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

Wind tunnel testing on a train model subjected to crosswinds with different windbreak walls

Hashmi, Anam; Hemida, Hassan; Soper, David

DOI: 10.1016/j.jweia.2019.104013

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

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Hashmi, A, Hemida, H & Soper, D 2019, 'Wind tunnel testing on a train model subjected to crosswinds with different windbreak walls', *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, vol. 195, 104013, pp. 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2019.104013

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:

Hashmi, A, Hemida, H & Soper, D 2019, 'Wind tunnel testing on a train model subjected to crosswinds with different windbreak walls', Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics, vol. 195, 104013, pp. 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2019.104013

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.

Wind tunnel testing on a train model subjected to crosswinds with different windbreak walls
Syeda Anam Hashmi*, Hassan Hemida, David Soper
School of Civil Engineering, University of Birmingham, UK, B15 2TT
*Corresponding author's e-mail: sah232@bham.ac.uk
Abstract
Crosswind stability of high-speed trains has been a prominent research topic for several decades, primarily motivated by the frequent rail-related accidents under strong crosswinds. In this study, the

7 primarily motivated by the frequent rail-related accidents under strong crosswinds. In this study, the 8 influence of different windbreak walls on train aerodynamic properties whilst subjected to crosswinds 9 was assessed. The experimental campaign measured surface pressures on a stationary 1:25 model-scale 10 of Class 390 Pendolino train under varying wind incidence angles with different windbreak walls inside 11 a wind tunnel. For the first time, the work considers transition regions in windbreak walls, where transition regions refer to random geometrical changes in the distance between the train and the 12 13 windbreak wall. Differences in pressure distribution on the train surface with and without different windbreak walls are evident. Forces on the train are calculated using the mean pressure coefficients. 14 15 Overall, at a yaw angle of 90°, the tallest windbreak wall usually provided lowest mean pressure distribution on the surface of the model train due to the shielding effects; while the windbreak wall with 16 17 a transition region of 90° usually produced the highest mean pressure distribution, comparatively. At a 18 yaw angle of 30°, the results from windbreak walls with transition regions were relatively uniform

19 indicating a smooth pressure distribution.

20 Keywords:

Train aerodynamics; Crosswinds; Model-scale tests; Pressure coefficients; Side and lift force
 coefficients; rolling moment coefficients; Windbreak walls, Wind tunnel tests

23 **1. Introduction**

24 The high-speed rail industry is a growing sector in terms of train speeds and the number of railway lines in the United Kingdom (RSSB, 2016; Department for Transport, 2017), and other countries including 25 26 China, Japan, United States and many European countries (Fujii et al., 1999; Deeg et al., 2008). With 27 clear indication that rail passenger numbers are likely to double in the upcoming years (RSSB, 2016), 28 it is crucial to develop high-speed and highly efficient trains, as well as the infrastructure to be able to 29 run such services. In addition to this, the current aim of optimising commercial rail vehicles involves 30 designing high-speed trains to be light-weight and longer (Diedrichs et al., 2003). This can be problematic as the stability of these commercial rail vehicles to crosswind forces has been a well-known 31 problem for more than three decades now (Copley, 1987; Baker et al., 2004; Dorigatti et al., 2015). This 32 is because the effects of external aerodynamics on high-speed trains are usually pronounced under 33 34 strong crosswinds. As Copley (1987) pointed out, the weight of the train is the only factor which 35 counteracts the aerodynamic overturning forces. Therefore, an obvious deterioration in the running 36 performance of a train can be anticipated under high aerodynamic loads, caused mainly by high wind speeds. It is known that under crosswinds the resultant wind speed, calculated from the wind and train 37 38 speeds, and yaw angle are the important factors on vehicle dynamics. Consequently, Hemida and 39 Krajnovic (2010) suggested that high-speed trains are potentially at a risk of derailing or overturning 40 due to the impact of strong crosswinds, which hit the train surfaces. This was also supported by Browand 41 et al. (2009) who suggested that design factors on the new generation of trains may lead to a huge impact 42 on train stability. Although the occurrence of rail-related accidents is rare, passenger safety cannot be 43 compromised on. Therefore, it is important to first understand the flow fields which develop around 44 trains under crosswinds and thereafter, several measures need to be realised to improve the safety and 45 the stability of high-speed trains.

46

48 For a number of years, considerable attention has been paid to the issue of crosswinds affecting highspeed trains by several researchers (Cooper, 1979; Schulte-Werning and Matschke, 1997; Fujii et al., 49 1999; Cheli et al., 2010; Hemida and Baker, 2010; Baker et al., 2011). These researchers have 50 51 investigated the different factors which trigger vehicle instability in strong crosswinds. Tomasini et al. 52 (2015) put forward the view that two approaches can be adopted to overcome the risks caused by crosswinds. One method is to restrict the speed of the vehicles to strict regulations while the other deals 53 54 with installing wind barriers. Often referred to as wind fences or windbreak walls, these are usually 55 built along the railway line, besides the track, where strong crosswinds are expected (Schulte-Werning et al., 2002; Bocciolone et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2013; He et al. 2014) in order to reduce the effect of 56 57 crosswinds on the stability of trains while ensuring passenger comfort. Overall, such windbreaks can be customised according to the wind speed, wind pressure and the surrounding topological conditions. 58

59 Generally, wind barriers have been examined through the use of four techniques; full-scale field tests 60 (Richardson and Richards, 1995); wind tunnel tests (Chu et al., 2013; Tomasini et al., 2015); numerical modelling (Mohebbi and Rezvani, 2017) and analytical methods (Avila-Sanchez et al., 2016). Schulte-61 Werning et al. (2002) draws on research conducted within the TRANSAERO project that involved 62 carrying out experimental studies to report an initial analysis of the influence of windbreaks. The study 63 64 considered the influence of strong crosswinds with different types of wind barriers for both static and moving models and further attempted to address the reduction of the aerodynamic forces on rail vehicles 65 through wind barriers. Similar experimental analyses have been performed in the Politecnico di Milano 66 67 wind tunnel to evaluate the characteristics of solid and porous types of wind barriers (Bocciolone et al., 2008). To be more precise, Zhang et al. (2013) states that a wind barrier reduces the magnitude of the 68 aerodynamic rolling moment coefficient acting on the train under crosswind conditions. On the basis of 69 the current evidence, Tomasini et al. (2015) stated that creating long barriers in length and achieving 70 71 high Reynolds number is quite problematic in wind tunnel testing. Thus, Tomaisini et al. performed a 72 series of tests in a wind tunnel to analyse the characteristics of different windbreaks and the 73 corresponding effects on train wind loads. The tests were performed at high Reynolds number to avoid 74 scaling effects and employed long wind barriers to reduce boundary layer effects, which are pronounced 75 with short length barriers (Tomasini et al., 2015). Analysis of the results revealed that the existence of 76 a wind barrier significantly decreases the dependency of all aerodynamic coefficients to the Reynolds 77 number. Specifically, the sensitivity of the side force and rolling moment coefficients was observed to 78 disappear while the lift force coefficient reduced considerably. While the study can be considered as a 79 notable one, it concludes that the distance between the wind barrier and the track is an important 80 parameter. However, an important problem which has not been addressed yet is the random geometrical 81 change in the structure of windbreak walls. The abovementioned technique of installing windbreak walls is deemed effective if the wind barrier is built entirely parallel to the track. Whereas, in reality it 82 is not possible to develop an entirely uniform and continuous windbreak structure due to possible 83 complexities in the surrounding terrain such as cuttings, which cannot be avoided. The windbreak wall 84 85 would therefore consist of a discontinuous structure with a series of transition regions. Transition regions refer to the random changes in the shape of the windbreak wall which as mentioned earlier 86 87 occur due to the different terrains and topographies which exist around the railway track. Therefore, the 88 random change in the distance between the windbreak wall and the railway track, known as the 89 transition region, can result in the formation of vortices around the train body, which may hit the train surfaces potentially leading to stability issues for the train. Moreover, despite the several benefits of 90 91 wind protections, a few researches have stated the drawbacks associated with the use of wind barriers. 92 As mentioned by Zhao et al. (2015), wind barriers can create a large number of vortices when interacting 93 with train aerodynamic flows and crosswind creating potential issues for the stability of the train. Wind barriers can 'agitate' the wind flow thus causing increased turbulence effects, which lead to 94 95 complexities in the flow fields around the trains (Zhang et al., 2013; Guo et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2015). 96 Due to these complexities, there has been a relatively little research carried out on the effect of wind 97 protections on the aerodynamic behaviour of trains. Also, despite being in considerable attention, few publications discuss in precise detail the effects of wind barriers in particular. Most studies, such as 98 99 Avila-Sanchez et al. (2016), considered only the effects of windbreaks on a bridge system while some 100 other CFD related studies lacked proper experimental validation (Bi et al., 2011; Li et al., 2012; Guo et 101 al., 2015).

102 It is therefore important to explore both, experimentally and numerically the aerodynamic performance of trains subjected to crosswinds with different types of windbreak walls in order to propose the best 103 possible design of a windbreak wall. This paper presents and analyses the results of a series of 104 experiments performed at the University of Birmingham's Wind Tunnel facility. The main aim of this 105 research is to provide an understanding of the aerodynamic flow on a passenger train subjected to 106 107 crosswinds, both with and without windbreak walls, and investigate how transition regions in windbreak walls affect the magnitude of the surface pressure experienced by the train. This paper deals with only 108 109 one transition zone in a track. Thus, the distance between multiple transition regions is irrelevant to this 110 paper.

111 Several researchers in the past have attempted to simulate aerodynamic characteristics of moving trains using either experimental or numerical simulations (Krajnovic et al., 2012; Dorigatti et al., 2015; 112 113 Premoli et al., 2016; Niu et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2018; Deng et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2019). However, most CFD studies present in the literature on the use of windbreak wall lack accurate validation data 114 from wind tunnel tests or similar. The novelty of this paper lies in providing a first step towards 115 understanding an aerodynamic issue that is not well understood. It is acknowledged that the train model 116 in the experiments is stationary, but the achieved data is still valuable for a complicated engineering 117 118 problem that is yet to be understood. Moreover, there are several publications available in the literature such as the works of Zhang et al. (2013; 2017), which have studied the aerodynamic properties of wind 119 barriers on a train bridge model to calculate dynamic response. These studies, which are considered 120 121 notable, were also performed on stationary models to obtain the three-component coefficients for the vehicle. Furthermore, Avila-Sanchez et al. (2014; 2016) also present an interesting research where the 122 shelter effectiveness of a set of windbreaks placed over a railway twin-track embankment is 123 experimentally analysed. A set of wind tunnel tests were undertaken and results corresponding to 124 125 pressure tap measurements over a section of a typical high-speed train were presented. All of these 126 studies along with the studies of Cheli et al. (2010). Tomasini et al. (2015) and He et al. (2014) did not 127 take into account the relative movement of the train unit compared to the walls, but the results presented were considered remarkable and ones which would benefit the readers. In terms of Dorigatti et al. (2015) 128 129 research, the authors have confirmed that differences between the static and moving model experiments were observed only on the nose region of the train. Over the rest of the train body, it was proved that 130 131 any difference in the pressure distribution between the static and moving experiments were within the experimental uncertainty. The study further stated that in terms of the overall mean aerodynamic side 132 133 and lift forces and rolling moment coefficients, the static experiments are sufficient.

134 Similarly, the current study is an initial step towards understanding the impact of windbreak walls with different designs on a typical passenger train. Based on the data presented in this study, a number of 135 other motivational studies can be carried out, which can consider the relative movement of the train. To 136 accomplish the aim of this study, a stationary 1:25 scale model of a Class 390 Pendolino train with an 137 appropriate Single Track with Ballast and Rail (STBR) was setup in the wind tunnel to perform 138 experiments at crosswind angles of 30° and 90°. These experiments measured the surface pressure on 139 the model train with and without different windbreak walls of different heights and with different 140 transition regions in order to investigate the effect of these parameters on the aerodynamic flow around 141 142 a stationary train.

