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The Ingard-Myers condition, modelling the effect of an impedance wall under a mean flow by assuming a vanishingly thin boundary layer, is known to lead to an ill-posed problem in time-domain. By analysing the stability of a linear-then-constant mean flow over a mass-spring-damper liner in a 2D incompressible limit, we show that the flow is absolutely unstable for \( h < h_c \) and convectively unstable or stable otherwise. This critical \( h_c \) is by nature independent of wave length or frequency and is a property of liner and mean flow only. An analytical approximation of \( h_c \) is given, which is complemented by a contourplot covering all parameter values. For an aeronautically relevant example, \( h_c \) is shown to be extremely small, which explains why this instability has never been observed in industrial practice. A systematically regularised boundary condition, to replace the Ingard-Myers condition, is proposed that retains the effects of a finite \( h \), such that the stability of the approximate problem correctly follows the stability of the real problem.
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1. Introduction

The problem we address is primarily a modelling problem, as we aim to clarify why a seemingly very thin mean flow boundary layer cannot be neglected. At the same time, the physical insight we provide may help to interpret recent experimental results.

Consider a liner of impedance $Z(\omega)$ at a wall along a main flow $(U_0, \rho_0, c_0)$ with boundary layer of thickness $h$ and acoustic waves of typical wavelength $\lambda$. At the wall, with vanishing mean flow velocity, the impedance relates the Fourier transformed pressure $\hat{p}(\omega)$ and normal velocity component $\hat{v}(\omega) \cdot n$ in the following way (see Hubbard 1995)

$$\hat{p} = Z(\hat{v} \cdot n)$$

(where normal vector $n$ points into the wall). This, however, is not a convenient boundary condition when the mean flow boundary layer is thin and the effective mean flow model is one with slip along the wall. In such a case the Ingard-Myers model (see Ingard 1959; Myers 1980; Eversman & Beckemeyer 1972; Tester 1973b) utilizes the fact that if $h \ll \lambda$, the sound waves don’t see any difference between a finite boundary layer and a vortex sheet, so that the limit $h \to 0$ can be taken, resulting into the celebrated Ingard boundary condition (see Ingard 1959) for mean flow along a straight wall in (say) $x$-direction

$$i\omega(\hat{v} \cdot n) = \left[i\omega + U_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right] \left(\frac{\hat{p}}{Z}\right)$$

or its generalisation by Myers (1980) for mean flow along a curved wall

$$i\omega(\hat{v} \cdot n) = \left[i\omega + V_0 \cdot \nabla - n \cdot (n \cdot \nabla V_0)\right] \left(\frac{\hat{p}}{Z}\right).$$

It is clear that both conditions are extremely useful for numerical calculations in those cases where the boundary layer is indeed negligible.

For a long time, however, there have been doubts (see Tester 1973a; Rienstra 2003; Rienstra & Tester 2008) about a particular wave mode that exists along a lined wall with flow and the Ingard-Myers condition. This mode has some similarities with the Kelvin-Helmholtz instability of a free vortex sheet (see Rienstra 2007) and may therefore represent an instability, although the analysis is mathematically subtle (see Brambley & Peake 2006, 2008; Brambley 2008, 2009).

Since there was little or no indication that this instability was genuine, the problem seemed to be of minor practical importance, at least for calculations in frequency domain. However, once we approach the problem in time domain such that numerical errors generate perturbations of every frequency, it appears to our modeller’s dislike that the instability is at least in the model very real. The flow appears to be absolutely unstable (see Chevaugeon, Remacle & Gallez 2006; Brambley & Peake 2006) and in fact it is worse: it is ill-posed, as Brambley showed (see Brambley 2009). Still, this absolute instability has not (see Jones 2007) or at least practically not (see Bauer & Chapkis 1977) been reported in industrial reality, and only very rarely experimentally (see Brandes & Ronneberger 1995; Aurégan, Leroux & Pagneux 2005; Aurégan & Leroux 2008; Marx, Aurégan, Baillet & Valière 2009) under special conditions. Although there is little doubt that the limit $h \to 0$ is correct, there must be something wrong in our modelling assumptions. In particular, there must be a very small length scale in the problem, other than $\lambda$, on which $h$ scales at the onset of instability. This is what we will consider here.

The present paper consists of three parts.

