



**Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive**  
**DSpace Repository**

---

Faculty and Researchers

Faculty and Researchers' Publications

---

1994

# Decoupling Approximations Applied to an Infinite Array of Fluid Loaded Baffled Membranes

Scandrett, C. L.; Kriegsmann, G. A.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

---

<https://hdl.handle.net/10945/35057>

---

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

*Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun*



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School**  
**411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle**  
**Monterey, California USA 93943**

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

**Decoupling Approximations Applied to an Infinite  
Array of Fluid Loaded Baffled Membranes**

by

**C. L. Scandrett**

Department of Mathematics, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA

**G. A. Kriegsmann**

Department of Mathematics and the Center for  
Applied Mathematics and Statistics, New Jersey Inst. Tech., Newark, NJ  
O.N.R. contract number N00014-92-J-1261

Classification: 65N Partial Differential Equations, boundary value problems  
76Q Hydrodynamic sound, acoustics  
Keywords: Finite Difference Methods, Waveguides  
Nonlocal Radiation Boundary Conditions

## Abstract

Application of a time dependent nonlocal radiation boundary condition, used in conjunction with the finite difference technique is applied to the acoustic problem of scattering from an infinite array of baffled, fluid loaded membranes. The new boundary operator is compared with the second order Engquist and Majda boundary operator, and with several fluid/structure decoupling approximation techniques in the determination of scattering amplitudes.

## Introduction

The scattering of a plane acoustic wave by a periodic array of baffled membranes is studied in this paper. This scattering problem is not only mathematically and physically interesting in its own right, but it also a critical component for an analysis of a large finite array [1,2]. In the paper by Crighton et al[3], the example of scattering from an array of fluid loaded membranes is reviewed as a simple model which displays many of the features found in scattering from more complicated arrays, such as scattering and radiation from transducer arrays[4], and periodically stiffened plates used in hull construction[5]. This paper addresses the numerical problem of solving such scattering problems, and explores the usefulness of recent approximate techniques.

Floquet theory is first applied to reduce the physical domain above the array into a fundamental cell which is a waveguide-like region above a single membrane. The solution in this cell is composed of propagating and evanescent modes which carry the scattered energy away from the membrane. Next, a new radiation boundary operator is derived which essentially annihilates all the propagating modes when applied at an artificial boundary  $y = R_b$ , which is several wavelengths above the array. Using this operator and finite differences provides an accurate numerical approximation to the scattered field in the truncated fundamental cell.

In addition to developing an accurate finite difference scheme to study the scattering problem, three approximate methods are proposed and implemented. The first two are derived from a pseudo-differential equation formulation of the problem wherein the back pressure from a single membrane is expressed as the square root of a differential operator. Approximations relating the membrane displacement to the pressure are obtained by approximating the square root by its truncated Taylor series or a rational function. Using the first term in the Taylor series gives the plane wave approximation [6] while using the first two terms gives an approximation derived elsewhere by Kriegsmann and Scandrett, and Miksis and Ting (KSMT) [7,8,9] for a single baffled membrane. Both these approximations yield simple analytical results for the field within the fundamental cell. Finally, the third approximation comes about by truncating the Green's function to incorporate only the propagating modes of the cell. Then the integro-differential equation for the membrane motion is solved using finite differences. This is called the propagating mode

approximation (PM) or NLRB (Nonlocal Radiation Boundary Condition) approximation.

Results using these three approximations are compared against those of the full finite difference scheme (FFD). Except for frequencies near resonance, the plane wave and KSMT approximations agree very well with the FFD results - the KSMT approximation being slightly superior. Near resonant frequencies the plane wave approximation becomes inaccurate while the KSMT approximation is still quite good. In both cases the PM approximation gives excellent results although it requires considerably more numerical effort.

An outline of the paper follows. In section 1, the formulation of the problem is given; followed by section 2, which gives a description of the finite difference scheme and the radiation operator. In this section, comparison of the new operator to the second order radiation operator of Engquist and Majda[10] is done. Section 3 outlines the derivation of the approximate techniques used, and the paper concludes with several examples.

## 1. Formulation

A periodic array of identical membranes, each of length  $A$ , is held in place by an acoustically rigid infinite baffle. The uniform spacing between membranes is  $B$ , resulting in a periodic geometry of period  $2a$ , where  $2a = A + B$ . Above the array is a homogeneous and isotropic acoustic fluid and below it a vacuum. The baffled structure is insomified by a plane time harmonic pressure wave of radial frequency  $\omega$  (See Fig. 1a).

