Effect of a Viscoelastic Foundation on the Dynamic Stability of a Fluid Conveying Pipe

Nawras Haidar Mostafa^{*}

Mechanical Engineering Department, College of Engineering, University of Babylon, Babel, Iraq

Abstract: In this study, the natural frequency of a simply supported pipeline (hinged type) conveying one-dimension incompressible steady fluid flow set on viscoelastic foundation is investigated by using finite element analysis and the critical fluid velocity with different parameters such as stiffness and viscous coefficients of foundation are obtained. The foundation is simulated using the modified Winkler's model to introduce the effect of time dependent viscosity term. Some known results are confirmed and some new ones obtained. Two components of foundation, stiffness and viscosity, seemed to act on the critical flow velocity of the pipe in contrary trend. Where, increasing the foundation viscosity attempted to decrease the critical flow velocity in the pipe. While, increasing foundation viscosity attempted to decrease it. At some ranges of pipe length, the foundation viscosity effect seems to be more extreme. Increasing the fluid velocity leads to monotonic reduction in the system damping ratio. Two parameters, pipe length and fluid density which relate to the natural frequency of pipeline conveying fluid are studied in detail and the results indicate that the effect of Coriolis force on natural frequency is become more effective by increasing pipe length and fluid density besides increasing fluid flow velocity.

1. Introduction

Piping systems are widely utilized to convey fluids in many industrial fields, ranging from chemical plants to biological engineering systems. Examples include fuel pipes in engine systems, heat transfer pipes in power generation plants, refrigerators, air-conditioners, heat exchangers, chemical plants piping, hydropower systems and so forth. Piping vibration problems are therefore very important in industry. The instability problem of flexible pipes conveying fluid provides a paradigm for the modelling and analysis of the instability mechanisms of fluid-structure interaction systems. The stability and dynamic characteristics are now well understood. The dynamics are known to be sensitively dependent on flow velocity and support/boundary conditions. In general, it has been established that an initially straight pipe that conveys a fluid with a relatively low speed is stable. In other words, each disturbance applied to that pipe causes a vibration that decreases with time. It has been also found that for fluid speed values higher than a certain value (the critical flow velocity) even a small disturbance could

* Corresponding author; e-mail: <u>nawras1980@gmail.com</u>

© 2014 Chaoyang University of Technology, ISSN 1727-2394

Keywords: Finite element; fluid-structural interaction; modified Winkler model; viscoelastic foundation; simply supported pipe; stability.

result in a system vibration that increases with time. In the latter circumstances, therefore, the system equilibrium state is referred as unstable.