Firstly, we will show that the above modelling anomaly may be explained, in an inviscid model with a vanishingly thin mean shear flow, by the existence of a (non-zero) critical boundary layer thickness $h_c$, such that the boundary layer is absolutely unstable for
$0 < h < h_c$ and not absolutely unstable (possibly convectively unstable) for $h > h_c$. It appears that for any industrially common configuration, $h_c$ is very small. (We were originally inspired (see Rienstra & Vilenski 2008) for the concept of a critical thickness by the results of Michalke (1965, 1984) for the spatially unstable free shear layer, but it should be noted that an absolute instability is a more complex phenomenon.)

Secondly, we will make an estimate in analytic form of $h_c$ as a function of the problem parameters. This will be valid for a parameter range that includes the industrially interesting cases. A contourplot relating the three dimensionless parameter groups completes the picture for all parameter values.

Thirdly, we will propose a corrected or regularised “Ingard-Myers” boundary condition, that replaces the boundary layer (like the Ingard-Myers limit) but includes otherwise neglected terms that account for the finite boundary layer thickness effects. This new boundary condition is physically closer to the full problem and predicts (more) correctly stable and unstable behaviour.

2. The problem

2.1. Description

An inviscid 2D parallel mean flow $U_0(y)$ (figure 1), with uniform mean pressure $p_0$ and density $\rho_0$, and small isentropic perturbations

$$u = U_0 + \tilde{u}, \ v = \tilde{v}, \ p = p_0 + \tilde{p}, \ \rho = \rho_0 + \tilde{\rho}, \ (2.1)$$

satisfies the usual linearised Euler equations given by

$$\frac{1}{\rho_0 c_0^2} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial t} + U_0 \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial y} = 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial t} + U_0 \frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{dU_0}{dy} \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial x} = 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial t} + U_0 \frac{\partial \tilde{v}}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial y} = 0.$$

(2.2)

where $c_0$ is the sound speed and $(\partial_t + U_0 \partial_x)(\tilde{p} - c_0^2 \tilde{\rho}) = 0$. When we consider waves of the type

$$\tilde{p}(x, y, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{p}(x, y; \omega) e^{i\omega t} \ d\omega = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{p}(y; \alpha, \omega) e^{i\omega t - i\alpha x} \ d\alpha d\omega, \ (2.3)$$

(similarly for $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$), the equations become

$$\frac{i(\omega - \alpha U_0)}{\rho_0 c_0^2} \tilde{p} - i \alpha \tilde{u} + \frac{d\tilde{v}}{dy} = 0,$$

$$i(\omega - \alpha U_0) \tilde{u} + \frac{dU_0}{dy} \tilde{v} - i\alpha \tilde{\rho} = 0,$$

$$i(\omega - \alpha U_0) \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{\rho_0} \frac{d\tilde{p}}{dy} = 0. \ (2.4)$$

They may be further reduced to a form of the Pridmore-Brown equation (see Pridmore-Brown 1958) by eliminating $\tilde{v}$ and $\tilde{u}$

$$\frac{d^2 \tilde{p}}{dy^2} + \frac{2\alpha}{\omega - \alpha U_0} \frac{d\tilde{p}}{dy} + \left( \frac{(\omega - \alpha U_0)^2}{c_0^2} - \alpha^2 \right) \tilde{p} = 0. \ (2.5)$$
At $y = 0$ we have a uniform impedance boundary condition
\begin{equation}
-\frac{\partial p(0)}{\partial y(0)} = Z(\omega). \tag{2.6}
\end{equation}

We select solutions of surface wave type, by assuming exponential decay for $y \to \infty$.

The mean flow is typically uniform everywhere, equal to $U_\infty$, except for a thin boundary layer of thickness $h$. We look for frequency ($\omega$) and wavenumber ($\alpha$) combinations that allow a solution. The stability of this solution will be investigated as a function of the problem parameters. In particular we will be interested in the critical thickness $h = h_c$ below which the flow becomes absolutely unstable.

### 2.2. Dimension analysis and scaling

As the frequency and wave number at which the absolute instability first appears is part of the problem, it is clear that $h_c$ does not depend on $\omega$ or $\alpha$. As a consequence, the Ingard-Myers limit, $h \to 0$, based on $h/\lambda \ll 1$ ($\lambda$ a typical acoustic wavelength) is not applicable to the instability problem. Furthermore, since the associated surface wave (see Rienstra 2003, eqs. (12)-(13)) is of hydrodynamic nature and inherently incompressible, $h_c$ is only weakly depending on sound speed $c_0$, with $p_0$ also playing no role anymore.

