

Master of Science Thesis

---

# Title

Subtitle

Dikshant Sud

---

December 16, 2019



# Title

## Subtitle

Master of Science Thesis

For obtaining the degree of Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering  
at Delft University of Technology

Dikshant Sud

December 16, 2019



**Delft University of Technology**

Copyright © Aerospace Engineering, Delft University of Technology  
All rights reserved.

DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY  
DEPARTMENT OF AERODYNAMICS

The undersigned hereby certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Aerospace Engineering for acceptance the thesis entitled **“Title”** by **Dikshant Sud** in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Science**.

Dated: December 16, 2019

Supervisors:

---

Reader 1

---

Reader 2

---

Reader 3

---

Reader 4



---

# Table of Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>1 Scalar Flux Modelling</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background on Navier Stokes and scalar fluxes . . . . .	1
1.2 Gradient Diffusion Models . . . . .	3
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>9</b>





---

## List of Figures



---

## List of Tables



---

# Chapter 1

---

## Scalar Flux Modelling

In this chapter, an overview of the theory related to scalar flux and turbulence modelling is discussed. First, background on

### 1.1 Background on Navier Stokes and scalar fluxes

Fluid flows are governed by the Navier Stokes equations which can be expressed by equations 1.1 and 1.2 for incompressible flow of a Newtonian fluid without body forces. In these equations,  $u_i$  is the  $i$ -th component of the instantaneous velocity field,  $p$  is the instantaneous pressure field,  $\rho$  is the density and  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity of the fluid.

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 u_i}{\partial x_j^2} \quad (1.1)$$

$$\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_j} = 0 \quad (1.2)$$

Along with these conservation of mass and momentum equations, simulations concerning the transport of a passive scalar quantity  $\phi$  require an additional transport equation given in 1.3 without a source term. In equation 1.3,  $\phi$  is considered a passive scalar because it has no effect on material and flow properties and  $\Gamma$  is the relevant molecular diffusivity parameter. For simulations concerning passive heat transfer, the instantaneous temperature ( $\theta$ ) can be identified as the scalar quantity with thermal diffusivity  $\alpha$  as the relevant diffusivity constant [11].

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_j} = \Gamma \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x_j^2} \quad (1.3)$$

The Navier Stokes equations can be solved exactly by resolving all time and length scales accurately by using a Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS) method. However, the computational effort to accurately resolve all fluid length and time scales for industry relevant flows is made impossible due to turbulence. Turbulence can be characterised as a collection of eddies over

a range of different scales which are chaotic and unsteady in nature. The multi-scale properties of these turbulent eddies can be understood based on energy cascade and Kolmogorov's hypothesis for a fully turbulent flow at sufficiently high Reynold's number ( $Re$ ) expressed in equation 1.4, with characteristic velocity  $\mathcal{U}$  and length scale  $\mathcal{L}$ .

$$Re = \frac{\mathcal{U}\mathcal{L}}{\nu} \quad (1.4)$$

The largest eddies in the flow can be characterised with length scale  $l_0$ , characteristic velocity scale  $u_0$  and time scale  $\tau_0$  for which the Reynolds number  $Re_0$  is comparable to the flow  $Re$ . However, these large eddies are unstable and break-up to transfer energy to smaller eddies which undergo a similarly successive break-up process until a point of sufficiently small eddies with stable motion is reached where molecular viscosity acts to dissipate the kinetic energy of the eddies. According to Kolmogorov's hypothesis, these small scale eddies are statistically isotropic and exhibit universal behaviour that can be determined by  $\nu$  and dissipation rate  $\epsilon$ . Based on unit analysis, the characteristic length  $\eta$ , velocity  $u_\eta$  and time  $\tau_\eta$  scales of these small scale Kolmogorov eddies are identified in equations 1.5-1.7 [16].

$$\eta = \left( \frac{\nu^3}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/4} \quad (1.5)$$

$$u_\eta = (\nu\epsilon)^{1/4} \quad (1.6)$$

$$\tau_\eta = \left( \frac{\nu}{\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} \quad (1.7)$$

The ratio between the largest and smallest turbulent scales can be expressed as a function of flow  $Re$  number as expressed in equations 1.8 and 1.9. As can be identified, the range of turbulent scales increase exponentially with flow Reynolds number. A DNS requires sufficiently small cell size and time step to accurately resolve the smallest eddies along with a suitable computational domain to capture the geometry and large eddies [16]. Therefore, with current computational resources, DNS of industry relevant flows, where  $Re$  can be in the order of  $10^{6-8}$ , is impossible.