In dimensionless variables  $\vec{x} = (x, y)$ , the equation governing the pressure in the fluid is

$$\nabla^2 P + k^2 P = 0 \quad (1)$$

where  $k = \omega A/c_a$  and  $c_a$  is the sound speed in the fluid. The spatial variables were made dimensionless by scaling with respect to  $A$ .

The equation for the lateral displacement of the  $j^{th}$  membrane after scaling is

$$\frac{d^2 W_j}{dx^2} + c^2 k^2 W_j = \varepsilon c^2 k^2 P(x, 0; k), \quad x \in \Omega_j \quad |j| = 1, 2 \dots \infty \quad (2)$$

where the dimensionless parameters  $c$  and  $\varepsilon$  are ratios of fluid to membrane wave speeds ( $c_a/c_m$ ) and densities ( $\rho_a A/\rho_m$ ) respectively. The  $\Omega_j$  denote the set of points occupied by the  $j^{th}$  membrane. The ratio of pressure to membrane displacement scale factors is  $A\omega^2 \rho_a$ .

The presence of the acoustically hard baffle introduces the boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial y}(x, 0) = 0, \quad x \notin \Omega \quad (3a)$$

where  $\Omega$  is that portion of the plane occupied by the baffles, while fixing the membranes' endpoints on the baffle requires

$$W_j = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega_j \quad |j| = 1, 2 \dots \infty \quad (3b)$$

where  $\partial\Omega_j$  denotes the end points of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  membrane. Equating the time harmonic normal velocities of the fluid and membrane at their points of contact yields

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial y} = W_j, \quad x \in \Omega_j, \quad y = 0 \quad (4)$$

The plane incident time harmonic pressure  $P^I$  is a solution of (1) and is given by

$$P^I(x, y; k) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-ik(x \cos \Theta_I + y \sin \Theta_I)} \quad (5)$$

where  $\Theta_I$  is the angle the incident wave makes with the positive  $x$  axis and the time dependence is assumed to be  $e^{-i\omega t}$ . If the line  $y = 0$  were entirely rigid, then the incident wave would be reflected as  $P^I(x, -y, k)$ . Accordingly, the total pressure is decomposed as

$$P(x, y; k) = P^I(x, y; k) + P^I(x, -y; k) + p(x, y; k), \quad 0 < y, \quad (6)$$

where the effect of the periodic array is manifest in  $p$ , the scattered field.

Inserting (6) into (1)-(4) it is found that  $p$  satisfies

$$\nabla^2 p + k^2 p = 0, \quad 0 < y, \quad (7a)$$

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in \bar{\Omega} \\ W_j, & x \in \Omega_j \end{cases} \quad (7b)$$

$$\frac{d^2 W_j}{dx^2} + c^2 k^2 W_j = \varepsilon c^2 k^2 \{2P^I(x, 0; k) + p(x, 0; k)\}, \quad x \in \Omega_j \quad (7c)$$

$$W_j = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega \quad (7d)$$

The formulation of the scattering problem is completed by requiring  $p$  to behave as an outgoing wave at  $\infty$ .

The formal solution of (7a) is given by

$$p(x, y; k) = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} a_n e^{i\gamma_n x + i\beta_n y}, \quad y > 0 \quad (8a)$$

$$\beta_n = \sqrt{k^2 - \gamma_n^2} \quad (8b)$$

$$\gamma_n = -k \cos \Theta_I + n\pi/a, \quad (8c)$$

where the reflection coefficients  $a_n$  are to be determined. This solution is formally valid for all  $(x, y)$  above the baffled membranes. The numbers  $\beta_n$  in (8b) are the propagation constants of the reflected waves scattered by the surface. For given  $k$ ,  $\Theta_I$ , and  $a$ , there are only a finite number of these that are purely real. That is, there are numbers  $N(k, \Theta_I, a)$  and  $M(k, \Theta_I, a)$  such that  $\beta$  is real for  $-M \leq j \leq N$  and is purely imaginary for  $j > N$  and  $j < -M$ . The latter modes represent surface waves which decay exponentially for  $y > 0$ , while the former correspond to radiating waves. Finally, using conservation of flux

(or power) arguments it is readily found that the coefficients  $a_n$ , for the propagating waves, satisfy the relationship

$$\Im \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \overline{p} W_0(x) dx = 2a \sum_{-M}^N \beta_n \|a_n\|^2 \quad (9)$$

where the overbar denotes complex conjugation and the  $\Im$ , the imaginary part of a complex number.

