An investigation into the effect of pressure source parameters and water depth on the wake wash wave generated by moving pressure source
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Abstract
In this study the effect of moving pressure source and channel parameters on the generated waves in a channel was numerically investigated. Draught, angle of attack and profile shape were investigated as parameters of pressure source and water depth and blockage factor as channel parameters on wave height. Firstly, the chosen Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) approach was validated with the experimental data over a range of speed. Then the CFD study was conducted for further investigations. It was shown that that by enlarging draught, angle of attack and beam of the pressure source, the wave height generated will be increased. Channel study showed that it is possible to increase the wave height generated by shallowing water for a given speed as long as the depth Froude number is subcritical and the wave height generated is independent of water depth for supercritical depth Froude numbers. The blockage factor has more influence at supercritical Froude depth values, while at subcritical Froude values is negligible compare with water depth.
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Introduction
The wake pattern which is produced by a moving point across the surface of deep water was first explained mathematically by Lord Kelvin (William Thomson) [1] and is known as the Kelvin wake pattern. All vessels operating in deep water produce a Kelvin type wave pattern consisting of two
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kinds of waves: transverse waves which crest across the ship track and divergent waves which crest
roughly parallel to the ship track, moving outward. The waves are confined to a wedge shaped region
behind the ship, and the half angle of the wedge is 19.5 degrees. This angle is independent of the ship
speed as long as the deep water condition is satisfied.

Many studies have been conducted into the effect of waves on vessels operating in shallow and
restricted waterways, for example [2, 3]. In addition, significant research has been conducted into
wash wave impacts on ecology and the environment, and vessel operation in shallow water close to
the coastline [4].

The wash waves generated by vessels can be also characterized in terms of the hull shape [5] and
operating condition [6]. Due to the great interest in wake wash effects, a considerable amount of
research effort has been conducted in recent years. In model experimental studies the focus has been
on designing low-wash ships and acquiring reliable data for validation [7-9].

Most research has been conducted using theoretical [10] or experimental [11, 12] approaches. For a
ship moving in water of uniform depth, linear and nonlinear theories can be applied usefully in the
subcritical and the supercritical speed range [13, 14]. Thin ship theory can be used for the wave
generation by a ship moving in a channel. This theory provides an alternative to higher order panel
methods for estimating wave resistance when applied solely to slender hulls [10], but it is not valid for
unsteady cases and transom stern flow separation [13]. More general shallow-water approximations
are obtained from Boussinesq type equations, which are valid for most arbitrarily unsteady cases.

Boussinesq’s equations based on a suitable reference level were used for computing ship waves in
shallow water. However this method is not able to predict the 3D flow pattern around the vessel [15].

An alternative is to combine the thin ship theory and the Boussinesq method. This hybrid approach
combines a steady nonlinear panel method for the near-ship flow with a Boussinesq solver for the far-
field wave propagation [13]. However, this method is only useful for steady problems. It should be
noted that due to the nonlinear and unsteady nature, as well as the large domain feature of the wash
problems, they can be neither solved well by the linear wave theory nor approximated efficiently by
nonlinear singularity methods. Typically, the finite volume method has been used to predict the wave
generated and its propagation [15, 16]. Previous studies by the authors showed that the numerical
approach can predict wave propagation accurately [17, 18].

In the present study, a pressure source model was tested at Australian Maritime College Towing Tank
at different speed and the generated waves parameters were captured by wave probes. Next, the
simulations were conducted by ANSYS-Fluent software version 14.5 in same condition as the
experimental. Through the comparison of computed and measured results, applicability of the
numerical method is examined. Subsequently the numerical approach was used for further
investigation.
**Experimental setup**

In order to generate waves, a moving wavedozer model was used as a pressure source during the experimental. The wavedozer model [19] is a wedge shape model with the constant beam (Figure ). The main particulars of the wavedozer are listed in Table .

This model was tested at the Australian Maritime College towing tank which has a length of 100m, and a width of 3.5m. The water depth for the tests was 1.5m in all conducted tests. Three wave probes were positioned at 0.75, 1.0 and 1.25 m from the centre-line of the model to record the wave parameters (Figure ), where $y^*$ is defined by the distance of the wave probe position over the width of the channel ($y^* = y/W$). Two load cells were installed on the model to measure the vertical and drag forces. The model was tested at various depth Froude numbers from 0.43 to 0.99.

