

Let's say we want to describe an object as it moves around in 3 dimensions, and for whatever reason (more on this later) we want to use Cylindrical Polar Coordinates (CPC). Let's go through every step.

First, how are CPC related to Cartesian coordinates?



Let's work out the scale factors $h_{\rho}, h_{\phi}, h_{z}$ and A|ways | ook for simplifications $Unit vectors \hat{\rho}, \hat{\phi}, \hat{z}.$ $\int Iike \cos^2 t \sin^2 = 1!$

 $\frac{\partial \vec{F}}{\partial \rho} = \cos\phi \hat{x} + \sin\phi \hat{y} + O \hat{z} \qquad \left| \frac{\partial \vec{F}}{\partial \rho} \right| = \sqrt{(\cos\phi)^2 + (\sin\phi)^2} = 1$

 $\Rightarrow h_p = 1 \quad \hat{p} = \cos\phi \hat{x} + \sin\phi \hat{y} + O\hat{z}$



 $\Rightarrow h\phi = \rho \qquad \hat{\phi} = -\sin\phi \hat{x} + \cos\phi \hat{y} + O\hat{z}$

 $\frac{\partial \vec{F}}{\partial z} = \hat{z} \Rightarrow h_{z} = 1 \hat{z}$ is same as Cartesian

Notice that $\hat{\rho} \in \hat{\phi}$ both depend on ϕ when we write them in terms of $\hat{x} \in \hat{y}$.

- Next, let's express the position \vec{r} entirely in CPC.

- $\vec{F} = r_{p}\hat{p} + r_{\phi}\hat{\phi} + r_{z}\hat{z}$ $r_{p} = \vec{r} \cdot \hat{p} = (p\cos\phi\hat{x} + p\sin\phi\hat{y} + z\hat{z}) \cdot (\cos\phi\hat{x} + \sin\phi\hat{y} + O\hat{z})$ $= p(\cos\phi)^{2} + p(\sin\phi)^{2} + z\pi O$
- $\Gamma_{\phi} = \overline{\Gamma} \cdot \hat{\phi} = (\rho \cos \phi \hat{x} + \rho \sin \phi \hat{y} + \xi \hat{z}) \cdot (-\sin \phi \hat{x} + \cos \phi \hat{y} + O \hat{z})$ $= -\rho \cos \phi \sin \phi + \rho \sin \phi \cos \phi + \xi \cdot \delta$ = 0
- $\Gamma_{z} = \vec{\Gamma} \cdot \hat{z} = \left(\rho \cos \phi \hat{x} + \rho \sin \phi \hat{y} + z \hat{z}\right) \cdot \hat{z}$
- $\Rightarrow \vec{F} = p\hat{\rho} + O\hat{\phi} + \tilde{z}\hat{z} \qquad \text{in } \hat{\rho}(\phi) = \cos\phi \hat{x} + \sin\phi \hat{y}$
- Okay, suppose we're describing an object moving around. At different times it may be getting closer to a further from the Z-axis, curling around the axis, or moving up or down parallel to the axis. In other words, p, ϕ , ξ , Z could all be changing. So we'll say they are functions of t. $\tilde{r} = \rho(t) \hat{\rho}(\phi(t)) + Z(t) \hat{z} = could$ to the object's position is changens.to the object's position is changens.At different times it may havedifferent positions labeled byxt

Now how do we write its velocity? I can think of 3 different ways to work this out. Let's look
 C each one.
 (1) Start w/ F in CPC & take its derivative

with respect to time.

 $\vec{\nabla}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\rho(t) \hat{\rho}(\phi(t)) + Z(t) \hat{Z} \right)$ $= \frac{d}{dt} \left(\rho(t) \hat{\rho}(\phi(t)) \right) + \frac{d}{dt} \left(Z(t) \hat{Z} \right)$

PRODUCT RULE PRODUCT RULE

 $\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt}\hat{\rho}(\phi(t)) + \rho(t) \frac{d\hat{\rho}(\phi(t))}{dt} + \frac{dz(t)}{dt}\hat{z} + z(t) \frac{d\hat{z}}{dt}$

CHAIN RULE

 $\frac{d\phi(t)}{dt} \frac{d\hat{\rho}(\phi)}{d\phi} = \frac{d\phi(t)}{dt} \hat{\phi}(\phi(t))$

 $\frac{d}{d\phi}\left(\cos\phi\hat{x}+\sin\phi\hat{y}\right)=-\sin\phi\hat{x}+\cos\phi\hat{y}$

 $\vec{v}(t) = \frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} \hat{\rho}(\phi(t)) + \rho(t) \frac{d\phi(t)}{dt} \hat{\phi}(\phi(t)) + \frac{dz(t)}{dt} \hat{z}$

To save space we usually use a dot above a quantity to indicate its time derivative, *É* we don't explicitly write arguments like (t) or

 $(\phi(t))$. So $V = p\hat{\rho} + p\dot{\phi}\hat{\phi} + \hat{z}\hat{z}$ $V = p\hat{\rho} + p\dot{\phi}\hat{\phi} + \hat{z}\hat{z}$ $N_{0}\hat{\phi}$ term in \vec{r} , but $N_{0}\hat{\phi}$ term in \vec{r} , but $N_{0}\hat{\phi}$ term \vec{r} , but $\hat{\phi}$ term \vec{r} , but

> This is nice and compact, but it's up to us to remember that $\rho, \phi, \dot{\epsilon}$ z are functions of t, and $\hat{\rho} \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\phi}$ are functions of ϕ !



