

Comparison of a spectral method with volume penalization and a finite volume method with body fitted grids for turbulent flows

Benjamin Kadoch, Thorsten Reimann, Kai Schneider, Michael Schäfer

▶ To cite this version:

Benjamin Kadoch, Thorsten Reimann, Kai Schneider, Michael Schäfer. Comparison of a spectral method with volume penalization and a finite volume method with body fitted grids for turbulent flows. Computers and Fluids, 2016, 133, pp.140-150. 10.1016/j.compfluid.2016.04.028 . hal-01455110

HAL Id: hal-01455110 https://hal.science/hal-01455110

Submitted on 3 Feb 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Comparison of a spectral method with volume penalization and a finite volume method with body fitted grids for turbulent flows

B. Kadoch^a, T. Reimann^b, K. Schneider^c, M. Schäfer^b

^aAix Marseille Université, CNRS, IUSTI UMR 7343, 13453, Marseille, France ^bFachgebiet Numerische Berechnungsverfahren im Maschinenbau, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany ^cAix Marseille Universit, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, M2P2 UMR 7340, 13451, Marseille, France

Abstract

We consider a turbulent flow past periodic hills at Reynolds number 1400 and compare two numerical methods: A Fourier pseudo–spectral scheme with volume penalization to model the no-slip boundary conditions and a finite volume method with body fitted grids. A detailed comparison of the results is presented for mean velocity profiles and Reynolds stress and confronted with those obtained by Breuer et al. [1]. In addition higher order statistics are performed and their scale-dependence is analyzed using orthogonal wavelets. Moreover, for the Fourier pseudo-spectral scheme, the influence of the Reynolds number is investigated.

Keywords: computational fluid dynamics, periodic hill, volume penalization, Fourier spectral method, finite volumes, wavelets

1 1. Introduction

Computational fluid dynamics in complex geometries is still a challenge
 especially for high Reynolds numbers. The thin boundary layers which desta bilize, subsequently detach and thus generate coherent vorticies are a key
 feature to understand turbulence generated by walls. Two main approaches

Preprint submitted to Computers & Fluids

January 15, 2016

Email address: benjamin.kadoch@univ-amu.fr (B. Kadoch)

have been developed so far, either body fitted grids using, e.q., finite vol-6 ume or finite element discretizations, or immersed boundary methods (IBM) 7 which are becoming more and more attractive due to their high flexibility. In-8 deed, for the latter the complex geometry is typically embedded into a larger g computational domain of simple shape, e.q., a rectangle. Hence classical dis-10 cretizations, using Cartesian grids, for which efficient solvers are available, 11 can be employed. The influence of the geometry and the no-slip boundary 12 conditions is modeled by modifying the underlying Navier–Stokes equations. 13 The origin of IBM can be traced back to Courant (1943) [2] in the context of 14 constraint optimization. A large range of immersed boundary methods can 15 be found since then, for example Lagrangian multipliers [4], level-set meth-16 ods [5], fictitious domain approaches and surface [6] and volume penalization 17 approaches [7]. For reviews we refer the reader to [8] and [9]. 18

19

Validation and benchmarking are an essential step in code development.
Comparing the results of different numerical methods enables us to know the
advantages and drawbacks. Their domain of validity can thus be checked
and their precision can be assessed.

24

In this study, we have chosen the volume penalization method [7] cou-25 pled with a Fourier pseudo-spectral method [10]. Investigations on the Gibbs 26 ocsillations which appear in Fourier based schemes can be found in [11], 27 as well as filtering techniques for removing this Gibbs phenomenon. The 28 code has been benchmarked in two space dimensions [12] and applied to 29 moving obstacles [13]. To evaluate the performance of this new method in 30 three-dimensional, turbulent fluid flow, it is compared here to that of a well-31 established second-order finite-volume method in terms of accuracy and effi-32 ciency. The latter, called "Fastest" [14] is based on a finite volume discretiza-33 tion and uses body fitted grids. The flow configuration is a well documented 34 benchmark "flow over periodic hills" [1]. This benchmark is of interest, since 35 it is a geometrically simple test case and there is no difficulty to specify 36 inflow/outflow boundary conditions. Moreover, the physical mechanisms of 37 separation on curved surfaces and the streamwise decorrelation enhanced, by 38 choosing a sufficiently large distance between the two hills, are an attractive 39 features of this test case. An other class of IBM was investigated recently 40 using this benchmark in [15]. The three-dimensional Fourier pseudo-spectral 41 code including volume penalization (denoted by "Pen4Flow") to impose non-42 periodic boundary conditions is thus applied for the first time to compute 43

fully developed turbulent flows. The aim of the paper is to show a detailed
benchmark of the volume penalization method for three-dimensional turbulent flows and to compare the efficiency with respect to a classical finite
volume code Fastest.