**Numerical simulation**

The CFD software ANSYS-Fluent version 14.5 was used as the flow solver [20]. The governing equations are three-dimensional Reynolds Averaged Navier-Stokes equations for incompressible flows. The Volume of Fluid (VOF) approach was used with a time-dependent and explicit time discretization scheme employed to solve the equations. The SIMPLE algorithm was used for the pressure-velocity coupling and the PRESTO scheme for the pressure interpolation. The k-epsilon model with the standard wall function was utilized for turbulence modelling. The 2nd order upwind scheme was used for solving the momentum equations and the High Resolution Interface Capturing scheme (HRIC) for the solution of the volume fraction equations.

Figure 34 shows the computational grid domain. For the numerical investigation, a domain comprising 6m in front of the model and 13.5m behind it was considered. The heave and trim were fixed at the same value as used in experimental tests. As the flow has a plane of symmetry about the centre plane, to decrease the processing time, half of the domain was used. The origin of the coordinate system was located at the middle of the model. The open channel boundary condition was used to specify the inlet and outlet boundary condition. Inlet velocity and outflow boundary conditions were selected for inlet and outlet boundaries respectively. A symmetry plane was used along the centre plane, and the remaining boundary surfaces along the exterior of the domain were set to no-slip wall conditions. The more details about mesh domain and cells’ properties are presented in (21).
Valuating the numerical approach

The results of the numerical simulation have been compared with experimental data in various figures. Figure 1 shows the drag coefficient results for the experimental and numerical investigations, and Figure 2 presents the vertical force (or lift) coefficient for different speeds. Drag and vertical force coefficients are defined as:

\[ C_d = \frac{\text{Drag}}{0.5 \times \rho \times V^2 \times D \times B} \]

\[ C_l = \frac{\text{Vertical Force}}{0.5 \times \rho \times V^2 \times LWL \times B} \]

Where \( \rho \) is water density, \( V \) is speed of the pressure source, \( D \) is draught, \( B \) is beam and \( LWL \) is length of waterline. It should be mentioned, the water separates from model sides during tests and only model bottom remains wet (21). In addition, the highest portion of total drag (95%) can be attributed to pressure drag (21). Therefore, in Equation 1, the area is equal \( D \times B \) and in Equation 2, the area is equal \( LWL \times B \). The standard error bars (5%) were shown for all the experimental data.

It is clear that the simulation results are in good agreement with the experimental data with respect to the forces. The percentage variations between numerical results and the experimental data are mostly less than 5%. To increase the accuracy of the results for lower speed, the mesh should be refined, however in this study the higher speeds are more interested. The free-surface elevation for depth Froude numbers 0.7 and 0.99 for nearest, middle and farthest wave probes are presented in Figure 1 to Figure 4. Free-surface elevations show the Fluent software is able to predict the wave patterns at different lateral distances. According to presented results, the numerical method is validated, and can be used to investigate the effects of changes in parameters. It should be mentioned that first wave behind the pressure source was considered as surfable wave, therefore surface elevation of the first wave behind the pressure source was considered and as soon as the first wave reached to steady state, the simulations were stopped. To improve the accuracy of the results in far filed the simulation time should be increased and mesh should be refined, however in this study was unnecessary.

Investigating the effect of various parameters

Pressure source parameters

Draught, beam and angle of attack are the main parameters of the wavedozer which were numerically investigated with respect to the wave generated height and propagation. Changing any of these
parameters will alter the wavedozer’s displacement. In this study, only one of the parameters was changed at a time and the rest kept constant in order to compare the numerical results and examine the effect of the changed parameter.