Section 2 explains the experimental setup and the methodology that was adopted in this investigative research on understanding the difference in the aerodynamic performance of a model-scale passenger train under crosswinds with and without different types of windbreak walls. Section 3 provides a detailed discussion of the results of the mean non-dimensional surface pressure distribution and the aerodynamic load coefficients on the train for the different test cases. Section 4 discusses the main outcomes of the research, while providing recommendations for further developments to this study.

149 2. Experimental methodology

150 2.1. The UoB wind tunnel facility

The University of Birmingham's (UoB) wind tunnel is an open-circuit wind tunnel facility which was constructed in 2012 with the purpose of simulating velocity and turbulence profiles. The wind tunnel consists of a 10 m long working test section and has a 2 m by 2 m square cross-section. 154 The facility is powered by a total of 49 axial fans which are arranged in 7 rows of 7 units each. Each

fan is expected to provide a maximum wind speed of about 10 m/s. Figure 1 shows the front and rear 155

view of the current wind tunnel. To provide a uniform wind speed with minimal turbulence, wind from 156 the fans flows through a honeycomb screen, which acts as a flow straightener, before entering the wind

- 157
- tunnel test section. 158



159 160

Figure 1: (a) Rear view and (b) Front view of the UoB wind tunnel.

161 2.1.1. Instrumentation

The wind tunnel facility makes use of 2 kHz Series 100 Cobra probes (TFI, 2011), which can measure 162 3D velocities of the flow and the static pressure. These multi-hole (4-hole) cobra probes are mounted 163 to clamp stands, positioned at the designated measuring points, and are capable of providing the three 164 components of time-varying (fluctuating) and time-averaged (mean) velocity in real-time. A 500 Hz 165 multi-channel, Digital Pressure Measurement System (DPMS) is available for measuring ground-plane 166 pressures and pressure fields on model scale buildings and vehicles. 167

168 The 64-channel DPMS was used to measure the pressure on the surface of the model train as the system is capable of measuring both, time-varying and time-averaged pressures thus making it suitable for the 169 170 measurement of rapidly fluctuating pressure distributions as well.

171 2.1.2. Crosswind characterisation of the wind tunnel

172 Characterising flows inside a wind tunnel is very important as it helps gain a better understanding of the crosswind simulations by providing an in-depth flow history in terms of the mean wind speeds and 173 174 turbulence intensities of the flow. Therefore, this study first investigated the flow in the wind tunnel by taking measurements at horizontal and vertical points. Horizontal Wind Profiles (HWP) were measured 175 176 at different heights from the ground and comprised of a total of 150 spanwise measuring positions. Vertical Wind Profiles (VWP) were measured from the floor of the wind tunnel to a height of 1.5 m 177 178 and comprised of a total of 100 measuring positions. These measurements were made at a distance of 6 m from the fans, which was the position of experimental setup. As expected, it was observed that there 179 180 are more differences in the mean velocities at lower heights as compared to higher heights. This is due 181 to boundary layer effects and the turbulence intensity being higher near the ground. Thus, the most feasible section for carrying out the experimental tests was chosen, which is at a height of 350 mm from 182 the floor of the wind tunnel. Figure 2a shows the VWP of the streamwise mean wind velocity and the 183 streamwise turbulence intensity in correspondence to the height of the model train while Figure 2b 184 shows the HWP of the mean streamwise velocity at a height of 350 mm from the floor of the wind 185 tunnel. The wind profile measurements conform to the CEN (2018) standards. 186







190 Figure 2: (a) Vertical mean Wind Profile: Velocity and streamwise turbulence intensity profiles of the wind tunnel measured with and without the placement of splitter plate (b) Horizontal mean Wind 191 Profile: Streamwise velocity at a height of 350 mm from the wind tunnel floor. 192

As evident, there is a boundary layer growth near the floor of the wind tunnel with an increase in the 193 streamwise mean wind velocity with height. Thus, it is deemed appropriate to perform experiments at 194 a splitter plate at height of 300 mm from the floor of the wind tunnel. The measurement of the vertical 195 196 velocity profile over the splitter plate allows for determining the impact of the presence of a wooden

splitter plate, its upwind edge and the blockage under the plate. However, upon measurement of bothprofiles, it was clearly visible that the presence of a splitter plate does not modify the wind speed profile,

199 especially in the section where the train model was placed.

An irregular trend is observed in the upper area of the wind tunnel. This signifies that the roof of the wind tunnel effectively acts as another boundary layer and thus might be possibly introducing larger irregularities and a resulting higher level of turbulence in the corresponding flow, circulating through the top part. However, this is not a cause of concern as the model used in this study is located below the section where irregularities begin. Furthermore, Table 1 provides the spanwise averages of the mean velocities (streamwise [u], vertical [v] and lateral [w]) and the associated turbulence intensities at a height of 350 mm from the floor of the wind tunnel, essentially where the train model was placed.

Mean wind velocity (m/s)			Turbulence intensity (%)					
u	v	W	Iu	Iv	I_w	I _{uvw}		
7.2	0.4	-0.5	6.2	5.2	4.9	5.5		

Table 1: Spanwise averages of mean wind velocity and turbulence intensities along the horizontal at a
 height of 350 mm from the floor of the wind tunnel.

209 *2.2. Scale model*

210 A 1:25 model of the Class 390 Pendolino train is adopted as the test vehicle in this study, as there is additional validation data available from the work conducted by Dorigatti et al. (2015). Dorigatti 211 examined the simplest case possible by adopting a conventional flat ground scenario with no ballast 212 shoulder or windbreaks. This was considered as a fundamental reference for further investigations 213 214 concerned with more realistic and critical scenarios such as a STBR (Single Track and Ballast Rail). 215 Thus, a STBR was chosen as a ground scenario in this study. This was also based on the study by Baker 216 et al. (2009) which stated that in the process of standardising wind tunnel tests, a reference scenario known as STBR has been proposed as the only ground scenario which should be considered (CEN, 217 218 2013). However, it is worth mentioning that even though a STBR is a reference scenario, in the presence 219 of barriers, the DTBR (Double Track Ballast and Rail) might modify the distance between the train and 220 any downwind barriers. This scenario can be tested in a further study.

221 Furthermore, wind tunnel experiments on a stationary model are carried out as these are the types of experiments which are currently prescribed in the railway standards (EC, 2008; RSSB, 2009; CEN, 222 223 2016) and have also been performed in a variety of investigations (Baker and Brockie, 1991; Cheli et al., 2010; Dorigatti et al., 2015; Avila-Sanchez et al., 2016). In terms of the choice of the wind incidence 224 angle, a wind incidence angle of 30° is chosen because this value is considered at the top of the realistic 225 range for high-speed trains (Cheli et al., 2011) while 90° represents the highest transversal wind case 226 (Cheli et al., 2010), is recommended in CEN (2018) standards, and as Baker (2014) states higher yaw 227 228 angles (above 60 degrees) are relevant for stationary trains. These wind incidence angles of 30° and 90° 229 were used for the first set of experiments. For the second set of experiments, four specific experimental 230 cases were chosen and were investigated under a varying wind incidence angle from 20° to 90° with an 231 increment of 10°. This was done to comprehend the sensitivity of the results to varying wind incidence angles and for understanding the worst wind incidence angle to the track and the train for the Class 390 232 233 train model, specifically at a particular case.

234 Figure 3a shows an image of the scale model which was used in this study and Figure 3b shows the full-scale Class 390 train. The scale model used in this study is a full reproduction of the leading car 235 236 and partial trailing car of the full-scale train. This research entailed measurements only on the leading car of the train for investigation, primarily because of the limitations of the wind tunnel size and also 237 238 several researchers (Barcala and Meseguer, 2007; Bocciolone et al., 2008; Cheli et al., 2010; Dorigatti 239 et al., 2015) in the past have focused their studies on the leading coach of the train only based on the 240 assumption that significant aerodynamic forces are present around this region. The partial trailing car which was a half-car is only included in this study to provide a realistic flow around the train, based on 241 the CEN (2018) standards. 242



- (a)
- 243 244

245

Figure 3: Image of the (a) 1:25 scale model of Class 390 Pendolino train used in this study (b) fullscale of the Class 390 Pendolino train.

246 2.2.1. Pressure taps

Pressure taps are created by drilling a small hole in the model surface. Each pressure tap is fashioned 247 248 by the insertion of cylindrical stainless-steel tubes with an inner diameter of 1.5 mm and an outer diameter of 2 mm. Each tube is 12 mm long and is connected to the holes on the internal walls of the 249 model by gluing them in place using an epoxy structural adhesive. 250

251 PVC tubings were used to connect the pressure taps to channels of the DPMS. A total number of 162 pressure taps are used in the experiments. All of these pressure taps are fitted on the model's leading 252 car and are arranged in a series of 14 loops (A-N), as shown in Figure 4. Table 2 provides the distance 253 of each loop (X) from the nose of the train, normalised to the total length of the first car (L), which was 254 1000 mm. In order to ensure consistency of the data received from different experimental runs, one 255 256 pressure tap was considered as the reference pressure tap. This tap was constantly monitored in each experiment by keeping it connected to one of the channels of the DPMS. Since the DPMS consists of 257 258 only 64 channels, each experiment was carried out three times.



259



Loop	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G
X/L	0.018	0.055	0.085	0.185	0.250	0.325	0.390
Loop	Н	Ι	J	Κ	L	М	Ν
X/L	0.480	0.560	0.665	0.750	0.810	0.890	0.970

Table 2: Longitudinal position of each loop (X) with respect to the overall length of the model (L). 262

263 2.3. Experimental setup

The train model was placed on top of the STBR, which was mounted centrally on a splitter plate. Figure 264 5 shows the overall dimensions of the train, STBR and the splitter plate. The overall length of the model 265 266 train is 1500 mm while the width is 110 mm and the height is 156 mm. The splitter plate is a wooden plate with a 20 mm thickness, positioned at a 300 mm height from the floor of the wind tunnel. The 267 268 distance between any windbreak wall and the track center was maintained as 240 mm.



Figure 5: Overall dimensions in mm of (a and b) the Class 390 Pendolino scale model (c) the STBR used in this study and (d) the splitter plate.

272 *2.3.1. Test cases*

A number of experiments were carried out for different cases at two different wind incidence angles:
 30° and 90°. These cases are illustrated in Figure 6 and are listed below:

- 275 (a) Track without any windbreak wall
- (b) Track with windbreak wall 1 (Height of 160 mm)
- 277 (c) Track with windbreak wall 2 (Height of 190 mm. Same as the train height)
- (d) Track with windbreak wall 3 (Height of 260 mm)
- (e) Track with windbreak wall 4 (Height of 210 mm with a 45° transition angle)
- 280 (f) Track with windbreak wall 5 (Height of 210 mm with a 90° transition angle)







Following on, another set of experiments were carried out with the purpose of investigating the effect of changing the wind incidence angle on the cases examined. To elaborate, in these experiments, windbreak walls 4 and 5 (i.e. the walls with transition regions) were mainly examined and explored in depth in addition to two more cases. The terms WWS and LWS denote Windward Side and Leeward Side, respectively.

