Turbulence and CFD models: Theory and applications

Roadmap to Lecture 10

- 1. SRS simulations Scale-resolving simulations
- 2. LES equations Filtered Navier-Stokes equations
- 3. Sub-grid scale models for LES
- 4. DES models
- 5. A few mesh resolution guidelines and rough estimates for LES/DES simulations
- 6. Final remarks on LES/DES turbulence models

Roadmap to Lecture 10

- 1. SRS simulations Scale-resolving simulations
- 2. LES equations Filtered Navier-Stokes equations
- 3. Sub-grid scale models for LES
- 4. DES models
- 5. A few mesh resolution guidelines and rough estimates for LES/DES simulations
- 6. Final remarks on LES/DES turbulence models

• Overview of the main turbulence modeling approaches.



- We have seen so far that DNS requires no mathematical modeling.
- In theory, it is the simplest of the approaches to deal with turbulence.
- The problem relies in the fact that very fine meshes and small time-steps are required to properly solve the turbulent scales.
- Make no mistake, if you run a simulation in laminar mode (with no turbulence models), you will get a solution, but unless you are using an extremely fine mesh, the results will be highly over or under predicted.



- LES/DES simulations are midway DNS and RANS.
- They are much affordable than DNS, but they still they require large computational resources and low dissipative numerical methods.
- In LES/DES simulations the large scales are fully resolved with the mesh and a small amount of turbulent viscosity is added to model the scales smaller than the local cell size.
- In LES/DES simulations, the mesh resolution determines the fraction of the energy spectrum directly resolved.



- RANS/URANS simulations are very affordable and very reliable (if good standard practices are followed).
- You can use RANS/URANS models with 2D and 3D cases, and steady and unsteady solvers.
- Using RANS/URANS turbulence models all scales are modeled.
- You can use RANS/URANS solutions as starting point for LES/DES simulations.
- The workhorse in CFD is RANS/URANS.



- Scale-resolving simulations or SRS, aim at resolving all or most of the scales in space and time.
- SRS simulations are intrinsically three-dimensional and unsteady.
 - Therefore, the meshing requirements are much larger than those for RANS/URANS simulations.
 - Also, the time-step requirements are more stringent.
- SRS simulations requires good meshes, accurate and robust numerical schemes, and CFL number requirements less than 1 for good accuracy.
 - We must minimize the numerical diffusion due to mesh resolution and numerical discretization.
- Sometimes, the two-dimensional approximation can be taken in SRS, but do it with a lot of care.
- The most well-known SRS approaches are LES (large eddy simulations) and DES (detached eddy simulations).
- DNS simulations also belong to the group of SRS methods.
- DNS simulations do not use any models.
 - They directly resolve all scales in space and time.

- In LES and DES simulations, the large scales are resolved.
- Then, the smallest scales are filtered (or modeled as in RANS/URANS).
- Therefore, the mesh resolution determines the fraction of the energy spectrum directly resolved.
- In a DNS simulation, the whole spectrum is resolved.
- In a good LES simulation, approximately 80% of the spectrum is resolved.
- In a URANS simulation, the whole spectrum is modeled.
- The turbulent power spectrum shown in the figure, represents the distribution of the turbulent kinetic energy k across the various length scales.
- It is a direct indication of how energy is dissipated with eddies size.
- Remember, this plot is local.



- In LES/DES simulations we aim at resolving a good percentage of the turbulence energy spectrum, something between 50% and 80%.
 - When we resolve 50% of the turbulence energy spectrum, we talk about VLES (very large LES).
 - We should always aim for at least 80% of the turbulence energy spectrum.
- For the small scales, simple models are introduced.
 - As for RANS/URANS, most of these models are based on the Boussinesq hypothesis and the gradient diffusion hypothesis.
- LES/DES simulations are much more costly than RANS/URANS simulations.
- And LES simulations are more costly than DES simulations.
- In general, LES simulations are not very practical for most engineering applications.
 - They require a lot of computational resources.
- LES/DES simulations can be wall resolving or wall modelling.
 - Obviously, wall resolving LES/DES simulations have larger computational requirements.
- Remember, in RANS/URANS simulations all scales are modeled.
 - This is the main difference between SRS simulations and RANS/URANS approaches.

- Simulation results for flow over a cylinder (vorticity isosurfaces).
- Turbulence is modeled as (a) shear-stress-transport (SST) steady RANS. (b) 2D SST URANS. (c) 3D SST URANS. Spalart-Allmaras DES on a (d) coarse grid and a (e) fine grid/ (f) SST DES on a fine grid [1].