**Draught**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Draught (m)</th>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>Angle of attack (deg)</th>
<th>LWL (m)</th>
<th>Displacement (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Blockage factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.006015</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table shows the dimensions of two wavedozers. Model 1 is the model which was used in the experimental tests and the previous simulations. To consider the effect of draught on generated waves, a new model (Model 2) was simulated. The draught of Model 2 was 20% more than Model 1. These simulations were conducted in deep water condition (1.5 m water depth). Since the tests were conducted in 1.5 m water depth, the draught change does not have a significant influence on the blockage factor. Blockage factor can be defined as:

$$\text{Blockage factor } (\kappa) = \frac{\text{Model cross section area } (A_s)}{\text{Channel cross section area } (A_c)}$$

The comparison between Model 1 and Model 2 shows that increasing the draught causes an increase in wave height. It is predicted there is a specific draught which generated wave starts to break and increasing draught more, does not have effect on the generated wave height. Figure to Figure present the wave heights comparison for two different models at different lateral distances, where y is lateral distance, B and W are model and channel widths respectively, $H$ is wave height of first wave behind the pressure source and $h$ is water depth.

**Angle of attack**

Another potentially important parameter is the angle of attack. The angle of attack is the angle between the entry surface and the water surface. The previous studies were conducted with a wavedozer with a 14 degree angle of attack. The 14 degree angle of attack was presented as the optimum angle in [19]. In this study, wavedozers with different angles of attack were simulated. By altering the angle of attack, the length of water line (LWL) and the displacement will be changed and
the draught and beam remained constant. The wavedozer with the lowest angle of attack has the largest displacement and vice versa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Draught (m)</th>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>Angle of attack (deg.)</th>
<th>LWL (m)</th>
<th>Displacement (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Blockage factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.006015</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.008505</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.01221</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.02145</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table presents the wavedozers parameters. Figure to Figure illustrate the wave heights for different wavedozers at different $F_r_{\text{h}}$.

By decreasing the angle of attack, the variation of wave height with lateral distances decreases. For example, for Model 5 (angle of attack of 4 degree) at $F_r_{\text{h}} = 0.9$, the wave height is almost constant for the entire width of the channel. By increasing the angle of attack, the maximum wave height is increased due to increasing the pressure gradient. It can be said that $\frac{D}{LWL} \alpha \frac{\delta p}{\delta x}$, where $\delta p$ is pressure gradient in longitudinal direction ($\rho$ is pressure force). Therefore by increasing the angle of attack for constant draught (D) the length of waterline (LWL) will decrease. Therefore, the pressure gradient will increase, and as a consequence, the wave generated height will increase. Model 5 has the largest displacement while it generates the lowest wave height. Increasing the displacement by changing the angle of attack (or LWL) has the opposite effect on wave height. By decreasing the angle of attack the model drag decreases. Figure and Figure show the drag and vertical forces for different angle of attack. The highest portion of total drag can be attributed to pressure drag (21). Increasing the angle of attack increases the pressure drag and decreasing the angle of attack increases the wetted area and as a result increases the viscous drag. It can be concluded that Model 5 with the largest displacement generates the lowest wave height because it has minimum pressure drag, and Model 1 with lowest displacement generated the highest wave height because it has maximum drag.

Beam

The effect of pressure source beam on the generated wave height and quality was investigated. For this investigation, the wavedozer beam was increased from 300mm (model 1) to 433mm (model 6). In addition, it should be noted that the wavedozer with 433mm beam (Model 6) has the same displacement as the model with 120mm draught (model 2) which was used previously for the draught investigation.
Table presents the characteristics of these models. Therefore, by comparing models 1 and 6, it is possible to see the effect of beam and displacement change on wave height and by comparing models 2 and 6, make it possible to see the effect of altering beam and draught, but maintaining displacement. The simulations were conducted in a channel with 3.5m width and 1.5m depth. Figure to Figure illustrate the results for the aforementioned models at different $Fr_h$.

The results show that by increasing the model beam, the generated wave height increases for all investigated $Fr_h$. The wave height of model 6 which has greater beam (the width of model 6 is about 44% larger than models 1 and 2) is about 28% to 98% larger than wave height for models 1 and 2 at various lateral distances. The comparison between models 1, 2 and 6 shows that adding displacement increases wave height, however the increase by increasing draught is small, whereas the increase due to a beam increase is large. The difference between models 6 and 2 can be explained by considering that the waterplane of Model 6 is larger than Model 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Draught (m)</th>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>LWL (m)</th>
<th>Water plane (m$^2$)</th>
<th>Angle of attack (degree)</th>
<th>Volume displacement (m$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table). Therefore increasing the displacement by increasing the beam generates a higher wave than increasing the draught. It is predicted that increasing the beam will increase the wave height till wave starts to break and then further increase of beam does not have influence on the wave height.