## 2. Finite Difference Scheme

The finite difference scheme which is used to solve the coupled fluid structure problem is very similar to that presented in Kriegsmann and Scandrett[7]. It is an explicit time marching scheme which is second order accurate in both time and space. The solution of the time harmonic problem is obtained from the explicit time domain calculations as a result of the limiting amplitude principle [11], which guarantees the approach to a steady state.

The spatial domain used is:  $|x| \leq a$  and  $0 \leq y \leq R_b$ . Unlike the single baffled membrane problem, wherein a radiation boundary condition needed to be applied in the fluid surrounding the membrane, the periodic array requires a radiation boundary condition only at  $y = R_b$ . (Along  $x = \pm a$ , periodic boundary conditions are required). In order for the radiation boundary condition to successfully model the infinite fluid, it must prevent reflection of the *radiating* modes generated by the fluid/membrane interaction.

Because the number of existing radiating modes and their directions of propagation are dependent upon the incident angle ( $\Theta_I$ ), frequency ( $k$ ) of the insonifying plane wave, and a separation parameter ( $a$ ), the radiation boundary condition applied at  $R_b$  must be flexible. Incorporated into the finite difference code is a time dependent nonlocal radiation boundary condition which effectively inhibits reflections from the boundary of all radiating modes. The radiation condition is similar to that used in the work of Fix and Marin[12], except that it is applied in the time domain rather than the frequency domain.

Development of the radiation condition follows from the time harmonic form of eq. (8a). For large values of  $y$ , evanescent modes are neglected, and the scattered pressure is

$$p(x, y, t; k) \approx \sum_{n=-M}^N a_n e^{i\gamma_n x + i\beta_n y - it}. \quad (10)$$

A radiation boundary condition which annihilates the  $n^{th}$  propagating mode is:

$$B_n(\phi) = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \beta_n \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}. \quad (11)$$

Applying boundary operators to each of the several modes yields:

$$\sum_{n=-M}^n B_n \{a_n(t) e^{i\gamma_n x + i\beta_n y}\} \approx 0 \quad (12)$$

where the time dependence of the modes has been incorporated into the coefficients  $a_n$ . The time dependent coefficients  $a_n(t)$  can be found from the time dependent form of equation eq. (8a) as:

$$a_n(t) = \frac{1}{2a} \int_{-a}^a e^{-i(\beta_n y + \gamma_n \xi)} p(\xi, y, t) d\xi \quad (13)$$

Inserting (13) into (12), applying (11), taking the partial with respect to  $y$  outside of the summation, and writing explicitly the  $a_n(t)$  coefficient in the summation yields the boundary operator:

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} \approx -\frac{1}{2a} \sum_{n=-M}^N \beta_n \int_{-a}^a e^{i\gamma_n(x-\xi)} \frac{\partial p}{\partial t}(\xi, y, t) d\xi \quad (14)$$

The above boundary operator is then center differenced and combined with the center differenced form of the wave equation resulting in a matrix equation for the unknown values of the pressure at the artificial boundary,  $y = R_b$ .

While application of the boundary operator does require a matrix factorization requiring  $O(n^3)$  operations, the factorization need be done only once *before* advent of the time domain difference calculations. Subsequent solutions of the unknown pressures at the artificial boundary are found using the *factored* form of the matrix which requires only  $O(n^2)$  operations, and therefore is relatively quick.

A stopping criterion is applied to halt the calculations when solutions to the problem at two different times differ by less than a prescribed tolerance level. In all of the results given, the iterations were stopped when the integrated membrane displacement *and* the integrated pressure at the artificial boundary differed in successive time levels by less than .00005.