• Influence of mesh density on the turbulent flow structures in SRS LES simulations [1].



• Influence of the numerical discretization scheme on the turbulent flow structures in SRS LES simulations. (a) Central differences schemes. (b) Bounded central differences scheme [1].



Vortex shedding past square cylinder – Vortices visualized by Q-criterion



Vortex shedding past square cylinder – Drag coefficient signal



Vortex shedding past square cylinder – Drag coefficient signal



- LES simulations are about:
 - Resolving the turbulent motion in space and time by using fine meshes and small time-steps.
 - Where we aim at modeling only a small portion of the turbulent spectrum, about 20% or less.
 - We also need to use low dissipative discretization schemes (in space and time).
 - LES simulations are also about computing your unsteady statistics and analyzing time series.

Roadmap to Lecture 10

1. SRS simulations – Scale-resolving simulations

2. LES equations – Filtered Navier-Stokes equations

3. Sub-grid scale models for LES

4. DES models

- 5. A few mesh resolution guidelines and rough estimates for LES/DES simulations
- 6. Final remarks on LES/DES turbulence models

- In LES simulations, the smallest scales need to be modeled (as in RANS/URANS).
- Therefore, we need to somehow remove or filter the smallest scales of the instantaneous field variables.
- In LES, we use a similar approach to the Reynolds decomposition, but we call it LES decomposition (or filtering decomposition),

$$\phi(\mathbf{x},t) = \tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t) + \phi'(\mathbf{x},t)$$

- Where the tilde represents the filtered quantity, and the prime represents the unresolved field.
- In the literature, most of the times the tilde is used to denote the filtered quantity.
- Hereafter, and just to simplify the typesetting and avoid confusion with the Favre average, we will use an overbar to denote the filtered quantity in the context of LES/DES simulations,

$$\phi(\mathbf{x},t) = \bar{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t) + \phi'(\mathbf{x},t)$$

- In LES, to remove the small scales we use a filter in space.
- You can see this operation as a rolling average.
- This filtered quantity represents the resolved scales (grid scales).
- Whereas, in RANS/URANS we use a time averaging to remove the fluctuations.
- This is the main difference between the techniques used to remove the fluctuations of small scales.
- By the way, these two concepts (filtering and time average) appear to be similar, but they are not. In fact, the rules used are different.
- At the end of the day, the instantaneous field can be decomposed as follows (LES decomposition),



- The derivation of the filtered incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (FNS) is somehow similar to the derivation of the incompressible RANS equations.
- The main difference is that instead of using the Reynolds decomposition, we use the LES decomposition (first introduced by Deardoff [1]),

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x},t) = \bar{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x},t) + \mathbf{u}'(\mathbf{x},t)$$
$$p(\mathbf{x},t) = \bar{p}(\mathbf{x},t) + p'(\mathbf{x},t)$$

- Remember, the overbar represents the filtered quantity.
- The prime symbol represents the unresolved quantity (or residual).
- The LES decomposition uses local spatial filter (or in the simplest case, spatial average).
- This is the main difference between the LES and Reynolds decomposition (which uses time averaging).

• As for the derivation of the RANS equations, we should be aware of a few filtering properties used when deriving the FNS.

• Remember, the overbar represents a spatial filter.

- To derive the filtered incompressible Navier-Stokes equations (FNS), we apply the filtering operator directly to the primitive variables.
- After some algebra, we arrive to the FNS equations,

- As you can see, the FNS equations are very similar to the RANS equations.
- The main different is that all variables are filtered in space and the appearance of the sub-grid scale stress tensor τ^{SGS} .
- And as for the RANS/URANS equations, this apparent stress tensor requires modeling.
- To derive the compressible LES equations, we proceed in a similar way, but we use massweighted averaging.
- Unfortunately, we cannot say that the derivation is straightforward.

- The sub-grid scale stress tensor τ^{SGS} can be further decomposed as follows,

$$\tau^{SGS} = \underbrace{(\overline{\mathbf{u}}\overline{\mathbf{u}} - \overline{\mathbf{u}}\overline{\mathbf{u}})}_{\mathbf{L}} + \underbrace{(\overline{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u'}}_{\mathbf{C}} + \overline{\mathbf{u'}\overline{\mathbf{u}}})}_{\mathbf{C}} + \underbrace{\overline{\mathbf{u'}\mathbf{u'}}}_{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{R}$$

- This is known as the triple decomposition, and it accounts for the interaction of the resolved scales and the small scales.
- In this definition, L is called the Leonard stresses, C is the called the cross-stress term, and R is called the sub-grid scale Reynolds stress (equivalent to the Reynolds stress tensor).
- The Leonard stresses (L) involves only the resolved quantities, and therefore it can be computed.
- The cross-term stresses (**C**) and SGS Reynolds stresses (**R**), they both involve unresolved scales and must be modeled.
- The cross-term stress represents the interaction of resolved and unresolved scales, whereas the SGS Reynolds stress represents the interaction of unresolved scales.
- At this point, the problem is how to model the cross-term stress and the sub-grid scale Reynolds stress.

