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Block-structured adaptive mesh refinement (SAMR)

For simplicity \( \partial_t q(x, y, t) + \partial_x f(q(x, y, t)) + \partial_y g(q(x, y, t)) = 0 \)

- Refined blocks overlay coarser ones
- Refinement in space and time by factor \( r_l \)
  [Berger and Colella, 1988]
- Block (aka patch) based data structures
  + Numerical scheme

\[
Q_{jk}^{n+1} = Q_{jk}^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \left[ F_{j+\frac{1}{2},k} - F_{j-\frac{1}{2},k} \right] \\
- \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta y} \left[ G_{j,k+\frac{1}{2}} - G_{j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \right]
\]

only for single patch necessary
+ Efficient cache-reuse / vectorization possible
- Cluster-algorithm necessary

Papers: [Deiterding, 2011a, Deiterding et al., 2009b, Deiterding et al., 2007]
Level transfer / setting of ghost cells

Conservative averaging (restriction):

\[ \hat{Q}_{jk}^l := \frac{1}{(r_{l+1})^2} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{r_{l+1}-1} \sum_{\iota=0}^{r_{l+1}-1} Q_{v+\kappa,w+\iota}^{l+1} \]

Bilinear interpolation (prolongation):

\[ \check{Q}_{vw}^{l+1} := (1 - f_1)(1 - f_2) Q_{j-1,k-1}^l + f_1(1 - f_2) Q_{j,k-1}^l + (1 - f_1)f_2 Q_{j-1,k}^l + f_1f_2 Q_{jk}^l \]

For boundary conditions: linear time interpolation

\[ \check{Q}_{\kappa}^{l+1}(t+\kappa\Delta t_{l+1}) := \left( 1 - \frac{\kappa}{r_{l+1}} \right) \check{Q}_{\kappa}^{l+1}(t) + \frac{\kappa}{r_{l+1}} \check{Q}_{\kappa}^{l+1}(t+\Delta t_l) \quad \text{for } \kappa = 0, \ldots, r_{l+1} \]
Recursive integration order

- Space-time interpolation of coarse data to set $I^l_i, i > 0$
- Regridding:
  - Creation of new grids, copy existing cells on level $l > 0$
  - Spatial interpolation to initialize new cells on level $l > 0$

![Diagram showing levels and regridding](image)
Conservative flux correction

Example: Cell \( j, k \)

\[
\dot{Q}^l_{jk}(t + \Delta t_l) = Q^l_{jk}(t) - \frac{\Delta t_l}{\Delta x_{1,l}} \left( F^l_{j+\frac{1}{2},k} - \frac{1}{r^2_{l+1}} \sum_{\kappa=0}^{r_{l+1}-1} \sum_{\iota=0}^{r_{l+1}-1} F^l+1_{v+\frac{1}{2},w+\iota}(t + \kappa \Delta t_{l+1}) \right)
- \frac{\Delta t_l}{\Delta x_{2,l}} \left( G^l_{j,k+\frac{1}{2}} - G^l_{j,k-\frac{1}{2}} \right)
\]

Correction pass:

1. \( \delta F^{l+1}_{j-\frac{1}{2},k} := -F^{l}_{j-\frac{1}{2},k} \)

2. \( \delta F^{l+1}_{j-\frac{1}{2},k} := \delta F^{l+1}_{j-\frac{1}{2},k} + \frac{1}{r^2_{l+1}} \sum_{\iota=0}^{r_{l+1}-1} F^l+1_{v+\frac{1}{2},w+\iota}(t + \kappa \Delta t_{l+1}) \)

3. \( \dot{Q}^l_{jk}(t + \Delta t_l) := Q^l_{jk}(t + \Delta t_l) + \frac{\Delta t_l}{\Delta x_{1,l}} \delta F^{l+1}_{j-\frac{1}{2},k} \)
Level-set method for boundary embedding

- Implicit boundary representation via distance function $\varphi$, normal $n = \nabla \varphi / |\nabla \varphi|$
- Complex boundary moving with local velocity $w$, treat interface as moving rigid wall [Deiterding et al., 2007]
- Construction of values in embedded boundary cells by interpolation / extrapolation [Deiterding, 2009, Deiterding, 2011a]
- Creation of level set from triangulated surface data with closest-point-transform (CPT) algorithm [Mauch, 2003, Deiterding et al., 2006]

Interpolate / constant value extrapolate values at

$\tilde{x} = x + 2\varphi n$

Velocity in ghost cells (slip):

$u' = (2w \cdot n - u \cdot n)n + (u \cdot t)t$

$= 2((w - u) \cdot n)n + u$
Parallelization

Rigorous domain decomposition
- Data of all levels resides on same node
- Grid hierarchy defines unique "floor-plan"
- Workload estimation

\[ W(\Omega) = \sum_{l=0}^{l_{\text{max}}} \mathcal{N}_l(G_l \cap \Omega) \prod_{\kappa=0}^{l} r_{\kappa} \]

- Parallel operations
  - Synchronization of ghost cells
  - Redistribution of data blocks within regridding operation
  - Flux correction of coarse grid cells
- Dynamic partitioning with space-filling curve

[Deiterding, 2005, Deiterding, 2011a]
AMROC framework and most important patch solvers

- Implements described algorithms and facilitates easy exchange of the block-based numerical scheme
- Hybrid WENO methods for LES and DNS: [Pantano et al., 2007, Lombardini and Deiterding, 2010, Ziegler et al., 2011, Cerminara et al., 2018]
- FSI deformation from water hammer: [Cirak et al., 2007, Deiterding et al., 2009a, Perotti et al., 2013, Wan et al., 2017]
- Level-set method for Eulerian solid mechanics: [Barton et al., 2013]
- Ideal magneto-hydrodynamics: [Gomes et al., 2015, Souza Lopes et al., 2018]
- ~500,000 LOC in C++, C, Fortran-77, Fortran-90
- V2.0 plus FSI coupling routines as open source at http://www.vtf.website
- Used here V3.0 with significantly enhanced parallelization (V2.1 not released)
AMROC strong scalability tests

3D wave propagation method with Roe scheme: spherical blast wave
- Tests run IBM BG/P (mode VN)

Time per highest level step

![Graph showing time per highest level step against CPUs]

64 × 32 × 32 base grid, 2 additional levels with factors 2, 4; uniform 512 × 256 × 256 = 33.6 · 10^6 cells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Grids</th>
<th>Cells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>65,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>271,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>7,190,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3D SRT-lattice Boltzmann scheme: flow over rough surface of 19 × 13 × 2 spheres
- Tests run Cray XC30m (Archer)

Time per highest level step

![Graph showing time per highest level step against CPUs]

360 × 240 × 108 base grid, 2 additional levels with factors 2, 4; uniform 1440 × 1920 × 432 = 1.19 · 10^9 cells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Grids</th>
<th>Cells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>9,331,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21367</td>
<td>24,844,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>10,838,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governing equations

Axisymmetric Navier-Stokes equations with chemical reaction

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}_v)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g}_v)}{\partial y} = \frac{\alpha}{y} (\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{g} + \mathbf{g}_v) + \mathbf{s}
\]

\[
\mathbf{q} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_i \\ \rho_u \\ \rho_v \\ \rho E \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{f} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_i u \\ \rho u^2 + p \\ \rho u v \\ u (\rho E + p) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_i v \\ \rho u v \\ \rho v^2 + p \\ v (\rho E + p) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{c} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{s} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\omega} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
f_v = \begin{bmatrix} \\ \rho D_i \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\tau_{xx}}{\tau_{xy}} + k \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + \rho \sum_j h_j D_j \frac{\partial Y_j}{\partial x} + u \tau_{xx} + v \tau_{xy} \\ \frac{\tau_{yy}}{\tau_{xy}} \\ \frac{\tau_{yy}}{\tau_{xy}} + k \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} + \rho \sum_j h_j D_j \frac{\partial Y_j}{\partial y} + u \tau_{xy} + v \tau_{yy} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
g_v = \begin{bmatrix} \\ \rho D_i \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\tau_{xy}}{\tau_{xx}} + k \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} + \rho \sum_j h_j D_j \frac{\partial Y_j}{\partial y} + u \tau_{xy} + v \tau_{yy} \\ \frac{\tau_{xx}}{\tau_{xy}} \\ \frac{\tau_{xx}}{\tau_{xy}} + k \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + \rho \sum_j h_j D_j \frac{\partial Y_j}{\partial x} + u \tau_{xx} + v \tau_{xy} \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\tau_{xx} = \frac{2}{3} \mu (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) + 2 \mu \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \\
\tau_{yy} = \frac{2}{3} \mu (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) + 2 \mu \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \\
\tau_{\theta\theta} = \frac{2}{3} \mu (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) + 2 \mu \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial y} \\
\tau_{xy} = \mu \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right) \\
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + \frac{\alpha v}{y} \right)
\]
Equation of state

Ideal gas law and Dalton’s law for gas-mixtures

\[
p(\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_K, T) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \rho_i = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \rho_i \frac{R}{W_i} T = \rho \frac{R}{W} T \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{K} \rho_i = \rho, \quad Y_i = \frac{\rho_i}{\rho}
\]

Caloric equation

\[
h(Y_1, \ldots, Y_K, T) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} Y_i h_i(T) \quad \text{with} \quad h_i(T) = h_i^0 + \int_0^T c_{pi}(s) ds
\]

Computation of \( T = T(\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_K, e) \) from implicit equation

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{K} \rho_i h_i(T) - \omega T \sum_{i=1}^{K} \frac{\rho_i}{W_i} - \rho e = 0
\]

for thermally perfect gases with \( \gamma_i(T) = c_{pi}(T)/c_{vi}(T) \) using an iterative Newton or bisection method
Chemistry and transport properties

Arrhenius-kinetics:
\[
\dot{\omega}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{M} (\nu^f_{ji} - \nu^r_{ji}) \left[ k^f_j \prod_{n=1}^{K} \left( \frac{\rho_n}{W_n} \right)^{\nu^f_{jn}} - k^r_j \prod_{n=1}^{K} \left( \frac{\rho_n}{W_n} \right)^{\nu^r_{jn}} \right] \quad i = 1, \ldots, K
\]

- Parsing of mechanisms and evaluation of $\dot{\omega}_i$ with Chemkin-II
- $c_{pi}(T)$ and $h_i(T)$ tabulated, linear interpolation between values

Mixture viscosity $\mu = \mu(T, Y_i)$ with Wilke formula
\[
\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \frac{Y_i \mu_i}{W_i \sum_{m=1}^{K} Y_m \Phi_{im}/W_m} \quad \text{with} \quad \Phi_{im} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} \left( 1 + \frac{W_i}{W_m} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( 1 + \frac{\mu_i}{\mu_m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{W_m}{W_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}
\]

Mixture thermal conductivity $k = k(T, Y_i)$ following Mathur
\[
k = \frac{1}{2} \left( W \sum_{i=1}^{K} \frac{Y_i k_i}{W_i} + \frac{1}{W \sum_{i=1}^{K} Y_i/(W_i k_i)} \right)
\]

Mixture diffusion coefficients $D_i = D_i(T, p, Y_i)$ from binary diffusion $D_{mi}(T, p)$ as
\[
D_i = \frac{1 - Y_i}{W \sum_{m \neq i} Y_m/(W_m D_{mi})}
\]

- Evaluation with Chemkin-II Transport library
Splitting methods

\[ \partial_t \mathbf{q} + \partial_x (f - f_\nu) + \partial_y (g - g_\nu) = \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} (c - g + g_\nu) + s \]

Dimensional splitting for PDE

\[ \mathcal{X}(\Delta t) : \quad \partial_t \mathbf{q} + \partial_x (f(q) - f_\nu(q)) = 0 \quad \text{IC:} \quad Q(t_m) \xrightarrow{\Delta t} \tilde{Q}^{1/2} \]

\[ \mathcal{Y}(\Delta t) : \quad \partial_t \mathbf{q} + \partial_y (g(q) - g_\nu(q)) = 0 \quad \text{IC:} \quad \tilde{Q}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{\Delta t} \tilde{Q} \]

Treat right-hand side as source term

\[ \mathcal{C}(\Delta t) : \quad \partial_t \mathbf{q} = \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} (c(q) - g(q) + g_\nu(q)) , \quad \text{IC:} \quad \tilde{Q} \xrightarrow{\Delta t} \tilde{Q} \]