A comparison was made with the current radiation boundary condition and the second order Engquist and Majda boundary operator [Ref. 10 equation (9)]. The Engquist and Majda operator was finite differenced in time and space; combined with the discretized form of the wave equation and periodic boundary conditions leading to a circulant Jacobi matrix; which is in turn solved repeatedly (as is NLRB) for the values of the unknown pressures at the artificial boundary of the numerical domain. Physically, this operator was designed to handle scattering problems for which the scattered wave should strike the artificial boundary at near normal incidence (a condition not always met in waveguides). A more appropriate boundary operator for waveguides is derived in Kriegsmann [13], but it becomes cumbersome if more than two modes of the waveguide are propagating. For this reason, the Engquist and Majda operator was chosen for the comparison. The two methods were tested on a waveguide problem for which analytical solutions were known. In particular, the waveguide was forced at one end ( $x = 0$ ) by known propagating and

evanescent modes. The side boundary conditions for this example were homogeneous Dirichlet at  $y = \pi$  and homogeneous Neumann at  $y = 0$ . Exciting the first three modes:

$$u_n = \cos(s_n y) e^{ix\sqrt{k^2 - s_n^2} - it}, \quad s_n = \frac{2n-1}{2}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

with amplitudes of one and running the finite difference codes which were identical except in their radiation boundary condition for 4000 iterations produced the mode amplitudes as functions of  $x$  shown in figure 1b. As can be seen, the Engquist and Majda operator does significantly better with the evanescent modes than does the non local radiation condition. However, in determining the amplitudes of the propagating modes, the Engquist and Majda operator produces an unwanted standing wave pattern. This type of pattern is less noticeable with the first mode compared to the second, due to the fact that the first mode's direction of propagation is more nearly normal to the artificial boundary, and therefore the Engquist and Majda boundary operator introduces only a negligible reflection. For this simple problem, it is possible to analytically calculate the amplitude of the standing wave pattern. Doing so for the second propagating mode at  $x = 3\pi/8$  the theoretical value is found to be 1.085 while the numerical solution yields 1.094. The incident angle of the second propagating mode measured from the boundary normal is  $\tan^{-1} \frac{s_2}{\beta_2} \approx 48.6$  degrees. For problems in which incident angles are in excess of this value, amplitudes of the standing wave patterns get considerably larger. It is also true that the amplitude of the standing wave is a function of where the artificial boundary has been placed and upon which mode and what value of  $k$  has been used.

For the fluid membrane coupled problem, it is difficult to know where to “best” determine the amplitudes of the propagating modes if one uses the Engquist and Majda radiation condition. One must also be concerned with spurious evanescent waves in applying the nonlocal boundary operator. For these reasons, both boundary conditions are used and compared. The results presented in the sequel demonstrate that the nonlocal boundary operator gives membrane displacement shapes very similar to those using the Engquist and Majda boundary operator. Furthermore in cases where there is a significant amount of radiated energy, the nonlocal boundary operator more nearly satisfies the energy conservation condition (eq. 9).

It should be noted that the Engquist and Majda radiation condition produces a matrix type operator just as the nonlocal boundary operator method does. In problems where Neumann, Dirichlet, or mixed B.C. are imposed on the sides of the waveguide, the Engquist and Majda operator is tridiagonal in form which is of course easier to handle than the full complex matrix produced by the nonlocal radiation condition. However, for periodic boundary conditions, the matrix for the Engquist and Majda condition remains sparse, but is no longer tridiagonal.

### 3. Approximate Techniques

In this section three approximations relating  $p(x, 0)$  to  $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x, 0)$  are given. Two of these are derived from the Kriegsmann and Scandrett[9] method, while the third is a



result of applying the time harmonic version of the radiation boundary operator (eq. 14) on the surface of the membrane.

When the Kriegsmann and Scandrett approximation for a single membrane is inserted into (7c) an equation for  $W_j(x)$  alone is obtained. From (8a)

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x, 0) = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} A_n e^{i\gamma_n x} \quad (15a)$$

$$p(x, 0) = -i \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{A_n}{\beta_n} e^{i\gamma_n x} \quad (15b)$$

where  $A_n = i\beta_n a_n$ . By expanding  $\frac{1}{\beta_n}$  in a power series in terms of  $\frac{\gamma_n}{k}$ , inserting this expansion into (15b), interchanging the orders of summation, formally replacing terms of the form  $\gamma_n^{2m} e^{i\gamma_n x}$  by  $(-1)^m \frac{d^{2m}}{dx^{2m}} e^{i\gamma_n x}$ , resumming the infinite series, and using (10a) equation (15b) becomes

$$p(x, 0) = -\frac{i}{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + D^2/k^2}} \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x, 0) \quad (16)$$

where  $D = d/dx$ . Inserting (16) into (7c) and using (7b) gives the pseudo-differential equation

$$\frac{d^2 W_j}{dx^2} + c^2 k^2 W_j = \varepsilon c^2 k^2 \{2P^I(x, 0; k) - \frac{i}{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + D^2/k^2}} W_j(x)\}, \quad x \in \Omega_j. \quad (17)$$