As there are no other length scales in the fluid, $h_c$ must scale on an inherent length scale of the liner. Suppose we have a liner of mass-spring-damper type with resistance $R$, inertance $m$ and stiffness $K$, then
\begin{equation}
Z(\omega) = R + i\omega m - i\rho_0 c_0 \cot(\omega L/c_0), \tag{2.7a}
\end{equation}

and designed to work near the first cell resonance frequency (where $\text{Im}(Z) = 0$), then $\omega L/c_0$ is small for the relevant frequency range, and we can approximate the Helmholtz resonator by a mass-spring-damper system with $K \approx \rho_0 c_0^2/L$ and $m = \tilde{m} + \frac{1}{3}\rho_0 L$ (see Richter 2009). Thus, we have 6 parameters ($h_c, \rho_0, U_\infty, R, m, K$) and 3 dimensions (m, kg, s), so it follows from Buckingham’s theorem that our problem has three dimensionless numbers, for example
\begin{equation}
\frac{R}{\rho_0 U_\infty}, \frac{mK}{\rho_0 U_\infty^2}, \frac{Kh_c}{\sqrt{mK \rho_0 U_\infty}}. \tag{2.8}
\end{equation}

Later (section 3.3) we will see that a proper reference length scale for $h_c$, i.e. one that preserves its order of magnitude, is a more complicated combination of these parameters. More specifically, we will find that we can write, for a function $H = O(1)$,
\begin{equation}
h_c \approx \left(\frac{\rho_0 U_\infty}{R}\right)^2 U_\infty \sqrt{m/K} H \left(\frac{R}{\rho_0 U_\infty}, \sqrt{mK/\rho_0 U_\infty}\right). \tag{2.9}
\end{equation}

However, at this stage nothing can be said about this scaling yet. Since nondimensionalisation on arbitrary scaling values is not particularly useful, at least not here, we therefore deliberately leave the problem in dimensional form.

### 2.3. The model: incompressible linear-then-constant shear flow

As the stability problem is essentially incompressible, we consider the incompressible limit, where $\omega/\alpha U_0 \ll c_0$. Then the Prandtl-Brown equation reduces to
\begin{equation}
\frac{d^2 \hat{p}}{dy^2} + \frac{2\alpha}{\omega} \frac{d}{dy} U_0 \frac{d \hat{p}}{dy} - \alpha^2 \hat{p} = 0. \tag{2.10}
\end{equation}
If we assume a linear-then-constant velocity profile of thickness $h$

$$U_0(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{U_\infty}{h} & \text{for } 0 \leq y \leq h \\ U_\infty & \text{for } h \leq y < \infty \end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

we have an exact solution for our problem. For $y \geq h$ we have

$$\hat{p} = Ae^{i\alpha y}, \text{ where } |\alpha| = \text{sgn}(\text{Re} \alpha) \alpha. \tag{2.12}$$

Other representations of $|\alpha|$ are $\sqrt{\alpha^2}$ or $\sqrt{i\alpha \sqrt{-i\alpha}}$ with principal square roots assumed for $\sqrt{\cdot}$ in all cases. $|\alpha|$ is the generalisation of the real absolute value function which is analytic in the right and in the left complex halfplane. It has discontinuities along $(-i\infty,0)$ and $(0,i\infty)$, which correspond with the branch cuts of the square roots. The notation $|\alpha|$ is very common in this kind of problems (see Lingwood & Peake 1999; Peake 1997, 2002), but of course should not be confused with the complex modulus of $\alpha$. However, in this paper the complex modulus does not occur.

In the shear layer region $(0,h)$ we have

$$\hat{p}(y) = C_1 e^{i\alpha y}(h\omega - \alpha y U_\infty + U_\infty) + C_2 e^{-i\alpha y}(h\omega - \alpha y U_\infty - U_\infty) \tag{2.13a}$$
$$\hat{u}(y) = \frac{\alpha h}{\rho_0} (C_1 e^{i\alpha y} + C_2 e^{-i\alpha y}) \tag{2.13b}$$
$$\hat{v}(y) = i\frac{\alpha h}{\rho_0} (C_1 e^{i\alpha y} - C_2 e^{-i\alpha y}). \tag{2.13c}$$

This last solution is due to Rayleigh (see Drazin & Reid 2004), but has been used in a similar context of stability of flow along a flexible wall by Lingwood & Peake (1999).