48

For the two solvers several grid levels are employed. As the considered flow is turbulent, statistical analysis are performed and compared with each other. In addition we also use orthogonal wavelets to decompose the flow into different scales of motion. Statistical quantities can thus be defined as a function of scale and direction.

54

The manuscript is organized as follows. In section 2 the "Flow over pe-55 riodic hills" configuration is explained and the two numerical methods are 56 shortly presented. Then in section 3, the results for the different codes are 57 described and the flow statistics are compared. Scale dependent analysis of 58 the results are also performed. Finally, the influence of the Reynolds num-59 ber is investigated for the pseudo-spectral code with the volume penalization 60 method. Some conclusions and perspectives are exposed at the end of the 61 manuscript. 62

63

⁶⁴ 2. Flow configuration and Numerical methods

65 2.1. Flow configuration

The classical benchmark "Flow over periodic hills" [1], is considered in detail at a Reynolds number of Re = 1400 which is based on the bulk velocity u_b at x = 0 and the bump height H. To check the influence of the Reynolds number, we also considered Re = 700 and Re = 2800. The boundary conditions are periodic along the streamwise x-direction and the spanwise z-direction. The flow is confined by a hill at the bottom and by a wall plane at the top (y-direction). The flow configuration is illustrated in Fig. 1.

73 2.2. Pen4Flow: Fourier pseudo-spectral code with "volume penalization"
 74 method

In this subsection, we present the volume penalization method and the
methodology to include the periodic hill configuration. More details on the
numerical and mathematical validation of this method can be found [13, 16].



Figure 1: Sketch of the 2d hill geometry. The dimension in spanwise z-direction is $l_z = 4.5H$.

The Fourier pseudo-spectral code solves the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in velocity-vorticity formulation. The volume penalization method modifies the Navier-Stokes equations by adding a penalization term to the right hand side of the momentum equation:

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{u}}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \nabla \boldsymbol{u} + \nabla \Pi - \nu \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{F} = -\frac{1}{\eta} \chi(\boldsymbol{u}), \quad \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \boldsymbol{\Omega} \quad (1)$$

84 with

83

$$-\nabla^2 \Pi = \nabla \cdot \left(\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{F} + \frac{1}{\eta} \chi(\boldsymbol{u}) \right)$$
(2)

where $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_x, u_y, u_z)$ is the velocity, $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ the kinematic viscosity, $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ is the 85 modified pressure, $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ the vorticity, \boldsymbol{F} an external force, η the permeability 86 (or penalization parameter) and χ the mask function which equals to 1 in Ω_s 87 (solid domain) and 0 in Ω_f (fluid domain). Figure 2 (a) shows the computa-88 tional domain $\Omega = \Omega_f \cup \Omega_s$ where Ω_f is the fluid domain (in white) and Ω_s 89 is the solid domain (in black). The solution of the penalized Navier–Stokes 90 equations does converge towards the solution of the Navier–Stokes equations 91 with no-slip boundary conditions [7]. The difference between the exact so-92 lution of the penalized equation and the exact solution of the Navier–Stokes 93 equations, called modeling error is proportional to $\sqrt{\eta}$ and for sufficiently 94 small values of η the solution is precise enough. 95 96

In space all variables are represented as truncated Fourier series, prod-97 uct and nonlinear terms are evaluated in physical space while derivatives 98 are evaluated in spectral space. For time integration a second order Adams-99 Bashforth scheme is used for the nonlinear and the penalization term. The 100 viscous term is integrated exactly using the semi-group formulation [13], 10 which means that the semi-group of the heat kernel is used for time integra-102 tion. This corresponds to the exact integration of the linear viscous term. 103 The numerical study was carried out on three different grids that differed 104 in the number of nodes employed, see Table 1. As the volume penalization 105 method takes care of generating the boundary layer, the numerical grid has 106 to be chosen sufficiently fine to be able to resolve these thin layers. For each 10 grid, the size l_y in the y-direction of the computational domain is chosen such 108 that y = 3.036 coincides with a collocation point and that the solid domain 109 on the top contains 10 points along the y-direction. In all simulations, the 110 penalization parameter is $\eta = 10^{-3}$ and the CFL constant is equal to 0.1. 111 The choice of the penalization parameter is a compromise which works well 112 for the resolutions considered here, more details on the influence of the penal-113 ization parameter can be found in [11]. For Pen4Flow, we observe that the 114 time step limitation comes from the CFL condition and not for the stability 115 limit $(\Delta t < \eta)$ imposed by the penalization term. 116

The flow is driven by an external force $F = f e_x \in \Omega$. In order to keep the desired mass flow rate constant throughout the whole simulation, a control function similar to [17], updates the forcing term on every time step:

$$f_{n+1} = f_n + (u_b - 2\tilde{u}_n + \tilde{u}_{n-1}) / (\alpha_f \Delta t)$$
(3)

where \tilde{u}_n is the measured bulk velocity at time level n, α_f a damping factor ($\alpha_f = 10$ for Pen4Flow and $\alpha_f = 1$ for Fastest). In all computations the time-step for Pen4Flow is $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$ and for Fastest $\Delta t = 1.5 \ 10^{-3}$.