**Pressure source profile shape**

According to the angle of attack study results, it was seen that the waves generated by a 4 degree angle of attack model had almost constant height across the channel while the model with angle of attack of 14 degrees generated higher waves. However, the bow waves generated by the 4 degree angle of attack were larger than those of the 14 degree angle of attack. A new model (model 8) was
generated. This model has a constant beam, with a 14 degree angle of attack at the front and a 4
degree angle of attack at the stern (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>0.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of water line (m)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of attack in front (degree)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of attack in stern (degree)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draught (m)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows model 8 schematically. Figure 2 to Figure 5 show the results between model 1
(14 degree angle of attack), model 5 (4 degree angle of attack) and model 8. The wave generated
heights for model 8 are smaller than those of model 1, but the wave height decrease of between
y’=0.57 and y’=0.71 lateral distances is slightly less compared to model 1.

According to the results, it can be concluded that the angle of attack in front of model (at the
stagnation point) is more effective in wave generated height. While the angle of attack at transom can
has effect on wave quality. It means, the wave height decrease of between 1.0 m and 1.25 m lateral
distances is slightly less compared to model 1 and more than model 8.

12 Channel parameters

13 Depth

The effect of water depth on generated wave height was investigated. Three water depths were
considered and the wavedozer with 0.1 m draught and 0.3 m beam was simulated at three different
speeds. The only difference between channels was the water depth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h [m]</th>
<th>V [m/s]</th>
<th>1.66</th>
<th>1.99</th>
<th>2.66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel 1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 presents $Fr_h$ for the given speeds at different water depths. $Fr_h$ values at 1.66 m/s forward
speed for all three different depths are less than 1 (sub-critical $Fr_h$). Figure 6 shows the wave height
results at 1.66 m/s speed for the three different water depths. According to the results, the generated
wave in the shallowest water has the largest wave height, because it has the highest $Fr_h$.

The $Fr_h$ at 1.99 m/s speed and 0.4 m water depth is equal to 1. The simulation results show the
generated bow wave (soliton wave) at this condition is larger than for the two other conditions and the
wave behind the pressure source has the lowest height at $Fr_h=1.0$ (Figure ). Figure presents the wave heights at different lateral distances for three different water depths at 1.99 m/s speed. Figure presents the results for 2.66 m/s at different water depths. The $Fr_h$ for all three conditions are larger than 1. Figure shows the time history of surface elevation at 0.75 lateral distances for 2.6 m/s speed at three different water depths. It can be seen that the shape of the waves are the same for $Fr_h$ larger than 1.2. It means the water depth does not have influence on the wave shape. Because the $Fr_h$ values are greater than one, the downstream pressure does not have an effect on the up-stream.

8 Blockage factor

By changing the water depth, depth Froude number and blockage factor will change simultaneously. It was shown in the previous section that changing the water depth has an effect on the generated wave characteristics. To separate the effect of depth Froude number and blockage factor by changing the water depth, a new channel was modelled (channel 4) and the results were compared with the two other channels results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Blockage factor ($\kappa$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel 1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 4</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table presents the parameters of the three channels which were used for this comparison. Channels 1 and 4 have the same water depth, and channels 3 and 4 have the same blockage factor but different water depths. The results for the three different speeds 1.66, 1.99 and 2.66 m/s are presented in Figure to Figure . The results indicate that the effect of depth Froude number on wave height is more important than the blockage factor for $Fr_h<1.0$ and the blockage factor at this range of $Fr_h$ is negligible. Therefore, higher $Fr_h$ generates larger wave (Figure 34). In Figure 35, model in Channel 3 is in sub-critical ($Fr_h=0.9$) and model in Channels 1 and 4 are in critical ($Fr_h=1.0$) Froude depth values. At supercritical Froude depth values the channel with lowest blockage factor generates the highest wave (Figure 36). More investigations are required to find the highest ineffective blockage factor. At highest ineffective blockage factor the channel cross section would be smallest cross section which does not have influence on the wave generated parameters.
Concluding remarks

In this study the influence of pressure source parameters, depth and blockage factors were investigated. Draught, angle of attack, beam and profile shape were investigated as the effective parameters of pressure source on wave height. Since the first wave behind the pressure source was considered as surfable wave, the effect of parameters on this wave was investigated.