(3) Velocity is the infinitesimal displacement df divided by the infinitesimal dt over which it happened. For any OCS

- $d\vec{r} = h_1 dq_1 \hat{e}_1 + h_2 dq_2 \hat{e}_2 + h_3 dq_3 \hat{e}_3$
- So for CPC $(h_p=1, h_s=p, h_z=1)$
 - $d\vec{r} = dp\hat{p} + p d\phi\hat{\phi} + dz\hat{z}$
- Of course all 3 calculations give the same \vec{v} . The last one is much simpler, right?
- Unfortunately, to work out the object's acceleration we have to follow approach 1 or 2 - there's no shortcut like method 3.
 - $\vec{a} = \frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\dot{\rho}(t) \hat{\rho}(\phi(t)) + \rho(t) \dot{\phi}(t) \hat{\phi}(\phi(t)) + \dot{z}(t) \hat{z} \right)$

 - $(ii) \frac{d}{dt} \left(\rho \dot{\phi} \dot{\phi}(\phi) \right) = \dot{\rho} \dot{\phi} \dot{\phi}(\phi) + \rho \ddot{\phi} \dot{\phi}(\phi) + \rho \dot{\phi} \frac{d}{dt} \dot{\phi}(\phi) \frac{d}{dt} \left(\sin\phi \dot{x} + \cos\phi \dot{y} \right)$ $= \dot{\rho} \dot{\phi} \dot{\phi} + \rho \ddot{\phi} \dot{\phi} + \rho \dot{\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt} \frac{d\phi}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{$
 - $\Rightarrow \vec{a} = (\vec{p} p\vec{\phi}^2)\hat{p} + (2\vec{p}\vec{\phi} + p\vec{\phi})\hat{\phi} + \vec{z}\hat{z}$

You could also start $w/\vec{a} = \vec{x}\cdot\vec{x} + \vec{y}\cdot\vec{y} + \vec{z}\cdot\vec{z}$ in Cortesian coords, use $x = p\cos\phi$ \vec{z} , $y = p\sin\phi$ to replace \vec{x} \vec{z} , \vec{y} w/ derivatives of $p \not\in \phi$, $\not\in$ then use dot - products of \vec{a} $w/\vec{p} \not\in \phi$ to work out $a_p \not\in a_{\phi}$.

Before we do an example, let's collect an results For position, velocity, é acceleration.

Again, notice I'm writing \hat{p} instead $\vec{F} = P P + \overline{z} \overline{z}$ ε of $\frac{dP(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon}$, and \hat{p} instead of $\hat{p}(\phi(\varepsilon))$, etz.

 $\vec{\mathbf{v}} = \vec{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \vec{\mathbf{p}} + \vec{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \vec{\mathbf{\phi}} + \vec{\mathbf{z}} \cdot \vec{\mathbf{z}} + \vec{\mathbf{z}} \cdot \vec{\mathbf{$

 $\vec{a} = (\vec{p} - p\vec{\phi}^2)\hat{p} + (2\dot{p}\vec{\phi} + p\vec{\phi})\hat{\phi} + \vec{z}\hat{z}$

How would we use these results?

Well, why do we use any OCS besides Cartesian Coordinates?

We use an OCS when it makes describing the system we're studying <u>easier</u>.

For example, suppose you have a bowl shaped like a hemisphere of radius R & you let a marble roll around inside it.



In that case it's the geometry of the system that's telling you to use SPC.

Sometimes, the right OCS makes it easier to describe farces. For example, suppose you have a mass M connected to a vertical rod by a spring w/ spring constant k. The point where the spring connects to the rod can move up or down, the spring can stretch or be compressed as the mass moves out or in, and the mass can also circle around the rod.

Sure, this is contrived, but can we write Newton's 2nd Law For the mass?

There are two forces acting on M: Fg pulls down & Fspr pulls in towards or pushes out from the rod depending in whether the spring is compressed or stretched. We'll use leg for the equilibrium length of the spring.



⇒ Use Cylindrical Polar Coordinates



$M \times \left(\left(\ddot{p} - p \dot{\phi}^2 \right) \hat{p} + \left(2 \dot{p} \dot{\phi} + p \ddot{\phi} \right) \hat{\phi} + \ddot{z} \hat{z} \right) = -M_{g} \hat{z} - k \left(p - l_{eq} \right) \hat{p}$

- ρ -comp: $M \times (\ddot{\rho} \rho \dot{\phi}^2) = -k(\rho l_{eq})$
- ϕ -comp: $M \times (2\dot{\rho}\dot{\phi} + \rho\ddot{\phi}) = 0$
- Z Comp: M Z = -Mg

There are lots of solutrons to these equatrons lots of ways the mass can move - and you'll learn how to solve them in Phys 314. Let's look C just one of the many possibilities.