The flow is initialized with $\boldsymbol{u}(t=0) = 0$. To trigger the instability, an impulsion is imposed during the first time interval [0, 2], *i.e.*, the forcing term is extended to $\boldsymbol{F} = f\boldsymbol{e_x} + f_{imp}\boldsymbol{e_z}$ with $f_{imp} = A\sin(2x2\pi/l_x) * \exp(1-2(y-l_y/2)^2) * \sin(2z2\pi/l_z)$ and A = 1 being a suitable amplitude.

128 2.3. Fastest: Finite volume method

117

To solve the transient, incompressible Navier-Stokes equations with the finite volume method on body-fitted grids, we employ the solver Fastest

[14]. This code is based on a cell-centered finite volume method on block-131 structured grids. Discretization of the convective term is carried out using 132 a multi-dimensional Taylor series expansion which preserves second-order 133 accuracy on strongly distorted grids [18], while the time is advanced by the 134 Crank-Nicolson scheme. This numerical procedure is of second order in space 135 and in time. The SIMPLE procedure is employed for the solution of the 136 pressure. Velocity and pressure fields are coupled via the Rhie-Chow inter-137 polation. The discretized system of equations is implicitly solved by Stone's 138 method. 139

Two grids were generated for the finite volume computations, the first 140 of which, subsequently referred to as fine grid, was constructed to fulfill 141 the requirements of a DNS, while a coarse grid was derived from that by 142 omitting every second node in each direction. A precursor RANS simulation 143 employing the ζ -f model of Hanjalić [19] gave an estimate of the Kolmogorov 144 length scale η . Following Pope's recommendations [20], a maximum ratio of 145 $\Delta x/\eta = 2.1$ was ensured over the entire domain for the construction of the 146 fine grid. For the boundary layer resolution, the normalized wall distance 147 of the first cell center y_1^+ was kept below 0.1 everywhere. A coarse grid 148 was derived from the fine one by omitting every second node in every index 149 direction. 150

The time step size was chosen such that CFL < 1 for all time steps. During the computation, the mass flux was kept constant utilizing (3) as external forcing. However, $u(t = 0)/u_b = 1.0$ was chosen as initial condition, and during the initial simulation period no additional forcing was necessary to excite the flow instabilities.

156 3. Results

First we consider the periodic hill configuration at Reynolds number Re = 1400 and compare Fastest and Pen4Flow with the results obtained by Breuer et al. [1]. Second, we focus on Pen4Flow and study the influence of the Reynolds number.

- 161
- 162 3.1. Case Re = 1400

In the following we present the results at Re = 1400 and study the influence of the resolution.

165



Figure 2: Numerical grids: (top) Pen4Flow (128³ for visualization), (bottom) Fastest for the coarsest grid ($442 \times 184 \times 200$).

Table 1 summarizes the numerical and physical parameters for both codes. Scaling of the CPU time with respect to the number of processors is given in Fig. 3 for both codes using coarse resolution, obtained on the HHLR supercomputer ("Hessischer Hochleistungsrechner"). Note that for Pen4Flow, the fluid domain height is constant and equal to $y_f = 3.036$ and the solid

domain height is chosen such that the solid contains 10 grid points and the
boundary of the fluid coincides with a grid point.

	N_x	N_y	N_z	y_l/H	FTT
Pen4Flow 256^3	256	256	256	3.15941	48.88
Pen4Flow 512^2256	512	512	256	3.09647	14.69
Pen4Flow 512^3	512	512	512	3.09647	29.19
Fastest coarse	221	92	100	3.05	215
Fastest fine	442	184	200	3.05	213

Table 1: Numerical parameters, flow domain height y_l/H , flow-through times (FTT = L/u_b) used for statistical evaluation for Re = 1400.



Figure 3: CPU time(s) for one iteration as function of the number of processors and for different resolutions using Pen4Flow and Fastest codes.