288 It must also be noted that each case was performed at varying wind incident angles, ranging from 20° 289 to 90° , with an increment of 10° . These cases are listed below:

- 290 (g) Track without any windbreak wall
- 291 (h) Track with windbreak wall 4 (Height of 210 mm with a 45° transition angle) in the WWS
- (i) Track with windbreak wall 5 (Height of 210 mm with a 90° transition angle) in the WWS
- (j) Track with windbreak wall 2 (Height of 190 mm) in the LWS only
- 294

A further test was performed at two different wind incidence angles, 30° and 90° for:

(k) Track with windbreak wall 4 (Height of 210 mm with a 45° transition angle) in the WWS and windbreak wall 2 (Height of 190 mm) in the LWS

298 The main reason for choosing three different heights for the continuous windbreak wall was to express 299 these heights with regards to the train height along with the track. Hence, windbreak wall 1 was meant to be shorter than the train height, windbreak wall 2 was same as the train height and windbreak wall 3 300 was designed to be much taller than train height. All these heights were chosen to assess the sheltering 301 effects of the windbreak walls on the train. In terms of the windbreak walls 4 and 5, the transition 302 regions were chosen in accordance to the appropriateness of the physical angle. Apparently, a transition 303 304 region of 90° appears to be the "normal" shape as it is the most appropriate physical angle and is also the maximum possible angle. Since 45° transition angle would account for a mid-way between the no 305 transition region (0° transition angle) and maximum transition region (90° transition region), it was also 306 307 considered in this study. Obviously, due to resource constraints, not every transitional angle can be 308 examined.

- Figure 7 shows the model set-up at yaw angles of 90°. The figure shows the case with windbreak wall 2. In light of the flow characterisation, for a yaw angle of 90°, the model was placed slightly on the left hand side in order to prevent any constraining effects of the wind tunnel side walls on the nose of the train along with an enhanced spanwise uniformity to the onset wind. Also, according to railway standards (CEN, 2018), a minimum distance of 8000 mm with respect to full-scale geometry is required from the nose of the train to the start of the track. Thus, in this study at 1:25 scale, a distance of 300
- 315 mm was maintained.

According to CEN (2018) standards, the blockage ratio is defined at a yaw angle of 30°. In this study, 316 317 the blockage represented by the train model, STBR and the splitter plate is approximately 6%, based on a length averaged cross-sectional area of the splitter plate at a 30° yawed configuration. It is worth 318 mentioning that the lower bound for the blockage ratio was 6% while the upper bound for the tallest 319 windbreak wall case was 10%. The UoB's wind tunnel used in this study requires no blockage 320 correction, based on EN 14067-6, Section 5.3.4.7 of CEN (2018). As CEN (2018) states, in closed test 321 sections, the coefficients are overestimated, thus it is conservative not to apply any blockage 322 323 corrections. Nevertheless, the blockage ratio, defined at a yaw angle of 30°, is recommended to be less 324 than 15%, which was also the case in this study, where the blockage ratio was much lower than 15%.

325 The Mach number is calculated as 0.03 while the ratio of the total length of the train model to the width of the tunnel is 0.75. These factors in addition to the design of the STBR agree well with the CEN 326 (2018) standards. The Reynolds number based on the reference velocity of the wind relative to the train 327 of 7.2 m/s and train height, was $\sim 1 \times 10^5$. It is acknowledged that the Reynolds number of the flow was 328 lower than that specified by CEN (2018), and the turbulence intensity of the flow was 5.5%, which was 329 higher than that specified by CEN (2018). However, the results of this work will be used in the future 330 to validate numerical simulations which will then be further performed to take into consideration flows 331 332 with higher Reynolds number for same cases.



Figure 7: The experimental set-up of the models inside the wind tunnel at a yaw angle of (a) 90°.

335

336 3. Results and Discussion

337 3.1. Mean pressure coefficients

This section provides and discusses the pressure distribution results obtained over the train surface for experimental cases (a - f) at wind incidence angles of 30° and 90° in terms of a non-dimensional pressure coefficient, C_P :

$$C_P = \frac{P - P_o}{0.5\rho V_{rel}^2} \tag{1}$$

341 where P is the actual surface pressure at a particular pressure tap, P_o is the reference pressure, ρ is the air density and V_{rel} is the reference velocity of the wind relative to the train. In terms of normalising the 342 343 data for achieving an accurate C_P value for each pressure tap, the reference pressure of a known location, 344 outside the wind tunnel section, was considered. This was done to ensure the location is not affected by the onset wind conditions. For the reference velocity, this was measured at the position of the test 345 models without the presence of the models, prior to the any experimental work. In addition, the mean 346 non-dimensional pressure coefficient, $\overline{C_P}$, provided for each tap was calculated based on the time-347 average values of the actual surface pressure at a particular pressure tap. 348

349 As discussed, loops A-N were arranged in a progressive manner from the nose to the tail of the leading 350 car of the model with a total of 162 pressure taps positioned on the first car only. Figure 8 shows that on rotation of the model about its axis, the pressure distribution at each segment was measured in four 351 352 circumferential sections. It must be noted that the location of pressure taps for each loop differed in 353 sectional placements due to the changing cross section of the train shape. Therefore, the best method of 354 representing data was in a polar coordinate form. The results can be divided into four different sections; 355 where WWS and LWS refer to the windward and leeward side of the model train respectively, ROOF 356 denotes the roof and UB denotes the underbody region of the model. Due to the design of the model, which shows continuous changes in its symmetry, the range of the polar angle varied for each region at 357 different longitudinal positions of the loops i.e. at different distances from the nose of the train, as 358 359 evident in Figure 4.



360 361

Figure 8: The orientation of angle θ with respect to onset wind.

In terms of the results obtained, different patterns of pressure distribution are evident over the surface of the train. Firstly, it is worth mentioning that the leading car of the Class 390 train has a streamlined design. Therefore, the cross-section of the frontal region of the train, characterised as the nose of the train, presents a significant increase in the cross-sectional area down the train length (from Loops A-C). Therefore, it can be anticipated that this significant change in the frontal part of the train (nose) would impact the results obtained. For simplicity, results on loops B, G and N are illustrated even

- though measurements were made at 14 loops located at different distances from the nose of the train.Nevertheless, this results section discusses the trend over the entire length of the train.
- 370

371 3.1.1. Results at a yaw angle of 90°

This section aims to discuss the test results obtained at a yaw angle of 90° for the experimental cases (a - f), mentioned in Section 2.3.1.

374 *3.1.1.1. Case (a): Track without any windbreak wall*

Although the main aim of this research was to investigate the effect of different types of windbreak walls on the flow which forms around the train, it was important to first obtain data for a case without any walls and just the model train. This will be used as a benchmark case and will show the intensity of the change in the results.

Figure 9 shows the mean surface pressure distribution on loops B, G and N for the case without any windbreak wall at a yaw angle of 90°. In this case, at and near the nose of the train (loops A-B), the highest pressure values (which can also be referred to as the lowest suction values) are observed on the WWS of the model, compared to other regions. This is as expected due to the wind directly impinging on the surface of the vehicle at the WWS thus indicating a region of stagnation at the windward face of the train. As expected, this is the case for all the loops which show positive $\overline{C_P}$ values at the WWS.

Based on the results presented in Figure 9, upon transition from the WWS to the ROOF of the model, 385 a sharp decrease in the positive pressure values can be observed signifying a large suction at this point. 386 387 This suggests that the windward edge on the roof of the train has a significant impact on the flow resulting in a negative gradient of pressure, thus indicating flow separation at this point. For similar 388 389 flows, based on the train height and free-stream velocity, the flow is expected to separate from the 390 windward corners of the roof (Copley, 1987; Baker and Sterling, 2009), which was also the case in this 391 study. Consequently, the flow tends to show weak suctions over the roof of the model while the wake 392 downstream of the model on the LWS seems to show a little effect on the overall pressure distribution. This analysis is based on the magnitude of the $\overline{C_P}$, which appears to be uniform on the leeward face, as 393 394 the flow progresses.

395 At further distances from the nose of the train, similar trends in the pressure distribution can be seen as compared to loops A and B. Positive pressure peaks are evident on the WWS of the model. Regions of 396 397 negative pressure are observed on the ROOF and LWS of the model with a strong suction peak obtained 398 in all cases on the windward edge of the roof, as mentioned before. Also, it seems that the flow stabilises 399 from the middle of the roof to the leeward side of the train, as shown by constant pressure values, 400 possibly indicating the reattachment of flow after separation. In terms of the underbody region of the 401 model, slight differences can be seen in the overall results obtained for the flow in this region. These 402 are perhaps not surprising based on the practical limitations and difficulties noted in the experimental 403 set-up. Since the pressure measurement system in this work was not on board and was based externally, 404 the pressure tubes were sourced from the bottom of the model. This might have provided a blockage effect on the flow thus creating the variations in the flow in this small region. The $\overline{C_P}$ in this region 405 tends to vary with showing both positive and negative $\overline{C_P}$ values. Reasons for positive $\overline{C_P}$ in this region could be based on the induction of stagnation area occurring at the upstream WWS, which might 406 407 408 influence this region.

409 Finally, according to the results obtained, it can be observed that close to the nose of the train, the 410 pressure varies significantly from one tap to another and also from one loop to the other. This is as

anticipated and thus shows the importance and influence of the shape of the nose in any crosswindstability case. However, at distances further down the train, the results tend to become more uniform.

413 However, near the roof of the train, the results show significant changes. Nevertheless, each loop and 414 in fact each measuring point has its own characteristic due to its position and the surrounding influence

415 on the entire train body. Over the middle of the roof, the flow showed uniform results at the tail of the

- 416 train while the results at the leeward side showed that near the nose of the train, there was a lower $\overline{C_P}$
- 417 distribution as compared to a farther distance (near the tail), where the $\overline{C_P}$ magnitude decreased and the
- 418 results provided higher values, comparatively. This indicates the strong characteristics of suction near
- the nose of the train in the leeward side of the model while a fully developed wake dominated by large
- 420 vortices forms at the leeward side at much farther distances from the nose. The results and trends
- 421 presented for this case are very similar to the results obtained by several researchers in the past (Copley,
- 422 1987; Chiu and Squire, 1992; Baker and Sterling, 2009; Baker, 2010).





Figure 9: Surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at (a) loop B, (b) loop G and (c) loop N for
the configuration without any windbreak walls at a yaw angle of 90°.



427 This section presents and discusses the results obtained for cases examining different windbreak walls 428 at a yaw angle of 90°. In order to provide a closer look at the results obtained with different types of windbreak walls, Figure 10 shows a comparison of the different types of windbreak walls examined at 429 430 three loops, B, G and N. Firstly, it is clearly apparent that the addition of any type of windbreak wall results in a significant difference in the surface pressure as compared to a case with no walls. It can be 431 432 stated that the addition of any windbreak wall provides more uniform pressure results between adjacent taps with almost constant values as compared to a no wall case where the mean surface pressure varies 433 434 rapidly when transiting from one region to another. A windbreak wall significantly reduces the intensity 435 of pressures on the windward side of the train while providing some uniformity to the results on the 436 leeward side of the train. These findings clearly make sense as the train is somewhat shielded from the on-coming crosswind flows by the windbreak structures. 437

438 Precisely, for loops located near the nose such as loop B, the results showed that as the height of the windbreak wall increased (from 160 mm to 260 mm), the $\overline{C_P}$ decreased, possibly due to the increased 439 shielding effect, while the trend depicted over the entire circumference of the loop was similar for all 440 three continuous wall types. Fairly uniform values for $\overline{C_P}$ are present over the windward side and roof 441 of the model. However, for walls consisting of transition regions, it is apparent that wall 5 with a 90° 442 443 transition region resulted in a higher pressure as compared to wall 4 with a 45° transition region. A significant pressure peak is observed in all cases at the transition from the middle of the roof to the 444 445 leeward side with wall 5 presenting the weakest suction peak. Moreover, the pressure results were similar for walls 2 and 3; uniform values were obtained for the pressure taps on the WWS of the model. 446 It is likely that these results are due to the fact that these pressure taps were all protected by the oncoming 447 crosswind due to the wall and thus a shielding effect of the windbreak wall. Whereas for wall 1, it can 448 449 be seen that slight variations in the pressure distribution were apparent on the WWS because of the 450 shorter height of the wall and the crosswind flow separating from the top edge of this wall and directly 451 impacting on the train surface.