### 2.4. The dispersion relation

When we apply continuity of pressure and particle displacement (which is, in this case, equivalent to continuity of normal velocity, since the mean flow is continuous) at the interface $y = h$, and the impedance boundary condition at $y = 0$, we obtain the necessary relation between $\omega$ and $\alpha$ for a solution to exists. This is the dispersion relation of the waves of interest, given by

$$0 = D(\alpha, \omega) = Z(\omega) + \frac{i\rho_0}{\alpha h} \frac{(h\omega - U_\infty)(\alpha h \Omega + |\alpha|(h\Omega + U_\infty)) e^{i\alpha h} + (h\omega + U_\infty)(\alpha h \Omega - |\alpha|(h\Omega - U_\infty)) e^{-i\alpha h}}{(\alpha h \Omega + |\alpha|(h\Omega + U_\infty)) e^{i\alpha h} - (\alpha h \Omega - |\alpha|(h\Omega - U_\infty)) e^{-i\alpha h}} \tag{2.14}$$

where

$$\Omega = \omega - \alpha U_\infty. \tag{2.15}$$

### 3. Stability analysis

#### 3.1. Briggs-Bers analysis

We are essentially interested in any possible spurious absolutely unstable behaviour of our model, as this has by far the most dramatic consequences for numerical calculation in time-domain (see Chevaugeon, Remacle & Gallez 2006). Of course, it is also of interest if the instability is physically genuine, like may be the case in the papers of Brandes & Ronneberger (1995); Aurégan, Leroux & Pagneux (2005); Aurégan & Leroux (2008); Marx, Aurégan, Baillet & Valière (2009), but for aeronautical applications this is apparently very rare (see Bauer & Chapkis 1977; Jones 2007).
To identify absolutely unstable behaviour we have to search for causal modes with vanishing group velocity (and an additional “pinching” requirement). For this we follow the method, originally developed by Briggs (1964) and Bers (1983) for plasma physics applications, but subsequently widely applied for fluid mechanical and aeroacoustical applications (see Huerre & Monkewitz 1985; Peake 1997; Lingwood & Peake 1999; Peake 2002; Brambley & Peake 2006, 2008).

If the impulse response of the system may be represented generically by a double Fourier integral

\[
\Psi(x, y, t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{L_\omega} \int_{F_\alpha} \frac{\varphi(y)}{D(\alpha, \omega)} e^{i\omega t - i\alpha x} d\alpha d\omega,
\]

the integration contours \(L_\omega\) and \(F_\alpha\) (figure 2) have to be located in domains of absolute convergence in the complex \(\omega\)- and \(\alpha\)-planes:

- For the \(\omega\)-integral, \(L_\omega\) should be below any poles \(\omega_j(\alpha)\) given by \(D(\alpha, \omega) = 0\), where \(\alpha \in F_\alpha\). This is due to causality that requires \(\Psi = 0\) for \(t < 0\) and the \(e^{i\omega t}\)-factor.
- For the \(\alpha\)-integral, \(F_\alpha\) should be in a strip along the real axis between the left and right running poles, \(\alpha^- (\omega)\) and \(\alpha^+ (\omega)\) given by \(D(\alpha, \omega) = 0\), for \(\omega \in L_\omega\).

The main idea is that we exploit the freedom we have in the location of \(L_\omega\) and \(F_\alpha\). The first step is that we check that there exists a minimum imaginary part of the possible \(\omega_j\):

\[
\omega_{\text{min}} = \min_{\alpha \in F_\alpha} [\text{Im} \omega_j(\alpha)].
\]

This is relatively easy for a mass-spring-damper impedance, because the dispersion relation is equivalent to a third order polynomial in \(\omega\) with just 3 solutions, which can be traced without difficulty. See figure 3 for a typical case (note that it suffices to consider \(\text{Re} (\alpha) > 0\) because of the symmetry of \(D\)). There is a minimum imaginary part, so Briggs-Bers’ method is applicable. Since \(\omega_{\text{min}} < 0\), the flow is unstable.

