Making use of the values of $(H+\nu P) / \mu P$ derived above we are now able to determine the value of a $P$ which best fits the experimental data by simple inspection of graphs or tables of the function $I^{\prime}$. In this case, again, a second approximation may be derived if necessary.

Having carried out the above procedures we are now in a position to determine the values of $I_{1}$ and $I_{2}$, and consequently the ratio $I_{2} / I_{1}$, corresponding to the actual experimental points, and then to calculate, using equation (5.5) of the previous section, the changes in the effective areas of the assemblies as a function of the applied pressure.

## d) Experimental method

The experimental procedures used in that part of the flow method involving the direct comparison of effective areas by balancing need no further consideration as they are exactly the same as those previously described in section 3 f . In the measurement of the rate of flow of the pressure balance fluid use is made of a very simple device. With the balance operating on an otherwise leak-proof system the change in volume of the contained fluid due to flow through the interspace between the piston and cylinder is exactly compensated by the gradual descent of the piston, and the rate of fall of the latter is thus directly propor-
series of measurements. As a fully temperaturecontrolled room was not available it was necessary to determine a temperature coefficient in order that each series of readings could be converted to a common temperature, which was taken to be $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. In general the apparatus and air temperatures were held to within a few tenths of a degree during any one series. In order to avoid extraneous friction, all the measurements were made with the piston and associated load in free rotation, the speed chosen being in the range 30 to $40 \mathrm{rev} / \mathrm{min}$. In any group of measurements at a given pressure readings were taken alternately for the two directions of rotation, and the mean taken, to ensure that any possible effects due to small helical errors on the piston surface were eliminated.

The changes of effective areas with pressure were also measured, using the same pressure transmitting fluid in each case, by the similarity method. The results of the measurements, and the comparison of the two methods, are discussed in the next section.

## 6. Results of the Flow Method

## a) Experimental parameters and correction terms

The various parameters and correction terms required in the derivation of the changes of effective area as a function of pressure are given in Tab. 3 for the two assemblies concerned, together with the dis-

Table 3. Parameters and correction terms

| Nominal area of assembly | Mean difference of piston diameters | $\frac{A_{0(1)}-A_{0(2)}}{A_{0}}=\frac{\delta r}{r}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|c\|} \frac{A_{P(1)}-A_{P(2)}}{A_{0}} \\ \text { experimental } \\ \text { value } \\ \text { (parts in } \left.10^{5}\right) \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \varrho_{0} \\ \text { (ex- } \\ \text { trap) } \end{gathered}$ | Typical values of correction term $I_{2} / I_{1}$ |  | Estimated value of $\alpha$ (bar ${ }^{-1}$ ) | Distortion coefficient ( $\mathrm{bar}^{-1}$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pressure } \\ & \text { (bar) } \end{aligned}$ | $I_{2} / I_{1}$ |  | Flow method | Similarity method |
| $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \mathrm{in}^{2} \\ \left(0.322 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right. \\ \text { approx. }) \end{gathered}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c} 5.45 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{in} \\ \left(13.8_{4} \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~cm}\right) \end{array}\right.$ | 21.6 | $\begin{gathered} 21.4 \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \text { independent } \\ \text { of pressure) } \end{array}\right. \end{gathered}$ | 1.48 | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 140 \\ 280 \\ 560 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 1.002 \\ & 1.005_{5} \\ & 1.004 \end{aligned}$ | $3.2 \times 10^{-3}$ | $4.25 \times 10^{-7}$ | $4.33_{8} \times 10^{-7}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \mathrm{in}^{2} \\ \left(0.129 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}\right. \\ \text { approx.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.75 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{in} \\ & \left(6.9_{8} \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~cm}\right) \end{aligned}$ | 17.5 | $17.5(\mathrm{P}=0)$ decreasing smoothly to 15.0(P=1500) | 1.32 | 0 250 500 1000 1500 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & 1.001_{5} \\ & 1.003 \\ & 1.002 \\ & 0.999 \end{aligned}$ | $2.3 \times 10^{-3}$ | $4.07 \times 10^{-7}$ | $3.98 \times 10^{-7}$ |

tional to the rate of flow. All that is necessary therefore is to time the descent of the piston over a constant short distance, the measured time being inversely proportional to the rate of flow. In practice this was carried out by using an optical magnification system and measuring the time of descent over a distance of the order 1 mm by stopwatch, but if the method were to be used at all extensively a more sophisticated procedure could obviously be substituted, using, for example, a photoelectric recording arrangement.

The work has been carried out using two pistoncylinder assemblies, of nominal effective areas 0.05 and $0.02 \mathrm{in}^{2}$, covering respectively pressure ranges up to about 600 bars and 1500 bars. The transmitting fluid used was in each case a mixture of two mineral oils, known commercially as Diala and Talpa respectively.

Since the coefficient of viscosity is markedly dependent on temperature precautions had to be taken to ensure that the temperature of the piston-cylinder assembly remained as constant as possible during a
tortion coefficients determined by the flow and similarity methods.

A good check of the internal consistency of the different measurements is provided by a comparison of the figures in the third and fourth columns of the Table from which it will be seen that the changes of effective area at zero pressure, calculated from the measured piston diameters, are in very close agreement with the changes determined experimentally by direct balancing. The correction terms $I_{2} / I_{1}$, of which typical values are given, nowhere differ from unity by as much as $1 \%$ in the present range of experiments, but owing to the form of the right hand side of equation (5.5) they are just sufficiently significant to warrant taking them into account. If the flow method were to be extended to higher pressure ranges it is likely that larger corrections would be involved, and these might eventually limit the pressure range attainable with reliability.

It will be seen that somewhat different values of the coefficient $\alpha$ were found in the two cases. This