The first serious study of the dynamics of pipes conveying fluid is due to reference [1] who derived the correct equations of motion and carried its analysis remarkably far, reaching admirably accurate conclusions regarding stability, in particular concerning the cantilevered system. Major research on the regarding stability and vibration of flexible pipes conveying fluid started in the 1950s in relation to the design of pipelines conveying oil. Reference [2] found that the critical flow velocity of a fluid conveying pipe on Winkler foundation is higher than the critical flow velocity of that pipe without foundation. In this manner, the Winkler foundation is proved to have a stabilizing effect on the pipe. Reference [3] used the Vlasov foundation model to describe the vibration of a pipeline containing flowing fluid and supported on an elastic foundation. The critical flow velocity of such pipe was solved analytically using interaction method .He concluded that elastic support would reduce that amplitude of the pipeline vibration. For pipes of a finite length, the dynamical behavior depends strongly on the type of boundary conditions at both ends [4]. References [5] and [6] have studied the dynamic stability of cantilevered pipes on foundations of constant modulus that support only a part of the pipe span. They have found that such foundations could either destabilize or stabilize the pipe depending on the position and length of the foundations. While references [7] and [8], have examined cantilevered pipes on Winkler foundations whose modulus is a certain sixth-, second- or first-order polynomial. They have concluded that all such foundations stabilize the pipe. Reference [9] studied numerically pinned-clamped and clamped-pinned pipes conveying fluid. He found that to predict the dynamical behavior of the clamped-pinned pipe, even 8 significant-figure accuracy was not good enough. The imaginary part of the complex eigen frequency seemed to be negative, implying unstable behavior for any flow velocity greater than zero. Reference [10] studied the optimal design of cantilevered fluid-conveying pipes. The aim of his study was to maximize the critical flow speed of the fluid by means of additional masses, supporting springs or dampers along the length of the pipe. The optimization problem was formulated by modeling the pipe by finite element method, using Euler-Bernoulli beam elements. The locations of the additional masses, springs and dampers and the properties of these elements (mass, spring constant and damping constant) were chosen as design parameters. The maximization problem for the critical fluid flow speed was solved by the sequential quadratic programming technique. Reference [11] applied the eliminated element-Galerkin method to calculate the natural frequency with different boundary conditions based on typical transverse vibration model. Then the relationship between simplified natural frequency of the pipeline and that of Euler beam was discussed. In a given boundary condition, the four components (mass, stiffness, length and flow velocity) which relate to the natural frequency of pipeline conveying fluid were studied in detail and the results indicate that the effect of Coriolis force on natural frequency was inappreciable. Reference [12] extended the Winkler's model to account the effect of time dependence in the simplest case to make it viscous. He applied the viscous model to solve a problem of rotating wheel sets on polymer rubber sheet. Good agreements between the proposed model and experimental data were obtained. Reference [13] investigated the resonant vibrations of a fluid-conveying pipe, with special consideration to axial shifts in vibration phase accompanying fluid flow and various imperfections. Small imperfections related to elastic and dissipative support conditions were specifically addressed, but the suggested approach was readily applicable to other kinds of imperfection, e.g. non-uniform stiffness or mass, non-proportional damping, weak nonlinearity, and flow pulsation. Reference [14] investigated the effects of flow velocity on the damping, stability, and frequency shift of microscale pipes

containing internal fluid flow. The analysis was conducted within the context of classical continuum mechanics, and the effects of structural dissipation (including thermo elastic damping in hollow beams), boundary conditions, geometry, and flow velocity on vibrations were discussed. The study showed that flow-induced damping and frequency shifts in representative single-crystal silicon structures could exceed the typical specifications for resonant micro sensors. To the best of our knowledge, other studies on dynamic stability of pipes on variable elastic foundations are not reported in the literature. It can be found in reference [15].

From the review of literature, it is found that the study of flow induced vibration in pipes conveying incompressible steady fluid flow mounted on viscoelastic foundation has not yet been explored so far. The aim of this is to clarify whether the critical flow velocity depends on the magnitude of the foundation stiffness, foundation damping, the pipe length, pipe thickness and fluid density for a hinged simply supported pipe conveying fluid rest on a viscoelastic foundation (modified Winkler model).

2. Viscoelastic extension of Winkler foundation

An analysis of the bending of beams on a viscoelastic foundation, if based on the Winkler model, is derived from the assumption that the foundation's reaction forces are proportional at every point to the deflection of the beam at that point. The differential equation of the elastic line is based on the assumption that a straight beam is supported along its entire length by a viscoelastic medium and subjected to vertical forces acting in the principal plane of the symmetrical cross section (see Figure 1).

Under these conditions, the beam will deflect, thus producing continuously distributed reaction forces in the supporting medium. One may make the fundamental assumption that the intensity (p) of the reaction forces at any point is proportional to the deflection of the beam at that point. The reaction forces are assumed to act vertically and in opposition to the deflection of the beam. Hence, where the deflection is directed downward (in a positive direction) the supporting medium will be compressed. However, where the deflection is negative, tension is produced; for the purposes of this research, the supporting medium is assumed to be able to take up such tensile forces.