Chemical source term

\[ \mathcal{S}(\Delta t) : \quad \partial_t \mathbf{q} = s(q) , \quad \text{IC:} \quad \tilde{Q} \xrightarrow{\Delta t} Q(t_m + \Delta t) \]

Formally 1st-order algorithm

\[ Q(t_m + \Delta t) = \mathcal{S}(\Delta t) \mathcal{C}(\Delta t) \mathcal{Y}(\Delta t) \mathcal{X}(\Delta t)(Q(t_m)) \]

but all sub-operators 2nd-order accurate or higher.
Finite volume schemes

Time discretization $t_n = n\Delta t$, discrete volumes $I_{jk} =$

$$[x_j - \frac{1}{2}\Delta x, x_j + \frac{1}{2}\Delta x] \times [y_k - \frac{1}{2}\Delta y, y_k + \frac{1}{2}\Delta y] =: [x_{j-1/2}, x_{j+1/2}] \times [y_{k-1/2}, y_{k+1/2}]$$

Approximation $Q_{jk}(t) \approx \frac{1}{|I_{jk}|} \int_{I_{jk}} q(x, t) \, dx$ and numerical fluxes

$$F(Q_{jk}(t), Q_{j+1,k}(t)) \approx f(q(x_{j+1/2}, y_k, t)),$$

$$F_v(Q_{jk}(t), Q_{j+1,k}(t)) \approx f_v(q(x_{j+1/2}, y_k, t), \nabla q(x_{j+1/2}, y_k, t))$$

yield (for simplicity)

$$Q_{jk}^{n+1} = Q_{jk}^n - \Delta t \Delta x \left[ F(Q_{jk}^n, Q_{j+1,k}^n) - F(Q_{j-1,k}^n, Q_{jk}^n) + \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} \left[ F_v(Q_{jk}^n, Q_{j+1,k}^n) - F_v(Q_{j-1,k}^n, Q_{jk}^n) \right] \right]$$

- Riemann solver to approximate $F(Q_{jk}^n, Q_{j+1,k}^n)$
- 1st-order finite differences for $F_v(Q_{jk}^n, Q_{j+1,k}^n)$ yield 2nd-order accurate central differences in (*)

Stability condition used:

$$\max_{i,j,k} \left\{ \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} (|u_{jk}| + c_{jk}) + \frac{8}{3} \frac{\mu_{jk} \Delta t}{\rho_{jk} \Delta x^2}, \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} (|u_{jk}| + c_{jk}) + \frac{2k_{jk} \Delta t}{c_{v,jk} \rho_j \Delta x^2}, \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} (|u_{jk}| + c_{jk}) + D_{i,jk} \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \right\} \leq 1$$
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Finite volume discretization – cont.

Symmetry source term $C(\Delta t)$: Use

$$Q_{jk}^{n+1} = Q_{jk}^n + \Delta t \left( \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} (c(Q_{jk}^n) - g(Q_{jk}^n) + \frac{1}{2} (G_v(Q_{jk}^n, Q_{j,k+1}^n) + G_v(Q_{j,k-1}^n, Q_{jk}^n)) \right)$$

within explicit 2nd-order accurate Runge-Kutta method

► Gives 2nd-order central difference approximation of $G_v$

► Transport properties $\mu$, $k$, $D_i$ are stored in vector of state $Q$ and kept constant throughout entire time step

Chemical source term $S(\cdot)$:

► 4th-order accurate semi-implicit ODE-solver subcycles within each cell

► $\rho$, $e$, $u$, $v$ remain unchanged!

$$\partial_t \rho_i = W_i \omega_i (\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_K, T) \quad i = 1, \ldots, K$$
Riemann solver for combustion

(S1) Calculate standard Roe-averages \( \hat{\rho} = \frac{\sqrt{p_L} p_R^+ + \sqrt{p_R} p_L^+}{\sqrt{p_L^+} + \sqrt{p_R^+}} \) and \( \hat{\dot{w}} = \frac{\sqrt{p_L w_L^+ + \sqrt{p_R w_R^+}}}{\sqrt{p_L^+} + \sqrt{p_R^+}} \) for \( \hat{u}, \hat{v}, \hat{H}, \hat{Y}_i, \hat{T} \).

(S2) Compute \( \hat{\gamma} := \frac{c_p}{c_v} \) with \( \hat{c}_{\rho (p/v)} i = \frac{T_R - T_L}{\int_{T_L}^{T_R} c_{i (p,v)} (\tau) d\tau} \).

(S3) Calculate \( \hat{\phi}_i := (\hat{\gamma} - 1) \left( \frac{\hat{u}^2}{2} - \hat{h}_i \right) + \hat{\gamma} R_i \hat{T} \) with standard Roe-averages \( \hat{e}_i \) or \( \hat{h}_i \).

(S4) Calculate \( \hat{c} := \left( \sum_{i=1}^{K+1} \hat{Y}_i \hat{\phi}_i - (\hat{\gamma} - 1) \hat{u}^2 + (\hat{\gamma} - 1) \hat{H} \right)^{1/2} \).

(S5) Use \( \Delta q = q_R - q_L \) and \( \Delta \rho \) to compute the wave strengths \( a_m \).

(S6) Calculate \( \mathcal{W}_1 = a_1 \hat{r}_1, \mathcal{W}_2 = \sum_{i=2}^{K+d} a_i \hat{r}_i, \mathcal{W}_3 = a_{K+d+1} \hat{r}_{K+d+1} \).

(S7) Evaluate \( s_1 = \hat{u} - \hat{\dot{c}}, s_2 = \hat{u} + \hat{\dot{c}}. \)

(S8) Evaluate \( \rho^*_L / R, u^*_L / R, e^*_L / R, c^*_L / R \) from \( q^*_L = q_L + \mathcal{W}_1 \) and \( q^*_R = q_R - \mathcal{W}_3 \).

(S9) If \( \rho^*_L / R \leq 0 \) or \( e^*_L / R \leq 0 \) use \( F_{HLL}(q_L, q_R) \) and go to (S12).

(S10) Entropy correction: Evaluate \( |\hat{s}_i| \).

\[ F_{\text{Roe}}(q_L, q_R) = \frac{1}{2} \left( f(q_L) + f(q_R) - \sum_{i=1}^{3} |\hat{s}_i| \mathcal{W}_i \right) \]

(S11) Positivity correction: Replace \( F_i \) by

\[
F^*_i = \begin{cases} 
Y^l_i, & F^*_i \geq 0, \\
Y^r_i, & F^*_i < 0
\end{cases}
\]

(S12) Evaluate maximal signal speed by \( S = \max(|s_1|, |s_3|) \).
Shock-induced combustion around a sphere

- Spherical projectile of radius 1.5 mm travels with constant velocity $v_I = 2170.6 \text{ m/s}$ through $\text{H}_2 : \text{O}_2 : \text{Ar}$ mixture (molar ratios 2:1:7) at 6.67 kPa and $T = 298 \text{ K}$.
- Mechanism by [Westbrook, 1982]: 34 forward reactions, 9 species.
- Axisymmetric Euler simulation on AMR base mesh of $70 \times 40$ cells.
- Comparison of 3-level computation with refinement factors 2,2 ($\sim 5 \text{ Pts/l}_g$) and a 4-level computation with refinement factors 2,2,4 ($\sim 19 \text{ Pts/l}_g$) at $t = 350 \mu\text{s}$.
- Higher resolved computation captures combustion zone visibly better and at slightly different position (see below).

Iso-contours of $p$ (black) and $Y_{\text{H}_2}$ (white) on refinement domains for 3-level (left) and 4-level computation (right).
Shock induced combustion from projectile flight

Lehr’s ballistic range experiments

- Spherical-nosed projectile of radius 1.5 mm travels with constant velocity through stoichiometric H$_2$ : O$_2$ : N$_2$ mixture (molar ratios 2:1:3.76) at 42.663 kPa and $T = 293$ K [Lehr, 1972]
- Axisymmetric Navier-Stokes and Eulers simulations on AMR base mesh of 400 $\times$ 200 cells, physical domain size 6 cm $\times$ 3 cm
- 4-level computations with refinement factors 2,2,4 to final time $t = 170$ $\mu$s. Refinement downstream removed.
- Main configurations
  - Velocity $v_I = 1931$ m/s ($M = 4.79$), $\sim 40$ Pts/$l_g$
  - Velocity $v_I = 1806$ m/s ($M = 4.48$), $\sim 60$ Pts/$l_g$
- Various previous studies with not entirely consistent results. E.g. [Yungster and Radhakrishnan, 1996], [Axda hl et al., 2011]
- Stagnation point location and pressure tracked in every time step
- All computations were on 32 cores requiring $\sim 1500$ h CPU each
Viscous case – $M = 4.79$

- 5619 iterations with CFL=0.9 to $t = 170 \mu s$
- Oscillation frequency in last 20 $\mu s$: $\sim 722$ kHz (viscous), $\sim 737$ kHz (inviscid)
- Experimental value: $\sim 720$ kHz

Schlieren plot of density
Viscous case – $M = 4.79$ – mesh adaptation
Comparison of temperature field

Inviscid
Viscous case – $M = 4.48$

- 5432 iterations with CFL=0.9 to $t = 170\,\mu s$
- Oscillation frequency in last 20 $\mu s$: $\sim 417$ kHz
- Experimental value: $\sim 425$ kHz

Schlieren plot of density

![Schlieren plot of density](image-url)
Oscillation mechanism

- Oscillation created by accelerated reaction due to slip line from previous triple point
Shock induced combustion from projectile flight

Inviscid case – $M = 4.48$

- 4048 iterations with CFL=0.9 to $t = 170 \mu s$
- Oscillation frequency in last 20 $\mu s$: $\sim 395$ kHz
- Experimental value: $\sim 425$ kHz

Schlieren plot of density
Deflagration to detonation transition in 2d

Hot sphere of 2500 K in stoichiometric H₂/O₂ in closed-end chamber of 2 cm diameter
Simulation of regular structures

- CJ detonation for H$_2$ : O$_2$ : Ar (2:1:7) at $T_0 = 298$ K and $p_0 = 10$ kPa, cell width 1.6 cm
- Perturb 1d solution with unreacted high-pressure pocket behind front
- Triple point trajectories by tracking max $|\omega|$ on auxiliary mesh shifted through grid with CJ velocity. $\omega = \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial u}{\partial y}$
- SAMR simulation with 4 additional levels (2,2,2,4), 67.6 Pts/l$_g$
- Configuration similar to Oran et al., J. Combustion and Flame 113, 1998.
Triple point analysis

Double Mach reflection structure shortly before the next collision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(p/p_0)</th>
<th>(\rho/\rho_0)</th>
<th>(T) [K]</th>
<th>(u) [m/s]</th>
<th>(M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>5.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.69</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40.61</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detonation propagation through pipe bends

- 2D Simulation of CJ detonation for $\text{H}_2 : \text{O}_2 : \text{Ar}/2 : 1 : 7$ at $T_0 = 298\ \text{K}$ and $p_0 = 10\ \text{kPa}$.
  Tube width of 5 detonation cells

- AMR base grid $1200 \times 992$. 4 additional refinement levels $(2,2,2,4)$. $67.6\ \text{Pts}/\text{l}_g$

- Adaptive computations use up to $7.1 \cdot 10^6$ cells ($4.8 \cdot 10^6$ on highest level) instead of $1.22 \cdot 10^9$ cells (uniform grid)

- $\sim 70,000\ \text{h CPU on 128 CPUs}$
  Pentium-4 2.2GHz
Triple point tracks

\[ \phi = 15^\circ \text{ (left, top)}, \phi = 30^\circ \text{ (left, bottom), and } \phi = 60^\circ \text{ (right)} \]
The effect of resolution - $\varphi = 15^\circ$

- On coarse meshes, the high energy release in triple points cannot be captured.
- Under sufficient resolution, the oscillation frequency is recovered after the bend.