Pseudo-differential equations involving square roots of differential operators occur in other branches of wave propagation and in particular, underwater acoustics [14]. There, theories such as the parabolic approximation and the wide angle parabolic approximation arise by replacing the square root by a polynomial or a rational function in the differential operator. In an analogous fashion an approximate differential equation for the displacement of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  membrane is deduced from (17) by approximating  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + D^2/k^2}}$  by a polynomial in  $D^2/k^2$ . For example, if only the first term of its Taylor series is used, then

$$\frac{d^2 W_j}{dx^2} + c^2 k^2 \left[1 + \frac{i\varepsilon}{k}\right] W_j = 2\varepsilon c^2 k^2 P^I(x, 0; k), \quad x \in \Omega_j. \quad (18)$$

This is just the ‘‘plane wave approximation’’, because the same approximation gives

$$p(x, 0) = -\frac{i}{k} \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x, 0) = -\frac{i}{k} W_j(x). \quad (19)$$

A more useful and accurate approximation results when the first two terms of the Taylor series are used. Then, the approximate equation becomes

$$\left[1 - \frac{i\varepsilon c^2}{2k}\right] \frac{d^2 W_j}{dx^2} + c^2 k^2 \left[1 + \frac{i\varepsilon}{k}\right] W_j = 2\varepsilon c^2 k^2 P^I(x, 0; k), \quad x \in \Omega_j, \quad (20)$$

and the corresponding result for  $p(x, 0)$  is

$$p(x, 0) = -\frac{i}{k} \left[ 1 - \frac{D^2}{2k^2} \right] W_j(x). \quad (21)$$

These are the same expressions derived in Kriegsmann and Scandrett[7] for a single membrane and Miksis and Ting[8] for a single membrane under a different limiting process.

The third approximation for the surface pressure in terms of the membrane displacement is found in the following manner. Set eq (15a) equal to  $W_j$  and the coefficient  $a_n$  ( $= A_n/i\beta_n$ ) can be found in terms of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  membrane's displacement:

$$a_n = \frac{1}{2ia\beta_n} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} e^{-i\gamma_n \xi} W_j(\xi) d\xi \quad (22)$$

Upon substitution of eq. (22) into eq.(15b), and neglecting evanescent modes, one obtains the third approximation used in this paper.

$$p(x, 0) = -\frac{i}{2a} \sum_{n=-M}^N \frac{1}{\beta_n} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} W_j(\xi) e^{i\gamma_n(x-\xi)} d\xi \quad (23)$$

This final approximation yields an integro-differential equation for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  membrane displacement and is therefor nearly as hard to solve as the fully coupled problem except that the number of modes has been reduced from infinite to only those which involve radiation of energy from the surface.

#### 4. Numerical Results

A series of graphs will be presented to show the applicability of the three impedance approximations, as well as some confirmation of the finite difference scheme used. In each of the examples, the following values are fixed:  $c = 0.5$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.2$ ,  $A = 1.0$ ,  $\Delta x = 1/30$  (except for the final figure for which it's  $1/50$ ), and  $\Delta t = .9k\Delta x/\sqrt{1 + 1/c^2}$ . The three parameters  $k$ ,  $B$ , and  $\Theta_I$  are varied to determine their effect on the solution of the scattering problem.

