UNIVERSITY^{OF} BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

A reflection on analytical tornado-like vortex flow field models

Gillmeier, Stefanie; Sterling, Mark; Hemida, Hassan; Baker, Christopher

DOI: 10.1016/j.jweia.2017.12.017

License: Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Gillmeier, S, Sterling, M, Hemida, H & Baker, C 2018, 'A reflection on analytical tornado-like vortex flow field models', *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, vol. 174, pp. 10-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2017.12.017

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1	A reflection on analytical tornado-like vortex flow field models			
2	S. Gillmeier ¹ , M. Sterling ² , H. Hemida ³ , C.J. Baker ⁴			
3 4 5 6	Department of Civil Engineering, School of Engineering, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom, ¹ <u>stefaniegillmeier-wls@web.de</u> , ² m.sterling@bham.ac.uk, ³ h.hemida@bham.ac.uk, ⁴ c.j.baker@bham.ac.uk			
7				
8 9	Abstract			
10	Given the difficulties associated with undertaking full-scale measurements in tornadoes, recourse			
11	is often made to models. In this field, analytical models have, perhaps surprisingly, stood the test			
12	of time, with the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan models frequently invoked to model the flow			
13	field of a tornado. These mathematical models are by their very nature, a simplification of what is			
14	a highly complex phenomenon. However, in many cases they have been represented as the 'truth'			
15	without the fundamental assumptions governing the model being either explored in detail or even			
16	acknowledged. This paper attempts to rectify this by giving detailed information about			
17	assumptions and limitations of each vortex model and critically assesses the ability (or otherwise)			
18	of the Rankine, Burgers-Rott, Sullivan, and the recently published Baker vortex model to simulate			
19	tornado-like flow. Comparisons are made to the flow field of a physically simulated tornado, which			
20	by its very nature is also a model, but arguably more realistic.			
21				
22	It was jound that the vortex models are able to represent certain flow patterns at certain neights			
23	but jail, and to their simplifications, in replicating the entire three-almensional flow structure			
24 25	oblainea experimentatiy.			
25	Keywords: Laboratory simulated tornado vortey: Analytical vortey models: Rankine vortey:			
20	Burgers-Rott vortex: Sullivan vortex: Baker vortex			
28	Durgers Kott vortex, Buillvan vortex, Baker vortex			
29				
30	1. Introduction			
31				
32	Within the Wind Engineering community, increasing attention is being paid to the effects of non-			
33	stationary, non-synoptic winds, i.e. tornadoes. The structure of full-scale tornadoes is highly			
34	complex, showing a three-dimensional flow field, instabilities, singularities and non-linear effects			
35	(e.g. Lewellen, 1993; Davies-Jones et al., 2001; Alexander and Wurman, 2008; Karstens et al.,			
36	2010). In order to understand the physical processes present in a tornado flow field, simplified			
37	models are needed, which reduce the degree of freedom present in full-scale observations, and			

- therefore allow a detailed and statistically representative evaluation of velocity and pressure fields. 38
- In order to provide this type of datasets, the tornado-like flow field was modelled experimentally 39

and/or numerically by several authors such as Ward, 1972; Church et al., 1979; Lewellen et al., 40 1997; Haan et al., 2008; Mishra et al., 2008; Natarajan, 2011; Sabareesh et al., 2012; Refan et al., 41 2014; Gillmeier et al., 2016; Liu and Ishihara, 2016; Nolan et al., 2017 and Tang et al., 2017. An 42 attempt to analytically model the three-dimensional flow in the boundary layer of a tornado-like 43 44 vortex was made by Kuo (1971) by alternatingly solving the two nonlinear boundary-layer equations for the radial and vertical distribution of velocities. The Bloor and Ingham vortex model 45 (1987) and the Vyas-Majdalani vortex model (Vyas et al., 2003) are exact inviscid solutions to the 46 Euler's equations in a confined conical and cylindrical domain, respectively. Xu and Hangan 47 (2009) analytically modelled an inviscid tornado-like vortex using a free narrow jet solution 48 combined with a modified Rankine vortex. However, it needs to be mentioned here that this 49 combined model is not an exact solution to the Navier-Stokes-Equations. Wood and White (2011) 50 presented a new parametric model of vortex tangential-wind profiles, which is based on the 51 52 Vatistas model (Vatistas et al., 1991) and is primarily designed to depict realistic-looking 53 tangential wind profiles observed in atmospheric vortices.

54

Despite this excellent work, the Rankine (Rankine, 1882), Burgers-Rott (Burgers, 1948; Rott, 55 1958) and Sullivan (Sullivan, 1959) vortex model are still the most commonly used vortex models 56 57 to replicate tornado-like flow behaviour. An overview of some of the before mentioned vortex models can be found in e.g. Kilty (2005), Batterson et al. (2007) and Kim and Matsui (2017). 58 However, with the increasing interest in the simulation of tornado-like flows, these models have 59 (in some cases and with varying degrees of success) been invoked in order to describe some 60 elements of the flow field. The authors feel that it is worth reflecting on the fundamental 61 62 assumptions behind these models and bench marking their performance against measured data obtained in controlled conditions. For that reason, this paper gives detailed information about the 63 derivation and simplifications of the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex model. In addition 64 to the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models, the recently published vortex model by 65 66 Baker and Sterling (2017), hereafter called 'Baker vortex model', is also included in the analysis. 67

- 68 Section two of this paper provides detailed information about the derivation and simplifications of 69 the above mentioned vortex models, while section three outlines the experimental methodology 70 used to assess the model suitability. The results of the model benchmarking can be found in section 71 four, with the main conclusions presented in section five.
- 72
- 73

74 2. Existing vortex models

- 75
- 76 2.1 Flow field notation
- 77

In what follows, a cylindrical coordinate system has been adopted as illustrated in figure 1. In figure 1, *r*, *z* and θ are the radial distance, vertical distance and circumferential angle, respectively. Thus, u_r , u_z and u_θ represent the radial, vertical and circumferential components of velocity. For the sake of simplicity the flow is considered to be incompressible for all models and a density of air of $\rho = 1.21 \text{kg/m}^3$ is assumed for all calculations. In this section, a brief description of the different vortex models examined in this paper is provided, together with the underlying assumptions.

85

Using the aforementioned notation, the continuity equation (Eq. 1) and radial (Eq. 2),
circumferential (Eq. 3) and vertical (Eq. 4) components of the Navier-Stokes-Equations (NSE) can

88 be expressed as:

 z, u_z θ, u_θ

Figure 1: Flow field notation.

=

、

89 90 91



95
$$\frac{\frac{\partial u_r}{\partial t}}{\frac{\partial t}{R1}} + \underbrace{u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r}}_{R2} + \underbrace{\frac{u_\theta}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial \theta}}_{R3} - \underbrace{\frac{u_\theta^2}{r}}_{R4} + \underbrace{u_z \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z}}_{R5}$$

96
$$-\frac{1}{\frac{\partial p}{\partial r}} + \underbrace{g_r}_{R7} + \nu \left(\underbrace{\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} \right)}_{R8} - \underbrace{\frac{u_r}{r^2}}_{R9} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial \theta^2}}_{R10} - \underbrace{\frac{2}{r^2} \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial \theta}}_{R11} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial z^2}}_{R12} \right)$$
(2)

97

98
$$\frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial t} + \underbrace{u_{r}}_{C1} \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial r} + \underbrace{\frac{u_{\theta}}{r}}_{C3} \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} + \underbrace{\frac{u_{r}u_{\theta}}{r}}_{C4} + \underbrace{u_{z}}_{C5} \frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial z} =$$

99
$$-\frac{1}{\underbrace{\rho r}}\frac{\partial p}{\partial \theta} + \underbrace{g_{\theta}}_{C7} + \nu \left(\underbrace{\frac{1}{r}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(r\frac{\partial u_{\theta}}{\partial r}\right)}_{C8} - \underbrace{\frac{u_{\theta}}{r^{2}}}_{C9} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{r^{2}}}\frac{\partial^{2}u_{\theta}}{\partial t^{2}} - \underbrace{\frac{2}{r^{2}}}\frac{\partial u_{r}}{\partial \theta}}_{C11} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial^{2}u_{\theta}}{\partial z^{2}}}_{C12}\right)$$
(3)

100

101
$$\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial t} + \underbrace{u_r \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r}}_{Z_2} + \underbrace{\frac{u_\theta}{r} \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial \theta}}_{Z_3} + \underbrace{u_z \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z}}_{Z_4} = \underbrace{\left(1, 2, (-2), -2, (-2), (-2$$

102
$$-\frac{1}{\underline{\rho}}\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \underbrace{g_z}_{Z5} + \nu \left(\underbrace{\frac{1}{\underline{r}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(r\frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r}\right)}_{Z7} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\underline{r}^2}\frac{\partial^2 u_z}{\partial \theta^2}}_{Z8} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial^2 u_z}{\partial z^2}}_{Z9}\right)$$
(4)

Here ρ is the density of the fluid, *t* is the time, *p* is the static pressure and \vec{g} is the gravity vector in its different components. The different terms in equations (1-4) have been labelled since, as will be demonstrated below, it is possible to derive the majority of the analytical models by disregarding different terms.

108

109 2.2 Rankine vortex model

110

The Rankine model has been adopted by a number of researchers (e.g. Hoecker, 1960; Church et al., 1979; Winn et al., 1999; Wurman and Gill, 2000; Brown and Wood, 2004; Lee et al., 2004; Mishra et al., 2008; Bech et al., 2009; Hashemi Tari et al., 2010; Wood and Brown, 2011; Refan and Hangan, 2016; Tang et al., 2017) to model tornado-like flow behaviour. The following assumptions are made in the derivation of the Rankine vortex model:

116 117

118

119

120 121 • The flow field is one-dimensional and as such equations (2) and (4) can be disregarded.

• The flow field is steady state, i.e., term R1 can be taken as zero.

• The flow is inviscid (μ =0), i.e., terms R8 - R12 can be neglected.

• Body forces can be neglected, i.e., $(\vec{g}=0)$.