Then we consider poles \(\alpha^-\) and \(\alpha^+\) in the \(\alpha\) plane, and plot \(\alpha^\pm(\omega)\)-images of the line \(\text{Im}(\omega) = c > \omega_{\text{min}}\). Note that while \(c\) is increased, contour \(F_\alpha\) has to be deformed in order not to cross the poles, but always via the origin because of the branch cuts along the imaginary axis. As \(c\) is increased, \(\alpha^+\) and \(\alpha^-\) approach each other until they collide for \(\omega = \omega^*\) into \(\alpha = \alpha^*\), where the \(F_\alpha\)-integration contour is pinched, unable to be further deformed; see figure 4 for a typical case. If \(\text{Im}(\omega^*) < 0\), resp. > 0, then \((\omega^*, \alpha^*)\) corresponds to an absolute, resp. convective instability. Since two solutions of \(D(\alpha, \omega) = 0\) coalesce, they satisfy the additional equation \(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} D(\alpha, \omega) = 0\), so \((\omega^*, \alpha^*)\) must satisfy the
Hydrodynamic Instability of Impedance Wall

Figure 3. Plots of $\text{Im}(\omega_j(\alpha))$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. All have a minimum imaginary part so Briggs-Bers' method is applicable. ($\rho_0 = 1.22$, $U_\infty = 82$, $h = 0.01$, $R = 100$, $m = 0.1215$, $K = 8166$.)

Figure 4. Plots of poles $\alpha^+(\omega)$ and $\alpha^-(\omega)$ for varying $\text{Im}(\omega) = c$ until they collide for $c = -165$. So in this example (with $\rho_0 = 1.22$, $U_\infty = 82$, $h = 0.01$, $R = 100$, $m = 0.1215$, $K = 8166$) the flow is absolutely unstable.

3.2. A typical example from aeronautical applications

As a typical aeronautical example we consider a low Mach number mean flow $U_\infty = 60$ m/s, $\rho_0 = 1.225$ kg/m$^3$ and $c_0 = 340$ m/s, with an impedance of Helmholtz resonator type (see Rienstra 2006)

$$Z(\omega) = R + i\omega m - i\rho_0 c_0 \cot \left( \frac{\omega L}{c_0} \right) = R + i\omega \left( \tilde{m} + \frac{1}{3} \rho_0 L \right) - i \frac{\rho_0 c_0^2}{\omega L},$$

which is chosen such that $R = 2\rho_0 c_0 = 833$ kg/m$^2$s, cell depth $L = 3.5$ cm and $\tilde{m}/\rho_0 = 20$ mm, leading to $K = 4.0 \cdot 10^6$ kg/m$^2$s$^2$ and $m = 0.039$ kg/m$^2$.

When we vary the boundary layer thickness $h$, and plot the imaginary part (= minus growth rate) of the found frequency $\omega^*$, we see that once $h$ is small enough, the instability becomes absolute. See figure 5. We call the value of $h$ where $\text{Im}(\omega^*) = 0$ the critical thickness $h_c$, because for any $h < h_c$ the instability is absolute. Note that $\text{Im}(\omega^*) \to -\infty$ for $h \downarrow 0$ so the growth rate becomes unbounded for $h = 0$, which confirms the ill-posedness of the Ingard-Myers limit, as observed by Brambley (2009). For the present example, the
Figure 5. Growth rate $\text{Im}(\omega^*)$ against $h$ of potential absolute instability at vanishing group velocity (pinch point) is plotted together with the corresponding complex frequency $\omega^*$ and wave number $\alpha^*$.

critical thickness $h_c$ appears to be extremely small, namely

$$h_c = 10.5 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{m} = 10.5 \mu\text{m}, \quad \text{with } \omega^* = 11023.4 \text{ s}^{-1}, \quad \alpha^* = 364.887 + i4188.99 \text{ m}^{-1}. \tag{3.4}$$

This result is typical. For other industrially relevant liner top plate porosities and thicknesses (leading to other values of $\hat{m}$), we find similar values, namely $h_c = 8.5 \mu\text{m}$ for $\hat{m}/\rho_0 = 10 \text{ mm}$, and $h_c = 13.6 \mu\text{m}$ for $\hat{m}/\rho_0 = 40 \text{ mm}$.

It is clear that these values are smaller than any practical boundary layer thickness, so a real flow will not be absolutely unstable, in contrast to any model that adopts the Ingard-Myers limit, even though this is at first sight a very reasonable assumption if the boundary layer is only a fraction of any relevant acoustic wave length.