$$\frac{\eta}{l_0} = Re^{-3/4} \quad (1.8)$$

$$\frac{\tau_\eta}{\tau_0} = Re^{-1/2} \quad (1.9)$$

An alternative to DNS is the Large Eddy Simulation (LES) method where only the large energy containing eddies of turbulence are solved for and the effect of the small eddies is modelled. The velocity field is decomposed into the resolved component  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  and unresolved subgrid-scale (SGS) component  $\mathbf{u}^{sgs}$  by using a filtering operation. The resolved component represents the motion of the large eddies for which the Navier Stokes equations are solved. The effect of the smaller scales is represented using the SGS tensor based on closure models that rely on assumptions of universal characteristics of small eddies [16].

Similar to the velocity field, LES of passive scalar transport involves filtering the scalar  $\phi$  into resolved  $\tilde{\phi}$  component and subgrid-scale  $\phi^{sgs}$  component. The SGS scalar flux  $\sigma_i$ , given by equation 1.10 is then closed by different models such as eddy diffusivity Smagorinsky model [4].

$$\sigma_i = \widetilde{u_i \phi} - \tilde{u}_i \tilde{\phi} \quad (1.10)$$

While LES models have grown in use for analysing fluid flows in recent years, they are still computationally intensive for industry relevant flows. Instead, solving the Reynolds Averaged Navier Stokes (RANS) equations is the most widely used method. The RANS equations can be obtained from the NS equations by (Reynolds) decomposing the velocity into a mean quantity  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$  and a fluctuating quantity  $\mathbf{u}'$ . The mean quantity represents the average value at a point over a fixed time interval. Similar decomposition is applied to the pressure and passive scalar to derive the full-form RANS equations [18].

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}_j}{\partial x_j} = 0 \quad (1.11)$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial t} + \bar{u}_j \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{p}}{\partial x_i} + \nu \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j^2} - \frac{\partial \overline{u'_i u'_j}}{\partial x_j} \quad (1.12)$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\phi}}{\partial t} + \bar{u}_j \frac{\partial \bar{\phi}}{\partial x_j} = \Gamma \frac{\partial^2 \bar{\phi}}{\partial x_j^2} - \frac{\partial \overline{u'_j \phi'}}{\partial x_j} \quad (1.13)$$

Equations 1.11-1.13 represent the RANS equations wherein terms  $\overline{u'_i u'_j}$  and  $\overline{u'_j \phi'}$  represent the Reynolds stress tensor and scalar flux vector, respectively. The Reynold stress tensor  $R_{ij}$  represents six additional unknowns (symmetric tensor) that need to be modelled to close the RANS momentum equation. Similarly, the scalar flux vector leads to an additional three unknowns that represent turbulent scalar fluxes that need to be modelled for closure of the passive scalar transport equation (1.13).

As the focus of this thesis is on modelling of the heat transport equation, the scalar flux term is treated as the turbulent heat flux term (THF) for which the  $\overline{u'_i \theta'}$  notation is adopted. Furthermore,  $\Gamma$  is treated as  $\alpha$  whereby the thermal diffusivity is defined in equation 1.14,  $Pr$  is the molecular Prandtl number and  $\theta$  represents the scalar temperature field. Finally, the focus of the thesis is on steady-state simulations and as such, the time-dependent gradient terms are dropped from the RANS equations for the rest of the report.

$$\alpha = \frac{\nu}{Pr} \quad (1.14)$$

## 1.2 Gradient Diffusion Models

The most widely adopted method for modelling the THF term is based on the gradient diffusion hypothesis wherein the scalar flux is linearly related to the mean temperature (scalar) gradient as given in equation 1.15. The diffusivity tensor  $\epsilon_h^{ij}$  represents the most generalised form for these models but is typically reduced to a scalar value [7].

$$\overline{u'_i \theta'} = -\epsilon_h^{ij} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j} \quad (1.15)$$

