44°</td>
<td>DMR(D)</td>
<td>REAL AIR</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>BRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST2D</td>
<td>5.148</td>
<td>46.5°</td>
<td>DMR(D)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>BRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST2D</td>
<td>5.046</td>
<td>46.5°</td>
<td>DMR(D)</td>
<td>REAL AIR</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>BRL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1 - Gridding for complex shock reflection problem used in FAST2D code. Shown schematically are incident, reflected and Mach shocks (solid lines) and slip surfaces (broken lines) for incident shock arriving from the left. The finely gridded region moves with Mach stems and triple points to provide resolution where it is needed most.
Fig. 2 - Types of shock reflections: RR, SMR, CMR, and DMR denote regular reflection and single, complex and double Mach reflection, respectively. D and A label detached and attached shocks, respectively. Closed circles represent calculations done with the Leapfrog-Trapazoidal code; open circles represent those done with FAST2D.
Fig. 3 - Wave structure and density contours with lines of discontinuity identified for
(a) complex Mach reflection case ($\theta = 20^\circ$, $M = 6.9$); (b) double Mach reflection case
($\theta = 26.56^\circ$, $M = 8.06$).
Fig. 4 - (a) Contours of Figure 3(a), labeled with density values used by Bendor; (b) Density (dots) and pressure (plus sign) contours calculated on wedge (circles, fitted by solid line) and calculated value (dots).
Fig. 5 - Comparison in complex Mach reflection case of experimentally measured density on wedge (circles, fitted by solid line) and calculated value (dots).

$M_s = 6.9$
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Fig. 6 - Rollup of slip line at wedge surface (solid line). Short line segments represent magnitude and direction of velocity at mesh points (dots), in reference frame of Mach stem.
Fig. 7 - Development of Mach shock in ideal-gas 44-degree calculation. Pressure contours are shown at times (a) $1.57 \times 10^{-3}$; (b) $4.09 \times 10^{-3}$; (c) $5.95 \times 10^{-3}$; (d) $1.54 \times 10^{-3}$ (this last frame taken from calculation using real air EOS).
Fig. 8 - Pressure plots from ideal-gas 44-degree calculation in orthographic projection at times (a) 0.00; (b) $1.13 \times 10^{-4}$; (c) $1.60 \times 10^{-4}$; (taken from calculation using real-air EOS).
Fig. 9 - Upper and lower diagrams show pressure in PSIA on the wedge as a function of position for $\theta = 46.5^\circ$ (real-air EOS) at two times in the simulation (upper traces and at two stations in the BLR experiments (lower traces).
Fig. 10 - Pressure profile on wedge in 46.5° ideal-gas calculation at four different times, showing the effect of improving resolution.
Fig. 11 - Plot of pressure vs position (46.5° wedge angle) along the trajectory 1-2-3-4 shown in the inset which intersects four surfaces of discontinuity (solid lines) transversely.
\[ \theta_w = 26.56^\circ \quad M_s = 8.06 \]

\[ \Delta q / q_o = 0.376 \]

**EXPERIMENTAL**

**L-T FCT**

**FAST2D**

Fig. 12 - Comparison between experimental, Leapfrog-trapezoidal, and FAST2D double-Mach-reflection density contours.
Fig. 13 - Pressure contours produced in detonation calculation (reflected shock in reactive medium) at times (a) \(1.10 \times 10^{-6} \mu s\); (b) \(2.70 \times 10^{-6} \mu s\); (c) \(3.62 \times 10^{-6} \mu s\); (d) \(3.91 \times 10^{-6} \mu s\); (e) \(4.50 \times 10^{-6} \mu s\); (f) \(6.73 \times 10^{-6} \mu s\).
Fig. 15 - Development of Mach shock in MoB calculation. Pressure contours are shown at times (a) $5.70 \times 10^{-5}$; (b) $7.03 \times 10^{-5}$; (c) $1.62 \times 10^{-4}$. 
Fig. 16 - Pressure histories at four sensor locations on ramp of structure sketched in Figure 14.
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