14.05 Pts/$l_{ig}$

28.1 Pts/$l_{ig}$

56.2 Pts/$l_{ig}$
Triple point structures – $\varphi = 15^\circ$

Triple point re-initiation after bend with change from transitional to Double Mach reflection
Triple point structures – $\varphi = 30^\circ$
Detonation cell structure in 3D

- 44.8 Pts/fg for H\textsubscript{2} : O\textsubscript{2} : Ar CJ detonation
- SAMR base grid 400x24x24 for one quadrant, 2 additional refinement levels (2, 4)
- Simulation uses ~18 M cells instead of ~118 M (unigrid)
- ~51,000 h CPU on 128 CPU Compaq Alpha. H: 37.6%, S: 25.1%

Schlieren plots of \(Y_{OH}\)

Schematic front view of the periodic triple point line structure right plot at the same time.
Temporal Development of Detonation Velocity

Point-wise reinitiation along L1 (left) and L1' (right)

Comparison with 2D Simulation

R. Deiterding – Detonation and hypersonics simulation with AMROC – Part I
Triple point analysis

Weakest TMR structure in Incident-Incident region immediately before collision

Schlieren plots perpendicular to $y$- and $z$-plane (right) and on triple point line tracks (below)

Tracks of triple point lines
Detonation ignition by a hot jet in 3d

- 3d Euler simulation on AMR base mesh of $64 \times 32 \times 16$ cells
- Domain size $3.2 \text{ cm} \times 1.6 \text{ cm} \times 0.8 \text{ cm}$
- Inflow of $\text{H}_2 : \text{O}_2 : \text{Ar}$ mixture (molar ratios 2:1:7) at 10 kPa and $T = 298 \text{ K}$ at CJ velocity $V_{\text{CJ}} = 1627 \text{ m/s}$
- Hot jet inflow with fully reacted CJ conditions, i.e., $T = 3296 \text{ K}$, $p = 172.7 \text{ kPa}$ and $\rho = 0.0893 \text{ kg/m}^3$
- Mechanism by [Westbrook, 1982]: 34 forward reactions, 9 species
- Computations on 1024 cores Intel E5-2692 2.20 GHz (Tianhe-2)
Detonation ignition process - Front view

Isosurfaces of $\rho$ at $t = 18.85 \mu s$ Isosurfaces of $\rho$ at $t = 224.34 \mu s$ Isosurfaces of $\rho$ at $t = 323.07 \mu s$ Isosurfaces of $\rho$ at $t = 334.10 \mu s$
Detonation propagation

- Continuous jet injection overdrives the detonation to $f \approx 1.07$
- Number of triple point lines is increased compared to CJ case
- Rectangular domain straightens triple point lines
- Primarily TMR triple point line structures visible as in previous case
Dynamic mesh refinement

- Mesh adaptation with 4 additional levels refined by factors 2, 2, 2, 2 →
  ~ 30.85 Pts/l
- Adaptation indicators similar as before
  \[ t = 234.10 \mu s \quad t = 253.32 \mu s \quad t = 272.78 \mu s \quad t = 292.46 \mu s \]
Shock-boundary layer interaction
Non-reactive case

Reactive case: $\text{H}_2 : \text{O}_2 : \text{Ar} = 15 : 17.85 : 67.15$
Detonation establishment in a scramjet combustor

Setup 1 – Experiment $\phi = 0.28$

$H_2 : O_2 : N_2 = 0.56 : 1.0 : 2.9, \rho_0 = 36.1 \text{ kPa}, \ T_0 = 581 \text{ K}, \text{ inflow } V_I = 1532 \text{ m/s}, \ V_{CJ} = 1431 \text{ m/s}$
Detonation-boundary layer interaction

Setup 1 – Numerical simulation $\phi = 0.28$

\[\rho\] and \[Y_{OH}\] distributions showing the interaction between the detonation wave and the boundary layer.
Setup 2 – Experiment $\phi = 0.29$

$H_2 : O_2 : N_2 = 0.58 : 1.0 : 2.9$, $p_0 = 36.1$ kPa, $T_0 = 581$ K, inflow $V_I = 1532$ m/s
Numerical simulation $\phi = 0.29$

- SAMR simulation with 4 additional levels (2,2,2,2), 137.8 Pts/lig
Conclusions – Detonations

▶ For small mechanisms, detailed detonation structure simulations and accurate DNS are nowadays possible for realistic 2d geometries
▶ Accurate studies for idealized 3d configurations feasible
▶ Resolution down to the scale of secondary triple points can be provided on parallel capacity computing systems
▶ Enabling components:
  ▶ Splitting methods combined with high-resolution FV schemes for hyrodynamic transport
  ▶ SAMR provides a sufficient spatial and temporal resolution. Savings from SAMR for pipe bend simulations: up to >680x
▶ Future work will concentrate on non-Cartesian and higher order schemes with low numerical dissipation geared to DNS.
References I


References II


References IV


References V


Riemann solver for combustion: carbuncle fix

Entropy corrections [Harten, 1983] [Harten and Hyman, 1983]

1. \( |\tilde{s}_i| = \begin{cases} |s_i| & \text{if } |s_i| \geq 2\eta \\ \frac{|s_i|^2}{4\eta} + \eta & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \)

\( \eta = \frac{1}{2} \max_i \{ |s_i(q_R) - s_i(q_L)| \} \)

2. Replace \( |s_i| \) by \( |\tilde{s}_i| \) only if \( s_i(q_L) < 0 < s_i(q_R) \)

\[ \tilde{\eta}_{j+1/2,k} = \max \{ \eta_{j+1/2,k}, \eta_{j,k-1/2}, \eta_{j,k+1/2}, \eta_{j+1,k-1/2}, \eta_{j+1,k+1/2} \} \]

2D modification of entropy correction [Sanders et al., 1998]:

Carbuncle phenomenon

▶ [Quirk, 1994]

▶ Test from [Deiterding, 2003]
### Clustering by signatures

Flagged cells per row/column

Second derivative of \( \Upsilon \), \( \Delta = \Upsilon_{\nu+1} - 2\Upsilon_{\nu} + \Upsilon_{\nu-1} \)

Technique from image detection: [Bell et al., 1994], see also [Berger and Rigoutsos, 1991], [Berger, 1986]
Recursive generation of $\tilde{G}_{l,m}$

1. 0 in $\Upsilon$
2. Largest difference in $\Delta$
3. Stop if ratio between flagged and unflagged cell $> \eta_{tol}$
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Thermodynamic Model

The two temperature thermodynamic model is used to model the thermodynamic nonequilibrium,

\[ e_s(T_{tr}, T_{ve}) = e^t_s(T_{tr}) + e^r_s(T_{tr}) + e^v_s(T_{ve}) + e^{el}_s(T_{ve}) + e^0_s \]

- Computationally efficient,
- Widely used,
- Integrated into the open source library Mutation++ [Scoggins and Magin, 2014].

The internal energies are calculated within the Mutation++ library using the Rigid-Rotator Harmonic-Oscillator (RRHO) model.
Governing Equations

The two temperature thermodynamic model has been implemented using the equations,

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial G}{\partial y} = W$$

where,

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_1 \\ \vdots \\ \rho_{N_s} \\ \rho u \\ \rho v \\ \rho e^{ve} \\ \rho E \end{bmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_1 u \\ \vdots \\ \rho_{N_s} u \\ \rho u^2 + p \\ \rho v u \\ \rho e^{ve} u \\ (\rho E + p) u \end{bmatrix}, \quad G = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_1 v \\ \vdots \\ \rho_{N_s} v \\ \rho u v \\ \rho v^2 + p \\ \rho e^{ve} v \\ (\rho E + p) v \end{bmatrix}, \quad W = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{w}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \dot{w}_{N_s} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ Q_{e^{ve}} \end{bmatrix}.$$
Source Terms

The net species production rates,

$$\dot{w}_s = M_s \sum_{r=1}^{N_r} (\beta_{sr} - \alpha_{sr}) \left[ k_{f,r} \prod_{i=1}^{N_s} \left( \frac{\rho_i}{M_i} \right)^{\alpha_{ir}} - k_{b,r} \prod_{i=1}^{N_s} \left( \frac{\rho_i}{M_i} \right)^{\beta_{ir}} \right] ,$$

$$k_{f,r}(T_c) = A_{f,r} T_c^{n_{f,r}} \exp \left[ -\theta_r / T_c \right] ,$$

and the energy transfer rate (neutral mixture),

$$Q_{ve} = \sum_s Q_s^{T-V} + Q_s^{C-V} + Q_s^{C-el} ,$$

$$Q_s^{T-V} = \rho_s \frac{e_s^V(T_{tr}) - e_s^V}{T_{V,s}} ,$$

$$Q_s^{C-V} = c_1 \dot{w}_s e_s^V , \quad Q_s^{C-el} = c_1 \dot{w}_s e_s^{el} ,$$

are both calculated using the Mutation++ library.
Numerical Integration

Finite volume method with two flux schemes implemented,

- Van Leer’s flux vector splitting method [van Leer, 1982],
- The AUSM scheme [Liou and Steffen Jr, 1993].

Second order in space and time,

- The MUSCL-Hancock scheme is used for the fluxes.
- Strang splitting is used to integrate the source term.
Double Wedge

Simulation of a double wedge in a high enthalpy flow of air [Pezzella et al., 2015].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_\infty$</th>
<th>$p_\infty$</th>
<th>$U_\infty$</th>
<th>$M_\infty$</th>
<th>$L_1$</th>
<th>$\theta_1$</th>
<th>$L_2$</th>
<th>$\theta_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>710 K</td>
<td>0.78 kPa</td>
<td>3812 m/s</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>50.8 mm</td>
<td>30°</td>
<td>25.4 mm</td>
<td>55°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table:* Double wedge geometry and experimental conditions.

- Five species mixture of air.
- Initial $200 \times 200$ cell mesh, with 3 levels of refinement.
- Embedded boundary used to define geometry.
- Van Leer flux scheme.
- Physical time of 242 $\mu$s.
Double Wedge

The temperature and mass fraction of atomic oxygen.

\[ t = 242 \mu\text{secs.} \]
Double Wedge

The mesh was refined using pressure and density gradients.

\[ t = 242 \, \mu \text{secs}. \]
Double Wedge

Dynamic load balancing distributes the cells across the processors.

\( t = 242 \mu \text{secs.} \)
Double Wedge

The AMR enables the flow features to be captured in detail.

The schlieren image is taken from [Pezzella et al., 2015].
Mapped Solution Update

Within the AMROC-Clawpack framework, the solution is stored in physical \((x, y)\) space and the fluxes are mapped from computational \((\xi, \eta)\) space.

Using dimensional splitting the solution update is given by:

\[
Q_{i,j}^{n+1} = Q_{i,j}^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta \xi} \left[ (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\nu)_{i+1,j} - (\hat{\mathbf{F}} - \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\nu)_{i,j} \right] \frac{\Delta \eta \Delta \xi}{V_{i,j}},
\]

\[
Q_{i,j}^{n+1} = Q_{i,j}^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta \eta} \left[ (\hat{\mathbf{G}} - \hat{\mathbf{G}}^\nu)_{i,j+1} - (\hat{\mathbf{G}} - \hat{\mathbf{G}}^\nu)_{i,j} \right] \frac{\Delta \eta \Delta \xi}{V_{i,j}},
\]

where \(V_{i,j}\) is the volume of cell \(i,j\) in physical space. \(\hat{\mathbf{F}}, \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\nu, \hat{\mathbf{G}}, \hat{\mathbf{G}}^\nu\) are the physical fluxes per computational unit length.
Mapped Mesh Computation

In the mapped mesh computations, the flux is transformed to align with the cell face,

\[ \hat{\mathbf{F}} = T^{-1} \mathbf{F}_n(T \mathbf{Q}_l, T \mathbf{Q}_r), \]

where \( T \) is the transformation matrix,

\[
T = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \hat{n}^x & \hat{n}^y & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -\hat{n}^y & \hat{n}^x & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
Mapped Inviscid Fluxes

The inviscid fluxes per computational unit length are found by:

- Rotating the momentum components to be normal to the face,
- Calculating the flux with the rotated solution vectors,
- Rotating the solution vector back,
- Scaling the flux using the ratio of the computational face to the mapped face.

In the $\xi$ directional sweep, this gives

$$F_{i-1/2,j} = T_{i-1/2,j}^{-1} F_n(T_{i-1/2,j} Q_{i-1,j}, T_{i-1/2,j} Q_{i,j}).$$

where $T$ is the rotation matrix used to rotate the momentum components, and $F_n$ is the normal flux through the face.