As mentioned, the most widely adopted gradient diffusion model assumes a singular scalar value to relate the THF to the mean scalar gradient called the gradient diffusion hypothesis (GDH). The underlying assumption of the GDH is that the turbulent transport of the scalar flux is down to the mean scalar gradient in the direction of  $-\nabla \cdot \phi$  related with the turbulent diffusivity term  $\alpha_t$  analogous to Fourier's law of heat conduction ([16]) which implies isotropic

turbulence. A further simplification is also typically employed in the GDH model based on the Reynolds analogy that assumes a similarity between turbulent momentum exchange and turbulent heat transfer ([2]) described in equation 1.16.

$$\overline{u'_i \theta'} = -\alpha_t \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j} = \frac{Pr_t}{\nu_t} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j} \quad (1.16)$$

In equation 1.16,  $Pr_t$  represents the turbulent Prandtl number and  $\nu_t$  is the turbulent eddy viscosity.  $Pr_t$  can be characterised as a function of the turbulent shear stress, the turbulent heat flux, the velocity gradient and the temperature gradient ([10]). Based on these quantities, numerous experimental studies have been performed to obtain empirical relations for the  $Pr_t$  number.

The simplest model proposed by Reynolds assumes that heat and momentum are transferred by the same processes, and as such values of  $\nu_t$  and  $\alpha_t$  are the same leading to turbulent Prandtl number of unity ([5]). Kays ([10]) showed that such an assumption of a constant turbulent Prandtl number holds true for the unique case of turbulent flow over a flat plate (zero streamwise pressure gradient) and that a constant  $Pr_t \approx 0.85$  number can be obtained based on curve fitting of the 'log-law' region of the thermal boundary layer. However, Kays also acknowledged the numerous limitation of applying this model for more complicated flow fields. Results from [3] and [17], evaluating the effect of pressure gradient on  $Pr_t$ , show that a favourable pressure gradient leads to an increase in  $Pr_t$  and an adverse pressure gradient leads to a decrease. Furthermore, Kays stated that the constant  $Pr_t$  only captures the log-law region of the thermal boundary layer but doesn't hold true for the sublayer and the 'wake' region at the outer edge of the thermal boundary layer. Instead, in the wake region, the  $Pr_t$  tends to decrease to 0.5-0.7 which represents the limitation of the model away from the wall. Alternatively, in the near-wall sublayer, empirical evidence shows a substantial increase in  $Pr_t$  ([22]). Kays also acknowledged that such a relation only holds true for moderate to high  $Pr$  number where molecular diffusivity is negligible in comparison to turbulent diffusivity.

To overcome these limitations, various algebraic equations have been proposed to calculate  $Pr_t$  analogous to the zero equation mixing length models for the closure of Reynolds stress tensor. A modification made to the constant  $Pr_t$  number was made by Jenkins who introduced the dependence of  $Pr_t$  on molecular  $Pr$ . Jenkins proposed a model based on heat conducting in or out of a turbulent eddy traversing orthogonal to the mean flow and proposed a relation based on the normalised turbulent eddy viscosity  $\nu_t^+ = \frac{\nu_t}{\nu}$  and the  $Pr$  number. The Jenkins model showed good correlation with low to moderate  $Pr$  experimental flows but required additional factors for better correlation with empirical data at higher Prandtl number ( $Pr = 0.7$ ) ([5]).

Cebeci ([5]) proposed a model for a wall-distance based turbulent Prandtl number inspired by Van Driest modelling of the viscous sublayer for Stokes flow and Prandtl's mixing length theory. The proposed model is defined by equation 1.17 and specified wall  $Pr_t$  prescribed by equation 1.18. In equation 1.17, expression for  $k_m$ ,  $k_h$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  are proposed based on analytical and experimental observations. In particular, expressions for  $k_m$  are based on Prandtl's mixing length concept for turbulent shear stress and value for  $A$  is empirically derived based on flat plate turbulent boundary layer data. Similarly,  $k_h$  and  $B$  are based on



turbulent thermal boundary layer properties for incompressible flat plate flow.

$$Pr_t = \frac{k_m}{k_h} \frac{1 - e^{-y/A}}{1 - e^{-y/B}} \quad (1.17)$$

$$Pr_t = \frac{k_m}{k_h} \frac{B}{A} = \frac{k_m}{k_h} \frac{B^+}{A^{A^+}} \quad (1.18)$$