3.3. Approximation for large $R/\rho_0 U_\infty$ and large $\sqrt{mK/R}$

Insight is gained into the functional relationship between $h_c$ and the other problem parameters by considering relevant asymptotic behaviour. If the wall has a high “hydrodynamic” resistance, i.e. $r = R/\rho_0 U_\infty \gg 1$ and a high quality factor of the resonator, i.e. $\sqrt{mK}/R = O(r)$, then the inherent scalings for $h_c$ appear to be $m/\rho_0 h_c = O(r^4)$, $\alpha h_c = O(r^{-1})$ and $\omega h_c/U_\infty = O(r^{-2})$, such that we get to leading order from $D(\alpha, \omega) = 0$ and $D_\alpha(\alpha, \omega) = 0$

$$i\left(m\omega - \frac{K}{\omega}\right) + \left(R + i\rho_0 U_\infty \frac{\alpha h_c}{U_\infty - \alpha^2 h_c^2}\right) + \cdots = 0,$$

$$i\left(\omega h_c - \frac{K}{\omega h_c}\right) + \left(\frac{2i\alpha^2 h_c^2}{(\omega h_c - \alpha^2 h_c^2)^2}\right) + \cdots = 0 \tag{3.5}$$
With the condition that $\omega$ is real, we have

$$\omega \approx \sqrt{\frac{K}{m}}, \quad \frac{\omega h_c}{U_\infty} + (\alpha h_c)^2 \approx 0, \quad \frac{R}{\rho_0 U_\infty} - \frac{i}{2\alpha h_c} \approx 0,$$

resulting into the approximate relation

$$h_c \approx \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\rho_0 U_\infty}{R} \right)^2 U_\infty \sqrt{\frac{m}{K}}.$$

(3.7)

This is confirmed by the numerical results given in figures 6 and 7. Here, dimensionless quantity

$$\frac{h_c R^2 \sqrt{K/m}}{\rho_0^3 U_\infty^3} = H \left( \frac{R}{\rho_0 U_\infty}, \frac{\sqrt{mK}}{\rho_0 U_\infty} \right),$$

(3.8)

the function $H$ of equation 2.9) is plotted as a function of dimensionless parameters $R/\rho_0 U_\infty$ and $\sqrt{mK}/\rho_0 U_\infty$. In figure 6 one parameter is varied while the other is held fixed at the conditions of the example in section 3.2, and vice versa. An even more comprehensive result is given in figure 7 where a contourplot of $H$ is given. From (3.7) we know that $H$ becomes asymptotically equal to 0.25. Indeed, we see that for a rather large parameter range - including the above example (indicated by a dot) - $H$ is found between 0.2 and 0.25. So expression (3.7) appears to be a good estimate of $h_c$ for $R$, $K$ and $m$ not too close to zero.

4. A regularised boundary condition

4.1. Approximations for small $\alpha h$

If we carefully consider the third order approximations of the exponentials for $\alpha h \to 0$, i.e. $e^{\pm \alpha h} \approx 1 \pm \alpha h + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha h)^2 \pm \frac{1}{6}(\alpha h)^3$, of both the numerator and denominator of the dispersion relation $D(\alpha, \omega) = 0$, then collect powers of $\alpha h$ up to $O(\alpha h)$, with $\omega h/\infty = O(\alpha h)$, and ignore higher order terms, we find

$$Z(\omega) \approx \frac{\rho_0}{i} \cdot \frac{\Omega^2 + |\alpha| \left( \omega \Omega + \frac{1}{3} U_\infty^2 \alpha^2 \right) h}{|\alpha| \omega + \alpha^2 \Omega h} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\Omega = \omega - \alpha U_\infty$. This expansion is obviously not unique. We can multiply numerator and denominator by any suitable function of $\alpha h$, re-expand, and obtain a different, but asymptotically equivalent form. For example, we can multiply by $e^{-|\alpha|h\theta}/e^{-|\alpha|h\theta}$ and
obtain after re-expanding numerator and denominator

\[
Z(\omega) \approx \frac{\rho_0}{i} \cdot \frac{\Omega^2 + |\alpha|(1 - \theta)\omega^2 - (1 - 2\theta)\omega\alpha U_\infty + \left(\frac{1}{3} - \theta\right)\alpha^2 U_\infty^2)h}{|\alpha|\omega + \alpha^2(\Omega - \theta\omega)h}
\]