In terms of the leeward side, the results showed slightly different trends. As shown in Figure 10a, for 452 loop B, Wall 1, which was much shorter in height exhibited the largest change in the results in 453 454 comparison to the other walls examined. At the leeward edge of the roof, Wall 1 resulted in low pressure 455 results, which then escalated to a higher pressure results as compared to the results obtained with most of the other walls, as the flow progressed on the leeside. These results may also be affected by the nose 456 457 region of the train. Similarly, for loop B, the results at the windward side of the model showed uniform 458 values of pressure from one tap to another. Again, wall 3 resulted in the lowest pressure along with wall 459 2 for the WWS and most of the ROOF region. Also, Figure 10a clearly indicates that wall 5 provided 460 the highest pressure results on all the pressure taps located at the windward and roof side and for most of the leeward side while showing clear difference as compared to the results obtained with other walls 461 near the nose of the train. 462

463 Along the longitudinal length of the train, at positions slightly farther from the nose of the train, it was observed that wall 3, which was the tallest, provided quite uniform results over the windward side of 464 465 the model. At further distances from the nose of the train, such as at loops G and N, as shown in Figure 10b and Figure 10c, it can be observed that wall 4 with a transition region of 45° showed the highest 466 467 pressure values over most of the circumference of the train. Also, wall 4 usually presented the highest pressure values as compared to wall 5 in some of the regions, as shown in Figure 10b and Figure 10c. 468 469 One reason for this could also be due to the design of the transition which meant that the distance 470 between the model and wall decreased comparatively. It was also noticed that wall 3 shows the lowest 471 pressure results comparatively. This can be based on the increased height of this wall.

In terms of the effect of wall 1 on the pressure distribution results, the shorter height of the wall meant that some of the pressure taps close at the ROOF were exposed to the onset wind and were not provided with any shielding effect of the wall. Thus, the results linked with this wall were noticed to show a sudden increase in pressure values as the flow progressed from the WWS to the ROOF, specifically near the rear end of the train, as shown by Figure 10c. A suction peak can also be found at the windward edge of the roof at loop N. However, along the surface of the roof and all the way to the LWS of the model, the $\overline{C_P}$ values went from a low value to a much higher value. One of the key findings from the

results revealed that the frontal loops, which were situated near the nose of the train showed higher $\overline{C_P}$ 479 results on the WWS compared to the leeward side, which was masked by either similar values or a little 480 lower $\overline{C_P}$ values. Whereas, at much further distances from the nose of the train, it was observed that the 481 LWS showed much higher $\overline{C_P}$ values when compared to the WWS for all different wall cases. Another 482 interesting finding from the results is based on loop N. Compared to other loops, the circumferential 483 pressure distribution on this loop showed a significant drop in the $\overline{C_P}$ value at the windward edge of the 484 roof, as mentioned earlier. Another suction peak was noticed near the bottom edge of the LWS. These 485 486 could be based on the fact that loop N was located right at the end of the first car and thus the results could have been influenced by the inter-carriage gap which was next to this loop. The random change 487 in the geometry of the model might have led to the flow vortex being separated at this point thus the 488 489 strong suction. Close to the rear end of the train, wall 3 was again observed to show the lowest pressure 490 results, mainly due to the abovementioned reason that this wall was the tallest thus was able to provide the greatest shielding effect. Overall, one interesting trend which was observed again was that near the 491 nose of the train, the $\overline{C_P}$ values had a lower value compared to near the tail of the train, where the $\overline{C_P}$ 492 showed higher values. It is also worth mentioning that the results for the wall 2 (which was 190 mm 493 tall) were very similar to the results of a continuous wall with a height of 210 mm. Therefore, the results 494 495 of the latter were not shown in this study as there seemed no point in expressing them.

496 To further elaborate the effect of the sharp transition regions in walls 4 and 5 on the flow around the 497 train, loops near the transition region such as loop G were examined carefully as these were mainly the 498 loops which were under the influence of these regions. As compared to all other loops, the usual trend involved wall 5 showing the highest $\overline{C_P}$ values at the entire circumference of the loops A-D, in 499 comparison to wall 4. Whereas, at loop G, where a sharp transition was present in both the walls, a 500 slight difference in the trend can be observed. At this point, wall 4 with a 45° transition region showed 501 the highest $\overline{C_P}$ results on the roof while wall 5 showed slightly lower $\overline{C_P}$ values over the roof. At loop 502 E (X/L = 0.250), the influence of wall 5 on the flow resulted in a weak suction peak at the middle of the 503 roof of a considerable different magnitude as compared to the results obtained on other pressure taps. 504 505 This might be an indication of the surface pressure approaching the reference pressure at this particular

506 point, which was clearly under the influence of the sharp transitions in the walls.



Figure 10: Comparison of the mean surface pressure coefficient distribution at (a) loop B, (b) loop G
 and (c) loop N for different windbreak wall cases at a yaw angle of 90°.

- 510 3.1.2. Results at a yaw angle of 30°
- 511 *3.1.2.1. Case (a): Track without any windbreak wall*

Firstly, it is worth mentioning that in contrast to the results obtained for a yaw angle of 90°, the magnitudes of the results for a no wall case were somewhere near the magnitudes of different wall cases. This was not the case for the former investigation involving a yaw angle of 90°, where the wind was hitting the surface of the train perpendicularly and thus the addition of walls implied that all or at least most of the train surface was covered by the direct impingement of the wind. Nevertheless, a significant difference is still apparent further down the train length and is discussed in this section.

518 For a no wall case, different flow patterns for the mean surface pressure distribution were identified 519 along the longitudinal length of the train, as shown in Figure 11. The nose of the train, which embraced 520 loops A, B and C was characterised by positive values of $\overline{C_P}$ for the WWS and the windward portion of the ROOF. This was the case at each different loop of the train, thus indicating a stagnation region 521 created due to the wind being directly impinged on the surface of the model. As the circumferential 522 pressure distribution results show, on each loop, the positive magnitude of $\overline{C_P}$ appeared to increase 523 initially at the WWS and then this positive magnitude continued to decrease continuously. Around the 524 525 ROOF, the results for the $\overline{C_P}$ provide a negative gradient as the flow transits from the WWS to the LWS. The transition from a stagnation region to a suction region is obvious from the results. 526

527 Furthermore, the leeward side of the train was characterised by a region of suction which included the roof of the model as well as the entire leeward side near the nose of the train. The only exception in the 528 results was on loop A, where the magnitude of $\overline{C_P}$ remained positive over the roof as well. This could 529 be due to the reduced cross-sectional area of this loop. Based on these results, a maximum suction peak 530 531 is observed at the leeward edge of the roof for loops close to the nose of the train, such as loop B, as 532 shown in Figure 11a. This indicates the presence of one or more vortices attached to the train surface which then progressively roll away from the train surface resulting in higher $\overline{C_P}$ values. This finding 533 534 was also reported by Hemida and Karjnovic (2009) and Dorigatti et al. (2015). However, moving away from the nose of the train, at loops such as loops G and N, as shown by Figure 11b and Figure 11c, a 535 536 suction peak is found to appear at the windward edge of the roof. This was also the case for a yaw angle 537 of 90° , suggesting a flow separation point at the windward edge of the roof. This echoes previous studies such as Copley (1987) and Baker and Sterling (2009). The flow separates from the windward edge of 538 539 the roof and does not reattach. Since all adjacent loops seem to show similar results at this point, it can be stated that this vortex is rolling up on the roof. It continues to drift progressively from the edge to 540 541 the centreline of the roof in some cases (Loop M) before completely detaching away from the train. 542 Moreover, near the rear end of the train, such as at loop N, a weaker suction peak is found at the bottom side of the leeward face. This suction peak might be related to a vortex which emanates from the leeward 543 edge of the LWS. Overall the results and trends presented for this case are very similar to the results 544 545 obtained by several researchers in the past (Copley, 1987; Hemida and Karjnovic, 2009; Dorigatti et 546 al., 2015).



Figure 11: Comparison of the mean surface pressure coefficient distribution at (a) loop B, (b) loop G
and (c) loop N for all cases examined at a yaw angle of 30°.

550 *3.1.2.2. All windbreak wall cases (b-f)*

The different types of windbreak walls showed a significant difference in the trend of the results as 551 compared to a no wall case, as evident in Figure 11. Firstly, for all walls, a similar trend was observed 552 for the circumferential pressure distribution. On the WWS, near the nose of the train, such as at loop B, 553 shown by Figure 11a, similar behaviour was observed as to the no wall case; however, the magnitude 554 of the $\overline{C_P}$ values varied significantly. For a no wall case, the WWS showed a stagnation region 555 characterised by positive $\overline{C_P}$ values; whereas, the addition of walls led to a region of suction on the 556 WWS, as anticipated from the 90° results presented in section 3.1.2. Comparatively, the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ value 557 was provided by the tallest wall, wall 3, and the highest $\overline{C_P}$ was shown by the shortest wall, wall 1 on 558 559 the WWS. Following on, the circumferential pressure distribution showed that on the nose of the train, the walls led to a higher value of $\overline{C_P}$ for each case for the ROOF region. This indicates that the walls 560 were able to provide a shielding effect to the WWS of the model but in case of the roof, the wind was 561 able to directly impinge and create stagnation regions thus producing large positive pressure values. 562 The $\overline{C_P}$ values then dropped significantly as the flow transits from the ROOF to the LWS, producing 563 regions of suction in the LWS. For the shorter height wall, wall 1, a similar trend was seen near the nose 564 of the train with a positive $\overline{C_P}$ peak occurring at the windward edge of the roof, while suction peaks 565 were observed at the leeward edge of the roof and at the bottom of the leeward face (loop B). Away 566 from the nose of the train, at loops G and N, as depicted by Figure 11b, a suction peak was observed at 567 568 the windward edge of the roof; however this was not the case for other loops. A similar trend was also 569 noticed at a yaw angle of 90°. Walls 2 and 3 showed somewhat similar results in comparison to each other with wall 3 showing the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution. One interesting finding was that the LWS of the 570 571 model depicted a smooth pressure distribution near the nose of the train with the use of wall 2, which 572 was not the case for the tallest wall (wall 3). In terms of transition regions in walls 4 and 5, near the nose of the train, wall 5 presented higher $\overline{C_P}$ values as compared to wall 4 over the WWS. However, in 573 the same region as the flow progressed around the surface of the train, wall 5 presented the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ 574 575 values compared to wall 4. In order to determine the effect of the sharp transitions on the exact location 576 where these were situated, the respective loops which were under the influence of the sharp transitions, such as loop G, were carefully examined; results on Loop G are presented in Figure 11b. At the WWS, 577 wall 4 showed the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution not only compared to wall 5 but to all other walls. An 578 interesting phenomenon revealed at yaw angle of 30° was that walls 4 and 5, with transition regions, 579 led to more uniform results where $\overline{C_P}$ was seen to approach zero. These uniform results with small 580 581 variations indicate the smooth pressure distribution around the train signifying the complete detachment of any vortical structures from the train body, especially at the LWS of the model. 582

583 *3.2. Overall aerodynamic load coefficients*

Under the action of crosswinds, a vehicle experiences several flow patterns around its body. As a result,
a pressure distribution forms around a body leading to a series of aerodynamic loads to develop. These
aerodynamic loads, which act on a train, can be classified as aerodynamic forces and moments.