Yokhot et al. [21] presented an analytical solution for the  $Pr_t$  based on the renormalisation group method to describe the process of heat transfer in turbulent pipe flow. They deduced a dependence of  $Pr_t$  on molecular  $Pr$  and the ratio  $\frac{\nu_t}{\nu}$  and showed it's applicability to a wide range of  $Pr$  numbers where  $Pr_t$  converges to 0.85 for high values of  $\frac{\nu_t}{\nu}$  ([19]). Further advancements in the modelling of the turbulent Prandtl number were proposed by [9]. With a modification introduced by [20], the extended formulation for the  $Pr_t$  was given in relation with the turbulent Peclet number ( $Pe_t$ ) given in equation 1.19 where  $Pr_{t,\infty}$  is given by expression 1.20. Furthermore, the  $Pe_t$  number is defined by equation 1.21 and constants C and D have values 0.31 and 100, respectively [19].

$$Pr_t = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2Pr_{t,\infty}} + CPe_t \sqrt{\frac{1}{Pr_{t,\infty}}} - (CPe_t)^2 \left(1 - e^{\frac{-1}{CPe_t \sqrt{Pr_{t,\infty}}}}\right)} \quad (1.19)$$

$$Pr_{t,\infty} = 0.85 + \frac{D}{PrRe^{0.888}} \quad (1.20)$$

$$Pe_t = Pr \frac{\nu_t}{\nu} \quad (1.21)$$

While these mixing length models improve the modelling of  $Pr_t$  for simple wall bounded flows, they are still poor for complex wall-free flows like scalar mixing due to jets. Furthermore, these models fail to account for transport phenomena like temperature fluctuations being transported from one area to another independent of the quality of locally modelled  $Pr_t$  [6].

### Scalar variance models

Instead, one or two equation models can be adopted which solve additional transport equations to obtain turbulent thermal timescales to derive the appropriate turbulent diffusivity  $\alpha_t$  as represented in equation 1.22.  $\tau_m$  represents a hybrid time-scale which is a function of scalar time-scale for temperature fluctuation  $\tau_\theta$  and dynamic time-scale for turbulent eddies  $\tau_u = \frac{k}{\epsilon}$ .

$$\alpha_t = C_\lambda f_\lambda \tau_m \quad (1.22)$$

For turbulent heat transport, typically transport equations for thermal variance  $k_\theta = \frac{\overline{\theta'^2}}{2}$  and thermal dissipation rate  $\epsilon_\theta$  are solved [? ]. The thermal time-scale is resolved as  $\tau_\theta = \frac{k_\theta}{\epsilon_\theta}$ .

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}k_\theta}{\mathcal{D}t} = D_{k_\theta} + \mathcal{T}_{k_\theta} + \mathcal{P}_{k_\theta} - \epsilon_\theta \quad (1.23)$$

Equation 1.23 represents the full transport equation for  $k_\theta$ . The left hand side term represents the advection of scalar variance represented using substantial derivative  $\frac{\mathcal{D}(\cdot)}{\mathcal{D}t} = \frac{\partial(\cdot)}{\partial t} + u_j \frac{\partial(\cdot)}{\partial x_j}$ . The terms on the right hand side represent production  $\mathcal{P}_{k_\theta}$ , molecular diffusion  $D_{k_\theta}$ , turbulent diffusion  $\mathcal{T}_{k_\theta}$  and dissipation  $\epsilon_\theta$  given in equations 1.24 - 1.27, respectively.

$$\mathcal{P}_{k_\theta} = -\overline{u'_j \theta'} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j} \quad (1.24)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{k_\theta} = -\frac{\overline{\partial u'_j k'_\theta}}{\partial x_j} \quad (1.25)$$

$$D_{k_\theta} = \alpha \frac{\partial^2 k_\theta}{\partial x_j^2} \quad (1.26)$$

$$\epsilon_\theta = \alpha \frac{\overline{\partial \theta' \partial \theta'}}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} \quad (1.27)$$

The triple correlation term in  $\mathcal{T}_{k_\theta}$  (eq:1.25) and Reynolds averaging of fluctuating scalar field in  $\epsilon_\theta$  (eq:1.27) introduce additional unknowns that need to be modelled for the closure of the transport equation of  $k_\theta$ . The turbulent diffusion term is typically approximated based on a gradient transport model which in a typical one or two equation model is given in equation 1.28 [?] [22]. For a second order closure model, the turbulent diffusion accounts for anisotropic turbulence by incorporating the resolved  $R_{ij}$  tensor as given in equation 1.29 [11].