Figure 1. Representation of modified Winkler foundation model

If a beam has a uniform cross section, then a unit of deflection of this beam will cause reaction in the foundation; consequently, at a point where the deflection is W(x, t), the intensity of the distributed reaction, per unit length of the beam, will be [12];

$$p(x,t) = k_0 W + \mu \frac{dW}{dt}$$
⁽¹⁾

Where k_o and μ are the stiffness and damping (viscous) coefficients of foundation per unit length respectively. The assumption p(x, t) implies that the supporting medium is viscoelastic. Its material, then, acts in accordance with Kelvin-Voigt model. Its viscoelasticity, therefore, may be characterized by the force which, distributed over a unit area, will cause a deflection equal to that unit. The constant values of the supporting medium, k_v and μ_v , are called the moduli of stiffness and viscous foundation respectively. Where,

$$k_o = bk_v \tag{2}$$

 $\mu = b\mu_{v}$

The units of the moduli k_v and μ_v are in (N/m³) and (N s/m³) respectively. While (b) is the width of the beam in contact with the base foundation (Figure 1). However, it should be remembered that k_o and μ includes the effect of the width of the beam and will be numerically equal to k_v and μ_v only if the beam is of a unit width.

3. Derivation of governing differential equation

The detailed analysis of the dynamics of straight flexible pipes conveying fluid is described by references [9] and [15]. In this section, the modeling and calculation method based on these papers are introduced. When a pipeline rests on a viscoelastic medium such as polymers, a model of the viscoelastic medium must be included in the governing differential equation.

The physical system analyzed is shown in Figure 2 (a). Forces and moments acting on the fluid and pipe elements, respectively, are shown in Figure 2 (b and c). The pipe is considered to be slender, and its lateral motions, W(x,t), to be small and of long wavelength compared to the diameter. The system consists of a uniform pipe of length (L), pipe mass per unit length (m), flexural rigidity (EI), conveying fluid of mass per unit length (M), flowing axially with velocity (U), and mounted on viscoelastic foundation with stiffness (k_o) and viscous damping (μ). The cross-sectional flow area is (A), inner perimeter is (S) and the fluid pressure is (p).

Consider then elements δx of the fluid and the pipe, as shown in Figure 2 (b and c). The fluid element of Figure 2 (b) is subjected to: (i) pressure forces, where the pressure p=p(x, t) because of frictional losses, p is measured above the ambient pressure, and t is the time; (ii) reaction forces of the pipe on the fluid normal to the fluid element, F δx , and tangential to it, ($\tilde{q}S\delta x$), associated with the wall-shear stress \tilde{q} ; (iii) gravity forces (Mg δx) in the W- direction.

Balancing the forces in W-direction of the fluid element while keeping in mind the small deflection approximation, yields

$$-F - M \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^2 W = pA \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x^2}$$
(4)

The sum of forces parallel to the pipes axis for constant flow velocity gives

$$A\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + \bar{q}S = 0 \tag{5}$$

Similarly, for pipe element of Figure 2 (c) one obtains

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + \bar{q}S = 0 \tag{6}$$

And the forces normal to the pipe axis for small deformation

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} + F + T \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x^2} + k_o W + \mu \frac{\partial W}{\partial t} = m \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial t^2}$$
(7)

where

$$Q = -\frac{\partial \breve{M}}{\partial x} = -EI \frac{\partial^3 W}{\partial x^3}$$
(8)

From equation (5) and equation (6), the wall shear stress \breve{q} is eliminated to result in

$$\frac{\partial(pA-T)}{\partial x} = 0 \tag{9}$$

The pipe end where x=L, the tension T in the pipe is zero and the fluid pressure is equal to ambient pressure, thus p=T=0 at x=L,

$$pA - T = 0$$

Combining all the above equations yields the following governing equation

$$EI\frac{\partial^4 W}{\partial x^4} + k_o W + \mu \frac{\partial W}{\partial t} + MU^2 \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x^2} + 2MU \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x \partial t} + (m+M) \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial t^2} = 0$$
(11)