587 Section 3.1 discussed the pressure results on the train surface for different cases by expressing the surface pressure distribution as a non-dimensional mean pressure coefficient, $\overline{C_P}$. This section aims to 588 provide an analysis on the overall mean aerodynamic load coefficients for the side (lateral), $\overline{C_Y}$, and lift 589 (vertical), $\overline{C_z}$, forces along with the rolling moments about the X-axis and leeward rail, $\overline{C_{M_X}}$ and $\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}}$, 590 respectively, for different test cases. Generally, these coefficients are considered as the main 591 592 components of the aerodynamic loads and are usually examined for cases involving the investigation 593 of train stability under crosswinds (Baker et al., 2004; Sanguer et al., 2004; Baker et al., 2009; RSSB, 594 2009; Cheli et al., 2011; Dorigatti et al., 2015; Gallagher et al., 2018).

In this study, the overall mean aerodynamic load coefficients were calculated using a methodology based on the measurement of surface pressure distribution over the train surface. This approach has been successfully used in several earlier studies as well (Sanquer et al.,2004; Dorigatti et al., 2015; Gallagher et al., 2018) and basically, involves the discrete integration of the mean pressure coefficient distribution over the train surface. This is achieved by converting the model surface into a simplified 600 geometry composed of discreet rectangular surfaces. While each discretised surface is centred on a 601 pressure tap, the edges of the surfaces extend all the way to the midpoint between two neighbouring pressure taps or the model edges for outer end taps. This discretisation of the model surface area into a 602 number of smaller areas around each pressure tap assumes that the pressure measured at each individual 603 pressure tap is constant and uniformly distributed across the corresponding surface. This methodology, 604 605 in fact, is an excellent approach when the surfaces associated to each pressure tap are small, especially where the pressure gradient is high. Similarly, the Class 390 model used in this study was discretised 606 into longitudinal stripes consisting of one loops of taps each. Forces on each surface were then 607 608 calculated using the mean pressure coefficients.

609 The mean overall load coefficients for the entire vehicle can be defined as (Dorigatti et al., 2015):

$$\overline{C}_{Y} = \sum_{j} \left[\sum_{i} \frac{\overline{C}_{p_{i,j}} A_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}_{i,j} \cdot \mathbf{y})}{A_{ref} L_{j}} \right] L_{j}$$
(2)

$$\overline{C_Z} = \sum_j \left[\sum_i \frac{C_{p_{i,j}} A_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}_{i,j} \cdot \mathbf{z})}{A_{ref} L_j} \right] L_j$$
(3)

$$\overline{C_{M_X}} = \sum_{j} \left[\sum_{i} \frac{\overline{C_{p_{i,j}}} A_{i,j}}{A_{ref} L_j H_{ref}} \frac{\|\mathbf{d}_{i,j} \times \mathbf{n}_{i,j}\|}{\mathbf{x}} \right] L_j$$
(4)

$$\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}} = \sum_{j} \left[\sum_{i} \frac{\overline{C_{p_{i,j}}} A_{i,j}}{A_{ref} L_{j} H_{ref}} \frac{\|\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{i,j} \times \mathbf{n}_{i,j}\|}{\mathbf{x}} \right] L_{j}$$
(5)

610

611 Where, based on the model discretisation, i is the index for an individual pressure tap on each loop, j is the index for the loops consisting of pressure taps and corresponds to the stripes of the discretised train 612 geometry, $\overline{C_{p_{i,j}}}$ and $A_{i,j}$ represent the mean pressure coefficient value and the discretised area of each 613 rectangular surface, respectively, A_{ref} is the nominal side area of the Class 390 leading car (78.66 m² 614 615 at full-scale), H_{ref} is the nominal height of the Class 390 leading car (3.159 m at full-scale) and L_i is the length of each longitudinal stripe on the discretised model. Furthermore, considering a 2D 616 simplification for an individual loop (at a known X/L), \mathbf{n}_i is the normal unit vector relative to each 617 surface, associated to each pressure tap, i, \mathbf{d}_i is the vector directed from the longitudinal axis (X) to the 618 midpoint (pressure tap) of each surface and $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i$ is the corresponding of \mathbf{d}_i but beginning from the leeward 619 rail. Finally, **x**, **y** and **z** are the unit vectors related to the X, Y and Z axes. 620

Figure 12 and Table 3 show the calculated values for the overall mean aerodynamic load coefficientsover the entire unit length of the vehicle for the different test cases at 90° and 30° yaw angles.





Figure 12: Overall mean aerodynamic load coefficients for different test cases at a yaw angle of (a) 90° (b) 30°.

	Yaw angle of 30°				Yaw angle of 90°				
Cases	$\overline{C_Y}$	$\overline{C_Z}$	$\overline{C_{M_x}}$	$\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}}$	$\overline{C_Y}$	$\overline{C_Z}$	$\overline{C_{M_x}}$	$\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}}$	
No Wall	0.620	0.487	-0.404	-0.490	0.886	0.844	-0.573	-0.730	
Wall 1	-0.101	0.040	0.045	0.058	-0.158	0.106	0.094	0.090	
Wall 2	-0.348	0.011	0.246	0.257	-0.057	0.156	0.006	0.006	
Wall 3	-0.669	0.118	0.465	0.451	-0.024	0.085	0.014	0.004	
Wall 4	-0.413	0.187	0.271	0.243	-0.026	0.122	0.003	-0.004	
Wall 5	-0.335	0.188	0.206	0.183	-0.033	0.110	0.012	0.008	

Table 3: Overall mean aerodynamic load coefficients for different test cases.

- In terms of the results, side forces are a measure of the difference in pressure between the WWS and LWS. As noted earlier, WWS experiences positive pressures, contrary to LWS which experience negative pressure. These two effects conjoin together to form an overall side force. Therefore, positive values of $\overline{C_Y}$ indicate that the side force is directed according to the crosswind flow while positive $\overline{C_Z}$ values refer to the lift force being directed upwards. Likewise, for rolling moments, $\overline{C_{M_X}}$ and $\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}}$, based on the reference system about the centre of track and leeward rail, respectively, negative values refer to overall moments which tend to overturn the vehicle.
- 636 3.2.1. Results at a yaw angle of 90°
- 637 *3.2.1.1. Case (a): Track without any windbreak wall*

For the case with no wall, since the crosswinds were able to impact the train surface directly, high 638 positive values for $\overline{C_Y}$ and $\overline{C_Z}$ were noticed, as illustrated in Figure 12a. This validates the point that the 639 action of wind can clearly lead to the overturning or derailment of a vehicle. At a yaw angle of 90°, 640 slightly higher magnitudes were observed for the force coefficients as compared to 30°. This is again 641 as expected, signifying the increased overturning probability when the crosswind blows perpendicularly 642 to the direction of travel of the vehicle. This is also in agreement with earlier studies, which show that 643 644 the aerodynamic force coefficients tend to increase in magnitude with an increase in the yaw angle 645 (Baker et al., 2009). Furthermore, at a yaw angle of 90°, the rolling moment about the leeward had a larger negative value compared to the rolling moment about the X-axis. This is an important finding as 646 Baker et al. (2009) mentions that usually for rail vehicles, the rolling moment about the leeward rail is 647 required for overturning risk calculations. This result is due to the fact that the vertical force, which is 648 649 directed upwards contributes to the lee-rail rolling moment while it does not contribute to the rolling 650 moment about the X-axis.

- Figure 13 presents the results for the mean load coefficients per unit length for different test cases at a yaw angle of 90°. The presented results show only eight of the loops along the length of the train body as other loops were equipped with only a few pressure taps.
- Firstly, based on Figure 13a, it can be observed that the entire train model is characterised by positive 654 values of $\overline{C_Y}$ per unit length except on loop A. This shows that a lateral net force exists in the direction 655 of wind and thus indicates the stagnation and suction pressure regions which are present on the WWS 656 657 and LWS of the train. The side force coefficients seem to increase on the nose of the train and then decrease along the length of the train body with the exception being on loops D and N. Considering the 658 shape of the Class 390 model and based on the results, it seems that the central part of the model has 659 slightly more stability. Also, a higher side force coefficient at loop N probably indicates the effects of 660 space size behind the leading car and in front of the second car. 661
- Positive values of the lift force coefficients are observed on the entire train body, as shown by Figure 13b. The lift force coefficients also follow the same trend as side force coefficients around the nose region of the train. However, at positions further from the nose, the lift force coefficients tend to decrease with the exception being at loop H. Since the lift force coefficient at each loop is evaluated based on the balance between the pressures on the ROOF and the UB region, it can be noticed that the UB region of loop H has a higher pressure as compared to the ROOF thus the high value.
- In terms of the rolling moments, as illustrated in Figure 13b and Figure 13c, it is worth mentioning that the side force contributes to an overall overturning moment, which then leads to negative $\overline{C_{M_X}}$ values. Therefore, both $\overline{C_{M_X}}$ and $\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}}$ values follow a similar trend as the side force coefficient along the length of the train body. Overall, it can be stated that the side force contribution to the rolling moments is dominant as compared to the lift force on any loop of the train. Nevertheless, the positive lift force coefficients are also able to increase the negative magnitudes of both $\overline{C_{M_X}}$ and $\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}}$ per unit length at any loop thus increase the overturning moment of the vehicle.



Figure 13: (a) Mean side force coefficient per unit length (b) mean lift force coefficient per unit length
(c) X-axis mean rolling moment coefficient per unit length (d) Leeward rail mean rolling moment
coefficient per unit length at a yaw angle of 90°

679 *3.2.1.2. All windbreak wall cases (b-f)*

A comparison between the no wall and with wall cases shows clearly that the overall $\overline{C_Y}$ values for 680 681 most loops of the train changed from positive to negative with the addition of any wall, as illustrated in Figure 12a. This was as expected and shows the huge impact of windbreak walls. The shielding effect 682 of windbreak walls results in negative and in some cases negligible overall $\overline{C_Y}$ values. An unusual trend 683 seems to appear at loop D for all cases at a yaw angle of 90°. Positive values of the side force coefficients 684 per unit length are observed in all cases. As Dorigatti et al. (2015) described, such a situation is an 685 686 indication of the lateral net force which exists in the direction of wind. Based on the respective 687 stagnation and suction regions of this loop, it is clearly evident that an intense low-pressure peak exists on the LWS of the loop, which might reflect the presence of vortices in this region and hence the positive 688 $\overline{C_V}$ results. Overall, the negative side force coefficient values for the different windbreak walls at other 689 loops decrease in magnitude with an increase in wall height. The lift force coefficients at an individual 690 691 loop can be noticed to decrease in magnitude with an increasing wall height. Also, it appears that the 692 transitional walls show results similar to Wall 3, the tallest wall.

A comparison on the results with and without transitional windbreak walls on loops E and H shows that there are not major differences in the results. However, Wall 5 with a transition region of 90° seems to have slightly lower magnitudes of rolling moments around the transition regions.

- $696 \qquad 3.2.2. Results at a yaw angle of 30^{\circ}$
- 697 *3.2.2.1. Case (a): Track without any windbreak wall*

For the case with no wall at both yaw angles, since the crosswinds were able to impact the train surface directly, high positive values for $\overline{C_Y}$ and $\overline{C_Z}$ were noticed, as shown in Figure 12. Furthermore, at a yaw angle of 30°, shown in Figure 12b, the rolling moment about the leeward had a larger negative value compared to the rolling moment about the X-axis. This trend was also observed for the yaw angle of 90° and also in similar investigations carried out earlier (Dorigatti et al., 2015) As mentioned earlier, this result is due to the fact that also the vertical force, which is directed upwards, contributes to the leerail rolling moment while it does not contribute to the rolling moment about the X-axis.