$$\mathcal{T}_{k_\theta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( \frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma_\theta} \frac{\partial k_\theta}{\partial x_j} \right) \quad (1.28)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{k_\theta} = C_{k_\theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( \frac{k}{\epsilon} \overline{u'_i u'_j} \frac{\partial k_\theta}{\partial x_j} \right) \quad (1.29)$$

For modelling the thermal variance dissipation, either a full transport equation for  $\epsilon_\theta$  is solved or an algebraic formulation based on a time scale ratio  $R$  given in equation 1.30. Based on the assumption that the ratio of thermal and dynamic time-scales is constant in an equilibrium boundary layer, a simple algebraic expression for  $\epsilon_\theta$  is proposed given in equation 1.31. Typically, a constant value of  $R = 0.5$  is assumed [11]. However, the assumption of a constant time scale ratio through the whole domain doesn't hold true for even simple shear flows as shown by the DNS of passive scalar transport for turbulent channel flows [8] where  $R$  deviates significantly near-wall and at the channel centre. Furthermore, specifying wall and algebraic models for  $R$  can be as difficult as specifying  $Pr_t$  itself specially in flows where  $Pr$  differs from unity [6].

$$R = \frac{\tau_\theta}{\tau_u} \quad (1.30)$$

$$\epsilon_\theta = \frac{\epsilon}{R} \frac{k_\theta}{k} \quad (1.31)$$

To overcome the limitation of the constant time-scale ratio, a transport equation for  $\epsilon_\theta$  can be directly solved for given in equation 1.32. The transport equation for  $\epsilon_\theta$  has a similar structure to that of  $k_\theta$  where  $D_{\epsilon_\theta}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_\theta}$  represent the molecular and turbulent diffusion of  $\epsilon_\theta$ . The equations for these terms has the same form as equations 1.26 and 1.25, respectively wherein  $k_\theta$  can be replaced by  $\epsilon_\theta$ . The  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^1$  -  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^4$  represent the production terms.  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^1$  represents production due to mean scalar gradient as shown in equation 1.33. Similarly,  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^2$  represents production due to mean velocity gradient represented in equation 1.34. The other production terms,  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^3$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^4$  represent the gradient and turbulent production, respectively shown in equations 1.35 and 1.36. Finally,  $\Upsilon_{\epsilon_\theta}$  represents the destruction term given in equation 1.37 [12].

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}\epsilon_\theta}{\mathcal{D}t} = D_{\epsilon_\theta} + \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_\theta} + \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^1 + \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^3 + \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^4 - \Upsilon_{\epsilon_\theta} \quad (1.32)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^1 = -2\alpha \overline{\frac{\partial u'_j}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j}} \quad (1.33)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^2 = -2\alpha \overline{\frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_j}{\partial x_k}} \quad (1.34)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^3 = -2\alpha u_j \overline{\frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j \partial x_k}} \quad (1.35)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^4 = -2\alpha \overline{\frac{\partial u'_j}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial \theta'}{\partial x_j}} \quad (1.36)$$

$$\Upsilon_{\epsilon_\theta} = 2\alpha^2 \overline{\left( \frac{\partial^2 \theta'}{\partial x_k \partial x_j} \right)^2} \quad (1.37)$$

The transport of  $\epsilon_\theta$  introduces additional knowns that need to be modelled for the closure of equation 1.32. Numerous scalar variance and dissipation models have been proposed that provide a complete model for the  $k_\theta$  and  $\epsilon_\theta$  equations along with equations for the hybrid time-scale  $\tau_m$  [22].

One of the early scalar variance models was proposed by Nagano and Kim [13] (NK model), wherein the hybrid time-scale is modelled as  $\tau_m = \sqrt{\tau_\theta \tau_u} = \tau_u \sqrt{2R}$ . The turbulent diffusion terms for both scalar variance and dissipation is modelled based on gradient-diffusion models similar to the form of equation 1.28. The  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^1$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^2$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^4$  and  $\Upsilon_{\epsilon_\theta}$  are modelled together based on a linear combination of mean flow gradients and time-scale ratios given in equation 1.38.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^1 + \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^4 + \Upsilon_{\epsilon_\theta} = & -C_{P1} f_{P1} \frac{2\epsilon_\theta}{k_\theta} \overline{u'_j \theta'} \frac{\partial \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j} - C_{P2} f_{P2} \frac{\epsilon_\theta}{k} \overline{u'_i u'_j} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j} \\ & - C_{D1} f_{D1} \frac{2\epsilon_\theta^2}{k_\theta} - C_{D2} f_{D2} \frac{\epsilon \epsilon_\theta}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (1.38)$$