Figure 2. (a) Simply supported pipe on viscoelastic foundation; (b) forces on fluid element; (c) forces and moments on pipe element

(10)

The term $(E_{I}\frac{\partial^{4}W}{\partial x^{4}})$ represents a force component acting on the pipe because of pipe bending. The term $(k_{o}W \text{ and } \mu \frac{\partial W}{\partial t})$ represents the force component acting on the pipe that comes from foundation stiffness and foundation damping respectively. The expression $(MU^{2}\frac{\partial^{2}W}{\partial x^{2}})$ represents the force component acting on the pipe as a result of flow around a deflected pipe (curvature in pipe). The term $(2MU\frac{\partial^{2}W}{\partial x\partial t})$ is the inertial force associated with the Coriolis acceleration arising because the fluid flows with velocity U relative to the pipe. In addition, this expression is the so-called anti-symmetric whirligig "damping" item. Because of its effect, the fluid structural interaction model belongs to complex eigenvalue problem. While the expression $((m+M)\frac{\partial^{2}W}{\partial t^{2}})$ is force acting on the pipe because of inertia of the pipe and the fluid flowing through it. A remarkable feature of equation (11) is the total absence of fluid-frictional effects, which at first

sight might appear to be an idealization. However, within the context of the other approximations implicit in this linearized equation, it may rigorously be demonstrated that fluid-frictional effects play no role in the dynamics of the system, a fact first shown by reference [16] and [17].

4. Finite element discretization

equation (11) is a fourth-order partial differential equation in two independent variables subject to various boundary conditions. It is very difficult to get its analytical solution, while we can use finite element method to get its numerical solution. The equation of element deflection for straight two dimensional beam element could have the form [18]:

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i(\mathbf{x}) q_i$$
(12)

Where q_i is the generalized coordinates (displacement and rotation, see Figure 3). N_i, (i=1, n) are the bending shape functions and W(x) is the deformation polynomial cubic function which define the displacements and rotations at the nodes.



Figure 3. Beam element nodal displacements shown in a positive sense

Determination of the former, using the method to be found in many finite element texts, proceeds by first writing W(x) as an n-termed polynomial with unknown coefficients, n being the number of degrees of freedom in the element. The choice of a cubic function to describe the displacement is not arbitrary. Clearly, with the specification of four boundary conditions, we can determine no more than four constants in the assumed displacement function.

The shape functions N_i are equal to

$$N_{I} = \frac{1}{\ell^{3}} (2x^{3} - 3\ell x^{2} + \ell^{3})$$
(13a)

$$N_2 = \frac{1}{\ell^2} (x^3 - 2\ell x^2 + \ell^2 x)$$
(13b)

$$N_{3} = \frac{1}{\ell^{3}} (3\ell x^{2} - 2x^{3})$$
(13c)

$$N_4 = \frac{1}{\ell^2} (x^3 - \ell x^2)$$
(13d)

where ℓ is the element length.

The above shape functions, N_i , represent the conventional two-dimensional beam elements which have two degrees of freedom at each node: one lateral displacement and one rotational.

The kinetic and potential energies of the pipe element can be expressed by

$$T_{I} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\ell} (M+m) \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial t}\right)^{2} dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e} q^{T} (M+m) \int_{0}^{\ell} N^{T} N dxq$$
(14)

$$V_{I} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\ell} EI\left(\frac{\partial^{2}W}{\partial x^{2}}\right)^{2} dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e} q^{T} EI \int_{0}^{\ell} N''^{T} N'' dxq$$
(15)