122 These assumptions reduce the NSE to the cyclostrophic equation (Eq. 5).

123

$$\frac{dp(r)}{dr} = \rho \, \frac{u_{\theta}(r)^2}{r} \tag{5}$$

124 125

The Rankine model also assumes that the flow consists of two separate flow regions. In the first 126 region, the core region (i.e., r < R, where R is the core radius, which is defined as the radial distance 127 128 from the vortex centre at which the circumferential velocity component is maximal), the flow is assumed to have a constant vorticity and is considered to be similar to that of a solid body. In the 129 second region, (r > R) it is assumed that the flow can be described by a potential flow field 130 (incompressible, inviscid and irrotational) (Alekseenko et al., 2007) and is inversely proportional 131 132 to the radial distance. These assumptions enable the circumferential velocity component to be modelled via an expression of the form: 133

134

135

$$\overline{u_{\theta}}(\bar{r}) = \begin{cases} \bar{r} & for \ (\bar{r} < 1) \\ \frac{1}{\bar{r}} & for \ (\bar{r} > 1) \end{cases}$$
(6)

136

137 where $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ is the normalised circumferential velocity component (= $u_{\theta}/u_{\theta,max}$, where $u_{\theta,max}$ is 138 the maximum value of u_{θ}) and \overline{r} is the radial distance normalised by the core radius, *R*. In equation 139 6, a discontinuity occurs at $\overline{r} = 1$. In order to avoid this, the model is occasionally modified as 140 shown in equation 6.1. However, the most commonly used form is shown in equation 6 and hence 141 will be used in what follows.

$$\overline{u_{\theta}}(\bar{r}) = \frac{2\bar{r}}{(1+\bar{r}^2)} \tag{6.1}$$

143 144

Combining equation (6) with equation (5) and integrating, yields an expression for the normalisedpressure distribution of the Rankine vortex model (Eq. 7):

147

$$\bar{p}(\bar{r}) = \begin{cases} \overline{p_{(r=0)}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^2 & for \ (\bar{r} < 1) \\ \\ \overline{p_{r \to \infty}} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^2 & for \ (\bar{r} > 1) \end{cases}$$

$$(7)$$

149

148

where $\overline{p}(\overline{r})$ is the normalised pressure $(= p(r) / \rho u_{\theta,max}^2)$, $\overline{p_{r\to\infty}}$ is the normalised static pressure, which is unaffected by the vortex and $\overline{p_{(r=0)}}$ is the static pressure at the vortex centre.

- 153 2.3 Burgers-Rott vortex model
- 154

The Burgers-Rott model has been adopted by a number of authors (e.g. Winn et al., 1999; Brown and Wood, 2004; Lee et al., 2004, Kosiba and Wurman, 2010; Wood and Brown, 2011; Wurman et al., 2013) to model tornado-like flow behaviour. Explicit in the derivation of the model are the following assumptions:

159

• The flow field is steady state, i.e., terms R1, C1 and Z1 are taken as zero.

- The viscosity is considered to be constant throughout the entire flow field.
- **162** Body forces can be neglected, i.e., $(\vec{g}=0)$.
- 163 The circumferential velocity component is assumed to be solely dependent on the radial 164 distance $(u_{\theta} = u_{\theta}(r))$.
- The vertical velocity component is assumed to be solely and linearly dependent on the vertical distance $(u_z = u_z(z) \text{ and } u_z \propto z)$.
- As a result of the last two assumptions, the radial velocity component is solely and linearly dependent on the radial distance $(u_r = u_r(r) \text{ and } u_r \propto r)$.
- 169 The static pressure is assumed to be solely dependent on radial and vertical distances (p = p(r,z)).

172 The above assumptions reduce equations (1 - 4) to the following simplified versions:

173

171

174
$$\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial(ru_r)}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} = 0 \qquad (1^*)$$

175

176
$$u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{u_{\theta}^2}{r} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial r} + \nu \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} \right) - \frac{u_r}{r^2} \right)$$
(2*)

$$u_r \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial r} + \frac{u_r u_\theta}{r} = \nu \left(\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial r} \right) - \frac{u_\theta}{r^2} \right)$$
(3*)

- 178 179
- 180

$$u_{z}\frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} \tag{4*}$$

Now, the Burgers-Rott model acknowledges that the flow within a tornado-like structure is likely 182 to be subject to changing levels of vorticity, which in turn will have implications for the associated 183 184 pressure field. Thus, it is assumed that the vertical velocity component changes with respect to height and the following relationship is adopted: 185

- 186
- 187 188

where $\overline{u_z}(\overline{z})$ is the normalised vertical velocity $(= u_z(z)/u_{\theta,max}), \overline{z}$ is the normalised vertical 189 height (= z/R) and \bar{a} is a constant, whose magnitude purports to account for the strength of vortex 190 stretching. It is also assumed that \bar{a} is related to the viscous dissipation, v, via an expression of the 191 form:

 $\overline{u_{z}}(\bar{z}) = 2\bar{a}\bar{z}$

192

$$\bar{a} = \frac{2\nu}{Ru_{\theta,max}} \tag{8.1}$$

194

193

Equation (8.1) implies that the viscous dissipation, v, continuously removes kinetic energy from 195 the flow, which is continuously introduced by vortex stretching. Using equation (8) and integrating 196 197 the simplified continuity equation (Eq. 1^*), an expression for the normalised radial velocity component, $\overline{u_r}$, can be obtained (Eq. 9). 198

- 199
- 200 201

 $\overline{u_r}(\bar{r}) = -\bar{a}\bar{r}$ (9)

202 Using equations (8) and (9), and solving the simplified NSE in the circumferential direction (Eq. 3*), an expression for the normalised circumferential velocity component, $\overline{u_{\theta}}$, can be found (Eq. 203 204 10).

- 205
- 206

 $\overline{u_{\theta}}(\bar{r}) = \frac{1}{\bar{x}} \left(1 - exp(-\bar{r}^2) \right)$ (10)

207

It is perhaps worth noting that $\overline{u_z}$ and $\overline{u_r}$ increase to infinity as $\overline{z} \to \infty$ and $\overline{r} \to \infty$, respectively, 208 209 which, it is suggested, may not be representative of a tornado-like flow structure.

210

The pressure distribution of the Burgers-Rott vortex model can be obtained by solving the 211 simplified NSE (Eq. 2* and Eq. 4*) using the model velocities (Eq. 8, Eq. 9, and Eq. 10). This 212 213 leads to the following equation for the normalised pressure distribution (Eq. 11).

214

215
$$\overline{p_{Burgers}}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) = \bar{p}(0,0) + \int_0^{\bar{r}} \frac{\overline{u_{\theta}}(\bar{r})^2}{\bar{r}'} d\bar{r'} - \frac{\bar{a}^2}{2}(\bar{r}^2 + 4\bar{z}^2)$$
(11)

6

(8)

218

217 2.4 Sullivan vortex model

The Sullivan model has also been adopted by a few researchers (e.g. Winn et al., 1999; Wood and Brown, 2011) to model tornado-like flow behaviour. The assumptions for this vortex model are:

- The flow field is steady state, i.e., terms R1, C1 and Z1 are taken as zero.
- The viscosity is considered to be constant throughout the entire flow field.

• Body forces can be neglected, i.e., $(\vec{g}=0)$.

- The circumferential velocity component is assumed to be solely dependent on the radial distance $(u_{\theta} = u_{\theta}(r))$.
- The vertical velocity component is assumed to be only dependent on radial and vertical distances. The dependence on the vertical distance is linear ($u_z = u_z(r, z)$ and $u_z \propto z$).
- As a result of the last two assumptions, the radial velocity component is solely dependent on the radial distance $(u_r = u_r(r))$.
- The static pressure is assumed to be solely dependent on radial and vertical distances (p = p(r,z)).
- 233

The above assumptions reduce the continuity equation (1), radial and circumferential components of the NSE (2-3) to simplified versions shown in equations $(1^* - 3^*)$. For the vertical component of the NSE (4) the following simplified versions is obtained.

237

238
$$u_{z}\frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial z} + u_{z}\frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} + \nu\left(\frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(r\frac{\partial u_{z}}{\partial r}\right)\right)$$
(4**)

239

One main difference of the Sullivan model compared to the Burgers-Rott model lies in the 240 complexity of the model solution. While the Burgers-Rott vortex model only allows single-celled 241 vortices to be generated, the Sullivan model potentially enables solutions for single and two-celled 242 vortices to be obtained; this is obtained via the use of a shape parameter, b (Eq. 12 and Eq. 13). 243 The effect of this parameter on the tornado-like flow field will be discussed in detail in section 2.7. 244 245 Unless stated otherwise, b = 3. The required vortex stretching is generated by suction at relatively large heights and is achieved by a non-linear increase of the vertical velocity component with 246 247 height, as illustrated in equation (12). The same normalisation used for the Burgers-Rott vortex model is applied for the Sullivan vortex model. 248

- 249
- 250

$$\overline{u_z}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) = 2\bar{a}\bar{z}\left(1 - b \cdot exp(-\bar{r}^2)\right) \tag{12}$$

251 252

Following the procedure described for the Burgers-Rott vortex model, expressions for $\overline{u_r}$ (Eq. 13)

253 and $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ (Eq. 14) can be obtained.

$$\overline{u_r}(\bar{r}) = -\bar{a}\bar{r} + \frac{2b\bar{v}}{\bar{r}}\left(1 - \exp(-\bar{r}^2)\right) \tag{13}$$

$$\overline{u_{\theta}}(\overline{r}) = \frac{1}{\overline{r}} \frac{H(x)}{H(\infty)}$$
with $x = \overline{r}^2$ and $H(x) = \int_0^x exp\left(-x' + 3\int_0^{x'} \frac{1}{x''} \left(1 - exp(-x'')\right) dx''\right) dx'$

$$(14)$$

- 258
- 259

It is perhaps worth noting, that for $\overline{r} = 0$ and $\overline{z} \to \infty$ the magnitude of $\overline{u_z}$ increases to infinity. Furthermore, also $\overline{u_r}$ increases to infinity for $\overline{r} \to \infty$ (Eq. 13). Similar to the Burgers-Rott model, it is suggested that this behaviour may be physically unrealistic in a tornado-like structure.