Figure 4 shows a three-dimensional representation of isosurfaces of the vorticity norm colored with the streamwise velocity. The computation has been obtained with the volume penalization method at resolution 512³. We observe that the flow is turbulent, characterized by the presence of vortices of different size. We can also identify a recirculation zone corresponding to an upstream (negative) velocity. In the following we will consider statistical quantities only. Table 2 shows that both codes yield similar values for the separation and reattachment point. A slight difference can however be
observed for the reattachment point which might be due to the penalization
method.

184



Figure 4: Isosurface of the vorticity norm $||\boldsymbol{\omega}|| = \sqrt{\omega_x^2 + \omega_y^2 + \omega_z^2}$ colored with the horizontal velocity u_x computed with the Pen4Flow code at resolution 512³ for Re = 1400.

	N_x	N_y	N_z	$x_{\rm sep}/H$	$x_{\rm reatt}/H$
Pen4Flow 512^3	512	512	512	0.26	5.26
Fastest coarse	221	92	100	0.26	5.20
Fastest fine	442	184	200	0.26	5.21
BPRM09 LESOCC	N_{tot}	=	$13.6 \ 10^6$	0.26	5.19

Table 2: Numerical parameters, separation point x_{sep}/H and reattachment point x_{reatt}/H .

185 3.1.1. Moment statistics

Table 3 summarizes the first and second order moments together with 186 the skewness and flatness values of the velocity fields for both codes at a 187 given time instant in the statistically steady state. We can note that aver-188 aging the results over time does not change the results and slight differences 189 (< 2%) appear only for high order moment statistics. The flatness reflects 190 the intermittency in a turbulent flow while the skewness factor of velocity is 191 related to the energy transfer, according to the Kolmogorov 4/5 law. The 192 results show that all values are in good agreement, even for the higher order 193 statistics. In all cases the difference is less than 5%. 194 195

	M_1	M_2	Flatness:	Skewness:
			M_{4}/M_{2}^{2}	$M_3/M_2^{3/2}$
$Pen4Flow 512^3$	0.218	0.228	4.57	2.025
Fastest fine grid 512^3	0.221	0.233	4.36	1.966

Table 3: Moments of the velocity field (averaged over the three components) for the Pen4Flow code (512^3) and for the Fastest code, at a given time instant in the statistically steady state. The data of the finite volume computed on the fine grid are interpolated onto an uniform grid with 512^3 grid points.

Figure 5 (top) shows the probability density functions (PDF), estimated 196 with a histogram using 50 bins, of the velocity at a given time instant in 197 the statistically steady state. We find that the PDFs do almost collapse ex-198 cept for weak negative values where we can observe a small deviation. Note 199 that the PDFs are plotted in log-lin representation, hence the difference is 200 negligible. Spectra of turbulent kinetic energy along the spanwise direction 201 are shown in figure 5 (bottom). A small inertial range with a $k^{-5/3}$ behavior 202 can be identified for k = 3 to 10, followed by a faster decay. The spectra 203 of both simulations collapse for low wavenumbers up to k = 60. For the 204 Fastest code we then find a saturation, while for the spectral code energy 205 further decays with increasing wavenumber. The saturation might be due to 206 the linear interpolation of the finite volume computation. 20

208

The statistical confidence of the second order moments can be quantified by the fourth order moments which are of the same order as the second order moments. Statistical convergence is also reflected by the velocity PDF shown in Fig. 5 (top). The tails do not show any fluctuations at the extreme values
and seem thus well converged.



Figure 5: Top: PDF of the velocity (averaged over the three components) at a given time instant in the statistically steady state. Bottom: Turbulent kinetic energy spectrum versus wavenumber k in the spanwise direction. The codes used are Pen4Flow and Fastest.

²¹⁵ 3.1.2. Mean velocity and Reynolds stress profiles

226

First we consider the volume penalization code and we study the influence 216 of the resolution on the statistics. Figure 6 shows mean velocity and Reynolds 217 stress profiles at four different streamwise locations, x = 0.5, 2, 4 and 6 for 218 three different resolutions, 256^3 , $512^2 \times 256$ and 512^3 . Note that the profiles 219 are all averaged over time (between 30 and 40 flow through times) and over 220 the spanwise direction. We observe that the influence of the resolution is 221 weak for all mean velocity profiles (Fig. 6 only shows the x-component $\langle u_x \rangle$) 222 while it is much more sensitive for the second order moments, illustrated in 223 Fig. 6 (right) for the cross Reynolds stress $\langle u'_x u'_y \rangle$. Hence in the following we 224 will consider only the two higher resolutions for Pen4Flow. 225

In Fig. 7 and 8, the coarse grid computations using Fastest show a good agreement for mean velocities with the fine grid computations, similar to what has been observed for Pen4Flow. Concerning the Reynolds stresses the differences are less pronounced than for Pen4Flow, but are still slightly more visible, in particular for the $\langle u'_{x}u'_{y}\rangle$ (see Fig. 7, bottom, right).