It is not immediately clear if there is a practically preferable choice of \(\theta\), but a particularly pleasing result seems to be obtained by \(\theta = \frac{1}{3}\). For this choice the coefficient of the highest power of \(\alpha\) in the numerator is reduced to 2 and the approximate solutions are remarkably close to the “exact” ones, at least in the industrial example considered here, as will shown below (section 4.3, figure 8). So in the following we will continue with the approximation

\[
Z(\omega) \approx \frac{\rho_0}{i} \cdot \frac{\Omega^2 + |\alpha|\omega\left(\frac{2}{3}\omega - \frac{1}{3}\alpha U_\infty\right)h}{|\alpha|\omega + \alpha^2(\Omega - \frac{1}{3}\omega)h} = \frac{i\Omega - \rho_0}{i\Omega_0} \frac{-|\alpha|}{i\Omega_0} \frac{i\omega\left(\frac{2}{3}i\omega - \frac{1}{3}i\alpha U_\infty\right)h}{i\omega \frac{-|\alpha|}{i\Omega_0} \frac{(-i\alpha)^2h - \frac{1}{3}i\omega - \frac{1}{3}i\Omega_0|\alpha|h}{i\Omega_0|\alpha|h}}.
\]

recast in a form convenient later.

4.2. A modified Ingard-Myers boundary condition

Although the approximation is for small \(\alpha h\), it should be noted that the behaviour for large \(\alpha\) is such that the solutions of this approximate dispersion relation have exactly the same behaviour with respect to the stability as the solutions of the original \(D(\alpha, \omega) = 0\) (see below). Not only are all modes \(\omega_j(\alpha)\) bounded from below when \(\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\), but also is the found \(h_c\) as a function of the problem parameters very similar to the “exact” one for the practical cases considered above. It therefore makes sense to consider an equivalent boundary condition that exactly produces this approximate dispersion relation and hence replaces the effect of the boundary layer (just like the Ingard-Myers limit) but now with
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If we include a small but non-zero \( h \) the ill-posedness and associated absolute instability can be avoided. Most importantly, this is without sacrificing the physics but, on the contrary, by restoring a little bit of the inadvertently neglected physics!

If we identify at \( y = 0 \)

\[
-i\alpha \bar{p} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \bar{p}, \quad -i|\alpha| \frac{1}{\i\rho_0} \bar{p} = (\hat{v} \cdot \hat{n}), \quad |\alpha|(\hat{v} \cdot \hat{n}) \sim \frac{\partial}{\partial n}(\hat{v} \cdot \hat{n}),
\]

(4.3)

for the normal vector \( \hat{n} \) pointing into the surface, then we have a “corrected” or “regularised” Ingard-Myers boundary condition

\[
Z(\omega) = \frac{\left(i\omega + U_\infty \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)\bar{p} - h\rho_0 i\omega\left(\frac{2}{3}i\omega + \frac{1}{3}U_\infty \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)(\hat{v} \cdot \hat{n})}{i\omega(\hat{v} \cdot \hat{n}) + \frac{h}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \bar{p} - \frac{1}{3}h i\omega \frac{\partial}{\partial n}(\hat{v} \cdot \hat{n})},
\]

(4.4)

which indeed reduces for \( h = 0 \) to the Ingard approximation, but now has the physically correct stability behaviour. (Note that the Myers generalisation for curved surfaces is far more complicated.)

Recently Brambley (2010) proposed a corrected Ingard boundary condition for cylindrical duct modes and smooth velocity profiles of compressible flows, derived from an approximate solution of matched expansion type for thin mean flow boundary layers, similar to the solution by Eversman & Beckemeyer (1972). At first sight, his results, when applied to a linear-then-constant profile, are not exactly in agreement with (4.1), but, as we pointed out before, these approximations are not unique, and to the best of our knowledge Brambley’s and our forms are asymptotically equivalent (apart from an obvious 2D-3D difference). In particular, there is no difference due to compressibility effects because these are of higher order in \( \alpha h \).