Where each prime sign that appears above the shape function symbol, i.e. "N", represents one time derivative with respect to x-coordinate. Thus, mass (\breve{m}) and stiffness (\breve{k}_1) matrices are equal to

$$\begin{split} \breve{m} &= \frac{(m+M)\ell}{420} \begin{bmatrix} 156 & 22\ell & 54 & -13\ell \\ 22\ell & 4\ell^2 & 13\ell & -3\ell^2 \\ 54 & 13\ell & 156 & -22\ell \\ -13\ell & -3\ell^2 & -22\ell & 4\ell^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\breve{k}_1 &= \frac{2EI}{\ell^3} \begin{bmatrix} 6 & 3\ell & -6 & 3\ell \\ 3\ell & 2\ell^2 & -3\ell & \ell^2 \\ -6 & -3\ell & 6 & -3\ell \\ 3\ell & \ell^2 & -3\ell & 2\ell^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(16)$$

Over the length of elastic foundation, this adds the following term to the total potential energy:

$$V_{2} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\ell} k_{o} W^{2} dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e} q^{T} k_{o} \int_{0}^{\ell} N^{T} N dx q$$
(18)

We recognize the stiffness term in the above summation,

$$\breve{k}_2 = k_o \int_0^\ell N^T N dx \tag{19}$$

Thus, the foundation stiffness matrix equals to

Nawras Haidar Mostafa

$$\breve{k}_{2} = \frac{k_{o}\ell}{420} \begin{bmatrix}
156 & 22\ell & 54 & -13\ell \\
22\ell & 4\ell^{2} & 13\ell & -3\ell^{2} \\
54 & 13\ell & 156 & -22\ell \\
-13\ell & -3\ell^{2} & -22\ell & 4\ell^{2}
\end{bmatrix}$$
(20)

The term $(_{MU^2} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x^2})$ has a potential energy that can be represented in terms of displacement shape function derived for the pipe as

$$V_{3} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\ell} MU^{2} \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial x} \right) \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial x} \right) dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e} q^{T} MU^{2} \int_{0}^{\ell} N'^{T} N' dxq$$
(21)

The stiffness matrix that comes from flow around the deflected pipe is equal to

$$\vec{k}_{3} = \frac{MU^{2}}{30\ell} \begin{bmatrix} 36 & 3\ell & -36 & 3\ell \\ 3\ell & 4\ell^{2} & -3\ell & -\ell^{2} \\ -36 & -3\ell & 36 & -3\ell \\ 3\ell & -\ell^{2} & -3\ell & 4\ell^{2} \end{bmatrix}$$
(22)

It is important to clear that stiffness matrix \breve{k}_3 leads to weaken the overall stiffness of the pipe system. The expression $(\mu \frac{\partial W}{\partial t})$ in equation (11) has a dissipation energy as

$$R_{I} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\ell} \mu \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial t}\right)^{2} dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e} q^{T} \mu \int_{0}^{\ell} N^{T} N dxq$$
(23)

Leading to

$$\breve{C}_{I} = \mu \int_{0}^{\ell} N^{T} N dx$$
⁽²⁴⁾

The foundation viscous matrix equals to

$$\breve{C}_{I} = \frac{\mu\ell}{420} \begin{bmatrix}
156 & 22\ell & 54 & -13\ell \\
22\ell & 4\ell^{2} & 13\ell & -3\ell^{2} \\
54 & 13\ell & 156 & -22\ell \\
-13\ell & -3\ell^{2} & -22\ell & 4\ell^{2}
\end{bmatrix}$$
(25)

While the expression $(2MU \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial x \partial t})$ represents the Coriolis force, which causes the fluid in the pipe to whip, can be represented by dissipation energy as

$$R_{2} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\ell} 2MU \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial x} \right) \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial t} \right) dx = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e} q^{T} 2MU \int_{0}^{\ell} N'^{T} N dx \dot{q}$$
(26)

This gives the unsymmetrical damping matrix

$$\breve{C}_{2} = \frac{MU}{30} \begin{bmatrix}
-30 & -6\ell & -30 & 6\ell \\
6\ell & 0 & -6\ell & \ell^{2} \\
30 & 6\ell & 30 & -6\ell \\
-6\ell & -\ell^{2} & 6\ell & 0
\end{bmatrix}$$
(27)

In general, the above matrices (mass, stiffness and damping) are classified according to their

category. Then each category element matrices are assembled to represent the whole pipe length model. The boundary conditions of the pipe ends are both simply supported (hinged type). While, the effect of viscoelastic foundation is represented as a dependent distributed load (according to equation 1) along the pipe length. These overall matrices will be arranged in a proper form to get the dynamic characteristics of the structure.