For the remaining gradient production  $\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^3$ , an approximation given in equation 1.39 is proposed with  $\alpha_t$  defined by equation 1.22. The model function  $f_\lambda$  along with individual model function terms in equation 1.38 are introduced to model wall proximity effects and the model coefficients are optimised for the case of homogeneous scalar turbulence.

$$\mathcal{P}_{\epsilon_\theta}^3 = \alpha \alpha_t (1 - f_\lambda) \overline{\left( \frac{\partial^2 \bar{\theta}}{\partial x_j \partial x_k} \right)^2} \quad (1.39)$$

The NK model showed improvements over the GDH models specially in cases like thermal entry region of a pipe where the Reynold's analogy doesn't hold true and  $Pr_t$  varies significantly [13]. However, further studies highlighted the limitation of the model for cases with varying wall temperature [22] as the  $\tau_m$  time-scale, which characterises large scale motion fails, is applied adjacent to walls where small scale dissipation is more dominant [14].

Therefore, model improvements have been proposed that aim to better capture near-wall turbulence characteristics by altering the function for  $\tau_m$  or adding damping functions. Nagano et al. [15] proposed a new ratio for time-scale  $\tau_m = \tau_u (2R)^2$  and added damping functions to improve near wall characteristics. Such a formulation allows for high variation in  $\tau_m$  for a given time-scale ratio  $R$  and thus, allows for smaller hybrid time-scale if the  $\tau_\theta$  and  $\tau_u$  time-

scales are modelled accurately. Abe et al. [1] introduced the widely adopted AKN model which introduces a new relation for  $\tau_m = \frac{2}{\frac{1}{\tau_u} + \frac{0.5}{\tau_\theta}}$  based on a harmonic average of thermal and dynamic time-scales such that the shorter time-scale is more weighted. The AKN model also introduces a new normalisation factor  $u_\epsilon \equiv (\nu\epsilon)^{1/4}$  instead of the friction velocity  $u_\tau$  which becomes zero at points of separation and attachment. Equation

---

## Bibliography

- [1] K. Abe, T. Kondoh, and Y. Nagano. A new turbulence model for predicting fluid flow and heat transfer in separating and reattaching flows-II. Thermal field calculations. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 38(8):1467–1481, 1995. ISSN 00179310. doi: 10.1016/0017-9310(94)00252-Q.
- [2] Y. Bartosiewicz and M. Duponcheel. Large-eddy simulation: Application to liquid metal fluid flow and heat transfer. *Thermal Hydraulics Aspects of Liquid Metal Cooled Nuclear Reactors*, pages 245–271, jan 2019. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-101980-1.00017-X. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B978008101980100017X>.
- [3] B. F. Blackwell, W. M. Kays, and R. J. Moffat. The turbulent boundary layer on a porous plate: An experimental study of the heat transfer behavior with adverse pressure gradients. aug 1972. URL <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=19730006564>.
- [4] Greg Burton. Large-eddy simulation of passive-scalar mixing using multifractal subgrid-scale modeling. *Annual Research Briefs 2005*, pages 211–222, 2005. URL <http://ctr.stanford.edu/ResBriefs05/burton05.pdf>.
- [5] T. Cebeci. A Model for Eddy Conductivity and Turbulent Prandtl Number. *Journal of Heat Transfer*, 95(2):227–234, may 1973. ISSN 0022-1481. doi: 10.1115/1.3450031. URL <https://asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/heattransfer/article/95/2/227/416697/A-Model-for-Eddy-Conductivity-and-Turbulent>.
- [6] G. Grötzbach. Anisotropy and Buoyancy in Nuclear Turbulent Heat Transfer – Critical Assessment and Needs for Modelling. 2007.
- [7] G. Grötzbach. Challenges in low-Prandtl number heat transfer simulation and modelling. *Nuclear Engineering and Design*, 264:41–55, nov 2013. ISSN 00295493. doi: 10.1016/j.nucengdes.2012.09.039. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0029549313000952>.
- [8] Arne V. Johansson and Petra M. Wikström. DNS and Modelling of Passive Scalar Transport in Turbulent Channel Flow with a Focus on Scalar Dissipation Rate Modelling. *Flow, Turbulence and Combustion*, 63(1/4):223–245, 2000. ISSN 13866184. doi: 10.1023/A:1009948606944. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1023/A:1009948606944>.
- [9] W. M. (William Morrow) Kays and M. E. (Michael E.) Crawford. *Convective heat and mass transfer*. McGraw-Hill, 1993. ISBN 0070337217.