Figure 14 presents the results for the mean load coefficients per unit length for different test cases at a yaw angle of 30°. The presented results show only eight of the loops along the length of the train body as other loops were equipped with only a few pressure taps. Based on the results, it can be observed that the entire train model is characterised by positive values of $\overline{C_Y}$ per unit length. This shows that a lateral net force exists in the direction of wind and thus indicates the stagnation and suction pressure regions which are present on the WWS and LWS of the train.

As shown by Figure 14a, the side force coefficients seem to increase on the nose of the train with 711 maximum values being reached at loops B and C. This is expected as the results agree with the study 712 presented by Dorigatti et al. (2015) and the reason for this is the existence of low-pressure, suction 713 714 peaks which exist in the LWS sections. Slightly lower side force coefficients at some positions of the 715 train sections indicate the absence of low-pressure peaks in the LWS of the train and the reduced intensities of pressure fields on the WWS and LWS. Also, a higher side force coefficient at loop N 716 probably indicates the effects of space size behind the leading car and in front of the second car. Positive 717 values of the lift force coefficients are observed on the entire train body as portrayed by Figure 14b.The 718 719 lift force coefficients also follow the same trend as the side force coefficients around the nose region of 720 the train. In addition, positive values of $\overline{C_Z}$ are also characterised by the suction on the upper face of the train being more intense than the UB region. Lower $\overline{C_Z}$ values along the length of the train refer to the 721 722 low-pressure peaks found on the roof.

723 In terms of the rolling moments shown in Figure 14c and Figure 14d, the side force contributes to an

overall overturning moment and negative $\overline{C_{M_X}}$ and $\overline{C_{M_{X,lee}}}$ values occur which follow a similar trend as

the side force coefficient along the length of the train body. Once again, the side force contribution to

the rolling moments can be seen to be dominant as compared to the lift force on any loop of the train.



Figure 14: (a) Mean side force coefficient per unit length (b) mean lift force coefficient per unit length
 (c) X-axis mean rolling moment coefficient per unit length (d) Leeward rail mean rolling moment
 coefficient per unit length at a yaw angle of 30°

731 *3.2.2.2. All windbreak wall cases (b-f)*

727

For all the wall cases, a comparison shows that the nose region and sections slightly father from the 732 nose region are characterised by positive side force coefficient values. However, from the central part 733 734 to the tail of the train, negative side force coefficients are evident. This is due to the practical limitations experienced at a yaw angle of 30° which meant that some onset wind was able to attack the train surface, 735 potentially the nose region. The shielding effect of windbreak walls is apparent as the magnitude of the 736 737 overall $\overline{C_Y}$ values decreases with an increase in the height of the walls, as shown in Figure 14b. However, it is apparent that the results for the side force coefficient along with the resulting rolling moment 738 739 coefficient tend to become sensitive to the overall increase in height of the windbreak wall. To elaborate, 740 with windbreak wall 3, $\overline{C_Y}$ becomes increasingly negative at this wind incidence angle. This would mean that this particular configuration would be worse in terms of safety than the case without any 741 742 windbreak wall. This is because the train would be at a higher risk of overturning in the opposite 743 direction with respect to wind. The main reason for such a result could be based on the practical 744 limitations of the experimental work at the wind incidence angle of 30°, as discussed earlier. Also, opposite to higher wind incidence angles, it is clear that at lower wind incidence angles, while the 745 windbreak wall height has a sheltering effect on the WWS of the train, a possible vortex is generated 746 due to an increased windbreak wall height (i.e. wall 3). This then produces a strong suction in the LWS 747 that can result in the overturning of the train in the windward direction. This result is confirmed by 748

Figure 11a, which shows the increased negative $\overline{C_P}$ at the nose of the train. Further from the nose of the 749 train, this is not the case due to the setup of the geometry. The lift force coefficients for the different 750 wall cases follow the same trend as the case without a wall, however with much lower magnitudes. 751 752 comparatively. Negative lift force coefficients at the nose of the train indicate a force directed downwards. This is mainly due to the intense stagnation over the roof of the nose of the train and low 753 pressures in the UB regions. Thereafter, positive lift force coefficients are visible over some loops 754 indicating the reduced magnitude and extensions of the stagnation regions on the roof. Moving on 755 towards the rear of the train, the $\overline{C_Y}$ values per unit length tend to reduce due to the existence of low-756 pressure peaks on the roof side of the train. Since the overturning moments are dependent mainly on 757 758 the side force, the roll moments are mostly characterised by negative values for the nose region of the train. However, these roll moments then become positive near the rear of the train. In terms of the effects 759 of the transition regions on loops E and H, the result show that wall 5 with a transition region of 90° 760 leads to much lower overturning moments hence signifying the stability this wall provides to the overall 761 train body. In fact, detailed analysis on the results show that the lowest roll moments at loop E were 762 obtained from the use of Wall 5. This was also the case for the yaw angle of 90°. 763

3.3. Effect of varying wind incidence angles on the mean pressure coefficients

Similar to section 3.1, this section provides and discusses the pressure distribution results obtained over the train surface for the experimental cases (g - j) in terms of a non-dimensional pressure coefficient, *C_P*. For simplicity, results on only certain important loops are illustrated. Nevertheless, this section

768 discusses the trend and results over the entire length of the train.

769 *3.3.1. Case* (g): *Track without any windbreak wall*

Figure 15 shows the $\overline{C_P}$ distribution at loop B and loop G of the train at varying wind incidence angles 770 for the case without any windbreak wall, respectively. With reference to Loop B, it is apparent that at 771 lower wind incidence angles (i.e. at 20° and 30°), the overall pressure results are much lower as 772 773 compared to the other wind angles on the WWS. As wind incidence angles increase from 20° to 60°, 774 the surface pressure also starts to increase with the highest surface pressure obtained at a wind incidence angle of 60° . These trends can be simply explained by the geometry set up, where at lower incidence 775 angles, the train acts as a barrier and thus blocks the flow. An interesting trend appears after the wind 776 777 incidence angle of 60° , where it is visible that the wind incidence angle of 70° , 80° and 90° results in 778 quite similar results at the WWS of the train. Also, the resulting surface pressure at these wind angles 779 is in the mid-range of the lowest and highest pressure results achieved at those particular tappings. At the windward edge of the roof, a drop in surface pressure is observed where lower surface pressure 780 781 results are yielded at higher wind incidence angles as compared to the lower wind incidence angles. This phenomenon stays valid over the roof. As the flow progresses over the train surface, the flow tends 782 783 to show weaker suctions over the roof of the model while the wake of the model on the LWS seems to 784 have a little effect on the overall pressure distribution. These trends have been discussed earlier as well 785 in section 3.1.1.1. Hence, to be more specific in terms of the different wind incidence angles in the LWS, the wind incidence angle of 50° seems to result in the lowest yet varying pressure distribution 786 while higher wind incidence angles such as 60° to 90° lead to a uniform pressure distribution in the 787 788 wake of the train.

789 Further away from the nose of the train, over the WWS and the roof of the train, the trend in the surface pressure distribution is same, however, the magnitude of the pressure values is different. Particularly in 790 791 the WWS of the train, similar to Loop B, the wind incidence angle of 20° results in lower pressure 792 results as compared to other increasing wind incidence angles. However, over the roof and the LWS of the train, the wind incidence angle of 20° results in the highest pressure distribution comparatively. 793 794 Dissimilar to Loop B, it appears that near the midpoint of the train and at distances farther from the nose of the train, the pressure distribution is similar in terms of the trends it adopts regardless of the 795 796 wind incidence angles, with obvious differences in terms of the magnitude of the pressure values. This 797 also shows the importance of the nose of the train as it confirms its influence on the flow fields around 798 the train.

799 Towards the rear of the first car of the train, it is apparent that from 20° to 50° of wind incidence angle, the pressure results follow a similar trend in the WWS with the lowest pressure results being yielded at 800 the lowest wind incidence angle. As the wind incidence angle increases, the highest wind incidence 801 angle results in the highest surface pressure distribution. This is as expected due to the increased 802 possibility of the direct impingement of wind on the train surface at increased wind incidence angles, 803 thus resulting in stagnation regions. Over the windward edge of the roof, a sharp decrease in pressure 804 805 is observable where strong suctions represent the possible detachment of flow vortices. Compared to 806 the other loops, which were at a lesser distance from the nose of the train, it appears that strong suctions 807 are evident near the tail of the train. This aspect has already been discussed in section 3.1.1.1. As the 808 flow progresses, uniform pressure distribution is obtained at the LWS with the lower wind incidence angles resulting in higher pressure results, comparatively. 809





Figure 15: Surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at (a) loop B and (b) loop G for varying windincidence angles without the presence of any windbreak walls.

813

815 3.3.2. Case (h): Track with windbreak wall 4 (Height of 210 mm with a 45° transition angle) in 816 the WWS

Figure 16 shows the $\overline{C_P}$ distribution at loop B and loop G of the train for varying wind incidence angles 817 with the windbreak wall 4 (i.e. the windbreak wall with the transition region of 45°) in the WWS of the 818 train, respectively. The results near the nose of the train show a fairly interesting trend where it is 819 820 apparent that at higher wind incidence angles (i.e. at wind incidence angles from 50° to 90°), the shielding effect of windbreak walls was able to play a role, hence resulting in much uniform pressure 821 distribution as compared to the lower wind incidence angles. In addition, even though the windbreak 822 823 wall was designed in order to barricade the oncoming flow, it appears that at a wind incidence angle of 824 20° and to some extend at wind incidence angles of 30° and 40° as well, a strong suction point existed at the windward edge of the roof. This was not the case for higher wind incidence angles. Also, over 825 the roof of the train, lower wind incidence angles resulted in higher pressure results as compared to the 826 827 uniform resulting effects of the windbreak wall at higher wind incidence angles. Nevertheless, in terms 828 of the leeward side, it was observed that the wind incidence angles do not have a major effect on the 829 pressure distribution with somewhat uniform results achieved at higher wind incidence angles. However, compared to other wind incidence angles, the wind incidence angle of 60° results in much 830 831 lower surface pressure results mostly, specially over the roof and the LWS of the train. It could be interpreted from these results that apart from a wind incidence angle of 20° , which seems to be one of 832 833 the most severe cases, the shielding effects of the windbreak wall 4 are apparent.

834 Away from the nose of the train, near the midpoint, the results show that all wind incidence angles lead to a fairly uniform pressure distribution with the lowest pressure results observed at lower wind 835 incidence angles. An interesting trend is evident at the windward edge of the roof where it can be 836 observed that at higher wind incidence angles (i.e. from 50° to 90°), a uniform constant pressure 837 838 distribution is obtained. However, for lower wind incidence angles at the same point, there is a sharp 839 increase in the surface pressure. This signifies the possible reattachment of flow in this region at lower 840 wind incidence angles (i.e. 20° to 40°) where it is also apparent that the windbreak wall was not able to 841 provide a complete shielding effect. The effect of the wind incidence angles is also apparent in the LWS 842 of the train.

Towards the rear of the train, it appears that as the wind incidence angle is increased, the resulting pressure decreases with lower surface pressure distribution achieved at the highest wind incidence angle. This was the case over the entire circumference of the train for loops located at the end of the first car such as loop M. A strong suction peak exists in the middle of the roof and the leeward edge of the roof. This is also discussed in detail in section 3.1.1.2.



Figure 16: Surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at (a) loop B and (b) loop G for varying wind incidence angles with the windbreak wall 4 in the WWS.

^{851 3.3.3.} Case (i): Track with windbreak wall 5 (Height of 210 mm with a 90° transition angle) in the WWS

Figure 17 shows the $\overline{C_P}$ distribution at loop B and loop G of the train for varying wind incidence angles with the windbreak wall 5 (i.e. the windbreak wall with the transition region of 90°) in the WWS of the train, respectively.