5. Damped dynamic eigenvalues

To analyze the dynamic eigenvalues of damped structure we should transfer the governing equation to the state-space coordinates. The standard equation of motion in the finite element form is

$$(m+M)\ddot{q} + C_{total}\dot{q} + k_{total}q = 0$$
⁽²⁸⁾

Where $C_{total} = \breve{C}_1 + \breve{C}_2$ and $k_{total} = \breve{k}_1 + \breve{k}_2 - \breve{k}_3$. The substitution is, [19]:

$$\dot{q} = \psi \tag{29}$$

Resulting in the following set of equations

$$Z = \frac{dZ}{dt} = HZ$$
(30)

where

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} q \\ \psi \end{bmatrix}$$
(31)

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & II \\ -(m+M)^{-1}k_{total} & -(m+M)^{-1}C_{total} \end{bmatrix}$$
(32)

where II is a unity matrix.

Therefore, we can obtain the natural frequencies (eigen values) and mode shapes (eigen vectors) by solving the mathematically well-known characteristic equation of

 $\lambda II - HZ = 0$

The solution of eigenvalue problem yields complex roots. The imaginary part of these roots represents the natural frequencies of damped system. The real part indicates the rate of decay of the free vibration.

6. Logarithmic decrement

A convenient way of determining the damping in a system is to measure the rate of decay of oscillation (the real part eigenvalue). The logarithmic decrement, τ , is the natural logarithm of the ratio of any two successive amplitudes in the same direction, where Y₁, and Y₂, are successive amplitudes, where [20]

$$\tau = ln \left(\frac{Y_1}{Y_2}\right) = \frac{2\pi\zeta}{\sqrt{1-\zeta^2}}$$
(34)

As mentioned before, the rate of decay is obtained from solving the characteristic equation (equation 33). So that the left hand term in equation (34) is already known and we should only

(33)

find the damping ratio (ζ) from the above equation.

7. Result and discussion

Figure 4(a) shows the relation between fluid velocity and the pipe frequency with various foundation stiffness of simply supported pipe mounted on viscoelastic foundation. As the foundation stiffness is increase, the natural frequency of the pipe is also increase. This behavior is taken place since the global stiffness of the system is increased. Furthermore, the relation between foundation stiffness and pipe frequency seems to be linear at constant fluid velocities as depicted in Figure 4(b).



Figure 4. Effect of foundation stiffness on the natural frequency of the pipe at different fluid velocities

Figure 5 shows the effect of viscous damping coefficient of the foundation on the first natural frequency of the pipe system with different fluid velocities. As it is well known, the damped natural frequencies of damped system are smaller than it is for undamped one. Thus, an increase in the foundation viscous coefficient leads to reduce the dynamic properties of the pipe system. This behavior is not always true for damped system. Where the damped natural frequency of the lowest mode may be higher than the corresponding undamped frequency depending on the choice of damping matrix and the mode separation [21].



Figure 6 presents the relation between pipe length and critical flow velocities for different foundation properties. As well known for a pipe without foundation, increasing the pipe length leads to reduce the pipe stiffness and raise its mass thus decreasing the critical flow velocity. This behavior is differing for a pipe with viscoelastic foundation. Where there is a reduction in the critical flow velocities with increasing the pipe length then at some pipe length the critical velocity start to rise, then after reducing again and continue with compacted values. This convexity in the curve is mainly caused by the foundation stiffness and this behavior is completely agree with the study that done by [3]. Moreover, when increasing foundation damping, the critical velocities exhibit more reduction in their values than it for small damping does. This behavior is caused by increasing the overall damping of the system that leads to decrease its damped natural frequency. Thus, we can say that, in viscoelastic foundation, damping induces destabilization effect, while foundation stiffness leads to stabilize the pipe. It has thus found that the criterion for global instability as the length is increased becomes closely related to the local properties of the waves in the pipe [22]. It is important to record that at some ranges of pipe length, the foundation viscosity effect seems extreme and obvious.