The scaling is given by:

$$\hat{F}_{i,j} = \frac{|n_{i-1/2,j}|}{\Delta \xi} F_{i-1/2,j},$$
Mapped Viscous Fluxes

The physical viscous flux per computational unit length in the $\xi$ directional sweep is given by,

$$\hat{F}^\nu_{i-1/2,j} = \frac{|n_{i-1/2,j}|}{\Delta \eta} \left[ (F^\nu \hat{n}^\nu)_{i-1/2,j} + (G^\nu \hat{\eta}^\nu)_{i-1/2,j} \right],$$

To calculate the derivatives needed for $F^\nu$ and $G^\nu$, one must use

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} = \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} \right) + \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \eta} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} \right),$$

and,

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} = \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial y} \right) + \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \eta} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial y} \right).$$
Boundary Conditions

For wall boundary conditions the ghost cell values are set by first transforming the domain variables,

\[ \hat{Q} = T_w Q_{\text{dom}} \]

Then setting the ghost cell variables using interpolation,

\[ \hat{Q}_{\rho u}^{gc} = \frac{-d_{gw} \hat{Q}_{\rho u}}{1 - d_{gw} d_{gd}} \]

and

\[ \hat{Q}_{\rho v}^{gc} = \hat{Q}_{\rho v} \text{ slip}, \quad \hat{Q}_{\rho v}^{gc} = \frac{-d_{gw} \hat{Q}_{\rho v}}{1 - d_{gw} d_{gd}} \text{ no - slip} \]

Then rotating the ghost cell values using the inverse transformation,

\[ Q_{gc} = T_w^{-1} \hat{Q}_{gc} \]
CFL condition

The time step must be adjusted to account for the changes in mesh size. The Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy (CFL) condition can be written as [Moukalled et al., 2015],

$$
\sum_f \left[ \frac{\lambda^v_f |n_f| d_f}{\Delta t} + \lambda^c_f |n_f| \right] - \frac{V_c}{\Delta t} \leq 0,
$$

where $\lambda^v_f$ and $\lambda^c_f$ are the viscous and convective spectral radii, respectively, and $d_f$ is the distance between the cell centres either side of the face.

Rearranging the above equation gives,

$$
\frac{\Delta t}{V_c} \sum_f \left[ \frac{\lambda^v_f}{d_f} + \lambda^c_f \right] |n_f| \leq 1.
$$
CFL Condition

With dimensional splitting, the CFL condition must be evaluated in each dimension separately, giving,

\[
\max \left( \left[ \frac{\lambda_v^{i-1/2,j}}{d_{i-1/2,j}} + \lambda_c^{i-1/2,j} \right] |n|_{i-1/2,j} + \left[ \frac{\lambda_v^{i+1/2,j}}{d_{i+1/2,j}} + \lambda_c^{i+1/2,j} \right] |n|_{i+1/2,j}, \right.
\]

\[
\left[ \frac{\lambda_v^{i,j-1/2}}{d_{i,j-1/2}} + \lambda_c^{i,j-1/2} \right] |n|_{i,j-1/2} + \left[ \frac{\lambda_v^{i,j+1/2}}{d_{i,j+1/2}} + \lambda_c^{i,j+1/2} \right] |n|_{i,j+1/2} \right) \frac{\Delta t}{V_c} \leq 1.
\]
Hypersonic Sphere

Simulations of a half inch sphere travelling at hypersonic speeds in air [Lobb, 1964].

Mach number range between 8.4 and 16.1, with \( \rho_\infty = 1333 \text{ Pa} \) and \( T_\infty = 293 \text{ K} \).

The shock standoff distance was measured at each condition.

The shock standoff distance is used to validate the non-equilibrium model.

Validation of the axi-symmetric source term.

\[
W_{\text{axi}} = \frac{1}{y} \begin{bmatrix}
\rho_1 v \\
\vdots \\
\rho_N v \\
\rho u v \\
\rho v^2 \\
(\rho E + p) v
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Hypersonic Sphere

Computed shock standoff distances compared with experimental data.
Hypersonic Sphere

Temperature Comparison

Species Mass Fractions

- Distance from sphere (m)
- Temperature (K)
- Mass fraction
- Species Mass Fractions
  - $Y_N$
  - $Y_O$
  - $Y_NO$
  - $Y_N2$
  - $Y_O2$
Mapped Mesh Computation

Experiments of a cylinder in hypersonic flow [Hornung, 1972] were simulated with the mapping and initial conditions given by,

\[ x = \xi \cos(\eta), \quad y = -\xi \sin(\eta). \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radius YN2</th>
<th>YN</th>
<th>T∞</th>
<th>p∞</th>
<th>U∞</th>
<th>M∞</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0127 m</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>1833 K</td>
<td>2.91 kPa</td>
<td>5590 m/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Cylinder geometry and freestream conditions

The implementation was verified by comparing a mapped computation with an embedded boundary computation.
Mapped Mesh Computation

\[ t = 100 \mu\text{sec} \]
Mapped Mesh Computation
Viscous Computations

Preliminary results have been obtained for computations including the viscous flux vectors,

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{F} - \mathbf{F}^v)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial (\mathbf{G} - \mathbf{G}^v)}{\partial y} = \mathbf{W}
\]

where,

\[
\mathbf{F}^v = \begin{bmatrix}
-J_{x,1} \\
\vdots \\
-J_{x,N_s} \\
\tau_{x,x} \\
\tau_{y,x} \\
\kappa_{ve} \frac{\partial T_{ve}}{\partial x} - \sum_{s=1}^{N_s} J_{x,s} e_{ve} \\
\kappa_{tr} \frac{\partial T_{tr}}{\partial x} + \kappa_{ve} \frac{\partial T_{ve}}{\partial x} + u \tau_{x,x} + v \tau_{y,x} - \sum_{s=1}^{N_s} J_{x,s} h_s
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and a similar expression is obtained for \( \mathbf{G}^v \).
Viscous Computations

The species diffusion uses a modified version of Fick’s diffusion law [Sutton and Gnoﬀo, 1998],

\[ J_{x,s} = -\rho D_s \frac{\partial Y_s}{\partial x} - Y_s \sum_{r=1}^{N_s} \left( -\rho D_r \frac{\partial Y_r}{\partial x} \right). \]

The viscous stress tensor, \( \tau_{i,j} \) is given by,

\[ \tau_{i,j} = \mu \left( \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \right) - \delta_{i,j} \frac{2}{3} \mu \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}, \]

where \( \delta_{i,j} \) is the Kronecker delta.

The diffusion coefficients, the viscosity and the thermal conductivities are all calculated within the Mutation++ library.
Viscous Computations

$t = 60 \mu\text{secs.}$
Flat Plate Comparison

To test the implementation of the viscous fluxes a comparison between the mapped AMROC solver and the SU2 solver was completed. A hyperbolic tangent mapping to stretch the grid away from the wall, with an initial spacing of $1 \times 10^{-5}$ m. A Mach 3 flow over a 0.3 m flat plate was simulated using both an isothermal and adiabatic wall using the same mesh in each solver.
Flat Plate Comparison

A comparison between the two boundary layers at 0.2 m is shown below,

Figure: A comparison of the velocity boundary layers over an adiabatic flat plate, where \( M_\infty = 3.0 \).

Figure: A comparison of the thermal boundary layers over an adiabatic flat plate, where \( M_\infty = 3.0 \).

Figure: A comparison of the velocity boundary layers over an isothermal flat plate, where \( M_\infty = 3.0 \).

Figure: A comparison of the thermal boundary layers over an isothermal flat plate, where \( M_\infty = 3.0 \).
Cylinder Heat Flux Computation

The mapped mesh solver has been validated by simulating a cylinder in a nonequilibrium, high enthalpy flow. The inflow conditions and results were taken from [Degrez et al., 2009].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_\infty$</th>
<th>$\rho_\infty$</th>
<th>$U_\infty$</th>
<th>$Y_{N_2}$</th>
<th>$Y_N$</th>
<th>$Y_{O_2}$</th>
<th>$Y_O$</th>
<th>$Y_{NO}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>694 K</td>
<td>3.26 g/m$^3$</td>
<td>4776 m/s</td>
<td>0.7356</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1340</td>
<td>0.07955</td>
<td>0.0509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** Freestream conditions for the HEG cylinder simulation.

A cylinder mesh was generated with hyperbolic tangent stretching away from the wall using a 1e-6 initial spacing.
Cylinder Heat Flux Comparison

The simulated results show good agreement with the experimental results:

![HEG Cylinder Surface Pressure](image)

**Figure:** A comparison of the experimental and simulated surface pressures in the HEG cylinder experiment.
Hybrid method

Convective numerical flux is defined as

\[ F_{\text{inv}}^n = \begin{cases} F_{\text{inv-WENO}}^n & \text{in } C \\ F_{\text{inv-CD}}^n & \text{in } \overline{C}, \end{cases} \]

- For LES: 3rd order WENO method, 2nd order TCD [Hill and Pullin, 2004]

Use WENO scheme to only capture shock waves but resolve interface between species.

Shock detection based on using two criteria together:

1. Lax-Liu entropy condition \(|u_R \pm a_R| < |u_* \pm a_*| < |u_L \pm a_L|\) tested with a threshold to eliminate weak acoustic waves. Used intermediate states at cell interfaces:

   \[ u_* = \frac{\sqrt{\rho_L u_L} + \sqrt{\rho_R u_R}}{\sqrt{\rho_L} + \sqrt{\rho_R}}, \quad a_* = \sqrt{\left(\gamma_* - 1\right)(h_* - \frac{1}{2} u_*^2)}, \ldots \]

2. Limiter-inspired discontinuity test based on mapped normalized pressure gradient \(\theta_j\)

   \[ \phi(\theta_j) = \frac{2\theta_j}{(1 + \theta_j)^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \theta_j = \frac{|p_{j+1} - p_j|}{|p_{j+1} + p_j|}, \quad \phi(\theta_j) > \alpha_{\text{Map}} \]
Results for shear layer in Mach reflection pattern

- **WENO/CD - 6 levels**
  - $\Delta x_{\text{min}} = 3.91 \cdot 10^{-6}$ m
- **WENO/CD - 7 levels**
  - $\Delta x_{\text{min}} = 1.95 \cdot 10^{-6}$ m
- **WENO/CD - 8 levels**
  - $\Delta x_{\text{min}} = 9.77 \cdot 10^{-7}$ m
- **MUSCL - 7 levels**
  - $\Delta x_{\text{min}} = 1.05 \cdot 10^{-6}$ m
- **MUSCL - 7 levels - Euler**
  - $\Delta x_{\text{min}} = 1.05 \cdot 10^{-6}$ m

- WENO/CD/RK3 gives results comparable to 4x finer resolved optimal 2nd-order scheme, but CPU times with SAMR 2-3x larger

- Gain in CPU time from higher-order scheme roughly one order
Detonation ignition by hot jet in 2d

(a) Detailed structure, (b) WENO usage

(a) Navier-Stokes, (b) Euler

Conclusions – Hypersonics

► We have developed a first 2D prototype of two-temperature model solver that is suitable for very high temperatures, i.e., high enthalpy re-entry flows
► The Cartesian version is fully integrated into SAMR AMROC-Clawpack; structured non-Cartesian version runs also within AMROC-Clawpack but only on non-adaptive meshes so far
► SAMR framework can remain basically unchanged; however mapping needs to be considered in prolongation and restriction, flux correction, visualization (work in progress)
► For moving geometries, the goal is a Chimera-type approach that constructs non-Cartesian boundary layer meshes near the body and uses SAMR in the far field
► Incorporation of the methodology into the hybrid WENO/CD scheme for high enthalpy DNS in 3D is proposed within the next two years
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Construction of coupling data

- Moving boundary/interface is treated as a moving contact discontinuity and represented by level set [Fedkiw, 2002][Arienti et al., 2003]

- Efficient construction of level set from triangulated surface data with closest-point-transform (CPT) algorithm [Mauch, 2003]

- One-sided construction of mirrored ghost cell and new FEM nodal point values

- FEM ansatz-function interpolation to obtain intermediate surface values

- Explicit coupling possible if geometry and velocities are prescribed for the more compressible medium [Specht, 2000]

\[
\begin{align*}
  u^F_n &:= u^S_n(t) \\ 
  \text{UpdateFluid}(\Delta t) \\ 
  \sigma^S_{nm} &:= -p^F(t + \Delta t)\delta_{nm} \\ 
  \text{UpdateSolid}(\Delta t) \\ 
  t &:= t + \Delta t
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{Inviscid fluid:} \\
  u^S_n &:= u^F_n
\end{align*}
\]
The signed distance $\varphi$ to a surface $I$ satisfies the eikonal equation [Sethian, 1999]:

$$|\nabla \varphi| = 1 \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi|_I = 0$$

Solution smooth but non-differentiable across characteristics. Distance computation trivial for non-overlapping elementary shapes but difficult to do efficiently for triangulated surface meshes:

- Geometric solution approach with closest-point-transform algorithm [Mauch, 2003]
The characteristic / scan conversion algorithm

1. Build the characteristic polyhedrons for the surface mesh

2. For each face/edge/vertex
   2.1 Scan convert the polyhedron.
   2.2 Compute distance to that primitive for the scan converted points

3. Computational complexity.
   - $O(m)$ to build the b-rep and the polyhedra.
   - $O(n)$ to scan convert the polyhedra and compute the distance, etc.