⁸⁵⁶ Compared to the results obtained with the windbreak wall 4, slightly different results were obtained 857 with the use of windbreak wall 5. At the nose of the train, while a suction point exists at the windward 858 edge of the roof at lower wind incidence angles, similar to with the use of windbreak wall 4 along with 859 an increase in pressure over the roof, a suction peak no longer exists in the LWS of the train. However, 860 one interesting finding is apparent at a wind incidence angle of 60° . If the two windbreak walls with transition regions (i.e. walls 4 and 5) are compared, it is clearly visible that while a uniform surface 861 pressure distribution is achieved with the use of windbreak wall with a transition region of 45°, this is 862 not the case with the windbreak wall with a transition region of 90°. With the latter, a varying flow field 863 864 is apparent indicating some disturbances in the flow, specifically at this wind incidence angle. At such

865 a wind incidence angle, it seems that a windbreak wall with a transition region of 45° is a better option. Also, any positive pressure values with the use of a windbreak wall indicate that the wind flow was able 866 to directly impinge and create stagnation regions. A physical interpretation of this trend could be that 867 while the oncoming flow was able to separate from the top edge of the windbreak fall, it possibly 868 reattached at the leeward edge of the roof. It also appears that at certain wind angles, the wind flow was 869 able to directly impinge and create stagnation regions thus producing large positive pressure values. For 870 higher wind incidence angles, i.e. 70° to 90°, the surface pressure distribution is fairly similar and 871 uniform over the entire circumference of the train. This is as expected due to the complete shielding 872 873 effect of the windbreak wall.

At the midpoint of the train, as seen in Figure 17b, due to the difference in the geometry of the 874 windbreak walls 4 and 5 (i.e. the difference in the shapes of the transition regions), the results seem to 875 have a resulting effect. To elaborate, in terms of the WWS of the train, at lower wind incidence angles 876 877 (i.e. 20° to 40°), it is visible that the windbreak wall 5 results in much higher surface pressure results as compared to the results obtained with the use of windbreak wall 4. Another interesting point is the 878 windward edge of the roof where the use of windbreak wall results in a sharp increase in pressure but 879 880 the use of windbreak wall 5 has no resulting significant impact on the surface pressure. Once again, at lower incidence angles the flow of the LWS of the train shows some differences when compared for 881 882 cases with windbreak walls 4 and 5, respectively. Following on, at higher incidence angles, i.e. from 50° to 90° , not only do the results show a uniform pressure distribution over the entire train surface, the 883 results for windbreak walls 4 and 5 are quite similar in terms of the trends and to a certain extent in 884 magnitude. It is worth mentioning that the results of these experimental cases (g - i) are similar to the 885 886 ones mentioned in section 3.1.1.2 for cases (a - f).

Towards the rear of the train, it is clear that the trend is very similar for both cases (h) and (i). This is mainly because the results at this section are at a farther distance from the actual position of the transition region. Nevertheless, some differences exist in these two cases at the same loop at some wind incidence angles. This shows that the wind incidence angle along with the shape of the transition region may have an impact on the train even at positions much further away from the point, which was directly under the impact of the transition region.

Figure 17: Surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at (a) loop B and (b) loop G for varying wind incidence angles with the windbreak wall 5 in the WWS.

897 3.3.4. Case (j): Track with windbreak wall 2 (Height of 190 mm) in the LWS

898 Figure 18 shows the surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at loop B for varying wind incidence 899 angles with the windbreak wall 2 (i.e. the continuous windbreak wall with the same height as the train height) in the LWS of the train. This experimental case allowed for modelling the windbreak wall 900 901 behind the train (i.e. downwind). In order to understand the impact of a windbreak wall behind the train, 902 the results of this case were compared with the case where no windbreak wall was used. Overall, as 903 expected, no differences were observed in the WWS. Up till a wind incidence angle of 50°, the trend of 904 the surface pressure distribution was similar for the two cases. Over the entire circumference of the train 905 at loop B, from 20° to 50° of wind incidence angle, the case with no windbreak wall resulted in lower 906 results as compared to the case with the windbreak wall behind the train. Also, not significant 907 differences in the magnitude of the pressure distribution were observable at all wind incidence angles 908 over the roof of the train. Moreover, in the wake of the flow, from 60° to 80° of wind incidence angle, 909 while the case with no windbreak wall resulted in uniform pressure, the addition of a windbreak wall 910 behind the train resulted in a lower but non-uniform surface pressure distribution.

911 At slightly further distances from the nose and at lower incidence angles, the results of the surface 912 pressure distribution are similar to the case without the presence of any windbreak wall. However, although the trend is similar, the magnitude of the surface pressure distribution is different with the wall 913 914 2 in the LWS always resulting in higher pressures, specifically in the LWS. Slight differences arise from a wind incidence angle of 60°, where the comparison between the two cases tend to show similar 915 916 results over the circumference of the loops. Also, the wall in the LWS continues to yield higher pressure 917 results, comparatively.

918 Further on, towards the rear of the train for lower wind incidence angles, while the pattern of the surface 919 pressure distribution is similar to the case without the presence of any windbreak wall, it is observed 920 that the windbreak wall on the LWS of the train does lead to a reduction in the haphazard pressure 921 distribution over the train's circumference. Although the fluctuations exist in terms of the flow as it 922 transits from one pressure to the other, these are less severe, comparatively. Moreover, at slightly higher wind incidence angles (i.e. 50° and 60°), an irregular trend is observed over the roof of the train. This 923 can be based on the nature of the wind incidence angle, which allows for lower pressure values with the 924 use of a windbreak wall in the LWS. However, as the wind incidence angle increases further (i.e. 70° 925 926 to 90°), both the trend and the magnitude of the surface pressure results are very similar to the case 927 without any windbreak wall in the LWS.

928

929

Figure 18: Surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at loop B for varying wind incidence angles 930 with the windbreak wall 2 in the LWS. 931

932

3.3.5. *Case (k): Track with windbreak wall 4 (Height of 210 mm with a 45° transition angle) in* the WWS and windbreak wall 2 (Height of 190 mm) in the LWS 933

934 Figure 19 shows the comparison of surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at loop B for wind 935 incidence angles of 30° and 90° for cases (e), (f) and (k), where 2 walls represent case (k). The purpose 936 of such a test was to test the effect of two barriers on the overall flow. Hence, this experimental case 937 allowed for modelling windbreak walls both, upwind and downwind the train. The comparison showed 938 that the results for case (k) follow the same trend as case (e).

939 For the wind incidence angle of 30° , the results for case (k) agree with the results for case (e) in the 940 WWS, as expected, with no major differences. Only differences observed were on the roof of the train where the use of two walls resulted in an increased $\overline{C_P}$ distribution. However, over the rest of the LWS 941 942 of the train, the results for case (k) agree well with the results for case (e).

For the wind incidence angle of 90°, overall, slightly higher $\overline{C_P}$ results were obtained with the use of two windbreak walls, but the trend was same as mentioned above. Away from the nose of the train, further down the body, the results did not show any significant differences.

946

Figure 19: Comparison of surface mean pressure coefficient distribution at loop B for wind incidence angles of (a) 30° and (b) 90° for cases (e), (f) and (k).

949

950 **4.** Conclusions

For the first time, this novel experimental study investigated the influence of windbreak walls with varying angles of transition regions on the flow around a model-scale passenger train. A series of wind tunnel tests were carried out for a number of windbreak walls at varying yaw angles. Windbreak walls were found to cause varying pressure distributions on the train surface. The results presented indicate a number of important findings:

- For the 90° yaw angle, in comparison to different windbreak walls, the windbreak wall with a 90° transition angle usually led to the highest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution on the train surface near the nose, while the tallest wall resulted in the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution, mostly.
- 959 At transition regions, at a yaw angle of 90°, a slight change in the results was observed where 960 the wall with a 45° transition region showed the highest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution as compared to all other 961 walls.

963

976

977

978

979

980 981

982

983

989

990 991

992

993

- Most differences in the results were observed at the windward side as compared to the leeward side thus suggesting the detachment of the flow in the wake of the flow.
- For the 30° yaw angle, up to the nose region of the train, the tallest wall was observed to result in the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution over the circumference of the train; while the shortest wall showed the highest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution.
- In terms of transition regions at a yaw angle of 30° , near the nose of the train, the wall with a transition angle of 90° provided the highest $\overline{C_P}$ results as compared to the wall with a transition angle of 45° . Beyond the nose region (loop D onwards), the wall with a transition angle of 45° was seen to result in the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ results as compared to all other walls along the longitudinal length of the body. From loop L onwards, the influence of the tallest wall on the flow resulted in the lowest $\overline{C_P}$ distribution.
- Walls with transition regions led to more uniform results where $\overline{C_P}$ was seen to approach zero. These uniform results with lesser variations indicate the smooth pressure distribution around the train signifying the complete detachment of any vortical structures from the train body.
 - Generally, a strong vortex can lead to the sharp transition or drop in the $\overline{C_P}$.
 - Overall, the addition of windbreak walls led to uniform results in the LWS comparatively, possibly due to the detachment of the flow in the wake region; while the shielding effects of different windbreak walls were clearly evident over the entire train body.
 - In terms of the differences in the results obtained for the yaw angles of 30° and 90°, it was observed at 30° yaw angle that due to the orientation of the model, both positive and negative $\overline{C_P}$ values were revealed, whereas at 90° yaw angle, the windbreak walls resulted in all lower $\overline{C_P}$ values.
- A comparison between the no wall and with wall cases shows clearly that the overall $\overline{C_Y}$ values for most loops of the train changed from positive to negative with the addition of any wall at both yaw angles. This was as expected and shows the huge impact of windbreak walls. Also, the shielding effect of windbreak walls results in negative and in some cases negligible overall side force coefficient values.
 - Although lift force coefficients remained positive even after the addition of windbreak walls, the intensity of change between the results was clear reflecting on the significant impact of walls.
 - Almost negligible rolling moments were observed with the use of windbreak walls at a yaw angle of 90° and somewhat positive rolling moments were observed with the use of windbreak walls at a yaw angle of 30°.
- 995
 The use of a windbreak wall in the LWS of the train seems unnecessary, as the flow does not seem to be significantly affected by the presence of this wall. However, the wall does lead to less fluctuations in the rapid transitions in the pressure over the circumference of the train.
- The use of a splitter plate does not have a significant effect on the velocity profile.
- 999 Every wind incidence angle, each loop and in fact each measuring pressure tap has its own characteristics due to its position and the surrounding influence. Yet, the results of all experimental cases are related to a certain extent.
- If the two windbreak walls with transition regions (i.e. walls 4 and 5) are compared, it is clearly visible that both tend to provide a uniform surface pressure distribution but there are certainly some differences between the two cases at different wind incidence angles.
- Overall, the windbreak walls used in this study have proved to be capable in reducing the loads on a train surface significantly.

1007 The main motivation of this study was to obtain an understanding of the aerodynamic flow, which 1008 exists around a train surface due to the presence of different kinds of windbreak walls. This paper provides some interesting results, which can be used to provide an insight to future works where 1009 the ultimate aim of this study would be to provide safety and stability of trains. While it is 1010 1011 acknowledged that in reality, there is a relative movement between the train and the windbreak 1012 walls, the aim of the current paper was not to calculate the aerodynamic forces and moment for a 1013 moving train in the transition region but to provide valuable experimental data for a stationary train in the transition region (with the use of a wind tunnel assessment), instead. The experimental data 1014 1015 from the present work can help act as a benchmark for future work, which can involve performing 1016 numerical simulations to better understand the flow structures in order to form an enhanced understanding of the flow behaviour around trains with windbreak walls. Numerical simulations 1017 will be able to exhibit numerous flow features, which may not be evident through experimental 1018 results while the experimental results will be used to validate the initial numerical simulations. In 1019 1020 addition, the flow around a high-speed train consists of several small structures due to the instabilities in the shear layers (Hemida and Krajnovic, 2010). The numerical simulations will help 1021 in studying the time-dependent behaviour of the flow structures and the resulting impact on the 1022 surface pressure of the train along with the aerodynamic coefficients. Numerical simulations will 1023 be able to easily assess the relative movement of the train with different windbreak walls along with 1024 1025 providing further details of the flow around transition regions in windbreak walls. Also, different 1026 scenarios such as the use of a DTBR with the presence of symmetrical barriers in both, WWS and 1027 LWS are recommended for any follow up studies.