Figure 6. Effect of pipe length on the critical fluid velocity for different mounting conditions

Figure (7) shows the effect of fluid velocity on the system's damping ratio for two different foundation viscosities. The damping ratio will decrease monotonically with increasing fluid velocity. This event is mainly caused by decreasing the rate decay of pipe vibration.



Figures 8 (a) and (b) show the percentage errors in the predicted natural frequencies of the pipe system with neglecting the Coriolis component for different pipe lengths and fluid densities

respectively. From these figures, a pipe with larger length and higher fluid density has the biggest frequency percentage error. Furthermore, increasing the flow fluid velocity leads to increase the percentage error.



Figure 8. Effect of whether considering coriolis force in (a)different pipe lengths; (b)different fluid densities

8. Conclusions

The effects of a viscoelastic foundation on the stability of a fluid conveying pipe were analyzed by using the extension of Winkler foundation model. The problem was analyzed numerically using finite element method. Some interesting conclusions have been drawn, as follows:

- a) The foundation stiffness leads to increase the fluid critical velocity , while foundation damping decreases it.
- b) There are ranged values of pipe length for each foundation properties that seems to be more affected by the foundation characteristics.
- c) Coriolis component still plays a major role in the dynamic behavior of pipe especially with larger length and heavier fluid.
- d) The damping ratio of the system is decreased monotonically with increasing the fluid velocity.

9. Nomenclatures

Symbol	Definition	Units
A	Cross-sectional flow area	m^2
b	Width of the beam in contact with the base foundation	m
Ŭ,	Foundation viscous matrix	-
Č ₂	Damping matrix caused by Coriolis force	-
e	Element	-
Е	Modulus of elasticity of pipe	N/m^2
f(x,t)	Intensity of reaction force of foundation	N/m^2
F	Reaction force inside the pipe	Ν
g	Acceleration constant	m/s^2
Н	Characteristic matrix	-
Ι	Pipe second moment of area	m^4
II	Unity matrix	-
k _o	Foundation stiffness coefficient per unit length	N/m^2
k _v	Foundation stiffness coefficient per unit area	N/m ³
\breve{k}_1	Stiffness matrix of pipe	-
Ĭk ₂	Foundation stiffness matrix	-
Ĭk ₃	Stiffness matrix comes from flow inside deflected pipe	-
L	Length of the pipe	m
l	Element length of pipe	m
М	Fluid mass per unit length	kg/m
m	Pipe mass per unit length	kg/m
m	Pipe mass matrix	N
M	Bending moment	N/m
N _i	Shape function	m/s
р	Pressure inside the pipe	m/s
Q	Shear force	N
ğ	Wall shear stress	N/m ²
q	Lateral displacement of pipe	m
ģ	Lateral velocity of pipe	m/s
ÿ	Lateral acceleration of pipe	m/s^2

S	Pipe inner perimeter	m
Т	Tension force in the pipe	Ν
t	Time	S
U	Fluid velocity relative to the pipe	m/s
x, W	Cartesian axes	-
μ	Foundation damping coefficient per unit length	$N s/m^2$
$\mu_{\rm v}$	Foundation stiffness coefficient per unit area	N s/m ³
λ	Eigen values	-
ζ	Damping ratio	-

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge fruitful discussions with Professor Michael P. Païdoussis (Department of Mechanical Engineering, McGill University).