- [10] William M. Kays. Turbulent Prandtl Number—Where Are We? *Journal of Heat Transfer*, 116(2):284–295, may 1994. ISSN 0022-1481. doi: 10.1115/1.2911398. URL <https://asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/heattransfer/article/116/2/284/383190/Turbulent-Prandtl-NumberWhere-Are-We>.
- [11] Michael Leschziner. *Statistical Turbulence Modelling for Fluid Dynamics — Demystified*. IMPERIAL COLLEGE PRESS, oct 2015. ISBN 978-1-78326-660-9. doi: 10.1142/p997. URL <https://www.worldscientific.com/worldscibooks/10.1142/p997>.
- [12] Y. Nagano. Modelling Heat Transfer in Near-Wall Flows. In *Closure Strategies for Turbulent and Transitional Flows*, pages 188–247. Cambridge University Press, jan 2001. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511755385.008. URL [https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/CBO9780511755385A016/type/book{\\_}part](https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/CBO9780511755385A016/type/book{_}part).
- [13] Y. Nagano and C. Kim. A Two-Equation Model for Heat Transport in Wall Turbulent Shear Flows. *Journal of Heat Transfer*, 110(3):583–589, aug 1988. ISSN 0022-1481. doi: 10.1115/1.3250532. URL <https://asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/heattransfer/article/110/3/583/382763/A-TwoEquation-Model-for-Heat-Transport-in-Wall>.
- [14] Y. Nagano and M. Shimada. Development of a two-equation heat transfer model based on direct simulations of turbulent flows with different Prandtl numbers. *Physics of Fluids*, 8(12):3379–3402, 1996. ISSN 10706631. doi: 10.1063/1.869124.
- [15] Y. Nagano and Y.M. Tagawa. An improved two-equation heat transfer model for wall turbulent shear flows. *Proc. ASME-JSME Thermal Eng. Joint Conf. 3, 1991*, pages 233–240, 1991. URL <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/10012380500/>.
- [16] Stephen B. Pope. *Turbulent Flows*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. ISBN 9780511840531. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511840531. URL <http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9780511840531>.
- [17] P. S. Roganov, V. P. Zabolotsky, E. V. Shishov, and A. I. Leontiev. Some aspects of turbulent heat transfer in accelerated flows on permeable surfaces. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 27(8):1251–1259, aug 1984. ISSN 00179310. doi: 10.1016/0017-9310(84)90053-X. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/001793108490053X>.
- [18] Riccardo Rossi. A numerical study of algebraic flux models for heat and mass transport simulation in complex flows. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 53(21-22):4511–4524, 2010. ISSN 00179310. doi: 10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2010.06.042. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2010.06.042>.
- [19] Chiranth Srinivasan and Dimitrios V. Papavassiliou. Prediction of the turbulent Prandtl number in wall flows with Lagrangian simulations. *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Research*, 50(15):8881–8891, aug 2011. ISSN 08885885. doi: 10.1021/ie1019497. URL <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/ie1019497>.
- [20] B. Weigand, J.R. Ferguson, and M.E. Crawford. An extended Kays and Crawford turbulent Prandtl number model. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 40(17):4191–4196, oct 1997. ISSN 0017-9310. doi: 10.1016/S0017-9310(97)00084-7. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0017931097000847>.

- 
- [21] Victor Yakhot, Steven A. Orszag, and Alexander Yakhot. Heat transfer in turbulent fluids—I. Pipe flow. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 30(1):15–22, jan 1987. ISSN 0017-9310. doi: 10.1016/0017-9310(87)90057-3. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0017931087900573>.
- [22] Dennis A. Yoder. Comparison of turbulent thermal diffusivity and scalar variance models. *54th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting*, 2016. doi: 10.2514/6.2016-1561.







