

Development of a regularization term in a TLES code in OpenFOAM

Samuel Maloney

Computational Science and Engineering Master

Seminar in Fluid Dynamics for CSE HS 2017

Institute of Fluid Dynamics
ETH Zürich

Supervisor: Daniel Oberle

Professor: Patrick Jenny

Abstract

Text

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	TLES	1
1.2	Regularization	1
1.3	Divergence Cleaning	2
2	Implementation	3
3	Results	4
4	Conclusion	5
	Bibliography	6

1 Introduction

DNS is computationally expensive, so go TLES!

1.1 TLES

Since for TLES filtering is done during the course of the numerical experiments, the filtering operation must be *causal*, ie. it must depend only upon the current and previous values of the quantity being filtered and not on any future values. Letting an overbar denote a time-filtered quantity and T denote the characteristic filter width, one obtains the following causal time-filtering operation for some filter kernel $G(t, T)$:

$$\bar{f}(t, T) = \int_{-\infty}^t G(\tau - t; T) f(\tau) d\tau$$

In this work only the exponential filter is discussed, namely:

$$G(t; T) = \frac{\exp(t/T)}{T} \longrightarrow \bar{f}(t, T) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{-\infty}^t \exp\left(\frac{\tau - t}{T}\right) f(\tau) d\tau$$

which is a second order low-pass filter and has the transfer function:

$$H(\omega, T) = \frac{1}{1 + iT\omega}$$

Since the integral formulation would require storage of the quantity at all previous time points in the simulation, the following equivalent differential form is used for implementation, as it can be integrated using standard time-marching schemes to update the filtered quantities at each step (where the explicit time-dependence of the quantities is now dropped for convenience):

$$\frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial t} = \frac{f - \bar{f}}{T}$$

1.2 Regularization

A regularization term based on work by Åkervik et al. [3] was investigated as a potential means to improve the stability of the method, and is outlined here.

1.3 Divergence Cleaning

An implicit condition of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations is that the divergence of the velocity field must be zero. However, numerical discretization schemes generally lead to non-zero values of the divergence which can be a potential source of instability during simulations. To this end, explicit divergence cleaning (DC) using the projection scheme, following the procedure outlined in section 5 of the work by Tóth [5] for DC of magnetic fields, was also considered for possible stabilizing effects.

2 Implementation

Implementation of the regularization term and divergence cleaning scheme was carried out using the open source OpenFOAM CFD code. For this seminar, a solver implementing the fundamental TLES methodology, which had been developed during a previous project, was used as a starting code.

3 Results

All simulations were carried out on the standard Pitz-Daily backward facing step geometry provided with OpenFOAM. The numerical viscosity of $\nu = 10^{-5}m^2/s$ and the inlet velocity of $u = 10m/s$ were kept constant for all runs. Using this inlet velocity and the channel width $L = 50.8mm$, the Reynold's number of the flow can be approximated as:

$$Re = \frac{uL}{\nu} = 50800$$

Since most cases of instability in the simulation manifested within the first few dozen time steps (approx. 30-40 or less), and given the large number of parameter sets that needed to be tested, for the purposes of this resport a simulation was considered 'stable' if it ran for 100 timesteps without failing. It is noted that a small number of the runs performed crashed even after 80+ timesteps, so this 100 timestep rule is certainly not an ironclad guarantee of stability over a much longer run. However, as in all of these cases it was the transition from stable to unstable that was under investigation, it suffices to warn that the reported minimal χ values required for stability should be regarded as providing only marginal stability, and slightly larger values might be safer in a real simulation to provide some margin of safety.

4 Conclusion

Bibliography

- [1] C. PRUETT, “Temporal large-eddy simulation: theory and implementation,” *Theor. Comput. Fluid Dyn.* **22**, 275 (2008).
- [2] S. STOLZ, N.A. ADAMS, AND L. KLEISER, “An approximate deconvolution model for large-eddy simulation with application to incompressible wall-bounded flows,” *Phys. Fluids* **13**, 997 (2001).
- [3] A. ÅKERVIK, L. BRANDT, D. S. HENNINGSON, J. HØPFFNER, O. MARXEN, AND P. SCHLATTER, “Steady solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations by selective frequency damping,” *Phys. Fluids* **18**, 068102 (2006).
- [4] P. JENNY, “Unsteady RANS closure,” Unpublished (2016).
- [5] G. TÓTH, “The $\nabla \cdot B = 0$ Constraint in Shock-Capturing Magnetohydrodynamics Codes,” *J. Comput. Fluids* **161**, 605 (2000).