The investigation indicated that increasing draught, angle of attack and beam will increase the wave height generated, while it was shown that wave height variation across the channel for a lower angle of attack is less than others. The pressure gradient will increase by increasing the angle of attack. Hence the wave generated by higher angle of attack wavelozer is larger than the lower. Comparing the results for the two different wavelozers with the same displacement and angle of attack, but different beam and draught, it can be seen that the model with the wider beam generates a higher wave. This means that the effect of beam on generated waves is greater than the effect of draught. The model with larger beam has larger water plane which means the volume of displacement close to free surface for model with larger beam is bigger than the model with larger draught. Consequently, the wave generated by wider wavelozer is higher than other one. Meanwhile, it is expected that there is limitation for effective draught and the draught larger than that does not have effect on wave generated height. Since only the portion of displacement close to free surface has effect on the wave generated. Increasing the beam with increase the wave height till the wave generated does not break.

The water depth study showed that by decreasing the water depth for a given speed, larger wave height will be generated as long as the $Fr_h$ is subcritical. When $Fr_h=1$ the bow (soliton) wave generated is higher than the wave behind the pressure source. It was also shown that water depth does not have an effect on the wave height for $Fr_h$ more than 1.2. It means for this range of $Fr_h$ the downstream does not have influence on upstream, because the pressure source moves faster than wave speed.

The blockage factor was investigated. The results indicate that the effect of depth Froude number on wave height is more important than the blockage factor for subcritical Froude depth values and the blockage factor at this range is negligible. At supercritical Froude depth values the channel with lowest blockage factor generates the highest wave. Further simulations are needed to find the highest ineffective blockage factor.
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**Figure captions**

1. Figure 1. Wavedozer model attached to the towing Tank carriage.
2. Figure 2. Layout of probes with pressure source.
3. Figure 3. Computational grid domain.
4. Figure 4. Comparison of experiment and numerical drag coefficients for different $Fr_h$ at 1500mm water depth.
5. Figure 5. Comparison of experiment and numerical lift coefficients for different $Fr_h$ at 1500mm water depth.
6. Figure 6. Free-surface elevation for $Fr_h=0.7$ at 750mm lateral distance from centre-line (WP1).
7. Figure 7. Free-surface elevation for $Fr_h=0.99$ at 750mm lateral distance from centre-line (WP1).
8. Figure 7. Free-surface elevation for $Fr_h=0.99$ at 1000mm lateral distance from centre-line (WP2).
9. Figure 8. Free-surface elevation for $Fr_h=0.99$ at 1250mm lateral distance from centre-line (WP3).
10. Figure 9. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1 and model 2 at $Fr_h=0.75$.
11. Figure 10. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1 and model 2 at $Fr_h=0.9$.
12. Figure 12. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1 and model 2 at $Fr_h=0.95$.
13. Figure 13. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1 and model 2 at $Fr_h=0.99$.
14. Figure 11. Wave height generated variation with respect to angle of attack (AoA) at different lateral distances for $Fr_h=0.75$.
15. Figure 12. Wave height generated variation with respect to angle of attack (AoA) at different lateral distances for $Fr_h=0.9$.
16. Figure 13. Wave height generated variation with respect to angle of attack (AoA) at different lateral distances for $Fr_h=0.95$.
17. Figure 14. Wave height generated variation with respect to angle of attack (AoA) at different lateral distances for $Fr_h=0.99$.
18. Figure 15. The drag coefficients variation with respect to Angle of Attack at different $Fr_h$.
19. Figure 16. The lift coefficients variation with respect to Angle of Attack at different $Fr_h$. 
Figure 17. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for models 1, 2 and 6 at $Fr_h=0.75$.

Figure 18. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for models 1, 2 and 6 at $Fr_h=0.9$.