263

The pressure distribution of the Sullivan vortex model can be obtained by solving the simplified NSE (Eq. 2^* and 4^*) using the model velocities (Eq. 12 - 14). This leads to the following equation for the normalised pressure distribution:

267

268

$$\overline{p_{Sullivan}}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) = \overline{p_{Burgers}}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) - \frac{18\bar{v}^2}{\bar{r}^2} \left(1 - exp(-\bar{r}^2)\right)^2 \tag{15}$$

269

270 2.5 Baker vortex model

271

Baker and Sterling (2017) developed a vortex model, which can reproduce the flow and pressure characteristics of a single and two-celled vortex. In order to enable comparisons with the aforementioned models, only the solution for the single-cell vortex with radial inflow and vertical updraft is analysed in this paper. The following assumptions are made in the derivation of the Baker vortex model:

277

279

278 •	The flow field	is steady state,	i.e., terms R1,	C1 and Z1	are taken as zero.
-------	----------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------------

- The flow is inviscid, i.e., terms R8 R12, C8 C12 and Z7 Z9 can be disregarded.
- Body forces can be neglected, i.e., $(\vec{g}=0)$.
- The circumferential velocity component is assumed to be dependent on radial and vertical distance $(u_{\theta} = u_{\theta}(r, z))$.
- The radial velocity component is assumed to be only dependent on radial and vertical distances $(u_r = u_r(r, z))$.
- As a result of the last two assumptions, the vertical velocity component is solely dependent on radial and vertical distances ($u_r = u_r(r, z)$).
- The static pressure is assumed to be solely dependent on radial and vertical distances (p = p(r, z)).
- 289

These assumptions reduce the continuity equation (1) to the simplified version shown in equation (1^*) and the NSE (Eq. 2 - 4) to the following simplified versions:

293
$$u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{u_{\theta}^2}{r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial r}$$
(2***)

$$u_r \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial r} + \frac{u_r u_\theta}{r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_\theta}{\partial z} = 0$$
 (3***)

296

295

297
$$u_r \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial r} + u_z \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z}$$
(4***)

298

In addition, the Baker model assumes that the radial velocity component takes the following form:

$$\overline{u_r}(\bar{r}, \bar{z}) = \frac{-4\bar{r}\bar{z}}{(1+\bar{r}^2)(1+\bar{z}^2)}$$
(16)

301 302

One of the potential advantages of this model compared to the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan 303 vortex models is that the radial velocity component is assumed to show a more realistic behaviour 304 (Eq. 16), i.e., rather than increasing to infinity for large radial distances, a maximum value is 305 reached at $r = r_m$ which then falls to zero for r = 0 and $r = \infty$. In the vertical direction, the radial 306 velocity distribution shows an attempt to replicate the tornado boundary layer by assuming a 307 maximum in the radial velocity component at a known distance above the ground $(z = z_m)$. For z 308 = 0 and $z = \infty$ the radial velocity falls to zero. Since the Baker vortex model focuses on the 309 distribution of the radial velocity component, different parameters are chosen for the normalisation 310 311 of velocities, radial and vertical distances. Velocities are normalised by the maximum radial velocity $(u_r(r_m, z_m) = u_{r,max})$ and radial and vertical distances are normalised by r_m and z_m , 312 313 respectively.

314

Using equation (16) and integrating the simplified continuity equation (1*), an expression for the normalised vertical velocity component, $\overline{u_z}$, can be obtained as follows:

 $\overline{u_z}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) = \frac{4\delta \ln(1+\bar{z}^2)}{(1+\bar{r}^2)^2}$

- 317
- 318
- 319

where δ is the ratio z_m/r_m . Using equations (16) and (17), and solving the simplified NSE in the circumferential direction (Eq. 3***), the following expression for the normalised circumferential velocity component, $\overline{u_{\theta}}$, can be obtained:

323

 $\overline{u_{\theta}}(\bar{r}, \bar{z}) = \frac{K\bar{r}^{\gamma-1} [ln(1+\bar{z}^2)]^{\gamma/2}}{(1+\bar{r}^2)^{\gamma/2}}$ (18)

324 325

Here, γ is a shape parameter (an arbitrary real number which can be used to adjust the shape of the circumferential velocity profile). *K* is a constant and related to Baker's definition of the swirl ratio, i.e., $S_{Baker} = 0.347 \text{ K}$. The swirl ratio in the Baker vortex model is defined as the ratio of $u_{\theta}(r_m, z_m)$ and $u_r(r_m, z_m)$. It is perhaps worth noting that $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ increases to infinity for $z \to \infty$. This increase is

(17)

assumed to be realistic for the lowest heights, relatively close to the surface, where surface
 roughness affects the vertical velocity distribution but becomes physically unrealistic for larger
 heights.

333

The pressure distribution of the Baker vortex model can be obtained by solving the simplified NSE (Eq. 2*** and Eq. 4***) using the model velocities (Eq. 16 - 18) and, assuming a shape parameter of $\gamma = 2$:

337

$$\overline{p_{Baker}}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) = -\frac{8\bar{r}^2\bar{z}}{(1+\bar{r}^2)^2(1+\bar{z}^2)^2} - \frac{4.15S_{Baker}^2(\ln(1+\bar{z}^2))^2}{(1+\bar{r}^2)} - \frac{4\ln(1+\bar{z}^2)(1-\bar{z}^2)}{(1+\bar{r}^2)^2(1+\bar{z}^2)^2}$$
(19)

339

It is worth noting that the surface pressure distribution equals zero for z = 0. This behaviour is physically unrealistic in a tornado-like structure and is discussed in Baker and Sterling (2017). It is assumed that pressure variations in the vertical direction can be neglected within the boundary layer ($z < z_m$) (Baker and Sterling, 2017) and consequently, it is assumed that $\overline{p_{Baker}}(\bar{r}, \bar{z} < 1) = \overline{p_{Baker}}(\bar{r}, \bar{z} = 1)$.

345

346 2.6 Circumferential velocity component

347

Unlike the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models, the Baker model has a shape 348 parameter, γ , which enables the shape of the circumferential velocity profile to be varied. The 349 effect of this parameter on the circumferential velocity field is illustrated in table 1 and figure 2. It 350 is perhaps worth noting that γ is related to \bar{r} in the following way ($\bar{r}^2 = \gamma - 1$) (Baker and 351 352 Sterling, 2017). Consequently, for $\gamma \leq 1$, the circumferential velocity component becomes physically unreasonable. Thus, to ensure results, which describe the behaviour of a forced vortex 353 at the centre, and a free vortex at larger radial distances, Baker and Sterling (2017) recommend 354 setting $\gamma = 2$. 355

356

Table 1 illustrates the ratio of $u_{\theta,max}$ and R of the corresponding models compared to the Rankine 357 358 vortex model with input parameters of R = 10m and $u_{\theta,max} = 10m/s$. For the Baker vortex model a swirl ratio of $S_{Baker} = 1$ is assumed and readings for the maximum circumferential velocity 359 360 component are taken at $z = z_m$. Table 1 shows that Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models 361 underestimate the actual input velocity by a factor of 0.64 and 0.32, respectively, and overestimate the core radius position, R, by a factor of 1.12 and 2.29 respectively. For the Baker vortex model 362 with a shape parameter of $\gamma = 2$, the radius at which $\overline{u_r}$ attains a maximum, is identical to the core 363 radius of the Baker vortex model and is also identical to the actual input core radius ($r_m = R_{Baker} =$ 364 *R*). Hence, the Rankine and Baker model results for $\gamma = 2$ in table 1 are identical. With increasing γ , 365 R_{Baker} increases and the magnitude of $u_{\theta,max,Baker}$ decreases (Table 1). For $\gamma = 3$, R and $u_{\theta,max}$ of 366 Baker and Burgers-Rott vortex model are similar and show a decrease in $u_{\theta,max}$ by about 367 $1/3 \times u_{\theta,max,Rankine}$ (Table 1). For $\gamma = 5$, *R* and $u_{\theta,max}$ of Baker and Sullivan vortex model are 368

similar and show a core radius, which is about $2 \times R_{Rankine}$ and a decrease in $u_{\theta,max}$ by about $2/3 \times u_{\theta,max,Rankine}$ (Table 1). Thus, in what follows, care has been taken to normalise, by the relevant model values of each vortex model as opposed to a standard value.

372

374			
375		$u_{\theta,max,x}$	R_x
376		$u_{ heta,max,Rankine}$	R _{Rankine}
377	x=Rankine	1	1
378	x=Burgers	0.64	1.12
379			
380	x=Sullivan	0.32	2.29
381	$x=Baker(\gamma=2, z=z_m)$	1	1
382			
383	$x=Baker(\gamma=3, z=z_m)$	0.64	1.41
384	x=Baker (γ =5, z=z _m)	0.33	2.0
385			

Table 1: Ratios of $u_{\theta,max}$ and R of the corresponding vortex models compared to the Rankine vortex model.

386

Figure 2 shows that among the four vortex models, large differences in the circumferential velocity 387 are found for $r < R_{model}$ between Sullivan and Baker vortex model with a shape parameter of $\gamma =$ 388 389 2 (Figure 2). This is not surprising as these vortex models represent two entirely different tornado flow types. The Sullivan model represents a two-celled vortex whereas the Baker model shows a 390 single-celled vortex structure. A single-celled vortex is defined as a relatively narrow column of 391 rising and rotating air. With increasing rotational energy, a downdraft forms in the vortex centre 392 393 and terminates aloft a stagnation point above which the vortex increases significantly in size (Trapp, 2000). This vortex transformation is known as 'vortex breakdown'. With a further increase 394 in rotational energy, the stagnation point lowers towards the ground. In a two-celled vortex, the 395 downdraft reaches the ground and therefore decreases $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ close to r = 0 whereas the structure of 396 397 the single-celled vortex shows a strong non-linear increase of $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ inside the vortex core ($r < R_{model}$) (Figure 2). 398









For the Baker model, close to the vortex core, $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ increases at a slower rate with increasing γ , and the circumferential velocity profile tends towards the shape of a two-celled vortex structure (Figure 2) (compared to the Sullivan vortex model). For larger radial distances ($r > R_{model}$), $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ of the Baker vortex model decreases at a slower rate compared to the other three models and largest differences are found between Rankine and Baker vortex model ($\gamma = 2$). Differences in the circumferential velocity of all vortex models decrease as $r \to \infty$.

409

The effect of γ on the circumferential velocity component with height is shown in Figure 3. For 410 relatively small vertical distances from the surface, $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ increases at a slower rate the larger γ is. 411 With increasing vertical distance, this behaviour reverses and $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ increases faster with height as γ 412 increases (Figure 3). Furthermore, figure 3 shows that independent from γ , $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ increases to infinity 413 for $z \to \infty$, albeit at different rates. It needs to be mentioned that the Baker vortex model is the 414 only model that takes a height dependence of u_{θ} into account. However, it does not represent the 415 416 vertical profile of the circumferential velocity observed in simulated tornado-like vortices or fullscale. For instance, Tang et al. (2017) showed that u_{θ} increases rapidly in the lowest heights with 417 the maximum circumferential velocity relatively close to the ground. With further increasing 418 height $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ decreases and remains relatively uniform in even greater heights. Refan et al. (2017) 419 showed that a similar behaviour was observed in five different full-scale tornadoes of different 420 intensity and flow structure. 421





Figure 3: Circumferential velocity component of the Baker vortex model in different heights for different γ values.