4. Problem reduction by evaluation only within specified max. distance

[Mauch, 2003], see also [Deiterding et al., 2006]
1. Put bounding boxes around each solid processors piece of the boundary and around each fluid processors grid

2. Gather, exchange and broadcast of bounding box information

3. Optimal point-to-point communication pattern, non-blocking
Coupling elements

Boundary Conditions:
- Inlet(s), Outlet(s), Walls, Velocities
- Initial Conditions:
  - Density, Pressure, Velocity

Receive Boundary location and velocity

Update boundary pressures using interpolation

Compute stable time step multiplied by N

Compute next time step

Send boundary location and velocity

Receive boundary pressures

Update boundary

Apply pressure boundary conditions at solid boundaries

Perform N sub iterations

Nodal constraints (Translation, Rotation)

Initial Conditions:
- Displacement, Velocity

R. Deiterding – Aerodynamics and fluid-structure interaction simulation with AMROC Part I
Proximal bodies in hypersonic flow

Flow modeled by Euler equations for a single polytropic gas with \( p = (\gamma - 1) \rho e \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \rho + \partial_s (\rho u_n) &= 0, \\
\partial_t (\rho u_k) + \partial_s (\rho u_k u_n + \delta_{kn} p) &= 0, \\
\partial_t (\rho E) + \partial_s (u_n (\rho E + p)) &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

Numerical approximation with

- Finite volume flux-vector splitting scheme with MUSCL reconstruction, dimensional splitting
- Spherical bodies, force computation with overlaid lattitude-longitude mesh to obtain drag and lift coefficients \( C_{D,L} = \frac{2F_{D,L}}{\rho v^2 \pi r^2} \)
- Inflow \( M = 10 \), \( C_D \) and \( C_L \) on secondary sphere, lateral position varied, no motion
Verification and validation

Static force measurements, \( M = 10 \):
[ Laurence et al., 2007 ]

- Refinement study: \( 40 \times 40 \times 32 \) base grid, up to without AMR up to \( \sim 209.7 \cdot 10^5 \) cells, largest run \( \sim 35,000 \) h CPU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \ell_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( C_D )</th>
<th>( \Delta C_D )</th>
<th>( C_L )</th>
<th>( \Delta C_L )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Comparison with experimental results: 3 additional levels, \( \sim 2000 \) h CPU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Computational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_D )</td>
<td>1.11 ± 0.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_L )</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dynamic motion, \( M = 4 \):

- Base grid \( 150 \times 125 \times 90 \), two additional levels with \( r_{1,2} = 2 \)
- 24,704 time steps, 36,808 h CPU on 256 cores IBM BG/P

[ Laurence and Deiterding, 2011 ]
Schlieren graphics on refinement regions
Treatment of thin structures

- Thin boundary structures or lower-dimensional shells require “thickening” to apply embedded boundary method.
- Unsigned distance level set function $\varphi$.
- Treat cells with $0 < \varphi < d$ as ghost fluid cells.
- Leaving $\varphi$ unmodified ensures correctness of $\nabla \varphi$.
- Use face normal in shell element to evaluate in $\Delta p = p^+ - p^-$.
- Utilize finite difference solver using the beam equation

$$\rho_s h \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial t^2} + EI \frac{\partial^4 w}{\partial x^4} = p^F$$

to verify FSI algorithms.
FSI verification by elastic vibration

- Thin steel plate (thickness $h = 1\, \text{mm}$, length $50\, \text{mm}$), clamped at lower end
- $\rho_s = 7600\, \text{kg/m}^3$, $E = 220\, \text{GPa}$, $l = h^3/12$, $\nu = 0.3$
- Modeled with beam solver (101 points) and thin-shell FEM solver (325 triangles) by F. Cirak
- Left: Coupling verification with constant instantaneous loading by $\Delta p = 100\, \text{kPa}$
- Right: FSI verification with Mach 1.21 shockwave in air ($\gamma = 1.4$)
Shock-driven elastic panel motion

Test case suggested by [Giordano et al., 2005]

- Forward facing step geometry, fixed walls everywhere except at inflow

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho &= 1.6458 \text{ kg/m}^3 \\
\mathbf{u}_1 &= 112.61 \text{ m/s}, \mathbf{u}_2 = 0 \\
p &= 156.18 \text{ kPa}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho &= 1.2 \text{ kg/m}^3 \\
\mathbf{u}_1 &= 0, \mathbf{u}_2 = 0 \\
p &= 100 \text{ kPa}
\end{align*}
\]

- SAMR base mesh $320 \times 64 \times 2$, $r_{1,2} = 2$

- Intel 3.4GHz Xeon dual processors, GB Ethernet interconnect
  - Beam-FSI: $12.25 \text{ h CPU}$ on $3 \text{ fluid CPU + 1 solid CPU}$
  - FEM-FSI: $322 \text{ h CPU}$ on $14 \text{ fluid CPU + 2 solid CPU}$

$t = 1.56 \text{ ms after impact}$
Detonation-driven plastic deformation

Chapman-Jouguet detonation in a tube filled with a stoichiometric ethylene and oxygen ($C_2H_4 + 3O_2$, 295 K) mixture. Euler equations with single exothermic reaction $A \rightarrow B$

$$\partial_t \rho + \partial_{x_n} (\rho u_n) = 0, \quad \partial_t (\rho u_k) + \partial_{x_n} (\rho u_k u_n + \delta_{kn} p) = 0, \quad k = 1, \ldots, d$$

$$\partial_t (\rho E) + \partial_{x_n} (u_n (\rho E + p)) = 0, \quad \partial_t (Y \rho) + \partial_{x_n} (Y \rho u_n) = \psi$$

with

$$p = (\gamma - 1)(\rho E - \frac{1}{2} \rho u_n u_n - \rho Y q_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = -kY \rho \exp \left(-\frac{E_A \rho}{p}\right)$$

modeled with heuristic detonation model by [Mader, 1979]

$$V := \rho^{-1}, \quad V_0 := \rho_{CJ}^{-1}, \quad V_{CJ} := \rho_{CJ}$$

$$Y' := 1 - (V - V_0)/(V_{CJ} - V_0)$$

If $0 \leq Y' \leq 1$ and $Y > 10^{-8}$ then

If $Y < Y'$ and $Y' < 0.9$ then $Y' := 0$

If $Y' < 0.99$ then $p' := (1 - Y') \rho_{CJ}$

else $p' := p$

$$\rho_A := Y' \rho$$

$$E := p' / (\rho (\gamma - 1)) + Y' q_0 + \frac{1}{2} u_n u_n$$

Comparison of the pressure traces in the experiment and in a 1d simulation
Thin elastic and deforming thin structures

Tube with flaps

- Fluid: VanLeer FVS
  - Detonation model with $\gamma = 1.24$, $p_{CJ} = 3.3$ MPa, $D_{CJ} = 2376$ m/s
  - AMR base level: $104 \times 80 \times 242$, $r_{1,2} = 2$, $r_3 = 4$
  - $\sim 4 \cdot 10^7$ cells instead of $7.9 \cdot 10^9$ cells (uniform)
  - Tube and detonation fully refined
  - Thickening of 2D mesh: $0.81$ mm on both sides (real $0.445$ mm)

- Solid: thin-shell solver by F. Cirak
  - Aluminum, J2 plasticity with hardening, rate sensitivity, and thermal softening
  - Mesh: 8577 nodes, 17056 elements

- 16+2 nodes 2.2 GHz AMD Opteron quad processor, PCI-X 4x Infiniband network, $\sim 4320$ h CPU to $t_{end} = 450$ $\mu$s
Fluid-structure coupling

Train-tunnel aerodynamics

Summary

Thin elastic and deforming thin structures

Tube with flaps: results

Fluid density and displacement in y-direction in solid

Schlieren plot of fluid density on refinement levels

[Cirak et al., 2007]
Coupled fracture simulation

![Diagram showing coupled fracture simulation with color-coded pressure and velocity vectors.](image)
Blast explosion in a multistory building

- 20 m × 40 m × 25 m seven-story building similar to [Luccioni et al., 2004]
- Spherical energy deposition ≡ 400 kg TNT, \( r = 0.5 \text{ m} \) in lobby of building
- SAMR: 80 × 120 × 90 base level, three additional levels \( r_{1,2} = 2, l_{\text{fsi}} = 1, k = 1 \)
- Simulation with ground: 1,070 coupled time steps, 830 h CPU (~25.9 h wall time) on 31+1 cores
- \(~ 8,000,000 \) cells instead of 55,296,000 (uniform)
- 69,709 hexahedral elements and with material parameters. [Deiterding and Wood, 2013]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \rho_s ) [kg/m(^3)]</th>
<th>( \sigma_0 ) [MPa]</th>
<th>( E_T ) [GPa]</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( K ) [GPa]</th>
<th>( G ) [GPa]</th>
<th>( \bar{\epsilon}_p )</th>
<th>( \rho_f ) [MPa]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blast explosion in a multistory building – II
Laboratory tunnel simulator [Zonglin et al., 2002]

Model solves the inviscid Euler equations

\[ \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0 \]
\[ \partial_t (\rho \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + \nabla p = 0 \]
\[ \partial_t (\rho E) + \nabla \cdot ((\rho E + p)\mathbf{u}) = 0 \]

with \( p = (\gamma - 1)(\rho E - \frac{1}{2} \rho \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{u}) \)

- Two-dimensional axi-symmetric computation
- \( p_0 = 100 \text{ kPa}, \rho_0 = 1.225 \text{ kg/m}^3, \gamma = 1.4 \)
- Roe shock-capturing scheme blended with HLL
- 2nd order accuracy achieved with MUSCL-Hancock method
Basic phenomena – $v_0 = 100 \text{ m/s}$

- $800 \times 25$ mesh with Cartesian cut-out (200, 5) to (800, 25)
- 2 level of additional refinement by factor 2

Pressure record at location (1020 mm, 20 mm) inside tunnel
Comparison with experiment – I

Pressure record at \((1020 \text{ mm}, 20 \text{ mm})\) for \(v_0 = 75 \text{ m/s}\). Experiment (left) and AMROC (right)
Comparison with experiment – I

Pressure record at (40 mm, 20 mm) for model velocity \( v_0 = 100 \text{ m/s} \). Experiment (left) and AMROC (right)
Variation of velocity and nose half angle

► Dependence on $v_0^2$ is the dynamic pressure influence (left)
► For constant blockage ratio and body velocity, using more pointed noses alleviates the maximal pressure level (right, nose half angle varied)
► For $v_0 \approx 140$ m/s a shock wave (tunnel boom) can be observed. Sharper noses also delay this phenomenon.
NGT2 prototype setup

- Next Generation Train 2 (NGT2) geometry by the German Aerospace Centre (DLR) [Fragner and Deiterding, 2016, Fragner and Deiterding, 2017]

- Mirrored train head of length \(\sim 60\) m, no wheels or tracks, train models 0.17 m above ground above the ground level.

- Train velocities 100 m/s and \(-100\) m/s, middle axis 6 m apart, initial distance between centers 200 m

- Base mesh of \(360 \times 40 \times 30\) for domain of \(360\) m \(\times 40\) m \(\times 30\) m

- Two/three additional levels, refined by \(r_{1,2,3} = 2\). Refinement based on pressure gradient and level set and regenerated at every coarse time step. Parallel redistribution at every level-0 time step.