In fig. 2 a plane wave of frequency other than an *in vacuo* eigenfrequency strikes the array at two different angles. In each case, it would appear that all of the approximate methods give results equivalent to the finite difference solutions. For the case  $\Theta_I = 11\pi/18$  four radiating plane waves are excited (i.e.  $\beta_n$  is real for  $-2 \leq n \leq 1$ ), while for  $\Theta_I = 5\pi/6$  the four radiating plane waves are associated with  $\beta_n$  where  $-3 \leq n \leq 0$ . In each case the modal coefficients  $a_n$ , found using the values of the membrane displacement (whose magnitudes are plotted in fig. 2), are given in Table I and can be seen to be in excellent agreement. For this example, the conservation equation (9) is nearly satisfied by both of the finite difference solutions. The relative error in trying to satisfy eq. (9) is given by

$$R = \frac{\Im \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \bar{p} W_0(x) dx - 2a \sum_{n=-M}^N \beta_n \|a_n\|^2}{\Im \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \bar{p} W_0(x) dx}. \quad (24)$$

For the cases  $\Theta_I = 5\pi/6$  and  $\Theta_I = 11\pi/18$ , the values of  $R$  were (NLRB): -.0715 (.0039), (EM - Engquist and Majda Boundary Condition): -.0076 (.0041); and NLRB:-.0253(.0253), EM: .0607(.0265), respectively. The values in parenthesis are the numerical values of the imaginary part of the integrals. In subsequent discussion, the values of  $R$  and of the imaginary parts of the corresponding integrals are given in Table III at the end of the paper.

In figs. 3 and 4, the frequency associated with  $k = 2\pi$  corresponds to the first *in vacuo* eigenfrequency of the membranes. In fig. 3 two plots are shown in which the value of  $\Theta_I$  is different while fig. 4 shows the effect of varying the spacing between membranes. In both figures the third approximation matches very well with the finite difference calculation whereas the PWA and KSMT approximations are off. The relative errors made at the point of maximum deflection of the membrane are approximately 7%, 5%, and  $< 1\%$  for the PWA, KSMT and NLRB approximations with  $\Theta_I = 11\pi/18$ . The relative errors increase for  $\Theta = 5\pi/6$  where again the PWA approximation is worst, while the NLRB approximation is best with a relative error  $< 1\%$ . In comparing the finite difference codes employing the values of  $R$  given from the table, one might assume that the nonlocal boundary operator is doing much better than the Engquist and Majda operator. The worst case for the latter operator being fig 3 with  $\Theta_I = 11\pi/18$  with an  $R$  value of .44 compared to .0041 for the nonlocal operator. A possible explanation for the large value of  $R$  in the Engquist and Majda solution is that the pressure and membrane displacement are incorrectly phased at the fluid membrane interface, causing some error in calculating the pressure-displacement integral.

Because the PWA and KSMT approximations derived in section 3 are the same as those presented in Kriegsmann and Scandrett[9] for a single baffled membrane, one might expect that these approximations are unable to account for interactions between membranes. Figure 4 shows the results of varying the value of  $B$  and in fact, the KSMT and PWA solutions are found to be identical. One would conclude that these approximations are therefore of limited value in problems where interactions between membranes are presumed to be strong.

Figure 5 is included to show what happens at “cutoff”, which occurs when one of the  $\beta_i$  equals zero. At this frequency it is hard to assess which if any of the methods is doing a good job. For this case the finite difference code using the Engquist and Majda operator is presumably the “best” since it has a lower  $R$  value than the nonlocal finite difference solution. Its  $R$  value is still however, relatively high (.2543). For the case just above cutoff, it can be seen that none of the approximate methods do very well nor does the finite difference code with the Engquist and Majda operator. The reason for their failure lies in the fact that a significant amount of energy is being radiated away at an angle of  $\approx 82$  degrees from the normal to the boundary (see the amplitude of  $A_{-3}$  in the tables). Just as the Engquist and Majda require near normal incidence to eliminate unwanted reflections, so too can the PWA and KSMT approximations be thought of as valid for cases of near normal scattering from the radiating membranes.

Figure 6 is similar to fig. 4 in that the spacing between membranes is allowed to vary, while holding  $\Theta_I$  and  $k$  fixed. The *second* in vacuo eigenfrequency of the membrane is at  $k = 4\pi$ . It is shown in fig 6 that in fact the difference in spacing between membranes has

very little effect on the actual membrane displacement. It does however effect which and how many modes will radiate energy. For  $B = 1$ , there are eight radiating plane waves  $-7 \leq n \leq 0$ , while for  $B = 2/3$  there are only five  $-4 \leq n \leq 0$ .