426 Another parameter that influences the shape of the circumferential velocity profile is the swirl 427 ratio, S_{Baker} . The magnitude of u_{θ} increases as the value of S_{Baker} increases. The position of the core 428 radius and the shape of the circumferential velocity profile are independent from the chosen swirl 429 ratio. For that reason, the effect of S_{Baker} on u_{θ} cannot be seen when normalising u_{θ} with 430 $u_{\theta,max,Baker}$ and radial distances with R_{Baker} .

431

432 2.7 Radial and vertical velocities and shape parameters

433

434 The Baker model is not the only model to employ a shape component. As shown in equation (8)and (12), both, the Burgers-Rott and Sullivan model also include a 'constant' to 'correct' the 435 vertical velocity. In addition, both models have a 'viscosity' parameter explicitly included in the 436 437 circumferential velocity component (which is not evident in equations (10) and (14) due to the normalisation adopted and assuming the relationship given in equation (8.1)). If it is assumed that 438 the viscosity parameter corresponds to the kinematic viscosity of air (i.e., $\nu \sim 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ at 20 °C), 439 then the calculated radial and vertical velocity components of the Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex 440 441 models are small. Hence, to ensure reasonable magnitudes of the velocity components (Figures 4 and 5), the viscosity needs to be increased by several orders of magnitude (Davies-Jones and 442 Kessler, 1974). Thus, in this context, the 'viscosity' parameter is essentially nothing more than a 443 'simple' shape parameter. 444

445

Figures 4 and 5 show the effect of the 'viscosity' parameter on the radial and vertical velocity distributions of the Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models. For the Burgers-Rott vortex model, a larger 'viscosity' parameter results in larger vertical and radial velocities (Figure 4). Hence, the larger the value of ν becomes, the greater the radial inflow towards the vortex centre and the stronger the vertical updraft gets (Figure 4). For the Sullivan vortex model, an increase in ν results in larger negative vertical velocities for $r < R_{Sullivan}$, and larger positive vertical velocities for r > $R_{Sullivan}$ (Figure 5). For the radial velocity, the larger ν is, the stronger the radial outflow at r < 453 $R_{Sullivan}$, and the stronger the radial inflow for $r < R_{Sullivan}$ gets (Figure 5). The radial distance at 454 which radial and vertical velocity components change sign is not affected by changes in the 455 'viscosity' parameter (Figure 5). This means that the size of the downdraft region close to r = 0 is 456 independent of ν .

457





Figure 4: Velocity components of the Burgers-Rott vortex model for different 'viscosity' values.







462

463 An additional shape parameter contained in the Sullivan vortex model is denoted as b, which influences the distribution of radial and vertical velocity components and can be adjusted to model 464 solutions for single and two-celled vortices. Figure 6 illustrates the effect of b on the radial and 465 vertical flow field of the Sullivan vortex model. For b = 0, radial and vertical velocity components 466 of the Sullivan vortex model are identical to the solutions obtained from the Burgers-Rott vortex 467 model. For b > 1, a two-celled structure can be obtained, which is indicated by negative vertical 468 469 velocities close to the vortex centre. The greater the magnitude of b gets, the more negative the vertical velocities in the vortex centre become, and additionally, the further the downdraft region 470 471 extends in the radial direction. For $r > R_{Sullivan}$, the vertical velocity converges to a value, which is independent of b but dependent on the height. Radial outflow velocities inside the vortex core are 472

473 larger for larger b values, and the larger b gets, the larger the region of radial outflow extends radially (Figure 6). Radial inflow velocities obtained with a lower b value increase slightly faster 474 in magnitude close to the vortex core but converge for larger radial distances (Figure 6). Hence, 475 differences of *b* are only significant inside the vortex core. 476





477

Figure 6: Velocity components of the Sullivan model for different *b* values.

480 The vertical velocity component of the Baker vortex model depends on the value of δ . The vertical velocity component at the vortex centre increases with increasing δ (Figure 7a). Additionally, 481 figure 7b shows that the vertical velocity component increases faster with height as δ increases. 482



483

a)





b)

485 Figure 7: The effect of δ on the vertical velocity component of the Baker vortex model for different radial distances 486 (a) and heights (b).

487

488 2.8 *The static surface pressure distribution*

489

The surface pressure distribution of Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models are shown in figure 8 for the case of v = 0. This restriction implies that the surface pressure distributions of the Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models are solely dependent on the circumferential velocity profile of the corresponding vortex model and equations (11) and (15) simplify to:

- 494
- 495

$$\overline{p_{Burgers}}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) = \overline{p_{Sullivan}}(\bar{r},\bar{z}) = \bar{p}(0,0) + \int_0^{\bar{r}} \frac{\overline{u_{\theta}}(\bar{r}')^2}{\bar{r}'} d\bar{r}'.$$
(20)

496

The last term on the right hand side gives the largest contribution to the entire pressure distribution of the Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex model. Thus, its value defines the magnitude of surface pressure increase from the vortex centre towards larger radial distances and is determined by the area under the circumferential velocity profile shown in figure 2. For that reason, this term is largest for the Burgers-Rott vortex model and results in what maybe a physically unrealistic surface pressure increase from the vortex centre (Figure 8). For the Sullivan vortex model, the magnitude of this term is of the same order as that one of the Rankine vortex model.

504

The entire pressure distribution of the Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models, depend on the contribution of the circumferential, radial and vertical velocity (Eq. 11 and Eq. 15), and therefore is dependent on the 'viscosity' parameter. Also shown in Figure 8, is the effect of *v* on the pressure distribution. The decrease in surface pressure with increasing radial distance originates from a combination of the vertical updraft and the potentially unrealistic increase in radial velocity, i.e., $\frac{\bar{a}^2}{2}(\bar{r}^2 + 4\bar{z}^2)$. These terms are identical in Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models, however, the different trends shown in figure 8 arise due to the normalisation, since $R_{Sullivan} > R_{Burgers-Rott}$.

The additional term in the surface pressure distribution of the Sullivan vortex model (i.e., $-\frac{18\overline{v}^2}{\overline{r}^2}(1-exp(-\overline{r}^2))^2)$ describes the effect of the non-linear behaviour of radial and vertical velocity components inside the vortex core on the pressure distribution. The downdraft close to the centre of the vortex increases the surface pressure distribution and places the minimum pressure at the radial position where vertical and radial velocity components are zero (Figure 8).



Figure 8: Surface pressure distribution of Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex model for different 'viscosity'
 values.

521

518

In order to enable a meaningful comparison of the surface pressure distributions, the 'viscosity' parameter, v, and the 'vortex stretching' parameters \overline{a} , need to be adjusted in the circumferential velocity and surface pressure distribution of the Burgers-Rott vortex model. This ensures that the increase in surface pressure is of similar order to that one of the Rankine and Sullivan vortex model. Thus, equation (10) needs to be modified by means of the relation given in equation (8.1) in the following way (Eq. 21) to obtain a circumferential velocity distribution for the Burgers-Rott vortex model, which is dependent on v and \overline{a} (Eq. 21).

529

$$\overline{u_{\theta}}(\bar{r}) = \frac{1}{\bar{r}} \left(1 - exp \left(-\frac{r\bar{a} \ u_{\theta,max}}{2\nu} \right)^2 \right)$$
(21)

531

532 *v* and \overline{a} need to be chosen independent from one another, which has the consequence that the input 533 parameters, *R* and $u_{\theta,max}$ vary (see Eq. 8.1). Unquestionably, this is physically not consistent but 534 seems to be the only way for the Burgers-Rott vortex model to generate a physically meaningful 535 surface pressure increase with increasing radial distance.

536

537 Figure 9 shows the surface pressure distribution for input parameters of R = 10m and $u_{\theta,max} =$

538 10m/s for the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan models. It is worth noting that the 'viscosity'

and 'stretching' parameter differ for different input parameters. The two-celled structure of the

- 540 Sullivan vortex, and hence, the decreased circumferential velocity component close to the vortex
- 541 core result in a relatively flat pressure distribution close to the vortex centre (Figure 8). The surface

- pressure distribution of the Burgers-Rott vortex increases at a faster rate close to the vortex centre 542
- due to a rapid increase in circumferential velocity in this region (Figure 8). The largest differences 543
- in the surface pressure distribution of the vortex models can be found inside the vortex core (r < r544
- R_{model}) and for radial distances around $r/R_{model} = 1.5$. This arises due to the relative differences in 545
- 546 the magnitude of the circumferential velocity predicted by the analytical models (section 2.6).



Figure 9: Surface pressure distribution of Rankine, adjusted Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex model.

549

The static 'surface pressure' distribution and the effect of the swirl ratio on the shape of the 550 distribution of the Baker vortex model is shown in figure 10. The 'surface pressure' distribution 551 552 of the Baker vortex model falls to zero for $r \to \infty$, however, the 'surface pressure' minimum is not 553 bounded for the Baker vortex model and decreases with increasing swirl ratio as shown in figure 10 from -1.99 $\times \rho u_r(r_m, z_m)$ to -17.94 $\times \rho u_r(r_m, z_m)$ for $S_{Baker} = 1$ to 3 due to the term 554 $\frac{4.15S_{Baker}^2(ln(1+\bar{z}^2))^2}{(1+\bar{z}^2)}$ (compare equation (19)). The effect of this on the 'surface pressure' 555 distribution is masked in figure 10 due to normalising the pressure distribution additionally with 556 $p(r,z_m)_{min}$ of the corresponding swirl ratio. This additional normalisation is applied to force all 557 558 pressures to tend to -1 as r/R tends to 0. It is noted that some numerical and experimental data, e.g., Natarajan and Hangan (2012) and Haan et al. (2008), show that the surface pressure minimum 559 decreases in magnitude with increasing swirl ratio which has been associated with a transition from

- a single-celled to a two-celled vortex. At present, although the Baker model is able to represent 561 multiple cell tornadoes, this behaviour is not incorporated into the current paper. 562
- 563





Figure 10: 'Surface pressure' distribution of the Baker vortex model for different swirl ratios (S_{Baker}).