4.3. Stability behaviour of the approximate dispersion relation

A way to study the well-posedness of the problem with the regularised boundary condition for a mass-spring-damper impedance is to verify the lower boundedness of \( \text{Im}(\omega) \) as a function of \( \alpha \). Since \( \omega \) is continuous in \( \alpha \) and finite everywhere, it is enough to consider the asymptotic behaviour to large real \( \alpha \) while keeping the other length scales fixed. Equation (4.2) leads to a third order polynomial in \( \omega \). Using perturbation techniques for small \( 1/\alpha \) we find that two of the roots behave to leading order as

\[
\omega = i \frac{R}{2m} \pm i \frac{1}{2m} \sqrt{R^2 - 4Km + O(1/\alpha)}
\]

while the third one is given by

\[
\omega = \frac{3}{2} \alpha U_\infty - \text{sgn}(\alpha) \left(\frac{9}{4} + \frac{\rho_0 h}{m}\right) \frac{U_\infty}{h} + O(1/\alpha)
\]

So for two of the three solutions, the imaginary part of \( \omega \) tends to some constant values, while the third is \( O(1/\alpha) \) and so approaches zero. This is confirmed by figure 8 for the same parameter values as in figure 3. Such being the case, the Briggs-Bers’ method is applicable.

If, for the proposed boundary condition (4.4), we vary again \( h \) and plot for the example of section 3.2 (as in figure 5) the imaginary part of the frequency \( \omega^* \), with \( \text{Im}(\omega^*) = 0 \), we find practically the same results as for the “exact value” (figure 9). Also the value \( h_c \) for which the flow turns from convectively unstable to absolutely unstable is very close to the “exact” value.
A rather good agreement was also found for the approximation that corresponds with 
\( \theta = 0 \) (equation 4.1) but the present high accuracy is definitely due to the particular 
choice of \( \theta = \frac{1}{3} \) (equation 4.2). See for example figure 8 where exact results are compared 
with the approximations for \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \theta = \frac{1}{3} \). A similar comparison in figure 9 is not 
given although it would have led to the same conclusion. The typical error of \( O(10^2) \) 
of the \( \theta = 0 \) approximation would be too small for the large graphs, but too big for the 
zoom-ins, to be visible.

From these results we think it is reasonable to assume that the stability behaviour of 
the regularised Ingard-Myers boundary condition is for the industrially relevant cases the 
same as for the finite boundary layer model studied here.
5. Conclusions

The stability of a mass-spring-damper liner with incompressible flow with linear-then-
constant velocity profile is analysed. The flow is found to be absolutely unstable for small but finite boundary layer $h_c$, say $0 < h < h_c$. In the limit of $h \downarrow 0$ the growth rate tends to infinity and the flow may be called hyper-unstable, which confirms the ill-posedness of the Ingard-Myers limit. These results in the incompressible assumption are confirmed in the recent paper by Brambley (2010) for compressible flows.

The critical thickness $h_c$ is a property of flow and liner, and has no relation with any acoustic wavelength. So neglecting the effect of a finite $h$ (as is done when applying the Ingard-Myers limit) can not be justified by comparing $h$ with a typical acoustic wavelength. An explicit approximate formula for $h_c$ is formulated, which incidentally shows that the characteristic length scale for $h_c$ is not easily guessed from the problem. This analytic result is completed by a contourplot giving $h_c$ for all parameter values. Anticipating a weak dependence of $h_c$ on Mach number and geometry, this result could be very useful for numerical simulations, to assess the order of magnitude of boundary layers that are not absolutely unstable.

In industrial practice $h_c$ is much smaller than any prevailing boundary layer thicknesses, which explains why the absolute instability of the present kind has not yet been observed. Although apparently never observed in industrial practice, there may be a convective instability that remains too small to be measured (in all the examples we investigated we found for $h > h_c$ a convective instability). The fact that we found no stable cases may be due to the simplifications adopted for our model.

The very existence of this critical $h_c$ emphasises that $h = 0$ is not an admissible modelling assumption, and a proper model (at least in time domain) will have to have a finite $h > h_c$ in some way. Therefore, a corrected “Ingard-Myers” condition, including $h$, is proposed which is not absolutely unstable for $h > h_c$. Since this is based on a 2D incompressible model with a linear velocity profile it goes without saying that some margin is to be taken when applied in a more realistic situation.

The linear profile has the great advantage of an exact solution, but of course the price to be paid is the absence of a critical layer singularity (see Campos, Oliveira & Kobayashi 1999), i.e. a singularity of the solution at $y = y_c$, where $\omega - \alpha U_0(y_c) = 0$. This is subject of ongoing research.
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