The final figure compares the results of exciting the membranes at their second and third in vacuo eigenfrequencies with separation and incident angle fixed. At higher frequencies, it can be seen that the KSMT approximation does a “better” job in mimicking the correct membrane displacement and hence the coefficients of the radiated plane waves. All approximations can be shown to approach the PWA for large frequencies since in that limit the  $\beta_n \rightarrow k$ , and the eqs. 21 and 23 collapse to eq. 19. Results for the computed coefficients can be found in table II.

TABLE I

$a_n$	FD	PWA	KMST	NLRB	$a_n$	FD	PWA	KMST	NLRB
Figure 2									
$\Theta_I = 5\pi/6$					$\Theta_I = 11\pi/18$				
$a_{-2}$	.02812	.02795	.02794	.02792	$a_{-3}$	.01614	.01590	.01590	.01597
$a_{-1}$	.03704	.03670	.03668	.03662	$a_{-2}$	.01506	.01485	.01484	.01488
$a_0$	.02860	.02827	.02826	.02818	$a_{-1}$	.00738	.00727	.00727	.00727
$a_1$	.00928	.00906	.00908	.00901	$a_0$	.00843	.00828	.00829	.00837
Figure 4									
$B = 2/3$					$B = 1$				
$a_{-3}$	.19058	.24477	.21755	.19280	$a_{-3}$	.14007	.16089	.14299	.14160
$a_{-2}$	.16436	.21172	.18818	.16666	$a_{-2}$	.15914	.18336	.16299	.16131
$a_{-1}$	.16686	.21526	.19135	.16941	$a_{-1}$	.15140	.17493	.15551	.15381
$a_0$	.15726	.20317	.18068	.15989	$a_0$	.14597	.16931	.15057	.14876
Figure 5									
$\Theta_I = 2\pi/3$					$\Theta_I = 2.01\pi/3$				
$a_{-3}$	cutoff	cutoff	cutoff	cutoff	$a_{-3}$	.59231	.80478	.71529	.60270
$a_{-2}$	.12081	.28866	.25657	.29394	$a_{-2}$	.21231	.28689	.25500	.21480
$a_{-1}$	.13465	.31802	.28268	.32375	$a_{-1}$	.23438	.31512	.28010	.23598
$a_0$	.12317	.28871	.25665	.29383	$a_0$	.21363	.28523	.25356	.21369

TABLE II

$a_n$	FD	PWA	KMST	NLRB	$a_n$	FD	PWA	KMST	NLRB
Figure 7									
$k = 6\pi$					$k = 4\pi$				
$a_{-11}$	.00732	.00947	.00843	.00785	$a_{-11}$	NR	NR	NR	NR
$a_{-10}$	.00212	.00223	.00199	.00191	$a_{-11}$	NR	NR	NR	NR
$a_{-9}$	.01160	.01392	.01238	.01161	$a_{-9}$	NR	NR	NR	NR
$a_{-8}$	.01535	.01856	.01651	.01544	$a_{-8}$	NR	NR	NR	NR
$a_{-7}$	.00884	.01069	.00951	.00887	$a_{-7}$	.02188	.02544	.02262	.02236
$a_{-6}$	.00185	.00226	.00201	.00192	$a_{-6}$	.05165	.06004	.05337	.05257
$a_{-5}$	.00539	.00652	.00580	.00546	$a_{-5}$	.05716	.06642	.05904	.05808
$a_{-4}$	.00206	.00252	.00225	.00214	$a_{-4}$	.02637	.03062	.02722	.02672
$a_{-3}$	.01244	.01505	.01338	.01280	$a_{-3}$	.02301	.02673	.02376	.02336
$a_{-2}$	.01512	.01819	.01618	.01580	$a_{-2}$	.05622	.06522	.05798	.05682
$a_{-1}$	.00879	.01022	.00923	.00964	$a_{-1}$	.05352	.06190	.05507	.05375
$a_0$	.00556	.00568	.00560	.00526	$a_0$	.02570	.02922	.02621	.02522