567 The effect of the radial velocity profile on the 'surface pressure' is, not surprisingly, largest at the core radius (R_{Baker}) since this is where the radial velocity is maximum for $\gamma = 2$. When this term is 568 normalised by the value of $p(r, z_m)_{min}$ for each corresponding swirl ratio, its magnitude changes and 569 570 results in a different distribution of relative pressure (Figure 10). As a consequence, figure 10 shows that with increasing S_{Baker} the rate of change of pressure with increasing radial distance 571 increases and hence, the smaller the vortex becomes. It needs to be mentioned here that this is only 572 the case because the core radius (R_{Baker}) remains constant even though the swirl ratio changes. Due 573 to the shape of the radial velocity component, differences in figure 10 are largest at r/R_{Baker} (z = 574 z_m = 1. The last term in equation (19) represents the effect of vertical advection of radial velocity 575 on the 'surface pressure' distribution, i.e., $\left(-\frac{4ln(1+\bar{z}^2)(1-\bar{z}^2)}{(1+\bar{z}^2)^2(1+\bar{z}^2)^2}\right)$. When $z = z_m$, this term reduces to 576 577 zero.

- 578
- 579

580 **3. Experimental methodology**

581

In this section, the experimental methodology is presented, which was used to assess the ability
(or otherwise) of the introduced vortex models to simulate flow and pressure characteristics
obtained in a physical tornado-like vortex simulator.

585

586 *3.1 Tornado-like vortex simulator*

587

For this analysis, the University of Birmingham (UoB) tornado-like vortex generator $(3m \times 3m)$, which is based on the design by Ward (1972), is used (Figure 11). The generator consists of two chambers, a convergence chamber with height H_1 and diameter D_1 and a convection chamber with height H_2 and diameter D_2 . The aspect ratio (*a*) is defined as the ratio of updraft radius (1/2 D_3) and convergence chamber height and therefore results in an aspect ratio of a = 2 for the configuration shown in Figure 11. Angular momentum is introduced by guide vanes around the 594 convergence chamber, which can be set to different angles. By changing the guide vane angle, the

vorticity in the flow can be altered and different vortex structures can be generated.



597 598

599

602 603

Figure 11: An illustration of the UoB tornado-like vortex generator.

600 The kinematic and dynamic similarity of the generated vortex is controlled by the Reynolds 601 number, Re, (Eq. 22) and the swirl ratio, S, (Eq. 23).

$$Re = \frac{Q}{\nu \ 0.5D_3} \tag{22}$$

 $S = \frac{\tan(\alpha)}{2a}$

605 606

604

Here, *Q* is the flow rate through the simulator and ν is the kinematic viscosity of air. The guide vane angle, α , is the angle relative to the radial velocity component (Figure 11).

609

610 *3.2 Measurement setup and data quality*

611 612 Poin

Point velocity measurements were made with 100Hz using a Cobra Probe, which was mounted to 613 a two-axis traverse system inside the simulator. This traverse system enabled the probe to be positioned with an accuracy of 1mm at nine heights (z) above the simulator's surface (0.01m, 614 0.05m, 0.10m, 0.15m, 0.20m, 0.25m, 0.30m, 0.40m, 0.50m, 0.60m) with a radial spacing of 615 0.025m from the centre of the simulator up to a radial distance of 0.60m. The size of the probe is 616 less than 10⁶ times smaller than the convergence chamber and the influence of the traverse system 617 on the surface pressure measurements was found to be smaller than the experimental measurement 618 619 uncertainty. The Cobra Probe can measure velocity data greater than 2m/s within a cone of influence of +/- 45°. These limitations can have a direct influence on the measured data. For 620 example, if the recorded data quality (percentage of velocity samples of a measured time series 621 622 which are >2m/s and have an angle of attack $<+/-45^\circ$) is less than 100% then this can introduce a 623 bias in the calculated velocity vector – the lower the data quality the greater the potential bias. To minimize the bias in time averaged velocities, only those positions with a data quality of greater 624

20

(23)

than 80% were accepted for further analysis. This threshold is assumed to provide a suitablecompromise between data quality and quantity.

627

The pressure distribution is measured with 100Hz on the ground plane along two perpendicular lines denoted x and y in figure 11. Surface pressure taps are distributed along these lines with a spacing of 0.05m from the simulator's centre up to a distance of 0.75m.

631

Different types of uncertainties have to be distinguished. The experimental uncertainty is a
 combination of uncertainties due to measuring a finite time series (statistical uncertainty), human
 error such as probe and guide vane angle positioning (repeatability) and the uncertainty of the
 measurement device itself.

636

637 *3.2.1 Statistical uncertainty*

638

The statistical uncertainty is a measure of uncertainty of the time average with respect to the 639 unsteadiness of the flow or surface pressure field. Therefore, it is highly important to verify that 640 641 the time average of a statistically, stationary stochastic process (such as a tornado) converges against the mean value of all possible realisations within the chosen measurement duration. In 642 643 order to address the statistical uncertainty for this study, convergence tests were undertaken. For the convergence tests, time series were measured for a duration of 600 seconds. Running averages 644 (RA) with increasing sampling durations (from 10 seconds – 600 seconds) were calculated and 645 shown as envelope on the y-axis for the corresponding averaging time. For example, figures 12a 646 and 12b show the convergence tests of the circumferential velocity component and surface 647 pressure at the core radius of the lowest measurement height and at the centre of the simulator, 648 respectively for S = 0.69. 649





Figure 12: Convergence test of circumferential velocity (a) and surface pressure (b) for S = 0.69.

652

Figure 12 indicates that the uncertainty is reduced after a measurement duration of 80 seconds for velocities and 60 seconds for surface pressures. Hence, for this study, velocity and pressure measurements were conducted for a period of 80 and 60 seconds, respectively. The corresponding statistical uncertainties are shown in percentage of the time-average of the corresponding circumferential velocity component ($u_{\theta,mean,600s}$) and surface pressure ($p_{mean,600s}$) which was obtained after sampling for 600 seconds (Table 2).

	<i>S</i> = 0.14	<i>S</i> = 0.30	<i>S</i> = 0.69
	Velocity		
$u_{\theta}(r=R)_{mean,600s} [m/s]$	5.31	9.39	10.51
$u_{\theta}(r=R)_{uncertainty}$ [%]	<u>±1.94</u>	±1.02	<u>±0.54</u>
$u_r(r=R)_{uncertainty}$ [%]	<u>±5.96</u>	<u>+</u> 3.17	±0.52
$w(r=R)_{uncertainty}$ [%]	<u>±1.21</u>	<u>±0.55</u>	±0.25
	Pressure		
$p(r=0)_{mean,600s} [Nm^{-2}]$	-136.30	-224.22	-164.44
$p(r=0)_{uncertainty}$ [%]	±26.75	<u>±5.94</u>	<u>+</u> 1.16

660 Table 2: Statistical uncertainties of time-averaged velocity components and surface pressure.

661

662 The 80-second time average of circumferential and vertical velocity components can be 663 determined with an uncertainty of less than $\pm 2\%$ for all swirl ratios. Uncertainties of the radial 664 velocity components are slightly larger with about $\pm 6\%$, $\pm 3\%$ and $\pm 0.5\%$ for S = 0.14, S = 0.30665 and S = 0.69, respectively.

666

667 For the surface pressure, 60 seconds of measurement time allow to determine the time-average to about $\pm 27\%$, $\pm 6\%$ and $\pm 1\%$ for S = 0.14, S = 0.30 and S = 0.69, respectively. The uncertainty of 668 surface pressure measurements at the centre of the simulator seems to be dependent on the swirl 669 ratio, with lower uncertainties with increasing swirl ratio. This could be an indication for a more 670 unstable vortex movement for the lowest swirl ratio compared to larger S. This behaviour cannot 671 be observed in the uncertainties associated with the velocity measurements. A potential reason for 672 this could be that the vortex movement occurs relatively close to the vortex centre where surface 673 674 pressure gradients are relatively large, especially for the lowest swirl ratio, and for that reason, 675 core radii positions are not that strongly affected by this behaviour.

676

677 *3.2.2 Repeatability*

678

The repeatability is the degree to which repeated measurements under unchanged boundary conditions show the same results. Surface pressure measurements and the radial profile of velocities in the lowest measurement height were repeated for five times for each swirl ratio. The measurement repeatability is analysed in form of a distribution of all possible differences of these repetitions. For example, figures 13a and 13b show the measurement repeatability distribution of circumferential velocity component and surface pressure for S = 0.69.



0.69.

685 686

687

688

The standard deviation (STD) of the corresponding distributions was chosen as a representative 689 measure to evaluate the repeatability, which is shown in table 3 for velocity components and 690 surface pressures. Absolute values are given instead of percentages as these uncertainties are 691 assumed to apply for all corresponding time averaged results. Similar to the statistical uncertainty, 692 also table 3 shows that the repeatability of surface pressure measurements is dependent on the 693 694 swirl ratio. For S = 0.14 and S = 0.30 the repeatability is not only dependent on the swirl ratio but also on the radial distance. For that reason, a repeatability dependent on r is introduced because a 695 uniform value would highly underestimate the repeatability of measurement positions close to the 696 vortex centre, and highly overestimate the repeatability for positions further away from the vortex 697 centre (Table 3). No significant dependence on the radial distance was found for the repeatability 698 699 of surface pressure measurements for S = 0.69 and all velocity measurements. Consequently, a uniform measurement repeatability independent from r is used for those cases (Table 3). 700 701

	S=0.14	S=0.30	S=0.69
	Velocity		
$u_{\theta,uncertainty} [m/s]$	<u>±0.51</u>	<u>±0.44</u>	±0.32
$u_{r,uncertainty} [m/s]$	<u>±0.46</u>	<u>±0.58</u>	±0.22
Wuncertainty [m/s]	±0.17	<u>±0.16</u>	±0.08
	Puncertainty [Nm ⁻²]		
-0.05m < r < 0.05m	<u>+</u> 53.58	<u>±21.74</u>	±5.42
$r = \pm 0.1m$	±12.98	±17.34	±5.42
r > 0.1m & r < -0.1m	±1.86	<u>+</u> 3.82	±5.42

702 Table 3: Repeatability of time-averaged velocity components and surface pressures.

703

The low repeatability close to the vortex centre for S = 0.14 and S = 0.30 is not too surprising as the statistical uncertainty found at those positions (Table 2) is limiting the repeatability. Therefore, large uncertainties for S = 0.14 and S = 0.30 close to the vortex core can partly be explained by the

⁷⁰⁷ large statistical uncertainty at these positions. Furthermore, these findings suggest that especially

708 positions close to the centre are sensitive to small variations in the boundary conditions such as 709 guide vane angle positioning.