Figure 19. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for models 1, 2 and 6 at $Fr_h=0.95$.

Figure 20. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for models 1, 2 and 6 at $Fr_h=0.99$.

Figure 21. Model 8 of B=0.3m, LWL=0.4m, AOA at transom=4 degrees, AOA at front=14 degrees and D=0.1m.

Figure 22. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1, 5 and 8 for $Fr_h=0.75$.

Figure 23. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1, 5 and 8 for $Fr_h=0.9$.

Figure 24. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1, 5 and 8 for $Fr_h=0.95$.

Figure 25. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for model 1, 5 and 8 for $Fr_h=0.99$.

Figure 26. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for three different water depths at 1.66 m/s speed.

Figure 27. Free-surface elevation at 0.75 m lateral distances at 1.99 m/s speed for three different water depths.

Figure 28. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for three different water depths at 1.99 m/s speed.

Figure 29. Non-dimensional wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for three different water depths at 2.66 m/s speed.

Figure 30. Free-surface elevation at 0.75 m lateral distances at 2.66 m/s speed for three different water depths.

Figure 31. Wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for three different water depths at 1.66 m/s speed.

Figure 32. Wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for three different water depths at 1.99 m/s speed.
Figure 33. Wave heights variation with respect to lateral distances for three different water depths at 2.66 m/s speed.

**Table captions**

Table 1. Wavedozer Principal Particulars.

Table 2. Wavedozers dimensions.

Table 3. Wavedozers with different angle of attack parameters.

Table 4. The pressure sources characteristics.

Table 5. The characteristics of model 8.

Table 6. $Fr_h$ for different speeds at different water depth.

Table 7. Three different channels parameters for blockage factor investigation.
Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam (m)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft (m)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of attack (deg.)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.
Figure 4.

Figure 5.
Figure 6.

Figure 7.
Figure 8.

Figure 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Draught (m)</th>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>Angle of attack (deg)</th>
<th>LWL (m)</th>
<th>Displacement (m³)</th>
<th>Blockage factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.006015</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

![Graph](image.png)

Figure 10.
Figure 11.

- Model 1
- Model 2

Figure 12.
Figure 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Draught (m)</th>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>Angle of attack (deg.)</th>
<th>LWL (m)</th>
<th>Displacement (m³)</th>
<th>Blockage factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.006015</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.008505</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.01221</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.02145</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.
Figure 14.

Figure 15.
Figure 16.

Figure 17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>(m²)</th>
<th>(degree)</th>
<th>(m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.

Figure 20.
Figure 21.

Figure 22.
Figure 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam (m)</th>
<th>0.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of water line (m)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of attack in front (degree)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of attack in stern (degree)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draught (m)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.
Figure 24.

![Graph showing H/A vs. (y-B/2)W for Model 1, Model 5, and Model 8.](image)

Figure 25.

![Graph showing H/A vs. (y-B/2)W for Model 1, Model 5, and Model 8.](image)

Figure 26.

![Graph showing H/A vs. (y-B/2)W for Model 1, Model 5, and Model 8.](image)
Figure 27.

Figure 28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>h [m]</th>
<th>1.66</th>
<th>1.99</th>
<th>2.66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel 1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.

Figure 29.
Figure 30.

Figure 31.
Figure 32.

Figure 33.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Blockage factor (κ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel 1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 4</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 34.
### Appendices

#### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\nabla)</td>
<td>Volume displacement</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>Wave height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\kappa)</td>
<td>Blockage factor</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Water depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi)</td>
<td>Longitudinal distance</td>
<td>(\text{LWL})</td>
<td>Length of waterline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A_c)</td>
<td>Channel cross section area</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOA</td>
<td>Angle of attack</td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td>Speed of model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A_s)</td>
<td>Model cross section area</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>Width of channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Model beam</td>
<td>(\text{WP})</td>
<td>Wave probe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_d)</td>
<td>Drag coefficient</td>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>Lateral distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C_l)</td>
<td>Lift coefficient</td>
<td>(y')</td>
<td>(y/W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>Model draught</td>
<td>(\rho)</td>
<td>Water density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fr_h)</td>
<td>Depth Froude number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>