References

- Bourrieres, F. J. 1939. "Sur Un Phenomene D'oscillation Auto-Entretenue En Mecanique Des Fluids Reels". Publications Scientifiques et Techniques du Ministere de L'Air, (147). French.
- [2] Lottati, I. and Kornecki, A. 1986 .The effect of an elastic foundation and of dissipative forces on the stability of fluid conveying pipes. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 109(2): 327-338.
- [3] Chen, H. 1991. "Vibration of a Pipeline Containing Fluid Flow with Elastic Support". M. Sc. Thesis, Ohio University.
- [4] Lee, S. Y. and Mote, C. D. 1997. A generalized treatment of the energetics of translating continua, part II: beams and fluid conveying pipes. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 204(5): 735-753.
- [5] Elishakoff, I. and Impolonia, N. 2001. Does a partial elastic foundation increase the flutter velocity of a pipe conveying fluid? *Journal of Applied Mechanics-Transactions of the ASME*, 68(2): 206-212.
- [6] Djondjorov, P. 2001. Dynamic stability of pipes partly resting on winkler foundation. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics*, 31(3): 101-112.
- [7] Djondjorov, P., Vassilev, V., and Dzhupanov, V. 2001. Dynamic stability of fluid conveying cantilevered pipes on elastic foundations. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 247(3): 537-546.
- [8] Djondjorov, P. 2001. On the critical velocities of pipes on variable elastic foundation. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics*, 31(4): 73-81.
- [9] Païdoussis, M. P. 2004. "Fluid-Structure Interactions". Vol. 2. Academic Press: London.
- [10] Lumijärvi, J. 2006. "Optimization of Critical Flow Velocity in Cantilevered Fluid Conveying Pipes, with a Subsequent Non-Linear Analysis". Academic Dissertation to be presented with the assent of the Faculty of Technology, FI-90014 University of Oulu, Finland.
- [11] Huang, Y., Liu, Y., Li, B., Li, Y., and Yue, Z. 2010. Natural frequency analysis of fluid conveying pipeline with different boundary conditions. *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, 240(3): 461-467.
- [12] Mahrenholtz, O. H. 2010. Beam on viscoelastic foundation: an extension of Winkler's

model. Archive of Applied Mechanics, 80(1): 93-102.

- [13] Thomsen, J. and Dahl, J. 2010. Analytical predictions for vibration phase shifts along fluid-conveying pipes due to Coriolis forces and imperfections. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 329(15): 3065-3081.
- [14] Rinaldi, S., Prabhakar, S., Vengallatore, S., and Michael, P. 2010. Dynamics of microscale pipes containing internal fluid flow: Damping, frequency shift, and stability. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 329, 8: 1081-1088.
- [15] Païdoussi, M. P. 1998. "Fluid-Structure Interactions, Slender Structures and Axial Flow". Volume One, Academic Press: California, USA.
- [16] Benjamin, T. B. 1961. Dynamics of a system of articulated pipes conveying fluid: theory.(a). *Proceedings of the Royal Society (London) A*, 261, 1307: 457-486.
- [17] Benjamin, T. B. 1961. Dynamics of a system of articulated pipes conveying fluid. (b). *Proceedings of the Royal Society (London) A*, 261, 1307: 487-499.
- [18] Rao, S. S. 2004. "The Finite Element Method in Engineering". 4th ed. Elsevier Science & Technology Books.
- [19] Caughey, T. K. and O'Kelly, E. J. 1961. Effect of damping on the natural frequencies of linear dynamic systems. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 33, 11: 1458-1461.
- [20] Beards, C. F. 1996. "*Structural Vibration: Analysis and Damping*". 1st ed. Butterworth-Heinemann: An imprint of Elsevier Science.
- [21] Krodkiewski, J. M., 2008. "*Mechanical Vibrations*". 1st ed. The University of Melbourne, Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering: Melbourne.
- [22] Doared, O. and De Langre, E. 2002. Local and global instability of fluid-conveying pipes on elastic foundations. *Journal of Fluids and Structures*, 16(1): 1-14.