710

711 *3.2.3 Device uncertainty*

712

In this study, pressure transducers (HCLA12X5DB) with a typical uncertainty of \pm 5 Nm⁻² are 713 used. The Cobra Probe is accurate within ± 0.5 m/s for the velocity vector up to a turbulence 714 intensity of ~30%. Therefore, positions with a turbulence intensity greater than 30% are excluded 715 716 from the analysis. Since the device uncertainty for the Cobra Probe is given for the velocity vector (\vec{V}) ; the uncertainty of each velocity component needs to be calculated for each measurement 717 position based on the obtained average of the corresponding velocity component. Equation 24 718 shows as an example the calculation of the device uncertainty for the circumferential velocity 719 component at a certain position. 720

- 721
- 722

723

725

$$u_{\theta,uncertainty} = 0.5 \ \langle \frac{|u_{\theta}|}{\vec{v}} \rangle \tag{24}$$

724 3.2.4 Experimental uncertainty

The associated experimental uncertainty of velocity and surface pressure measurements, which is 726 727 shown as envelope in later figures is based on a combination of the repetition uncertainty (shown 728 in table 3) and the device uncertainty.

729 730

731 4. Comparison

732

In this section, flow field and surface pressure data for three different swirl ratios (S = 0.14, S =733 0.30, and S = 0.69) are analysed and the capability of the vortex models to replicate the 734 experimental results is evaluated. 735

736

737 4.1. The flow structure

738

739 In order to address the complex nature of the analysed flow fields, the 3-D velocity fields obtained for S = 0.14, S = 0.30 and S = 0.69 are shown in figure 14. Also shown are results of selected 740 741 analytical vortex models, which for the sake of brevity are not repeated for all swirl ratios. The 'viscosity' parameter for the Burgers-Rott and Sullivan model is assumed to be $v=0.05 m^2 s^{-1}$. 742 However, for the analysis presented in figure 14b, the actual 'viscosity' value is not that crucial 743 because the focus of this analysis lies rather on the flow structure than on the actual velocity 744 745 magnitude, which is affected by the 'viscosity'.

Velocity components are normalised by the maximum circumferential velocity $(u_{\theta,max})$ of the 747 corresponding swirl ratio. Radial/vertical distances are normalised by the corresponding core 748 radius (R). All of the simplified models presented in section 2 assume a height independent core 749 radius and all vortex models besides the Baker vortex model assume a height independent $u_{\theta max}$. 750 For this reason, velocity components are normalised by the height average of the maximum 751 circumferential velocity ($u_{\theta,max,average}$) of the corresponding swirl ratio (Eq. 25) and 752 radial/vertical distances are normalised by the corresponding height averaged core radius ($R_{average}$, 753 Eq. 26). The use of averaged quantities is considered to give the best indication of a representative 754 755 core radius and maximum circumferential velocity for all heights.

756 757

$$u_{\theta,max,average} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} u_{\theta,max}(z)_i$$
(25)

758

759

 $R_{average} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R(z)_i$ (26)

760

762

761 where N is the number of measurement heights.

A further degree of normalisation is undertaken to aid visual comparisons, i.e., each height (radial 763 distance) is normalised by the corresponding maximum of $z/R_{average}$ ($r/R_{average}$) for each swirl ratio 764 - the actual maxima used are given in the figure captions. Experimentally obtained $R_{average}$ and 765 $u_{\theta,max,average}$ (shown in figure 15) are used to calculate the flow field of the Rankine, Burgers-766 Rott, Sullivan and Baker vortex models for corresponding swirl ratios. Due to the restrictions when 767 measuring with the Cobra probe, the velocity field close to the vortex centre for all swirl ratios and 768 near the surface at larger radial distances for S = 0.14 could not be captured. Inside the vortex core 769 $(r < R_{average})$, velocity vectors are only shown at positions where absolute values of time averaged 770 radial and vertical velocities are larger than the corresponding measurement uncertainty. Hence, 771 only positions for which a clear directionality can be defined are presented in figure 14. 772

773





Figure 14: Experimental results of the 3-D velocity field are shown in a_1 (S = 0.14), a_2 (S = 0.30) and a_3 (S = 0.69). Corresponding results of Rankine, Burgers-Rott, Sullivan and Baker vortex models are shown in b_1 , b_2 , b_3 and b_4 , respectively. The normalised circumferential velocity component is shown as contour and radial and vertical velocity components are shown as 2-D vector field. To normalise heights and distances, maximum values of experimentally obtained ($z/R_{average}$) max and ($r/R_{average}$) max are used. For S = 0.14, S = 0.30 and S = 0.69 ($r/R_{average}$) max = ($z/R_{average}$) max = 5.58, 7.27 and 1.97, respectively.

In general, experimentally obtained flow characteristics reveal much more complex flow patterns compared to the vortex models (Figure 14). The measured circumferential velocity component for all swirl ratios increases towards the core radius and reaches the overall maximum close to the surface. Furthermore, a strong decrease in circumferential velocity can be observed with height in 789 the lower heights for all swirl ratios (Figure 14a). The circumferential velocity components of Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models (Figure 14b₁, Figure 14b₂, and Figure 14b₃) are 790 not a function of height and consequently, cannot represent the height dependence found in the 791 simulator (Figure 14a). The circumferential velocity of the Baker vortex model is height dependent 792 793 and increases with increasing height from the ground (Figure 14b₄), which is also not obtained experimentally. It can be noticed in figure 14a that for all swirl ratios, a strong inflow can be 794 detected close to the surface, up to the position where the overall maximum circumferential 795 velocity occurs. At this position, the radial velocity drops drastically and the vertical velocity 796 797 increases significantly.

798

Contrary to what may be expected, Figure 14a₁, shows a radial outflow from the vortex centre. However, this is supported by the work of Mishra et al., (2008) and Haan et al., (2008), where tentative evidence of a radial outflow close to the vortex centre can be inferred. Various possible reasons for this behaviour (including vortex core unsteadiness with respect to height) could be inferred, however, firm conclusions as to why this may be the case cannot, at present, be drawn.

804

With increasing swirl ratio (S = 0.69), a downdraft is detected close to the centre of the simulator (Figure 14a₃). This flow structure is expected for a two-celled vortex (see Sullivan vortex model, Figure 14c₃). However, the downdraft is directed slightly towards the simulator's centre which was also observed by Haan et al., (2008) for a high swirl ratio. The lack of detailed, fine scale, experimental data at the centre of the vortex make further conclusions difficult.

810

Burgers-Rott, Sullivan, and Baker vortex models, the measured flow pattern are far more complex
than the analytical models would suggest.

815

A more detailed analysis of the flow field can be found in figures 15 - 17 illustrating the circumferential, radial and vertical velocity components for z = 0.01m, z = 0.10m, z = 0.20m and z = 0.40m, for S = 0.14 (a), S = 0.30 (b) and S = 0.69 (c).

819

820 Experimentally obtained results for $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ (Figure 15) show that for all swirl ratios, the overall maxima of $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ occurs at the lowest measurement height (z=0.01m, Figure 15). The distribution of 821 circumferential velocity components at greater heights is relatively uniform and differences lie 822 within the experimental uncertainty (Figure 15). The lowest height reveals an entirely different 823 flow structure compared to the rest of the generated vortex. This suggests a similar vertical profile 824 of circumferential velocity components as observed by Kosiba and Wurman (2013). Figure 15 also 825 outlines differences in the circumferential velocity profile for different swirl ratios. Figure 15 826 shows that $u_{\theta,max,average}$ increases with increasing swirl ratio from 3.65 – 8.75m/s. Also, the core 827 radius increases with increasing swirl ratio from 0.11 - 0.31m. Results obtained for S = 0.30 do 828

not follow this trend and reveal an averaged core radius of 0.08m, which is smaller than the one observed for S = 0.14. However, it is worth noting that the difference between $R_{average}$ for S = 0.14and S = 0.30 is ~0.03m. This difference is within the experimental uncertainty of determining $R_{average}$ and would therefore be masked when taking the uncertainty of determining $R_{average}$ into account, which is approximately ± 0.02 m.

834

In general, the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models appear to underestimate the trend of $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ for S = 0.14 (Figure 15a), although the differences are close to or within the experimental uncertainty in most cases. However, the Baker model appears to predict the trend reasonably well for this swirl ratio. All models appear to fail to capture the distribution of $\overline{u_{\theta}}$ at relatively large values of *S* (Figure 15b).

840

841 Inside the vortex core, a comparison between experimentally obtained results and vortex models

is difficult due to the lack of good experimental data for S = 0.14 and S = 0.30 (Figure 15a and

Figure 15b). The circumferential velocity component of the Burgers-Rott and Baker vortex model

match the experimental data obtained for S = 0.69 (Figure 15c). Results from the Rankine and

845 Sullivan vortex model, again underestimate the magnitude of obtained circumferential velocities

846 for the highest swirl ratio.







c)

850 851 852

853

854

Figure 15: Measured circumferential velocity component for S = 0.14 (a), S = 0.30 (b) and S = 0.69 (c). Additionally, results of the circumferential velocity component of Rankine, Burgers-Rott, Sullivan, and Baker vortex models are shown. To normalise the radial distance, maximum values of experimentally obtained ($r/R_{average}$) max are used. For S = 0.14, S = 0.30 and S = 0.69 ($r/R_{average}$) max = ($z/R_{average}$) max = 5.58, 7.27 and 1.97, respectively.