Figure 6: Mean velocity (left) and Reynolds stress (right) profiles at four different locations x = 0.5, 2, 4 and 6 for Pen4Flow using different resolutions.

Now, we compare the statistics for the two codes for different resolutions and different streamwise positions. We also plot the results from [1] and we use the notation: BPRM09 for LES (adapted grid) and DNS (MGLET: non uniform spatial grid).

The comparison of the statistics for the two codes is shown for the mean 238 velocity and Reynolds stress profiles at location x = 0.5 and x = 4 in figure 7 239 and figure 8, respectively. The profiles are averaged over time and over 240 the spanwise direction. We observe that, the mean velocities $\langle u_x \rangle$ are the 24 same, the mean velocities $\langle u_y \rangle$, the Reynolds stress $\langle u'_x u'_x \rangle$ and $\langle u'_y u'_y \rangle$ almost 242 coincide, except at x = 0.5 where we observe a small deviation for $\langle u'_{y}u'_{y}\rangle$. 243 The profiles of the Reynolds stress $\langle u'_z u'_z \rangle$ and $\langle u'_x u'_y \rangle$ exhibit slight differences 244 for x = 2 and x = 4. Significant differences in $\langle u'_z u'_z \rangle$ are observed if we 245 compare with the results from [1], however Pen4Flow and Fastest do still 246 match. The difference is probably due to the fact that, in [1], Breuer et al. 24 plotted the turbulent kinetic energy k instead of the Reynolds stress $\langle u'_z u'_z \rangle$. 248 We checked the turbulent kinetic energy computed from our data and found 249 a good agreement with the $\langle u'_z u'_z \rangle$ obtained in [1]. 250

237

We can note also that for the mean vertical velocity $\langle u_y \rangle$, at x = 6 some fluctuations and an overestimation around y = 1 are observed for Pen4Flow. However, the fluctuations tend to disappear by increasing the resolution. The higher moments are more sensitive when we change the methods, but we can conclude that the two codes yield similar results which are in reasonable agreement.



Figure 7: Mean velocity (top) and Reynolds stress profiles (middle and bottom) at x = 0.5. The profiles are averaged over time and over the spanwise direction. The codes used are Pen4Flow and Fastest with fine and coarse grids. The results from [1] are also plotted and denoted by BPRM09 for LES (adapted grid) and DNS (MGLET: non uniform spatial grid).



Figure 8: Mean velocity (top) and Reynolds stress profiles (middle and bottom) at x = 4. The profiles are averaged over time and over the spanwise direction. The codes used are Pen4Flow and Fastest with fine and coarse grids. The results from [1] are also plotted and denoted by BPRM09 for LES (adapted grid) and DNS (MGLET: non uniform spatial grid).

²⁵⁷ 3.1.3. Wavelet analysis for the velocity fields

268

Wavelet decomposition of flow fields yields information on scale, position 258 and direction. Scale-dependent statistical analysis of turbulent flows can thus 259 be performed by considering the wavelet coefficients for example of velocity 260 or vorticity, see, e.q., [21]. Wavelet-based directional energies can be defined 261 which capture the properties of velocity gradients. The intermittency of the 262 flow in different directions can be quantified with scale-dependent directional 263 flatness. The scale-dependent velocity flatness was shown to quantify the spa-264 tial variability of the energy spectrum [22]. Here we will present applications 265 of scale dependent statistics of the velocity field for the periodic hill flow 266 computed with both methods presented above. 26

The velocity field, $\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}) = (u_x, u_y, u_z)$, is decomposed into an orthogonal wavelet series: with $\boldsymbol{x} = (x, y, z) \in [0, x_l] \times [0, y_l] \times [0, z_l]$ rescaled onto $[0, 2\pi]$ and given at resolution $N = 2^{3J}$, where J is the number of octaves in each spatial direction. The decomposition of \boldsymbol{u} into an orthogonal wavelet series yields:

$$\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \psi_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{x}), \tag{4}$$

where the multi-index $\lambda = (j, i_x, i_y, i_z, d)$ denotes the scale j, the position $i = (i_x, i_y, i_z)$, and the directions d = 1, 2, ..., 7 of the wavelets. Indeed, the wavelet decomposition in three dimensions yields seven directions due to the tensor product construction [23]. The corresponding index set Λ is

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \{ \mathbf{\lambda} = (j, i_x, i_y, i_z, d), \quad j = 0, ..., J - 1; \quad i_x, i_y, i_z = 0, ..., 2^J - 1$$
(5)
and $d = 1, ..., 7 \}.$

Due to the orthogonality the wavelet coefficients are given by $\tilde{u}_{\lambda} = \langle u, \psi_{\lambda} \rangle$ where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the L^2 -inner product, defined by