- The z-comp. tells us M is pulled down ε its vertical motion is freefall $(a_z = -g)$:
 - - $\Rightarrow Z(t) = Z(t_o) + V_z(t_o) \times (t t_o) \frac{1}{2} g \times (t t_o)^2$

The ϕ -component is interesting! $M \times (2\dot{\rho}\dot{\phi} + \rho\dot{\phi}) = 0 \quad \text{(No firce in }\dot{\phi} \text{ direction}$ $= \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{1}{dt} (\rho^2 \dot{\phi}) \quad \text{(2p} \dot{\phi} + \rho^2 \dot{\phi})$

 $\Rightarrow \frac{1}{p} \frac{d}{dt} \left(M p^{2} \dot{\phi} \right) = 0 \quad \text{end} \quad \text{This only works if} \\ M p^{2} \dot{\phi} = a \quad \text{constant!}$

\Rightarrow Mp² = Constant

- This is just the statement that one component of M's Angular Momentum $\vec{L} = \vec{F} \times \vec{P}$ is conserved blc there's no force in the $\hat{\phi}$ direction.
- We'll call the constant L_z (it's the z-comp. of the angular momentum), so
 - $M p^{2} \dot{\phi} = L_{z} \qquad \leftarrow \qquad However \quad M is moving, \\ p \not\in \dot{\phi} \quad satisfy \quad this eqn!$
 - Finally, the p-component is
 - $\dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\phi}^2 = -\frac{k}{M} (\rho l_{eq})$ Use $\dot{\phi} = \frac{L_z}{M\rho_z}$
 - $\ddot{\rho} \rho \left(\frac{L_z}{M\rho^2}\right)^2 = -\frac{k}{M}\left(\rho l_{eq}\right)$
 - $\Rightarrow \overrightarrow{\rho} \left(\frac{L_2}{M}\right)^2 \frac{1}{\rho^3} = -\frac{k}{M}\left(\rho l_{eq}\right)$
- There are <u>lots</u> of solins of this equation depending on how M starts off C t = t_o.

- One solution is p = constant, so $\dot{p} = 0 \notin \ddot{p} = 0$. For that to work we'd need just the right values of p - how far its stretched out - and L_z - how much angular momentum it has from spinning ($\dot{\phi}$) around the rod.

 $\dot{\beta}^2 - \rho \dot{\beta}^2 = -\frac{k}{M} \left(\rho - l_{eq}\right)$

 $-\left(\frac{L_2}{M}\right)^2 \frac{1}{p^2} = -\frac{k}{M}\left(p - l_{eq}\right)$ For example, suppose $k = 10^3 N/m$, $l_{eq} = 0.1 m$, and $M = 20 \text{ grams} = 2 \times 10^{-2} \text{ kg}$.

 $-\left(\frac{L_z}{0.02k_s}\right)^2 \frac{1}{p^3} = -\frac{10^3 \text{N/m}}{0.02k_s} \times (p-0.1m)$

Suppose you stretch it out so p = 15 cm = 0.15 m é spin it around the rod.

 $f\left(\frac{1-2}{0.02\,k_{\rm S}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(0.15\,{\rm m})^3} = \frac{10^3\,{\rm N/m}}{0.02\,k_{\rm S}} \times (0.05\,{\rm m})$

 $- 2 L_{z} = 0.02 L_{s} \times \left(\frac{10^{3} N/m}{0.02 L_{s}} \times 0.05 m \times (0.15m)^{3} \right)^{1/2}$

 $= 0.0581 \frac{k_{S}m^2}{S}$

 $L_{z} = 0.0581 \frac{45.m^{2}}{5} = M \rho^{2} \dot{\phi} = 0.02k_{s} (0.15m)^{2} \dot{\phi}$

 $\Rightarrow \dot{\phi} = 129.1 \text{ rad}/s$

- So p = 0.15m $\dot{\epsilon}$, $\dot{\phi} = 129.1$ rad/s - both <u>constant</u> - is one solution of these equations.



- This makes sense! For constant $p = 0.15m \not\in \phi = 129.1 rad/s$ the $\hat{\phi}$ comp. of \vec{V} is $V_{\phi} = p \dot{\phi} = 19.37 \text{ M/s}$. Maintaining that constant speed requires a centripeta acceleration $V_{\phi}^{2}/\rho = 2.5 \times 10^{3} \text{ m/sz}$. That's exactly what we get from the spring!

 $\vec{F}_{spr} = -10^{3} \frac{N}{M} \times (0.15 m - 0.1 m) \hat{\rho} = -50 N \hat{\rho}$ $\overrightarrow{F}_{spr} = - \frac{50N}{0.02} \hat{p} = -2500 \frac{M}{5} \hat{p}$

Looking back @ What we did, & keeping in mind that p >> O in CPC, can you see why this kind of solution doesn't exist for p < leq?
Again, this example is a little contrived. And there are many more complicated solins to the equations we worked aut. The point is just to show you that even that first step - writing out Frut = Ma - may be easier w/ an OCS!