- On 96 cores Intel Xeon E5-2670 2.6 GHz a final \(t_e = 3\) sec was reached after 12,385 sec / 43,395 sec wall time, i.e., 330 h and 1157 h CPU
Passing in open space – AMR and dynamic distribution

Domains of three-level refinement

Distribution to 96 processors

Enlargement of domain center shown
Pressure isosurfaces
Pressure transects

![Pressure record at 0.6375 sec for intersecting trains in freestream](image1)

![Pressure record at 0.8775 sec](image2)
Setup with realistic tunnel shape

- Two NGT2 trains again at velocities 100 m/s and −100 m/s
- Prototype straight double track tunnel of 640 m length, initial distance between centers of trains 820 m
- Base mesh of 1060 × 36 × 24 for domain of 1060 m × 36 m × 24 m, three levels refined by \( r_{1,2,3} = 2 \)
- On 96 cores Intel Xeon E5-2670 2.6 GHz a final \( t_e = 5 \text{ sec} \) was reached after 84,651 sec wall time, i.e., 2257 h CPU
Pressure transects

Pressure record at 1.39875 seconds for trains intersecting inside a double-track tunnel

Probe 0m Y-axis

Probe 3m Y-axis
Conclusions – compressible flow aerodynamics

▶ A Cartesian embedded boundary method for compressible flows with block-based adaptive mesh refinement is an efficient and scalable prediction tool for pressure and shock waves created by moving bodies

▶ Multi-resolution and fluid-structure coupling problems can be tackled without expensive mesh regeneration
  - Level set approach easily handles large motions, element failure and removal
  - Dynamic adaptation ensures high resolution at embedded boundaries and essential flow features

▶ Aerodynamics of bodies with large motion are easily accessible
  - Current inviscid approach predicts maximal overpressure in front of trains reliably
  - For predicting the flow around entire trains, the boundary layer growing over the train body needs to be considered.
  - AMROC solvers for the compressible Navier-Stokes equations and even LES are already available, however, for this particular application a turbulent wall function on the embedded boundary first needs to be implemented. Such a wall function is currently work-in-progress for the LBM-LES solver.
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Approximation of Boltzmann equation

Is based on solving the Boltzmann equation with a simplified collision operator

\[ \partial_t f + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla f = \omega (f^{eq} - f) \]

\(\Rightarrow\) \(K_n = l_f / L \ll 1\), where \(l_f\) is replaced with \(\Delta x\)

\(\Rightarrow\) Weak compressibility and small Mach number assumed

\(\Rightarrow\) Assume a simplified phase space

Equation is approximated with a splitting approach.

1.) Transport step solves \(\partial_t f_\alpha + \mathbf{e}_\alpha \cdot \nabla f_\alpha = 0\)

Operator: \(T: \tilde{f}_\alpha(x + \mathbf{e}_\alpha \Delta t, t + \Delta t) = f_\alpha(x, t)\)

\[ \rho(x, t) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{18} f_\alpha(x, t), \quad \rho(x, t) u_i(x, t) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{18} \mathbf{e}_\alpha i f_\alpha(x, t) \]

Discrete velocities:

\[ \mathbf{e}_\alpha = \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha = 0, \\ (\pm 1, 0, 0)c, (0, \pm 1, 0)c, (0, 0, \pm 1)c, & \alpha = 1, \ldots, 6, \\ (\pm 1, \pm 1, 0)c, (\pm 1, 0, \pm 1)c, (0, \pm 1, \pm 1)c, & \alpha = 7, \ldots, 18 \end{cases} \]
Approximation of equilibrium state

2.) Collision step solves \( \partial_t f_\alpha = \omega (f_{\alpha}^{eq} - f_\alpha) \)

Operator \( C \):

\[
f_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) = \tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) + \omega \Delta t \left( \tilde{f}_{\alpha}^{eq}(\cdot, t + \Delta t) - \tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) \right)
\]

with equilibrium function

\[
f_{\alpha}^{eq}(\rho, u) = \rho t_\alpha \left[ 1 + \frac{3e_\alpha u}{c^2} + \frac{9(e_\alpha u)^2}{2c^4} - \frac{3u^2}{2c^2} \right]
\]

with \( t_\alpha = \frac{1}{9} \{ \frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4} \} \)

Pressure \( \delta p = \sum_\alpha f_{\alpha}^{eq} c_s^2 = \rho c_s^2 \).

Dev. stress \( \Sigma_{ij} = \left( 1 - \frac{\omega \Delta t}{2} \right) \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha i} e_{\alpha j} (f_{\alpha}^{eq} - f_\alpha) \)

Is derived by assuming a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution of \( f_{\alpha}^{eq} \) and approximating the involved \( \exp() \) function with a Taylor series to second-order accuracy.

Using the third-order equilibrium function

\[
f_{\alpha}^{eq}(\rho, u) = \rho t_\alpha \left[ 1 + \frac{3e_\alpha u}{c^2} + \frac{9(e_\alpha u)^2}{2c^4} - \frac{3u^2}{2c^2} + \frac{e_\alpha u}{3c^2} \left( \frac{9(e_\alpha u)^2}{2c^4} - \frac{3u^2}{2c^2} \right) \right]
\]

allows higher flow velocities.
Relation to Navier-Stokes equations

Inserting a Chapman-Enskog expansion, that is,
\[ f_\alpha = f_\alpha(0) + \epsilon f_\alpha(1) + \epsilon^2 f_\alpha(2) + \ldots \]
and using
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \epsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} + \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} + \ldots, \quad \nabla = \epsilon \nabla_1 + \epsilon^2 \nabla_2 + \ldots
\]
into the LBM and summing over $\alpha$ one can show that the continuity and moment equations are recoverd to $O(\epsilon^2)$ [Hou et al., 1996]
\[
\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0
\]
\[
\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = -\nabla \rho + \nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}
\]
Kinematic viscosity and collision time are connected by
\[
\nu = \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{\tau_L}{\Delta t} - \frac{1}{2} \right) c \Delta x
\]
from which one gets with $\sqrt{3} c_s = \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t}$ [Hähnle, 2004]
\[
\omega_L = \tau_L^{-1} = \frac{c_s^2}{\nu + \Delta t c_s^2 / 2}
\]
Initial and boundary conditions

- Initial conditions are constructed as $f_{\alpha}^{eq}(\rho(t = 0), u(t = 0))$

**Boundary conditions (applied before streaming step)**

- No-slip
- Slip
- Symmetry

- Outlet basically copies all distributions (zero gradient)
- Inlet and pressure boundary conditions use $f_{\alpha}^{eq}$

**Complex geometry:**

- Use level set method as before to construct macro-values in embedded boundary cells by interpolation / extrapolation [Deiterding, 2011].
- Distance function $\varphi$, normal $n = \nabla \varphi / |\nabla \varphi|$. Triangulated meshes use CPT algorithm [Mauch, 2003].
- Construct macro-velocity in ghost cells for no-slip BC as $u' = 2w - u$
- Then use $f_{\alpha}^{eq}(\rho', u')$ or interpolated bounce-back [Bouzidi et al., 2001] to construct distributions in embedded ghost cells
Normalization

The method is implemented on the unit lattice with $\Delta \tilde{x} = \Delta \tilde{t} = 1$

$$\frac{\Delta x}{l_0} = 1, \quad \frac{\Delta t}{t_0} = 1 \rightarrow c = 1$$

Lattice viscosity $\nu = \frac{1}{3} \left( \tau - \frac{1}{2} \right)$ and lattice sound speed $c_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ yield again

$$\omega_L = \frac{c_s^2}{\nu + \frac{c_s^2}{2}} = \frac{c_s^2}{\nu + \Delta t c_s^2 / 2}$$

Velocity normalization factor: $u_0 = \frac{l_0}{t_0}$, density $\rho_0$

$$Re = \frac{uL}{\nu} = \frac{u}{\nu} \frac{l}{l_0} = \frac{\tilde{u}}{\tilde{\nu}}$$

Trick for scheme acceleration: Use $\tilde{u} = Su$ and $\tilde{\nu} = S\nu$ which yields

$$\tilde{\omega}_L = \frac{c_s^2}{S\nu + \Delta t / S \frac{c_s^2}{2}}$$

For instance, the physical hydrodynamic pressure is then obtained for a caloric gas as

$$p = (\tilde{\rho} - 1)c_s^2 \frac{u_0^2}{S^2} \rho_0 + \frac{c_s^2 \rho_0}{\gamma}$$
Adaptive LBM

1. Complete update on coarse grid: \( f^{C,n+1}_\alpha := C(T(f^{C,n}_\alpha)) \)
2. Interpolate \( f^{C,n}_\alpha \) onto \( f^{f,n}_\alpha \) to fill fine halos. Set physical boundary conditions.
3. \( \tilde{f}^{f,n}_\alpha := T(f^{f,n}_\alpha) \) on whole fine mesh. \( f^{f,n+1/2}_\alpha := C(\tilde{f}^{f,n}_\alpha) \) in interior.
4. \( \tilde{f}^{f,n+1/2}_\alpha := T(f^{f,n+1/2}_\alpha) \) on whole fine mesh. \( f^{f,n+1}_\alpha := C(\tilde{f}^{f,n+1/2}_\alpha) \) in interior.
5. Average \( \tilde{f}^{f,n+1/2}_\alpha \) (inner halo layer), \( \tilde{f}^{f,n}_\alpha \) (outer halo layer) to obtain \( \tilde{f}^{C,n}_\alpha \).
6. Revert transport into halos:
   \( \bar{f}^{C,n}_\alpha := T^{-1}(\tilde{f}^{C,n}_\alpha) \)
7. Parallel synchronization of \( f^{C,n}_\alpha, \tilde{f}^{C,n}_\alpha \).
8. Cell-wise update where correction is needed:
   \( f^{C,n+1}_\alpha := C(T(f^{C,n}_\alpha, \tilde{f}^{C,n}_\alpha)) \)

Algorithm equivalent to [Chen et al., 2006].
Flow over 2D cylinder, $d = 2 \text{ cm}$

- Air with
  $\nu = 1.61 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$,
  $\rho = 1.205 \text{ kg/m}^3$

- Domain size
  $[-8d, 24d] \times [-8d, 8d]$

- Dynamic refinement based on velocity. Last level to refine structure further.


- Base lattice $320 \times 160$, 3 additional levels with factors 2, 4, 4.

- Resolution: $\sim 320$ points in diameter $d$

- Computation of $C_D$ on 400 equidistant points along circle and averaged over time. Comparison above with [Henderson, 1995].
Oscillating cylinder – Setup

Motion imposed on cylinder

\[ y(t) = A_t \sin(2\pi f_t t), \quad \theta(t) = A_\theta \sin(2\pi f_\theta t) \]

- Setup follows [Nazarinia et al., 2012]. Here \( A_\theta = 1 \) for all cases.
- Natural frequency of cylinder \( f_N \approx 0.6154 \text{s}^{-1} \).
- Strouhal number \( St_t = f_t D / U_\infty \approx 0.198 \) for all cases.
- Chosen here \( D = 20 \text{mm} \)
- Fluid is water with \( c_s = 1482 \text{ m/s}, \nu = 9.167 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}, \rho = 1016 \text{ kg/m}^3 \)
- Constant coefficient model deactivated for Case 1, active for Case 2 with \( C_{sm} = 0.2 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>( A_t )</th>
<th>( f_t = f_\theta )</th>
<th>( V_R )</th>
<th>( U_\infty )</th>
<th>( Re )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>( D/4 )</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>( D/2 )</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>( D/4 )</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3030</td>
<td>6310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>( D/2 )</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3030</td>
<td>6310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Laloglu, RD. Proc. 5th Int. Conf. on Parallel, Distributed, Grid and Cloud Computing for Engineering, Civil-Comp Press, 2017.
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Case 1b, $V_R = 1$, $Re = 1322$

- Visualization enlargement of cylinder region
- Base mesh is discretized with $320 \times 160$ cells, 3 additional levels with factor $r_l = 2, 2, 2$
- 80 cells within $D$ on highest level
- Speedup $S = 2000$
- Basically identical setup in commercial code XFlow for comparison
Case 1b, $V_R = 1$, $f_t = f_\theta = 0.6$, Re = 1322

- Increase of rotational velocity leads to formation of a vortex pair plus single vortex. Drag and lift amplitude roughly doubled.
- Laminar results in good agreement with experiments of [Nazarinia et al., 2012].
Case 2a, $V_R = 0.5$, $f_t = f_\theta = 3$, $Re = 6310$

- Oscillation period: $T = 1/f_t = 0.33\, s$. 10 regular vortices in 1.67\, s.
- CPU time on 6 cores for AMROC: 635.8\, s, XFlow $\sim 50\%$ more expensive when normalized based on number of cells.
### Computational performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow type</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$\Delta t_0$ [s]</th>
<th>Total cells</th>
<th>$\Delta t_e$ [s]</th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>$y^+$</th>
<th>CPU time [s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMROC</td>
<td>XFlow</td>
<td>AMROC</td>
<td>XFlow</td>
<td>AMROC</td>
<td>XFlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laminar</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>85982</td>
<td>84778</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laminar</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>91774</td>
<td>90488</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbulent</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>0.00031</td>
<td>232840</td>
<td>216452</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>6310</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbulent</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>0.00031</td>
<td>255582</td>
<td>246366</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>6310</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Intel-Xeon-3.50-GHz desktop workstation with 6 cores, communication through MPI
- Same base mesh and always three additional refinement levels
- AMROC: single-relaxation time LBM, block-based mesh adaptation
- XFlow: slightly more multi-relaxation time LBM, cell-based mesh adaptation
- AMROC uses $\sim 7.5\%$ more cells on average more cells
- Normalized on cell number Case 2a is $50\%$ more expensive for XFlow than for AMROC-LBM
- Case 2b is $42\%$ more expensive in CPU time alone
Two-segment hinged wing