²⁸⁰ $\langle f,g \rangle = \int_{[0,2\pi]^3} f(\boldsymbol{x})g(\boldsymbol{x})d\boldsymbol{x}$, for each velocity component. The coefficients ²⁸¹ measure fluctuations of \boldsymbol{u} around scale 2^{-j} and around position $2\pi i/2^j$ in one ²⁸² of the seven possible directions. The N wavelet coefficients $\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}_{\lambda}$ are efficiently ²⁸³ computed from the N grid point values of $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ using the fast wavelet transform, ²⁸⁴ which has linear complexity [24]. In this study, we have chosen the Coiffet ²⁸⁵ 30 wavelet, which has 10 vanishing moments ($\int \boldsymbol{x}^p \psi(\boldsymbol{x}) d\boldsymbol{x} = 0, p = 0, ..., 9$) ²⁸⁶ and which is well adapted to represent the current flow simulations. The *a*-order moments dependent on the scale index j and the direction dare defined as:

$$M^{a}_{(j,d)}(u_{i}) = \langle \tilde{u}_{i}^{a} \rangle_{(j,d)}, \quad \text{where } \boldsymbol{i} = i_{x}, i_{y}, i_{z} \text{ and } a \in \mathbb{N}.$$
(6)

²⁸⁹ $\langle \rangle_{(j,d)}$ is the average over all positions i of the wavelets for a given direction ²⁹⁰ d and a given scale j.

291

At a given time instant in the statistically steady state, we applied the 292 wavelet based multi-scale analysis. Scale-dependent moments are shown in 293 figure 9 for Pen4Flow with 512^3 collocation grid points and for the finite 294 volume code with a fine grid interpolated on an uniform Cartesian grid 512^3 . 295 Large scale corresponds to J = 0 and small scale to J = 8. The second order 296 moments show the distribution of turbulent kinetic energy at different scales 297 and yield similar results for both codes. The scale-dependent flatness, which 298 is a measure for intermittency of the flow, obeys to the same behavior, but 299 the difference between the two curves is small. The skewness (not shown 300 here) gives for both cases similar values. Both codes show thus the same be-30 havior for the scale dependent statistics from the largest to the smallest scale. 302 303



Figure 9: Scale-dependent second order moments (left) and scale dependent flatness (right) for the three different velocity components for Pen4Flow with 512^3 collocation grid points and for Fastest with a fine grid interpolated on an uniform Cartesian grid 512^3 .

To get further insight into the scale dependence of the Pen4Flow and the Fastest computations, we consider in Fig. 10 scale dependent moments of the

velocity fields in different spatial directions, defined in eq. (6) using an or-306 thogonal wavelet decomposition. In Fig. 10 (top) the second order moment 307 of the three velocity components in the longitudinal and transverse direc-308 tions, *i.e.*, for u_x the longitudinal direction corresponds to x while y and z 309 are the transverse directions, is shown. Large scale corresponds to J = 0310 and small scale to J = 8. For clarity, we decided to omit the mixed direc-311 tions xy, xz, yz, xyz. The scale dependent first (not shown here) and second 312 order moments, are almost the same for both codes. The behaviors of the 313 scale-dependent flatness are also similar; indeed the difference between the 314 two curves is small for all scales, except for the smallest scale J = 8 where 315 the deviation is more pronounced. 316

317

318 3.2. Influence of the Reynolds number

In the following, we investigate the influence of the Reynolds number using the Pen4Flow code and compare the results again with those obtained by Breuer et al. [1]. In Table 4, the separation and reattachment points are compared for three Reynolds numbers, Re = 700, 1400 and 2800. Slight differences are observed for the separation point, while the discrepancies are larger for the reattachment by comparison with those obtained with BPRM09 LESOCC code.

-	_	-
3	2	6

	$x_{\rm sep}/H$	$x_{\rm reatt}/H$
Re = 700		
Pen4Flow $N = 256^3$	0.30	5.30
BPRM09 LESOCC	0.29	5.24
Re = 1400		
Pen4Flow $N = 512^3$	0.26	5.26
BPRM09 LESOCC	0.26	5.19
Re = 2800		
Pen4Flow $N = 512^3$	0.24	5.44
BPRM09 LESOCC	0.21	5.41

Table 4: Reynolds numbers, separation point x_{sep}/H and reattachment point x_{reatt}/H . The results from [1] are also plotted and denoted by BPRM09 for LES (adapted grid).



Figure 10: Scale-dependent second order moments (top) and scale dependent flatness (bottom) for the three velocity components in the three main directions. The codes used are Pen4Flow with 512^3 collocation grid points and Fastest with a fine grid interpolated on a Cartesian uniform grid 512^3 .