1028

1029 Acknowledgements

1030 The author(s) would like to thank the technical staff at the University of Birmingham's wind tunnel
1031 facility for their invaluable assistance provided throughout the experimental work in this project. The
1032 work was financed by a University of Birmingham funded scholarship and was supported by the EU
1033 H2020 project LiftTRAIN (701693).

1034

1035 Declaration of Conflicting Interests

1036 The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or1037 publication of this article.

1038

1039 **5. References**

Avila-Sanchez, S., Pindado, S., Lopez-Garcia, O. and Sanz-Andres, A., 2014. Wind Tunnel Analysis
of the Aerodynamic Loads on Rolling Stock over Railway Embankments: The Effect of Shelter
Windbreaks. The Scientific World Journal. 1-17.

Avila-Sanchez, S., Lopez-Garcia, O., Cuerva, A., Meseguer, J., 2016. Characterisation of cross-flow
above a railway bridge equipped with solid windbreaks. Eng Struct. 126, 133-146.

- Baker, C., 2010. The flow around high speed trains. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 98, 277-298.
- Baker, C., 2014. A review of train aerodynamics Part 1 Fundamentals. The Aeronautical Journal. 118
 (1201), 201-228.
- Baker, C., Brockie, N., 1991. Wind tunnel tests to obtain train aerodynamic drag coefficients: Reynolds
 number and ground simulation effects. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 38, 23-28.

- Baker, C., Cheli, F., Orellano, A., Paradot, N., Proppe, C., Rocchi, D., 2009. Cross-wind effects on road
 and rail vehicles. Vehicle System Dynamics. 47 (8), 983-1022.
- Baker, C., Hemida H., Iwnicki, S., Xie, G., Ongaro, D., 2011. Special issue: The integration of crosswind forces into train dynamic modelling. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers.
 Part F J. Rail Rapid Transit. 225 (2), 154-164.
- Baker, C., Jones, J., Lopez-Calleja, F., Munday, J., 2004. Measurements of the crosswind forces on
 trains. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 92, 547-563.
- Baker, C., Sterling, M., 2009. Aerodynamic Forces on Multiple Unit Trains in Cross Winds. ASME. J.
 Fluids Eng. 131 (10), 101103-101103-14.
- Barcala, M., Meseguer, J., 2007. An experimental study of the influence of parapets on the aerodynamic
 loads under cross wind on a two-dimensional model of a railway vehicle on a bridge. Proceedings of
 the Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Part F J. Rail Rapid Transit. 221 (4), 487-494.
- Bi, H., Ma, G., Wang, H., 2011. Aerodynamic characteristics of high-speed trains with wind fence. In:
 The 3rd international conference on transportation engineering. Chengdu, China. 2521–2526.
- Bocciolone, M., Cheli, F., Corradi, R., Muggiasca, S., Tomasini, G., 2008. Crosswind action on rail
 vehicles: wind tunnel experimental analyses. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 96, 584-610.
- Browand, F., Ross, J., McCallen, R., 2009. The Aerodynamics of Heavy Vehicles II: Trucks, Buses,and Trains. Berlin.
- 1068 CEN, 2013. Railway applications Aerodynamics Part 4: Requirements and test procedures for
 1069 aerodynamics on open track. BS EN 14067-4:2013. CEN/TC 256.
- 1070 CEN, 2018. Railway applications Aerodynamics Part 6: Requirements and test procedure for cross
 1071 wind assessment. PrEN 14067–6 2009-02. CEN/TC 256.
- 1072 Cheli, F., Corradi, R., Rocchi, D., Tomasini, G., Maestrini, E., 2010. Wind tunnel tests on train scale
 1073 models to investigate the effect of infrastructure scenario. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 98, 353-362.
- 1074 Cheli, F., Rocchi, D., Schito, P., Tomasini, G., 2011. Steady and moving high-speed train crosswind
 1075 simulations. Comparison with wind-tunnel tests. In: Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress on
 1076 Railway Research, WCRR 2011. Lille, France.
- 1077 Chiu, T.W., Squire, L.C., 1992. An experimental study of the flow over a train in a crosswind at large
 1078 yaw angles up to 90°. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 45, 47-74.
- 1079 Chu, C., Chang, C., Huang, C., Wu, T., Wang, C., Liu, M., 2013. Windbreak protection for road vehicles
 1080 against crosswind. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 116, 61-69.
- 1081 Cooper, R., 1979. The probability of trains overturning in high winds. In: Proceedings of the 5th
 1082 International Conference on Wind Engineering, Fort Collins. 2, 1185-1194.
- 1083 Copley, J., 1987. The three dimensional flow around railway trains. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 26, 21-1084 52.
- 1085 Deeg, P., Jonsson, M., Kaltenbach, H-J., Schober, M., Weise, M., 2008. Cross comparison of
 1086 measurement techniques for the determination of train induced aerodynamic loads on the track bed. In:
 1087 Proceedings of the conference on Bluff Bodies Aerodynamics and its Applications. Milano, Italy.
- Deng, E., Yang, W., Lei, M., Zhu, Z., & Zhang, P., 2019. Aerodynamic loads and traffic safety of highspeed trains when passing through two windproof facilities under crosswind: A comparative study.
 Engineering Structures, 188, 320-339.
- 1091 Department for Transport, 2017. Rail factsheet: 2017. National Statistics. Crown copyright.

- Diedrichs, B., 2003. On computational fluid dynamics modelling of crosswind effects for high-speed
 rolling stock. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Part F J. Rail Rapid Transit. 217
 (3), 203-226.
- Dorigatti, F., Sterling, M., Baker, C., Quinn, A., 2015. Crosswind effects on the stability of a model
 passenger train A comparison of static and moving experiments. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 138, 3651.
- EC, 2008. TSI—technical specification for Interoperability of the trans-European high-speed rail
 system, 'rolling stock' sub-system, TSI-HS2008/232/EC. Off. J. Eur. Union.
- Fujii, T., Maeda, T., Ishida, H., Imai, T., Tanemoto, K., Suzuki, M., 1999. Wind induced accidents of
 train vehicles and their measurements in Japan. Q.J. RTRI Japan. 401, 50-55.
- Gallagher, M., Morden, J., Baker, C., Soper, D., Quinn, A., Hemida, H., Sterling, M, 2018. Trains in
 crosswinds comparison of full-scale on-train measurements, physical model tests and CFD
 calculations. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 175, 428-444.
- Guo, W., Xia, H., Karoumi, R., Zhang, T., Li, X., 2015. Aerodynamic effect of wind barriers and
 running safety of trains on high-speed railway bridges under crosswinds. J. Wind Struct. 20 (2), 213236.
- He, X., Zou, Y. F., Wang, H. F., Han, Y., Shi, K., 2014. Aerodynamic characteristics of a trailing rail
 vehicles on viaduct based on still wind tunnel experiments. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 135, 22-33.
- Hemida, H., Baker, C., 2010. LES of the flow around a freight wagon subjected to crosswind. Comput
 Fluids. 39 (10), 1944-1956.
- Hemida, H., Krajnovic, S., 2009. Exploring flow structure around a simplified ICE2 train subjected to
 a 30 degrees side wind using LES. Engineering Applications of Computational Fluid Mechanics. 3, 2841.
- Hemida, H., Krajnovic, S., 2010. LES study of the influence of the nose shape and yaw angles on flowstructures around trains. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 98, 34-46.
- Krajnović, S., Ringqvist, P., Nakade, K., & Basara, B., 2012. Large eddy simulation of the flow around
 a simplified train moving through a crosswind flow. Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial
 Aerodynamics, 110, 86-99.
- Li, B., Xu, Z., Yang, Q., Feng, S., 2012. Effects of railway wind fence on the aerodynamic forces of
 train and fence. In: The 12th international symposium on structural engineering. Wuhan, China. 625630.
- Liu, T., Chen, Z., Zhou, X., & Zhang, J., 2018. A CFD analysis of the aerodynamics of a high-speed
 train passing through a windbreak transition under crosswind. Engineering Applications of
 Computational Fluid Mechanics, 12(1), 137-151.
- Mohebbi, M., Rezvani, M., 2017. Two-dimensional analysis of the influence of windbreaks on airflow
 over a high-speed train under crosswind using lattice Boltzmann method. Proceedings of the Institution
 of Mechanical Engineers. Part F J. Rail Rapid Transit. 232(3), 863-872.
- Niu, J., Zhou, D., & Wang, Y., 2018. Numerical comparison of aerodynamic performance of stationary
 and moving trains with or without windbreak wall under crosswind. Journal of Wind Engineering and
 Industrial Aerodynamics, 182, 1-15.
- Premoli, A., Rocchi, D., Schito, P., & Tomasini, G. I. S. E. L. L. A., 2016. Comparison between steady
 and moving railway vehicles subjected to crosswind by CFD analysis. Journal of Wind Engineering
 and Industrial Aerodynamics, 156, 29-40.
- Richardson, G.M., Richards, P.J., 1995. Full-scale measurements of the effect of a porous windbreakon wind spectra. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerod. 54-55, 611-619.

- 1137 RSSB, 2009. Resistance of Railway Vehicles to Roll-Over in Gales, Railway Group Standard GM/RT
 1138 2142. Rail Safety and Standards Board Ltd.
- 1139 RSSB, 2016. Leading Health and Safety on Britain's Railway. Rail Safety and Standards Board Ltd.
- Sanquer, S., Barre, C., deVirel, M.D., Cleon, L.M., 2004. Effect of crosswinds on high-speed trains:
 development of a new experimental methodology. J. Wind Eng. Ind. Aerodyn. 92, 535–545.
- Schulte-Werning, B., Grégoire, R., Malfatti, A., Matschke, G., 2002. TRANSAERO A European
 Initiative on Transient Aerodynamics for Railway System Optimisation. Springer. Berlin.
- Schulte-Werning, B., Matschke, G., 1997. Measures and strategies to minimise the effect of strong
 crosswinds on high speed trains, Proceedings of the WCRR World Congress of Railway Research,
 Florence, Italy. vol. E. 569–575.
- 1147 TFI, 2011. Turbulent Flow Instrumentation Cobra Probe Getting started guide. Technical report.
- Tomasini, G., Giappino, S., Cheli, F., Schito, P., 2015. Windbreaks for railway lines: Wind tunnel
 experimental tests. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Part F J. Rail Rapid Transit.
 230(4), 1270-1282.
- Yang, W., Deng, E., Lei, M., Zhu, Z., & Zhang, P., 2019. Transient aerodynamic performance of high speed trains when passing through two windproof facilities under crosswinds: A comparative study.
- 1153 Engineering Structures, 188, 729-744.
- Zhang, T., Guo, W. and Du, F., 2017. Effect of windproof barrier on aerodynamic performance ofvehicle-bridge system. Procedia Engineering. 199, 3083-3090.
- Zhang, T., Xia, H., Guo, W., 2013. Analysis on running safety of train on bridge with wind barriers
 subjected to cross wind. J. Wind Struct. 172, 203-225.
- Zhao, H., Zhai, W., and Chen, Z., 2015. Effect of noise barrier on aerodynamic performance of high-speed train in crosswind. J. Wind Struct. 202, 213-236.