Configuration by [Toomey and Eldredge, 2008]. Manufactured bodies in tank filled with water. Prescribed translation and rotation

\[ X_t(t) = \frac{A_0}{2} \frac{G_t(ft)}{\max G_t} C(ft), \quad \alpha_1(t) = -\beta \frac{G_r(ft)}{\max G_r} \]

with \( G_r(t) = \tanh[\sigma_r \cos(2\pi t + \Phi)] \),

\[ G_t(t) = \int_t \tanh[\sigma_t \cos(2\pi t')] dt' \]

- 7 cases constructed by varying \( \sigma_r, \sigma_t, \Phi \)
- Rotational Reynolds number \( \text{Re}_r = \frac{2\pi \beta \sigma_r f c^2}{(\tanh(\sigma_r) \nu)} \) varied between 2200 and 7200 in experiments
- [Toomey and Eldredge, 2008] reference simulations with a viscous particle method are for \( \text{Re}_r = \{100, 500\} \)

\begin{align*}
A_0 (cm) & 7.1 \\
c (cm) & 5.1 \\
d (cm) & 0.25 \\
\rho_b (kg/m^3) & 5080 \\
f (Hz) & 0.15
\end{align*}
Case 1 - $\sigma_r = \sigma_t = 0.628$, $\Phi = 0$, $Re_r = 100$

- Quiescent water
  $\rho_f = 997 \text{ kg/m}^3$
  $c_s = 1497 \text{ m/s}$

- No-slip boundaries in $y$, periodic in $x$-direction

- Base level:
  100 $\times$ 100 for $[-0.5, 0.5] \times [-0.5, 0.5]$ domain

- 4 additional levels with factors 2,2,2,4

- Coupling to rigid body motion solver on 4th level

Right: computed vorticity field (enlarged)
Quantitative comparison

- Evaluate normalized force $F_{x,y} = 2F_{x,y}^*/(\rho_f^2 c^3)$ and moment $M = 2M^*/(\rho_f f^2 c^4)$ over 3 periods

- [Wood and Deiterding, 2015] Used finest spatial resolution $\Delta x/c = 0.0122$
- [Toomey and Eldredge, 2008]: $\Delta x/c = 0.013$ ($Re_r = 100$), $\Delta x/c = 0.0032$ ($Re_r = 500$)

- Temporal resolution $\sim 113$ and $\sim 28$ times finer

Hinge deflection angle over time

Case 1
- $\sigma_t = 0.628$
- $\sigma_r = 0.628$
- $\Phi = 0$

Case 2
- $\sigma_t = 1.885$
- $\sigma_r = 1.885$
- $\Phi = 0^\circ$

Experimental results (–); Current (– –)
An LBM for thermal transport

Consider the Navier-Stokes equations under Boussinesq approximation

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}) &= -\nabla p + \nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{F} \\
\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u} T) &= D \nabla^2 T
\end{align*}
\]

with \( \mathbf{F} = g \beta (T - T_{\text{ref}}) \).

An LBM for this system needs to use two distribution functions \( f_\alpha \) and \( g_\alpha \).

1.) Transport step \( \tilde{T} \):

\[
\tilde{f}_\alpha(x + e_\alpha \Delta t, t + \Delta t) = f_\alpha(x, t), \quad \tilde{g}_\alpha(x + e_\alpha \Delta t, t + \Delta t) = g_\alpha(x, t)
\]

2.) Collision step \( \tilde{C} \):

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) &= \tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) + \omega_{L,\nu} \Delta t \left( \tilde{f}^\text{eq}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) - \tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) \right) + \Delta t \mathbf{F}_\alpha \\
\tilde{g}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) &= \tilde{g}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) + \omega_{L,D} \Delta t \left( \tilde{g}^\text{eq}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) - \tilde{g}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) \right)
\end{align*}
\]

with collision frequencies

\[
\omega_{L,\nu} = \frac{c_s^2}{\nu + c_s^2 \Delta t/2}, \quad \omega_{L,D} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{c_s^2}{D + \frac{3}{2} c_s^2 \Delta t/2}
\]
Equilibrium operators

This incompressible method uses in 2D [Guo et al., 2002]

\[
f_{\alpha}^{(eq)} = \begin{cases} -4\sigma_0 p - s_{\alpha}(u), & \text{for } \alpha = 0, \\ \sigma_{\alpha} p + s_{\alpha}(u), & \text{for } \alpha = 1, \ldots, 8, \end{cases}
\]

where

\[
s_{\alpha}(u) = t_{\alpha} \left[ \frac{3e_{\alpha}u}{c^2} + \frac{9(e_{\alpha}u)^2}{2c^4} - \frac{3u^2}{2c^2} \right]
\]

with \( t_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{9} \{ 4, 1, 1, 1, \frac{1}{4}, 1, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4} \} \) and \( \sigma_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{3} \{ -5, 1, 1, 1, \frac{1}{4}, 1, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4} \} \)

\[
g_{\alpha}^{(eq)} = \frac{T}{4} \left[ 1 + 2e_{\alpha} \cdot u \right] \text{ for } \alpha = 1, \ldots, 4
\]

Forces are applied in y-direction only:

\[
F_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{i3} - \delta_{i6}) e_i \cdot F
\]

Moments:

\[
\mathbf{u} = \sum_{\alpha > 0} e_i f_{\alpha}, \quad p = \frac{1}{4\sigma} \left[ \sum_{\alpha > 0} f_{\alpha} + s_0(u) \right], \quad T = \sum_{\alpha = 1}^{4} g_{\alpha}
\]
Heated rotating cylinder

- $R = 15$, domain: $[-6R, 16R] \times [-8R, 8R]$
- $Re = 2U_\infty R/\nu = 200$, $U_\infty = 0.01$
- Peripheral velocity $V = \Omega R$, $V/U_\infty = 0.5$
- Base grid $288 \times 240$ refined by three levels with $r_1 = 2$, $r_{2,3} = 4$ using scaled gradients of $u$, $v$, $T$

$$\begin{align*}
v &= 0, \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = 0, \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} = 0 \\
u &= U_\infty \\
v &= 0 \\
T &= T_C \\
v &= 0, \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = 0, \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} = 0
\end{align*}$$
Natural convection

Characterized by

$$Ra = \frac{g \beta \Delta TH^3}{\nu D}$$

\( a = \text{AMROC-LBM}, \)
\( b = \text{[Fusegi et al., 1991] (NS - uniform)} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>( u_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( y_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( v_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( x_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( Nu_{\text{ave}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( Ra = 10^3 )</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Ra = 10^4 )</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>2.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Ra = 10^5 )</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>4.646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turbulence modeling

Pursue a large-eddy simulation approach with $\tilde{f}_\alpha$ and $\tilde{f}_\alpha^{eq}$, i.e.

1.) $\tilde{f}_\alpha(x + e_\alpha \Delta t, t + \Delta t) = \tilde{f}_\alpha(x, t)$

2.) $\tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) = \tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) + \frac{1}{\tau} \Delta t \left( \tilde{f}_\alpha^{eq}(\cdot, t + \Delta t) - \tilde{f}_\alpha(\cdot, t + \Delta t) \right)$

Effective viscosity: $\nu^* = \nu + \nu_t = \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{\tau_\star^L}{\Delta t} - \frac{1}{2} \right) c \Delta x$ with $\tau_\star^L = \tau_L + \tau_t$

Use Smagorinsky model to evaluate $\nu_t$, e.g., $\nu_t = (C_{sm} \Delta x)^2 |\mathbf{S}|$, where

$$|\mathbf{S}| = \sqrt{2 \sum_{i,j} \overline{S}_{ij} \overline{S}_{ij}}$$

The filtered strain rate tensor $\overline{S}_{ij} = (\partial_j \overline{u}_i + \partial_i \overline{u}_j)/2$ can be computed as a second moment as

$$\overline{S}_{ij} = \frac{\Sigma_{ij}}{2 \rho c_s^2 \tau_\star^L \left( 1 - \frac{\omega L \Delta t}{2} \right)} = \frac{1}{2} \rho c_s^2 \tau_\star^L \sum_{\alpha} e_{\alpha i} e_{\alpha j} (\tilde{f}_\alpha^{eq} - \tilde{f}_\alpha)$$

$\tau_t$ can be obtained as [Yu, 2004, Hou et al., 1996]

$$\tau_t = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{\tau_\star^L} + 18 \sqrt{2} (\rho_0 c_s^2)^{-1} C_{sn}^2 \Delta x |\mathbf{S}| - \tau_L \right)$$
Further LES models

Dynamic Smagorinsky model (DSMA)

\[ C_{sm}(\mathbf{x}, t)^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle L_{ij} M_{ij} \rangle}{\langle M_{ij} M_{ij} \rangle} \]

\[ L_{ij} = T_{ij} - \tau_{ij} = \hat{u}_{i} \hat{u}_{j} - \hat{u}_{i} \hat{u}_{j} \]

\[ M_{ij} = \Delta^2 \hat{S}_{ij} - \Delta^2 \hat{S}_{ij} \]

No van Driest damping implemented yet!

Wall-Adapting Local Eddy-viscosity model (WALE)

\[ \nu_t = (C_w \Delta x)^2 \text{OP}_{WALE}, \quad \text{where} \ C_w = 0.5 \]

WALE turbulence time-scale

\[ \text{OP}_{WALE} = \frac{(J_{ij} J_{ij})^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(\tilde{S}_{ij} \tilde{S}_{ij})^{\frac{5}{4}} + (J_{ij} J_{ij})^{\frac{9}{4}}} \]

\[ J_{ij} = \tilde{S}_{ik} \tilde{S}_{kj} + \tilde{\Omega}_{ik} \tilde{\Omega}_{kj} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} (\tilde{S}_{mn} \tilde{S}_{mn} - \tilde{\Omega}_{mn} \tilde{\Omega}_{mn}) \]

Effective relaxation time (see previous slide):

\[ \tau^*_L = \frac{\nu + \nu_t + \Delta t c_s^2/2}{c_s^2} \]
Forced homogeneous isotropic turbulence

- Fourier representation
- Periodic boundaries, uniform mesh
- Use of external forcing term, i.e., result independent of initial conditions

Forcing:

\[ F_x = 2A \left( \frac{\kappa_y \kappa_z}{|\kappa|^2} \right) G(\kappa_x, \kappa_y, \kappa_z) \]
\[ F_y = -A \left( \frac{\kappa_x \kappa_z}{|\kappa|^2} \right) G(\kappa_x, \kappa_y, \kappa_z) \]
\[ F_z = -A \left( \frac{\kappa_x \kappa_y}{|\kappa|^2} \right) G(\kappa_x, \kappa_y, \kappa_z) \]

with phase

\[ G(\kappa_x, \kappa_y, \kappa_z) = \sin \left( \frac{2\pi x}{L} \kappa_x + \frac{2\pi y}{L} \kappa_y + \frac{2\pi z}{L} \kappa_z + \phi \right) \]

for \(0 < \kappa_i \leq 2\) and \(\phi\) being a random phase value.
Comparison with model spectrum

Time-averaged energy spectrum (solid line) \([N = 128^3 \text{ cells}, \nu = 3e^{-5} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}]\)
against a modelled one (dashed line and the -5/3 power law (dot-dashed line).
LES model spectra

Time-averaged energy spectra normalised by the turbulent kinetic energy $k$ and the integral length scale $L_{11}$ of LBM DNS and LES for two resolutions and DNS of the highest resolution for the viscosity value $\nu = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$. 
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Decaying homogeneous isotropic turbulence

- Restart DNS of $512^3$ resolution without forcing. Volume-averaging to $128^3$ cells gives DSMA and WALE initial conditions

![Graphs showing evolution of turbulent kinetic energy and energy spectra](image)