As example in Fig. 11, we selected the position x/h = 4 as the comparison of the results for the other positions shows the similar tendencies. Again we start with the mean velocity profile for $\langle u_x \rangle$ and $\langle u_y \rangle$, we observe that for the three Reynolds numbers all curves agree reasonably well. The Reynolds stress profiles, Fig. 11 middle and bottom, reflect the same tendency, however for $\langle u'_x u'_x \rangle$ we observe larger differences compared to the mean velocity. Nevertheless, for the worst case, Re = 2800, the differences are below 10%.



Figure 11: Mean velocity (top) and Reynolds stress profiles (middle and bottom) at x = 4 for Reynolds number Re = 700, 1400, 2800. The profiles are averaged over time and over the spanwise direction. The code used is Pen4Flow with fine and coarse grids. The results from [1] are also plotted and denoted by BPRM09 for LES (adapted grid).

334 4. Conclusion

The flow over a periodic hill configuration has been revisited using a Fourier pseudo-spectral code with volume penalization and a finite volume

code with body fitted grids. This classical benchmark involves complex, 337 non-Cartesian geometries and turbulent flow conditions. The presence of a 338 recirculation zone caused by the presence of the hill constitutes an additional 339 difficulty. This detailed study showed that the volume penalization code and 340 the finite volume code reproduce well the physics of this flow and produce 343 similar results. Wavelet analysis enabled us to show that the multi-scale 342 physics is almost the same for both codes. The volume penalization method 343 is a powerful technique to impose Dirichlet boundary conditions in complex 344 geometries using still a Fourier pseudo-spectral method, which has been con-345 fronted here for three different Reynolds numbers. 346

34

The pros and the cons for Pen4Flow and Fastest can be summarized as 348 follows. Due to the volume penalization method, Pen4Flow is very flexible 349 for changing the geometry and the convergence of the method is mathemat-350 ically justified and proved in [7]. The penalization method becomes more 35 efficient for higher Re numbers [25] because the penalization boundary layer 352 is proportional to $\sqrt{\eta \nu}$. Moreover for this code, no linear system has to be 353 solved (differential operators are diagonal) and most computational cost is 354 due to the FFT, for which highly efficient parallel implementations are avail-355 able. We can note also that the Gibbs oscillations are not amplified [11] and 356 the method does not show numerical diffusion and dispersion. However, the 35 penalization term models boundary conditions with first order accuracy only 358 which is also the case for the geometrical errors due to the mask function 359 (staircase effect). Equidistant grids are required in Pen4Flow, which is less 360 efficient as fine grid size is required close to the boundary. Furthermore, the 361 volume penalization technique requires more grid points as the governing 362 equations have to be solved in the whole domain, including both solid and 363 fluid domains. Finally, the time step is limited due to stability restrictions 364 imposed by the penalization term in addition to the classical CFL limit. In 365 conclusion, considering these latter points, the volume penalization method 366 is an attractive alternative to simulate turbulent flows in complex geometries. 367 Fastest takes advantage of body fitted grids which are well adapted to the 368 geometry and involve no interpolation error. As a consequence less grid 369 points are required compared to Pen4Flow. The curvilinear grid with block-370 structured grids enables to have boundary conditions fulfilled exactly. Nev-371 ertheless, Fastest adopts the SIMPLE projection scheme for imposing the 372 incompressibility, which is not exactly fulfilled. The finite volume scheme, 373 used in this code, is second order accurate in space and time, and an alge-374

braic system has to be solved in each time step. The parallelization is also
less efficient, as shown in Fig. 3. Finally, Fastest is less flexible compared to
Pen4Flow since the grid has to be generated for a given geometry.

378

Interesting perspectives of Pen4Flow are the application to compute turbulent flows in complex geometries which are simply defined by the mask function and which may even vary in time, as it is the case in fluid-structure interaction problems. The implementation of additional transport equations, e.g. for passive scalars, or the Boussinesq approximation is another promising direction. The necessary Neumann boundary conditions can be implemented using the technique proposed in [16].

386 Acknowledgements

B.K. thankfully acknowledges financial support and hospitality from the Graduate School of Excellence Computational Engineering at TU Darmstadt. B.K. and K.S. thank D. Kolomenskiy for providing the spectral code Pen4Flow. K.S. thanks the international affairs office of Aix Marseille Université for financial support.