**TABLE III**

case	R(NLRB)	$f$ (NLRB)		R(EM)	$f$ (EM)
Figure 2					
$\Theta_I = 5\pi/6$	-.0715	.0039		-.0076	.0041
$\Theta_I = 11\pi/18$	-.0253	.0253		.0607	.0265
Figure 3					
$\Theta_I = 5\pi/6$	-.0011	.8417		-.0510	.8830
$\Theta_I = 11\pi/18$	.0041	3.780		-.4429	4.973
Figure 4					
B=2/3	.0093	.8207		-.1646	.9391
B=1	.0121	.9191		.0549	.8726
Figure 5					
$\Theta_I = 2\pi/3$	.5559	1.242		.2543	.2851
$\Theta_I = 2.01\pi/3$	-.0001	2.269		-.2281	2.573
Figure 6					
B=1	.0105	.3096		.1313	.2670
B=1/5	.0163	.3093		.0122	.3090
Figure 7					
$k = 6\pi$	.0168	.0325		.0058	.0322
$k = 4\pi$	.0050	.3043		.0883	.2778

## References

1. A. K. Jordan and R. H. Lang, *Radio Sci.* **14**, 1077 (1979).
2. G. A. Kriegsmann, Scattering by Acoustically Large Corrugated Planar Surfaces, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **88**, 492 (1990).
3. D. G. Crighton and D. Innes, Low Frequency Acoustic Radiation and Vibration Response of Locally Excited Fluid-Loaded Structures, *J. Sound Vib.* **91**, 293 (1983).
4. A.C. Hemion, R. Bossut, J.N. Decarpigny, C. Audoly, Analysis of the Scattering of a Plane Wave by a Doubly Periodic Structure using the Finite Element Method: Application to Compliant Tube Gratings, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **87**, 1861 (1990).
5. C.H. Hodges, J. Power, and J. Woodhouse, The Low Frequency Vibration of a Ribbed Cylinder, Part I: Theory, *J. Sound Vib.* **101**, 219 (1985).
6. R.D. Mindlin and H.H. Bleich, Response of an Elastic Cylindrical Shell to a Transverse, Step Shock Wave, *J. Appl. Mech.*, **20**, 189 (1953).
7. G. A. Kriegsmann and C. L. Scandrett, Assessment of a New Radiation Damping Model for Structural Acoustic Interactions, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **86**, 788 (1989).
8. M. J. Miksis and L. Ting, *Wave Motion* **11**, 545 (1989).
9. G. A. Kriegsmann and C.L.Scandrett, Decoupling Approximations for Structural Acoustic Interactions, *Appl. Math. Lett.* **3**, 51 (1990).
10. R. Clayton and B. Engquist, Absorbing Boundary Conditions for Acoustic and Elastic Wave Equations, *Bull. Seis. Soc. Am.* **67**, 1529 (1977).
11. C. S. Morawetz, The Limiting Amplitude Principle, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **15**, 349 (1962).
12. G. J. Fix and S.P. Marin, Variational Methods for Underwater Acoustic Problems, *J. Comp. Phys.* **28**, 253 (1978).
13. G. A. Kriegsmann, Radiation Conditions for Wave Guide Problems, *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.* **3**, 318 (1982).
14. F. D. Tappert, The Parabolic Approximation Method, Wave Propagation and Underwater Acoustics, *Lecture Notes in Physics*, No. 70, ed. J. Keller and J.S. Papadakis, 224 (1977).



## Figure Captions

Fig 1a: Problem Configuration

Fig 1b: Comparison of the Nonlocal(NLRB) and Engquist and Majda (EM) Radiation Boundary Operators. Boundary conditions for the waveguide are homogeneous Dirichlet ( $y=\pi$ ) and homogeneous Neumann ( $y=0$ ), resulting in 2 propagating modes. Amplitudes of the two propagating, and one of the evanescent modes are plotted as a function of the position along the waveguide ( $x$ ). The exact answer should be one for each propagating mode, and exponentially decreasing for the evanescent mode.

Fig 2: Comparison of solutions displaying membrane displacement at a nonresonant (in vacuo) frequency, for two different incident angles.

Fig 3: Same as fig.2 except that the membranes are being excited at their first in vacuo resonant frequency, again for two different incident angles.

Fig 4: Same as fig. 3, except that results are displayed at the first in vacuo resonant frequency of the membranes for two different inter-membrane spacings.

Fig 5: Comparison of solutions at and near the waveguide cutoff frequency. Cut off occurs at  $\Theta_I = \frac{2\pi}{3}$ .

Fig 6: Comparison of solutions showing membrane displacement at the second in vacuo resonant frequency of the membranes, for two different inter-membrane spacings.

Fig 7: Comparison of solutions showing membrane displacement at the second and third in vacuo resonant frequencies of the membranes.