Evolution of the turbulent kinetic energy $k$ (left) and energy spectra at $t = 68.72$ (right) for DNS of $512^3$ against DSMA and WALE of $128^3$ cells resolution.
Flow field comparison

Contours of vorticity magnitude ($|\omega| = 0.18$) at $t = 4.91$ (left) and $t = 68.72$ (right) for DNS (thin blue lines) of $512^3$ against DSMA (dotted black lines) and WALE (thick red lines) of $128^3$ cells resolution.
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Wind tunnel simulation of a prototype car

Fluid velocity and pressure on vehicle

- Inflow 40 m/s. LES model active. Characteristic boundary conditions.
- To $t = 0.5$ s ($\sim 4$ characteristic lengths) with 31,416 time steps on finest level in $\sim 37$ h on 200 cores (7389 h CPU). Channel: $15$ m $\times$ $5$ m $\times$ $3.3$ m
Mesh adaptation

Used refinement blocks and levels (indicated by color)
Flow over a motorcycle

- Inflow 40 m/s. Bouzidi pressure boundary conditions at outflows. CSMA LES model active.
- SAMR base grid $200 \times 80 \times 80$ cells, $r_{1,2,3} = 2$ yielding finest resolution of $\Delta x = 6.25\text{mm}$. 23560 time steps on finest level
- Forces in AMROC-LBM are time-averaged over interval $[0.5s, 1s]$
- Unstructured STAR-CCM+ mesh has significantly finer as well as coarser cells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Forces (N)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAR-CCM+</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMROC</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mexico experimental turbine – $0^\circ$ inflow

- Setup and measurements by Energy Research Centre of the Netherlands (ECN) and the Technical University of Denmark (DTU) [Schepers and Boorsma, 2012]
- Inflow velocity $14.93 \text{ m/s}$ in wind tunnel of $9.5 \times 9.5$ m cross section.
- Rotor diameter $D = 4.5 \text{ m}$. Prescribed motion with $424.5 \text{ rpm}$: tip speed $100 \text{ m/s}$, $Re_r \approx 75839$ TSR 6.70
- Simulation with three additional levels with factors 2, 2, 4. Resolution of rotor and tower $\Delta x = 1.6 \text{ cm}$
- $149.5 \text{ h}$ on 120 cores Intel-Xeon (17490 h CPU) for 10 s
- Data collected as average during $t \in [5, 10]$. Load on blade 1 as it passes through $\theta = 0^\circ$ (pointing vertically upwards), 35 rotations
Mexico experimental turbine – $30^\circ$ yaw

- 157.6 h on 120 cores Intel-Xeon for 10 s (70.75 revolutions) $\rightarrow \sim 22.25$ h CPU/1M cells/revolution
- $\sim 12$ M cells in total – level 0: 768,000, level 1: $\sim 1.5$ M, level 2: $\sim 6.8$ M, level 3: $\sim 3.0$ M
- For comparison [Schepers and Boorsma, 2012]:
- Wind Multi-Block Liverpool University (34 M cells): 209 h CPU/1M cells/revolution
- EllipSys3D (28.3 M cell mesh): $\sim 40.7$ h CPU/1M cells/revolution, but $\sim 15\%$ error in $F_x$ and $T_x$ already for $0^\circ$ inflow [Sørensen et al., 2014]
Comparison along transects – 30° yaw

Blade loads: $F_x$: Ref = 13.66 N, cur. = 14.8 N (8.3%)
$T_x$: Ref = 7.72 Nm, cur. = 8.36 Nm (8.3%)

Inflow velocity $u_\infty = 8 \text{ m/s}$. Prescribed motion of rotor with $n_{\text{rpm}} = 33$, $r = 14.5 \text{ m}$: tip speed $46.7 \text{ m/s}$, $Re_r \approx 919,700$ TSR 5.84

- Simulation with three additional levels with refinement factors 2, 2, 4.
- Refinement based on vorticity and level set.
- Sampled rotor and circular regions ($r_c = 1.5r$) every 0.034 s over $t = [8, 18] \text{ s}$
- Computing 84,806 highest level iterations to $t_e = 18 \text{ s}$.
- $\sim 24$ time steps for $1°$ rotation
Simulation of the SWIFT array

- Three Vestas V27 turbines (geometric details prototypical). 225 kW power generation at wind speeds 14 to 25 m/s (then cut-off)
- Prescribed motion of rotor with 33 and 43 rpm. Inflow velocity 8 and 25 m/s
- TSR: 5.84 and 2.43, $Re_r \approx 919,700$ and 1,208,000
- Simulation domain $448 \text{ m} \times 240 \text{ m} \times 100 \text{ m}$
- Base mesh $448 \times 240 \times 100$ cells with refinement factors 2, 2.4. Resolution of rotor and tower $\Delta x = 6.25 \text{ cm}$
- 94,224 highest level iterations to $t_e = 40 \text{ s}$ computed, then statistics are gathered for $10 \text{ s}$ [Deiterding and Wood, 2016]
Vorticity – inflow at $30^\circ$, $u = 8 \text{ m/s}$, $33 \text{ rpm}$

- Top view in plane in $z$-direction at 30 m (hub height)
- Turbine hub and inflow at $30^\circ$ yaw leads to off-axis wake impact.
- 160 cores Intel-Xeon E5 2.6 GHz, 33.03 h wall time for interval $[50, 60]$ s (including gathering of statistical data)
- $\sim 6.01$ h per revolution ($961$ h CPU) $\rightarrow \sim 5.74$ h CPU/1M cells/revolution
Levels – inflow at $30^\circ$, $u = 8 \text{ m/s}$, 33 rpm

- At 63.8 s approximately 167M cells used vs. 44 billion (factor 264)
- $\sim 6.01 \text{ h per revolution (961 h CPU)} \longrightarrow \sim 5.74 \text{ h CPU/1M cells/revolution}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Grids</th>
<th>Cells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>10,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,464</td>
<td>20,674,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39,473</td>
<td>131,018,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>4,909,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vorticity development – inflow at $0^\circ$, $u = 8 \text{ m/s}$, 33 rpm

- Refinement of wake up to level 2 ($\Delta x = 25 \text{ cm}$).
- Vortex break-up before 2nd turbine is reached.
Refinement – inflow at $0^\circ$, $u = 8 \text{ m/s}$, 33 rpm
Mean point values – inflow at 0°,

- Turbines located at (0, 0, 0), (135, 0, 0), (−5.65, 80.80, 0)
- Lines of 13 sensors with Δy = 5 m, z = 37 m (approx. center of rotor)
- $u$ and $p$ measured over $[40\, s, 50\, s]$ (1472 level-0 time steps) and averaged

$u = 25\, m/s, 43\, rpm, \, \text{TSR}=2.43$

$u = 8\, m/s, 33\, rpm, \, \text{TSR}=5.84$

$u = 25\, m/s, 43\, rpm, \, \text{TSR}=2.43$
Lattice Boltzmann equation in mapped coordinates

Consider mapping from Cartesian to non-Cartesian coordinates

\[ \xi = \xi(x, y), \eta = \eta(x, y) \]

with

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial y}. \]

Under this transformation the convection term reads

\[ \mathbf{e}_\alpha \cdot \nabla f_\alpha = e_{\alpha x} \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x} + e_{\alpha y} \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial y} = \left( e_{\alpha x} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} + e_{\alpha y} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial y} \right) \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial \xi} + \left( e_{\alpha x} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} + e_{\alpha y} \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial y} \right) \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial \eta}, \]

and hence the lattice Boltzmann equation becomes

\[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \tilde{e}_{\alpha \xi} \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial \xi} + \tilde{e}_{\alpha \eta} \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial \eta} = -\frac{1}{\tau} (f_\alpha - f_{eq}). \]
Scheme construction

Currently using the explicit 4th-order Runge-Kutta scheme

\[ f_1^{\alpha} = f_t^{\alpha}, \quad f_2^{\alpha} = f_1^{\alpha} + \frac{\Delta t}{4} R_1^{\alpha}, \]
\[ f_3^{\alpha} = f_1^{\alpha} + \frac{\Delta t}{3} R_2^{\alpha}, \quad f_4^{\alpha} = f_1^{\alpha} + \frac{\Delta t}{2} R_3^{\alpha}, \]
\[ f_{t+\Delta t}^{\alpha} = f_1^{\alpha} + \Delta t R_4^{\alpha}. \]

with

\[ R_{\alpha(i,j)} = -\left( \tilde{e}_{\alpha \xi(i,j)} f_{\alpha(i+1,j)} - f_{\alpha(i-1,j)} \right) + \frac{1}{\tau} \left( f_{\alpha(i,j)} - f_{\alpha(i,j)}^{eq} \right) \]

for the solution, 2nd-order central differences to approximate derivatives.
A 4th-order dissipation term

\[ D = -\epsilon \left( (\Delta \xi)^4 \frac{\partial^4 f_\alpha}{\partial \xi^4} + (\Delta \eta)^4 \frac{\partial^4 f_\alpha}{\partial \eta^4} \right) \]

is added for stabilization [Hejranfar and Hajihassanpour, 2017].
Prototype implementation is presently on finite difference meshes!
Adaptive lattice Boltzmann method
LES
Aerodynamics cases
Non-Cartesian LBM
Summary

Verification and validation for 2d cylinder

2d cylinder study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>$C_d$</th>
<th>$C_p(0)$</th>
<th>$C_p(180)$</th>
<th>$2L/D$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tritton, 1959</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson, 1995</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis and Chang, 1970</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Hejranfar and Ezzatneshan, 2014]</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tritton, 1959</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson, 1995</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis and Chang, 1970</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Hejranfar and Ezzatneshan, 2014]</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2$L/D$ is normalized length of wake behind cylinder.
2d cylinder study – unsteady flow case

Verification and validation for 2d cylinder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>St</th>
<th>$C_d$</th>
<th>$C_f$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>[Chiu et al., 2010]</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>[Chiu et al., 2010]</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re</th>
<th>CPU-time</th>
<th>Mesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>24:55:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>06:08:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>27:10:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>05:57:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>113:15:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>05:58:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>AMROC-LBM</td>
<td>130:37:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>06:03:42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions – subsonic aerodynamics with LBM

- Cartesian LBM is a very efficient low-dissipation method for subsonic aerodynamic simulation and especially suitable for DNS and LES.

- Cartesian CFD with block-based AMR is faster than cell-cased AMR and tailored for modern massively parallel computer systems.

- Fast dynamic mesh adaptation in AMROC makes FSI problems with complex motion easily accessible. Time-explicit approach leads to very tight coupling.

- For high Reynolds number flows around complex bodies an LES turbulence model is vital for stability (so are higher-order in- and outflow boundary conditions).

- Currently validating and extending (dynamic) Smagorinsky with wall-near damping and WALE model for realistic problems.

- Turbulent wall function boundary condition model under development.

- Accurate simulation of thin, wall-resolved boundary layers is dramatically more efficient with the non-Cartesian LBM approach, despite the availability of AMR in AMROC.
  - Develop non-Cartesian version of AMROC-LBM as near-term goal.
  - Chimera technique within AMROC-LBM might be long-term goal.
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Motion solver

Based on the Newton-Euler method solution of dynamics equation of kinetic chains [Tsai, 1999]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
F \\
\tau_P
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
m1 & -m[c] \times \\
m[c] \times I_{cm} & -m[c] \times [c] \times
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
a_P \\
\alpha
\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}
m[\omega] \times [\omega] \times [c] \\
[\omega] \times (I_{cm} - m[c] \times [c] \times)
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
\omega
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

\(m = \text{mass of the body}, \ 1 = \text{the } 4 \times 4 \text{ homogeneous identity matrix}, \)
\(a_P = \text{acceleration of link frame with origin at } p \text{ in the preceding link’s frame,} \)
\(I_{cm} = \text{moment of inertia about the center of mass,} \)
\(\omega = \text{angular velocity of the body,} \)
\(\alpha = \text{angular acceleration of the body,} \)
\(c = \text{the location of the body’s center of mass,} \)
and \([c] \times, [\omega] \times\) denote skew-symmetric cross product matrices.

Here, we additionally define the total force and torque acting on a body,

\[
\begin{align*}
F &= (F_{FSI} + F_{\text{prescribed}}) \cdot C_{xyz} \quad \text{and} \\
\tau &= (\tau_{FSI} + \tau_{\text{prescribed}}) \cdot C_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \quad \text{respectively.}
\end{align*}
\]

Where \(C_{xyz}\) and \(C_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\) are the translational and rotational constraints, respectively.