- It is important to mention that the decomposition of the sub-grid scale stress tensor τ^{SGS} is not unique.

$$\tau^{SGS} = \underbrace{(\overline{\mathbf{u}}\overline{\mathbf{u}} - \overline{\mathbf{u}}\overline{\mathbf{u}})}_{\mathbf{L}} + \underbrace{(\overline{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{u'}}_{\mathbf{C}} + \overline{\mathbf{u'}\overline{\mathbf{u}}})}_{\mathbf{C}} + \underbrace{\overline{\mathbf{u'}\mathbf{u'}}}_{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{R}$$

- In this case we used the triple decomposition or Leonard decomposition.
- Also, this decomposition is not Galilean invariant (i.e., the solution is not the same in every inertial frame).
- Germano [1], proposed a modification to make this decomposition Galilean invariant,

$$\tau^{SGS} = L^m_{ij} + C^m_{ij} + R^m_{ij}$$

• Where the superscript m indicates the modified stresses.

• The modified stresses can be written as follows,

$$L_{ij}^{m} = \overline{\bar{u}_{i}\bar{u}_{j}} - \overline{\bar{u}}_{i}\overline{\bar{u}}_{j}$$
$$C_{ij}^{m} = \overline{\bar{u}_{i}u_{j}'} + \overline{u_{i}'\bar{u}_{j}} - \left(\overline{\bar{u}}_{i}\overline{u}_{j}' + \overline{u}_{i}'\overline{\bar{u}}_{j}\right)$$
$$R_{ij}^{m} = \overline{u_{i}'u_{j}'} - \overline{u}_{i}'\overline{u}_{j}'$$

- The modified Leonard stress L_{ij}^m is determined with the filtered grid-scale velocity, but the evaluation of the modified cross-term stresses C_{ij}^m and modified SGS stresses R_{ij}^m requires the use of models.
- The difference between L_{ij} and L_{ij}^m is,

$$B_{ij} = L_{ij}^m - L_{ij} = \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{\bar{u}}_i \bar{\bar{u}}_j$$

• This term is known as the scale-similarity term [1] and is used in scale-similarity models, such as the one we just introduced.

• In the appendix, you will find an extended derivation of the filtered Navier-Stokes equations and the expansion of the non-linear term \overline{uu} using the triple decomposition (or Leonard decomposition).

- In LES models, the governing equations need to be filtered (local spatial filter).
- You can see these filters as a rolling average used to filter fluctuations.
- In the figure below, you can see the effect of filtering a signal and three commons filter kernels.
- The local spatial filtering operation simple consist in removing the very small fluctuations.
- Different filters have different properties.

References: S. Pope. Turbulent Flows. Cambridge University Press. 2014.

 In the figure, the upper thin line represents the sampled velocity and the bold line the filtered velocity using a Gaussian filter.

$$\bar{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t) = \int G(r,\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}-r,t)dr$$

 In the figure, the lower thin line represents the field residual (fluctuations) and the bold line the filtered field residual.

$$\phi'(\mathbf{x},t) = \phi(\mathbf{x},t) - \bar{\phi}(\mathbf{x},t)$$

Remember, the filtering operation is done in space and in every single time-step.

References: S. Pope. Turbulent Flows. Cambridge University Press. 2014.

Turbulence energy spectrum

- In LES simulations, we aim at resolving 80% of the turbulence energy spectrum.
- Recall that the turbulent power spectrum represents the distribution of the turbulent kinetic energy across the various length scales.
- It is a direct indication of how energy is dissipated with eddies size.
- The mesh resolution determines the fraction of the energy spectrum directly resolved.
- Remember, the turbulent kinetic energy peaks at integral length scale l_0 .
- In SRS simulations, this scale must be sufficiently resolved.

Turbulence energy spectrum

- The finer the mesh the less energy that is being modeled.
- The width of the filter function is determined by the local mesh size.
- Many of the filtering functions are designed for uniform hexahedral meshes.
- Therefore, in LES simulations it is highly recommended to use hexahedral meshes with a low growth rate factor (preferably less than 1.1).
- Your goal is to have a mesh fine enough so that it will resolve 80% of the turbulence energy spectrum.