855 Figure 16 illustrates the radial distribution of $\overline{u_r}$ for z = 0.01m, z = 0.10m, z = 0.20m and z = 0.40m. Additionally a height average is calculated and shown for all velocities obtained for z > 0.01m. It 856 needs to be mentioned here that the swirl ratio (S) defined in equation 23 is, unlike the definition 857 adopted in the Baker vortex model (S_{Baker}) , solely a function of the tornado generator 858 859 characteristics. For that reason, values of S and S_{Baker} differ for the same flow field in the following figures. As illustrated in figure 16a and 16b, the Baker model fits the data obtained reasonably 860 well close to the surface, whereas the Sullivan and Burgers-Rott vortex model are a better fit for 861 862 experimental data obtained in greater heights. This is perhaps not too surprising given the 863 assumptions embedded in the models. However, for the largest swirl ratio (Figure 16c), the Baker model only represents the trend in the lowest height for normalised radial distances greater than 864 0.6, whereas the Sullivan model performs better for the lowest height and for lower normalised 865 radial distances. 866

867

For S = 0.14, the radial outflow inside the vortex core suggests the structure of a (limited height) 868 two-celled vortex. Thus, in general, the height averaged structure of $\overline{u_r}$ appears to be reasonably 869 represented by the Sullivan vortex model (Figure 16a). Even though one feature of a two-celled 870 vortex is present for S = 0.14, the vertical downdraft suggested by the Sullivan vortex model at 871 872 the vortex centre was not capture (Figure 17a). For the vertical velocity component obtained with S = 0.14, none of the vortex models is capable of replicating the maximum updraft just outside the 873 vortex core (Figure 17a). However, for larger radial distances, results of Burgers-Rott and Sullivan 874 vortex model can be used to reproduce height averaged vertical velocities (Figure 17a). Certainly, 875 876 it needs to be mentioned here that for this case, the vortex models fail to replicate the complex behaviour observed experimentally. Although there are only few positions available for a 877 comparison in the lowest height, radial and vertical velocity component of the Baker vortex model 878 are in good agreement with the experimental data (Figure 16a and Figure 17a). 879

For S = 0.30, radial velocities are mainly directed towards the vortex centre (radial inflow). The 881 magnitude of radial velocities in greater heights z > 0.01 m is relatively low compared to radial 882 velocities obtained in the lowest height (z=0.01m). The best fit for this 'single-celled' flow 883 884 behaviour is achieved with the Burgers-Rott vortex model with a relatively low 'viscosity' parameter $(v=0.0015m^2s^{-1})$ to minimise the increase of radial inflow from the vortex centre to 885 larger radial distances. Similar to the vertical velocity component found for S = 0.14, also here the 886 maximum updraft outside the vortex core (Figure 17b) cannot be replicated by any of the 887 introduced vortex models. However, for larger radial distances the Burgers-Rott vortex model can 888 be used to model the height averaged behaviour (Figure 17b). Nevertheless, the complex vertical 889 890 flow structure cannot be captured. Radial and vertical velocity component of the Baker vortex model on the other hand are in good agreement with the experimental data for z=0.01m (Figure 891 892 16b and Figure 17b).

893

For S = 0.69, radial velocities (Figure 16c) are found to be directed inwards, towards the vortex 894 centre (radial inflow), even though a downdraft close to the vortex centre is found (Figure 17c). In 895 terms of vortex models, this means that the radial velocity shows a 'single-celled' behaviour with 896 897 radial inflow (Burgers-Rott and Baker), whereas the vertical velocity illustrates a 'two-celled' structure with downdraft (Sullivan). None of the presented vortex models is capable of 898 representing both of the observed flow patterns. For S = 0.69, the flow field obtained is far more 899 complex than the assumed flow structure of a single or a double-celled vortex. In this case, the 900 flow reveals a 'multi-celled' structure with a weak radial inflow and updraft outside the core vortex 901 902 and relatively strong radial inflow and downdraft inside the core vortex (Figure 16c and Figure 17c). 903

904

905 For radial and vertical velocity components of S = 0.69, an attempt is shown to use Sullivan and 906 Baker vortex model to replicate some of the flow patterns observed in the lowest height (z =0.01m). For the radial velocity component in the lowest height (Figure 16c), the Baker vortex 907 model captures the radial inflow outside the vortex core but overestimates velocities inside the 908 909 vortex core. The decrease in radial inflow around the core radius can be replicated with the Sullivan 910 vortex model, however, close to the vortex centre, the Sullivan vortex model is not able to replicate the flow field and also for larger radial distances the Sullivan vortex model fails due to its 911 increasing radial velocity component with increasing radial distance (Figure 16c). 912

913

For the vertical velocity (Figure 17c), the Sullivan vortex model can represent parts of the observed results. By means of the shape parameter, b, the downdraft region around the vortex centre of the Sullivan vortex model can be extended in the radial direction so that for b = 12, results of the Sullivan model show some similarity with the increase in radial inflow from the vortex core towards the vortex centre (Figure 17c). However, increasing, b, also results in an increasing

downdraft at the core radius, which for S = 0.69 is highly overestimated. The Baker vortex model

920 is not able to replicate the downdraft close to the vortex centre and the relatively strong vertical

921 updraft around the core radius.



Figure 16: Measured radial velocity component for S = 0.14 (a), S = 0.30 (b) and S = 0.69 (c). Additionally, results of the radial velocity component of Burgers-Rott (b) and Sullivan vortex model (a and c) are shown. Results of the Baker vortex model are shown for the lowest height (z = 0.01). To normalise the radial distance, maximum values of experimentally obtained ($r/R_{average}$) max are used. For S = 0.14, S = 0.30 and S = 0.69 ($r/R_{average}$) max = ($z/R_{average}$) max = 5.58, 7.27 and 1.97, respectively.



933 Figure 17: Measured vertical velocity component for S = 0.14 (a), S = 0.30 (b) and S = 0.69 (c). Additionally, results 934 of the vertical velocity component of Burgers-Rott (a and b) and Sullivan vortex model (a and b) are shown. Results 935 of the Baker vortex model are shown for the lowest height (z = 0.01). To normalise the radial distance, maximum 936 values of experimentally obtained $(r/R_{average})_{max}$ are used. For S = 0.14, S = 0.30 and S = 0.69 $(r/R_{average})_{max} =$ 937 $(z/R_{average})_{max} = 5.58, 7.27$ and 1.97, respectively.

- 939 4.2 Surface pressure distribution
- 940

- Figure 18 and figure 19 show the surface pressure distribution for S = 0.14, S = 0.30, and S = 0.69.
- Additionally, the surface pressure distributions of the Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex
- models are illustrated in figure 18 and results of the Baker vortex model are shown in figure 19.
- 945 Looking at figures 18 and 19, it could be concluded that differences in the measured surface pressure distribution depend significantly on the swirl ratio. As expected, the smallest vortex 946 shows the fastest increase in surface pressure from the vortex centre towards larger radial distances 947 (S = 0.14). The slope of the surface pressure change is determined by the measured surface 948 pressure distribution but also affected by the normalisation of radial distances. This means, for the 949 950 same surface pressure distribution, a larger core radius leads to a surface pressure distribution, which is increasing faster from the vortex centre towards larger radial distances. For that reason, 951 the surface pressure distribution of S = 0.30 and S = 0.60 reveal an unexpected behaviour. The 952 surface pressure distribution obtained with S = 0.69 displays a faster increase of surface pressure 953 954 with increasing radial distance compared to the pressure distribution measured with S = 0.30. This can be explained by the relatively small averaged core radius for S = 0.30 ($R_{average, (S=0.30)} = 0.08$ m) 955 compared to $R_{average}$ of S = 0.14 ($R_{average}$, (S=0.14) = 0.11m) and S = 0.69 ($R_{average}$, (S=0.69) = 0.31m). 956
- 957

To avoid an unphysical decrease in surface pressure with increasing radial distance, the 'viscosity' parameter of the Sullivan vortex model is chosen to be zero and for the Burgers-Rott vortex model, v and \bar{a} are adjusted for each swirl ratio to guaranty a physically reasonable surface pressure increase with increasing radial distance (Figure 18).

962

963 The largest differences in the surface pressure distribution of the vortex models is found close to the vortex centre, whereas largest differences in the experimental surface pressure data for the 964 three different vortices are found outside the vortex core (Figure 18). The surface pressure 965 966 distributions of the Rankine and Burgers-Rott vortex models are in good agreement with the experimental data for S = 0.69 (Figure 18), albeit the Burgers-Rott vortex model fails for larger 967 radial distances due to a physically unrealistic decrease in surface pressure, which is explained in 968 section 2.8. Also, the Sullivan vortex model shows good agreement for this swirl ratio (S = 0.69) 969 970 but only for larger radial distances. Close to the vortex centre, the Sullivan vortex model 971 underestimates experimental results due to its two-celled structure (Figure 18). Even though a 972 downdraft is present close to the vortex centre for S = 0.69, the effect of it is not visible in the experimentally obtained surface pressure distribution. 973

974

All three solutions of the Baker vortex model match the experimental surface pressure for S = 0.30the best (Figure 19). The swirl ratio of the Baker vortex model (S_{Baker}) is responsible for differences in the surface pressure distribution. However, differences in S_{Baker} for the three analysed vortices are too small to cause significant differences in the surface pressure distribution (Figure 19). To allow a more flexible surface pressure model, the shape parameter, γ , in the Baker model needs to

980 be treated as a variable when deriving the static pressure distribution (Eq. 19). This would allow

different core radii (R_{Baker}) and also different shapes of the surface pressure distribution to be generated. However, in this work, the surface pressure equation for the Baker vortex model (Eq. 19) assumes a shape parameter of $\gamma=2$. Consequently, the calculated surface pressure distributions shown in figure 19 assume a constant core radius (R_{Baker}) for all three vortices. For this reason, the surface pressure distributions of the Baker vortex model does not allow an accurate representation of the experimentally obtained surface pressure profiles.



Figure 18: Measured surface pressure distribution for S=0.14 (a), S=0.30 (b), and S=0.69 (c) and surface pressure of Rankine, Burgers-Rott, and Sullivan vortex model.
 990



991

987



- 994
- 995

996 **5. Conclusion**

- 997
- Based on this analysis, the following main conclusions can be drawn:
- 999

- Despite the simplicity of all the models examined, it has been shown that this area of
 research is highly complex, largely due to the interpretation of the different parameters
 involved.
- The Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex models are able to replicate some parts of the flow field. However, parameters, which need to be chosen to make the model results fit the experimental data (ν, \bar{a} and b) differ for surface pressure and different velocity components of the same vortex.
- The Baker vortex model seemed to be the best model to replicate the radial inflow close to the ground. However, it fails for larger heights over the range tested.
- Measured flow pattern are far less structured and organised than the pattern suggested by any of the vortex models. Consequently, none of the presented models can be used to represent the three dimensional vortex structures of experimentally generated tornado-like vortices.
- 1013 Rankine, Burgers-Rott and Sullivan vortex model are able to replicate the surface pressure 1014 distribution of one of the analysed vortices (S = 0.69) but due to their limitations, these 1015 models are not adequate enough to replicate a variety of differently shaped pressure 1016 distributions.
- The Baker vortex model with a shape parameter of $\gamma = 2$ allows the representation of the surface pressure distribution obtained for (S = 0.30). A more general expression for the surface pressure is required to represent experimental data for all three vortices.
- 1020 1021

1022 **References**

1023

Alekseenko, S.V., Kuibin, P.A., Okulov, V.L., 2007. Theory of Concentrated Vortices. Springer Berlin Heidelberg
New York. ISBN 978-3-540-73376-8. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-73376-8

