

Comments and Addenda

The section Comments and Addenda is for short communications which are not appropriate for regular articles. It includes only the following types of communications: (1) Comments on papers previously published in *The Physical Review* or *Physical Review Letters*. (2) Addenda to papers previously published in *The Physical Review* or *Physical Review Letters*, in which the additional information can be presented without the need for writing a complete article. Manuscripts intended for this section must be accompanied by a brief abstract for information-retrieval purposes. Accepted manuscripts follow the same publication schedule as articles in this journal, and page proofs are sent to authors.

Reply to comments on "Qualitative explanation of Pellam's helium paradox"

Robert V. Penney

39410 Koppnick Road, Plymouth, Michigan 48170

(Received 10 April 1975)

A recent paper of Lynch is found valid. The heat-exchange torque vanishes for uniform heating provided that we go to the infinitely thin disk.

Recently, Lynch<sup>1</sup> claimed to show that my conclusions about the temperature dependence and sense of the heat-exchange torque on a Rayleigh disk, when it is heated were invalid. He was correct, in fact.

To see this, consider the expression developed by the author<sup>2</sup> for the heat-exchange torque  $\vec{\tau}_{\text{heat}}$ ,

$$\vec{\tau}_{\text{heat}} = \int \frac{\vec{r} \times \rho_n \kappa (\vec{v}_n - \vec{v}_s) dS}{\rho_s T + \rho_n \vec{v}_n \cdot (\vec{v}_n - \vec{v}_s)} \quad (1)$$

and apply it to a two-dimensional flow problem (infinitely long plate); the superfluid is modeled by potential flow.

The boundary conditions are twofold; one is the mass current density satisfying the equation

$$\vec{J} \cdot d\vec{S} = (\rho_n \vec{v}_n + \rho_s \vec{v}_s) \cdot d\vec{S} = 0 \quad (2)$$

on the surface of the disk.

The other condition arises from the heat flow from the disk  $\kappa$ , which is taken to satisfy the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa d\vec{S} &= \vec{Q} \cdot d\vec{S} = \left\{ (\mu + \frac{1}{2} v_s^2) \vec{J} + \rho_s T \vec{v}_n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \rho_n \vec{v}_n [\vec{v}_n \cdot (\vec{v}_n - \vec{v}_s)] \right\} \cdot d\vec{S} \\ &= \left\{ \rho_s T + \rho_n [\vec{v}_n \cdot (\vec{v}_n - \vec{v}_s)] \right\} \vec{v}_n \cdot d\vec{S} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

on the surface of the disk.

The torque becomes<sup>3-5</sup> per unit length,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\tau}_{\text{heat}} &= \rho_s \oint (\vec{r} \times \vec{v}_{s\parallel}) (\vec{v}_{s\perp} \cdot d\vec{S}) \\ &\quad + (\rho_s \rho / \rho_n) \oint (\vec{r} \times \vec{v}_{s\perp}) (\vec{v}_{s\perp} \cdot d\vec{S}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\vec{v}_{s\parallel}$  and  $\vec{v}_{s\perp}$  are the components of the superfluid flow parallel and perpendicular to the surface.

Specifically, we apply the torque formulation to a cylinder with an elliptical cross section, such as

$$X^2/a^2 + Y^2/b^2 = 1. \quad (5)$$

We have calculated the torque per unit length, and it reads

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{heat}} &= \frac{V_0(a+b)ab}{s_n T} \oint \frac{\kappa(\theta) \sin(\theta - \alpha) d\theta}{r_0} \\ &\quad + \frac{\rho}{\rho_n \rho_s} \frac{a^2 - b^2}{(s_n T)^2} \oint \kappa^2(\theta) \sin\theta \cos\theta d\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$V_0$  is the uniform velocity at  $r = \infty$ ,  $r_0^2 = a^2 \sin^2\theta + b^2 \cos^2\theta$ .

Now, when we go to the limit of  $b \rightarrow 0$ , an infinitely thin disk; the first term vanishes, leaving Lynch's result.<sup>1</sup>

To repeat, Lynch has shown that my estimation of the torque of a Rayleigh disk due to heat-exchange forces<sup>5</sup> was incorrect.

<sup>1</sup>R. Lynch, Phys. Rev. A 10, 1435 (1974).

<sup>2</sup>R. Penney, Phys. Rev. Lett. 25, 138 (1970).

<sup>3</sup>L. M. Milne-Thomson, *Theoretical Hydrodynamics*, 2nd ed. (Macmillan, New York, 1950), p. 163.

<sup>4</sup>R. Penney, Phys. Fluids 10, 2147 (1967).

<sup>5</sup>Unless there is trapped circulation around the elliptic cylinder. See, for example, R. Penney and A. W. Overhauser, Phys. Rev. 164, 268 (1967).