- 392
- [1] M. Breuer, N. Peller, Ch. Rapp and M. Manhart. Flow over periodic
 hills Numerical and experimental study in a wide range of Reynolds
 number. *Computers & Fluids*, **38**:433-457, 2009.
- [2] R. Courant. Variational methods for the solution of problems of equi librium and vibrations. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 49:1–23, 1943.
- [3] J. Fröhlich, C.P. Mellen, W. Rodi, L.Temmerman and M.A. Leschziner.
 Highly resolved large-eddy simulation of separated flow in a channel with
 streamwise periodic constrictions. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **526**, 1966, 2005.
- [4] R. Glowinski and Y. Kuznetsov. On the solution of the Dirichlet problem
 for linear elliptic operators by a distributed Lagrange multiplier method. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. I*, **327**:693-698, 1999.
- [5] Y. Cheny and O. Botella. The LS-STAG method: A new immersed
 boundary/level-set method for the computation of incompressible viscous flows in complex moving geometries with good conservation properties. J. Comput. Phys. 229:1043-1076, 2010.

- [6] C. S. Peskin, . (1972). Flow patterns around heart valves: a numerical
 method. J. Comput. Phys., 10(2):252–271, 1972.
- ⁴¹¹ [7] P. Angot, C.-H. Bruneau and P. Fabrie. A penalization method to take ⁴¹² into account obstacles in viscous flows. *Numer. Math.*, **81**:497, 1999.
- [8] C.S. Peskin. The immersed boundary method. Acta Numer., 11:479517, 2002.
- [9] R. Mittal and G. Iaccarino. Immersed boundary methods. Annu. Rev.
 Fluid Mech., 37:23961, 2005.
- ⁴¹⁷ [10] C. Canuto, M.Y. Hussaini, A. Quarteroni and T.A. Zang. Spectral Meth-⁴¹⁸ ods in Fluid Dynamics. *Springer-Verlag*, 1988.
- [11] G. H. Keetels, U. D'Ortona, W. Kramer, H.J.H. Clercx, K. Schneider
 and G.J.F. Van Heijst. Fourier spectral and wavelet solvers for the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations with volume-penalization: Convergence of a dipolewall collision. J. Comput. Phys., 227(2) 919–945,
 2007.
- ⁴²⁴ [12] K. Schneider. Numerical simulation of the transient flow behaviour
 ⁴²⁵ in chemical reactors using a penalization method. *Comput. Fluids*,
 ⁴²⁶ **34**:1223-1238, 2005.
- L. Kolomenskiy and K. Schneider. A Fourier spectral method for the
 Navier-Stokes equations with volume penalization for moving solid obstacles. J. Comput. Phys., 228:5687–5709, 2009.
- [14] Fastest User Manual, Institute of Numerical Methods in Mechanical
 Engineering. Technische Universität Darmstadt, 2004.
- [15] P. H. Chang, C.C. Liao, H.W. Hsu, S.H. Liu and C.A. Lin. Simulations of
 laminar and turbulent flows over periodic hills with immersed boundary
 method. *Comput. Fluids*, **92**:233–243, 2014.
- [16] B. Kadoch, D. Kolomenskiy, P. Angot and K. Schneider. A volume penalization method for Navier-Stokes flows and scalar advection-diffusion
 with moving obstacles. J. Comput. Phys., 231:4365–4383, 2012.

- [17] Y. Benarafa, O. Cioni, F. Ducros and P. Sagaut. RANS/LES coupling for
 unsteady turbulent flow simulation at high Reynolds number on coarse
 meshes. Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg., 195(23-24):2939-2960,
 2006.
- [18] T. Lehnhäuser and M. Schäfer, Improved linear interpolation practice
 for finite-volume schemes on complex grids. Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids,
 38(7):625-645, 2002.
- [19] K. Hanjalić, M. Popovac and M. Hadziabdić. A robust near-wall ellipticrelaxation eddy-viscosity turbulence model for CFD. Int. J. Heat and *Fluid Flow*, 25(6):1047–1051, 2004.
- ⁴⁴⁸ [20] S. B. Pope. Turbulent Flows. *Cambridge University Press*, 2000.
- [21] K. Schneider and O. Vasilyev. Wavelet methods in computational fluid dynamics. Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech., 42:473-503, 2010.
- [22] W. J. T. Bos, L. Liechtenstein and K. Schneider. Small scale intermittency in anisotropic turbulence. *Phys. Rev. E*, **76**:046310, 2007.
- [23] I. Daubechies. Ten lectures on wavelets. *Philadelphia: Society for indus- trial and applied mathematics*, **61**:198–202, 1992.
- [24] S. Mallat. A Wavelet Tour of Signal Processing. Academic Press, 2nd
 ed. 1999.
- [25] R. Nguyen van yen, D. Kolomenskiy and K. Schneider. Approximation of the Laplace and Stokes operators with Dirichlet boundary conditions through volume penalization: a spectral viewpoint. *Numer. Math.*, 128:301–338, 2014.