- Alexander, C.R. and Wurman J.M., 2008. Updated mobile radar climatology of supercell tornado structures and
 dynamics. 24th Conference on Severe Local Storms, Savannah, GA.
- Baker C.J. and Sterling M., 2017. Modelling wind fields and debris flight in tornadoes. Journal of Wind
 Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 168, 312-321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2017.06.017
- 1032
 1033 Batterson J.W., Maicke B.A., Majdalani J., 2007. Advancements in Theoretical Models of Confined Vortex
 1034 Flowfields. Defense Technical Information Center, University of Tennessee Space Institute, Tullahoma, TN 37388.
- 1035
 1036 Bech J., Gayà M., Aran M., Figuerola F., Amaro J., Arús J., 2009. Tornado damage analysis of a forest area using
 1037 site survey observations, radar data and a simple analytical vortex model. Atmospheric Research 93, 118–130.
 1038 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2008.10.016
- 1039
 1040 Bloor, M.I.G., Ingham, D.B., 1987. The flow in industrial cyclones. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 178, 507-519.
 1041 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022112087001344
 1042
- Brown, R.A., Wood, V.T., 2004. Comparisons of Doppler velocity tornadic vortex signatures with signatures from
 model vortices. 22nd Conference on Severe Local Storms, Anonymous Hyannis, MA.
- 1045

1046 Burgers, J.M., 1948. A Mathematical Model Illustrating the Theory of Turbulence. Advances in Applied Mechanics 1047 1, 171-199. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2156(08)70100-5 1048 1049 Church, C.R., Snow, J.T., Baker, G.L., Agee, E.M., 1979. Characteristics of Tornado-Like Vortices as a Function of 1050 Swirl Ratio: A Laboratory Investigation. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 36, 1755-1776. 1051 https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1979)036<1755:COTLVA>2.0.CO;2 1052 1053 Davies-Jones, R. and Kessler, E., 1974. Tornadoes. Weather and Climate Modification, W. N. Hess, Ed., Wiley, 552-1054 595. 1055 1056 Davies-Jones, R., Trapp, R.J., Bluestein, H.B., 2001. Tornadoes and Tornadic Storms. Meteorological Monographs 1057 50, 167-222. https://doi.org/10.1175/0065-9401-28.50.167 1058 1059 Gillmeier, S., Sterling, M., Hemida, H., 2016. An Analysis of the Influence of a Tornado Generator's Geometry on 1060 the Flow Field. 8th International Colloquium on Bluff Body Aerodynamics and Applications. Boston, Massachusetts, 1061 USA. 1062 1063 Haan Jr, F.L., Sarkar, P.P., Gallus, W.A., 2008. Design, construction and performance of a large tornado simulator 1064 for wind engineering applications. Engineering Structures 30, 1146-1159. 1065 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2007.07.010 1066 1067 Hashemi Tari, P., Gurka, R., Hangan, H., 2010. Experimental investigation of tornado-like vortex dynamics with 1068 swirl ratio: The mean and turbulent flow fields. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 98, 936-1069 944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2010.10.001 1070 1071 Hoecker, W.H., 1960. Wind speed and air flow patterns in the Dallas tornado of April 2, 1957. Monthly Weather 1072 Review 88, 167-180. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1960)088<0167:WSAAFP>2.0.CO;2 1073 1074 Karstens, C.D., Samaras, T.M., Lee, B.D., Gallus Jr., W.A., Finley, C.A., 2010. Near-Ground Pressure and Wind 1075 Measurements in Tornadoes. Monthly Weather Review 138, 2570-2588. https://doi.org/10.1175/2010MWR3201.1 1076 1077 Kilty, K.T., 2005. Steady-state tornado vortex models. http://www.kilty.com/pdfs/models.pdf (last accessed 1078 08/06/2017). 1079 1080 Kim, Y.C., Matsui, M., 2017. Analytical and empirical models of tornado vortices: A comparative study. Journal of 1081 Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 171, 230-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2017.10.009 1082 1083 Kosiba, K., Wurman, J., 2010. The Three-Dimensional Axisymmetric Wind Field Structure of the Spencer, South 1084 Dakota, 1998 Tornado. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 67, 3074-3083. https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JAS3416.1 1085 1086 Kosiba, K., Wurman, J., 2013. The Three-Dimensional Structure and Evolution of a Tornado Boundary Layer. 1087 Weather and Forecasting 28, 1552-1561. https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-13-00070.1 1088 1089 Kuo, H.L., 1971. Axisymmetric Flows in the Boundary Layer of a Maintained Vortex. Journal of the Atmospheric 1090 Sciences 28, 20-41. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1971)028<0020:AFITBL>2.0.CO;2 1091 1092 Lee, J., Samaras, T., Young, C. R., 2004. Pressure measurements at the ground in an F-4 tornado. 22nd Conference 1093 on Severe Local Storms, Anonymous Hyannis, MA. 1094 1095 Lewellen, W.S., 1993. Tornado Vortex Theory, The Tornado: Its Structure, Dynamics, Prediction, and Hazards. 1096 Geophys. Monogr 79, edited by C. Church et al., pp. 19-39, AGU, Washington, D. C. https://doi.org/ 1097 10.1029/GM079 1098 1099 Lewellen, W.S., Lewellen, D.C., Sykes, R.I., 1997. Large-Eddy Simulation of a Tornado's Interaction with the 1100 Surface. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 54, 581-605. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-1101 0469(1997)054<0581:LESOAT>2.0.CO;2

- 1102
- 1103 Liu, Z., Ishihara, T., 2016. Study of the effects of translation and roughness on tornado-like vortices by large-eddy
- simulations. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 151, 1-24.
- 1105 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2016.01.006
- 1106
 1107 Mishra, A.R., James, D.L., Letchford, C.W., 2008. Physical simulation of a single-celled tornado-like vortex, Part A:
 1108 Flow field characterization. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 96, 1243-1257.
 1109 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2008.02.063
- 1110
 1111 Natarajan, D., 2011. Numerical Simulation of Tornado-like Vortices. The University of Western Ontario Electronic
 1112 Thesis and Dissertation Repository.
- 1113
 1114 Natarajan, D., Hangan H., 2012. Large eddy simulations of translation and surface roughness effects on tornado1115 like vortices. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 104-106, 577-584.
 1116 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2012.05.004
- 1117

Nolan, D.S., Dahl, N.A., Bryan, G.H., Rotunno, R., 2017. Tornado Vortex Structure, Intensity, and Surface Wind
Gusts in Large-Eddy Simulations with Fully Developed Turbulence. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 74, 15731597. https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-16-0258.1

- 1122 *Rankine, W.J.M., 1882. A Manual of Applied Physics.* 10th ed. Charles Griff and Co. 663 pp. 1123
- 1124 *Refan, M., Hangan, H., 2016. Characterization of tornado-like flow fields in a new model scale wind testing* 1125 *chamber. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 151, 107-121.*
- 1126 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2016.02.002
- 1127
- Refan, M., Hangan, H., Wurman, J., 2014. Reproducing tornadoes in laboratory using proper scaling. Journal of
 Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 135, 136-148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2014.10.008
- 1131Refan, M., Hangan, H., Wurman, J., Kosiba, K., 2017. Doppler radar-derived wind field of five tornado events with1132application to engineering simulations. Engineering Structures 148, 509-521.
- 1133 *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engstruct.2017.06.068* 1134
- Rott, N., 1958. On the viscous core of a line vortex. Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik ZAMP 9,
 543-553. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02424773
- 1137

1141

1148

- Sabareesh, G.R., Matsui, M., Tamura, Y., 2012. Dependence of surface pressures on a cubic building in tornado like
 flow on building location and ground roughness. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics 103,
 50-59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2012.02.011
- Sullivan, R.D., 1959. A Two-Cell Vortex Solution of the Navier-Stokes Equations. Journal of the Aerospace Sciences
 26, 767-768. https://doi.org/10.2514/8.8303
- 1144
 1145 Tang, Z., Feng, C., Wu, L., Zuo, D., James, D.L., 2017. Characteristics of Tornado-Like Vortices Simulated in a
 1146 Large-Scale Ward-Type Simulator. Boundary-Layer Meteorology, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-017-03051147 7
- 1149 Trapp R.J., 2000. A Clarification of Vortex Breakdown and Tornadogenesis. Monthly Weather Review 128, 8881150 895. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2000)128<0888:ACOVBA>2.0.CO;2
- Vatistas, G.H., Kozel V. and Mih, W.C., 1991. A simpler model for concentrated vortices. Experiments in Fluids, 11,
 73–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00198434
- 1154
 1155 Vyas, A. B., Majdalani, J., and Chiaverini, M. J., 2003. The Bidirectional Vortex. Part 1: An Exact Inviscid Solution.
 1156 AIAA 2003-5052. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2003-5052
- 1157

- Ward, N.B., 1972. The Exploration of Certain Features of Tornado Dynamics Using a Laboratory Model. Journal of
 the Atmospheric Sciences 29, 1194-1204. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1972)029<1194:TEOCFO>2.0.CO;2
- 1160

Winn, W.P., Hunyady, S.J., Aulich, G.D., 1999. Pressure at the ground in a large tornado. Journal of Geophysical
 Research: Atmospheres 104, 22067-22082. https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JD900387

- 11631164 Wood, V.T., Brown, R.A., 2011. Simulated Tornadic Vortex Signatures of Tornado
 - Wood, V.T., Brown, R.A., 2011. Simulated Tornadic Vortex Signatures of Tornado-Like Vortices Having One- and
 Two-Celled Structures. Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology 50, 2338-2342.
 - 1166 https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-11-0118.1
 - 1167
 - 1168 Wood, V.T., White, L.W., 2011. A New Parametric Model of Vortex Tangential-Wind Profiles: Development,
 - **1169** *Testing, and Verification. Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 68, 990-1006.
 - 1170 https://doi.org/10.1175/2011JAS3588.1
- 1171
- Wurman, J., Gill, S., 2000. Finescale Radar Observations of the Dimmitt, Texas (2 June 1995), Tornado. Monthly
 Weather Review 128, 2135-2164. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(2000)128<2135:FROOTD>2.0.CO;2
- 1174
- 1175 Wurman, J., Kosiba, K., Robinson, P., 2013. In Situ, Doppler Radar, and Video Observations of the Interior
- 1176 Structure of a Tornado and the Wind–Damage Relationship. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 94,
- 1177 835-846. https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00114.1
- 1178
- 1179 Xu, Z and Hangan, H., 2009. An Inviscid Solution for Modeling of Tornadolike Vortices. Journal of Applied
- **1180** *Mechanics* 76, 031011-031011-031015. https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3063632