Large-eddy simulation of compressible flows using a spectral multi-domain method

K. Sengupta¹, G. B. Jacobs² and F. Mashayek^{1*}

 Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Illinois at Chicago, 842 W. Taylor, Chicago, IL 60607.
 ² Department of Aerospace Engineering, San Diego State University,

5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182

SUMMARY

This paper discusses the development of a high-order, multidomain based large-eddy simulation (LES) for compressible flows. The LES model equations are approximated on unstructured grids of non-overlapping hexahedrals subdomains providing geometric flexibility. In each domain a high-order Chebyshev polynomial approximation represents the solution ensuring a highly accurate approximation with little numerical dispersion and diffusion. The sub-grid scale stress in the filtered LES equations is modeled with a dynamic eddy viscosity model, while the heat flux is represented with an eddy diffusivity model, employing a turbulent Prandtl number. The model constants are evaluated through a flexible dynamic procedure, that uses a high-order domain level filtering for the discrete test filter. The LES methodology is tested in a decaying isotropic turbulence and channel flow. The LES method improves the resolution of the turbulence spectrum as compared to a direct numerical simulations. The high-order LES methodology requires fewer degrees of freedom as compared to lower order LES methodologies to accurately resolve the turbulent flows.

KEY WORDS: Large-eddy simulation; multidomain method; compressible flow; spectral element filtering; isotropic turbulence; channel flow

1. INTRODUCTION

Large-eddy simulation has proven to be a viable technique for the computation of unsteady turbulent flows with large coherent structures in real complex applications. At moderate Reynolds numbers, LES is more economical and/or accurate than other established

^{*}Correspondence to: mashayek@uic.edu

computational techniques such as Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS) and Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) methods. DNS solves the governing equations without any turbulence modeling. Though it is accurate, DNS requires excessive computational cost to resolve the increasing turbulence scale range with increasing geometric complexity and Reynolds number. In RANS, on the other hand, all unsteady turbulence scales are modeled. While this reduces computational cost and enables computation of most engineering applications, it also prevents RANS from adequately capturing the true dynamics of the flow. LES bridges the gap between DNS and RANS and efficiently computes unsteady turbulent flows in moderately complex geometries at mid range Reynolds numbers found in many real applications. LES is based on scale separation in turbulent flows. The large scales, which are anisotropic and sensitive to boundary conditions are computed directly as in DNS, while the small scales that are more isotropic and universal are modeled. The modeling of the small scales reduces the computational cost, while the computation of the large scales provides detailed flow field information.

Numerical schemes are crucially affecting the fidelity of large-eddy simulations. Numerical errors in space and time can smear the solutions, overly dissipate turbulence, and so lead to an inaccurate computation of the turbulent flow. Ghosal [1] performed an analysis of the effect of numerical errors of a finite difference method on large-eddy simulation. He found that for low order finite difference schemes, the truncation error may be larger than modeled sub-grid stresses, unless the filter width is significantly larger than the grid size. Kravchenko and Moin [2] later extended the analysis to include the role of aliasing errors. It was shown that for low-order finite-differences, the high-wavenumber part of the energy spectrum is heavily distorted by truncation errors and the contribution from the sub-grid model becomes small. Inaddition, low-order schemes have large dispersion errors, which reduces the temporal accuracy of unsteady (wave dominated) flow computations.

With a high-order scheme many of the numerical error related inaccuracies of lowerorder schemes can be reduced and fewer degrees of freedom are required for an accurate solution. However, combining high-order accuracy with other desirable properties of a LES method including geometric flexibility and conservation properties has proven challenging. Conservative, low-order finite volume [3, 4] and finite element [5] methods have been developed that allow for complex geometry computation, but the geometric flexibility of current highorder LES, that mostly rely on spectral and compact finite difference methods [6], is limited. Single domain spectral methods based on for example Fourier series approximations have desirable high-wavenumber characteristics, but can only be used for rectangular geometries. Compact finite difference methods are more versatile than the single domain spectral schemes. However, the block Cartesian mesh requirement and overlapping stencil of compact difference methods complicates both boundary condition implementation and an accurate, robust, parallel implementation for complex geometries. Another drawback of the high accuracy of both spectral and high-order finite difference methods is that aliasing errors affect the stability of the methods. Aliasing errors can be reduced by a modified form of the non-linear advection terms [7] or by using non-conservative form of the energy equation [8]. Unfortunately these modifications do not guarantee robustness especially at high Mach numbers.

Spectral element methods [9, 10] are excellent candidates for LES, since they combine the accuracy of single domain spectral schemes with the flexibility of finite element method. In spectral elements the spatial resolution can be conveniently altered either by increasing the number of elements (h-refinement) or by increasing the polynomial order within the elements (p-refinement). In smooth solution spaces, the method provides asymptotically exponential rate of spatial convergence with p-refinement. Low dispersion errors in these methods lead to high temporal accuracy, making them suitable for wave dominated, unsteady problems. Moreover, low degree of data connectivity between non-overlapping elements facilitates efficient boundary condition implementation and parallel implementation.

Though spectral/hp element based DNS computations are well established, there have been limited attempts to perform spectral element based LES. Spectral element filtering strategies for LES was studied by Blackburn and Schmidt [11]. They investigated three different filtering techniques within two-dimensional spectral elements for the simulation of incompressible turbulent channel flow with a dynamic sub-grid model. Fischer and Mullen [12] introduced a spectral element filtering technique to stabilize their direct numerical simulation. Levin et al. [13] applied a two-step filtering procedure to control the growth of non-linear instabilities in their eddy resolving spectral element ocean model. A combined spectral element-Fourier method was used by Karamanos [14] for LES with an explicit sub-grid model. Karamanos and Karniadakis [15] introduced spectral vanishing viscosity concept for large-eddy simulation. The implementation was tested for turbulent channel flow using Fourier discretization in the streamwise direction and spectral/hp quadrilateral elements in the cross flow and wall-normal directions. These studies have focused on LES of *incompressible* flows. To the best of the authors knowledge there has not been any published work on LES of *compressible* flows using spectral element method.

In this paper, we develop a spectral/hp element large-eddy simulation technique for compressible flows using a Chebyshev spectral multi-domain method [16, 17, 18]. The method combines many features that are desirable in a numerical methodology for large-eddy simulation of turbulent flows in complex geometries, including: a high-order approximation within each sub-domain which restricts the numerical errors; complex geometries are easily computed with the unstructured hexahedral grid; the method is robust; the flux based methodology leads to a conservative scheme; and the non-overlapping elements yield perfect parallelization implementation as well as easy boundary condition implementation. We model the sub-grid scales using an eddy-viscosity model. A flexible dynamic procedure is employed to evaluate the sub-grid model constants. The explicit filtering associated with the dynamic procedure is accomplished through a sub-domain based high-order Lagrange-interpolant projection procedure consistent with the high-order multidomain method. The characteristics of the LES methodology are tested in a decaying isotropic turbulence and a turbulent channel flow.

The paper is organized as follows. First, we describe the governing equations for compressible flows and present the numerical method. Then, we discuss the LES formulation including the filtered equations, sub-grid models and the dynamic procedure. Next, we test our methodology in an isotropic turbulence and a turbulent channel flow. Conclusions and recommendations are reserved for the final section.

2. GOVERNING EQUATIONS AND NUMERICAL FORMULATION

2.1. Compressible Navier-Stokes equations

The governing equations for the compressible and viscous fluid flow are the conservation statements for mass, momentum and energy. They are presented in non-dimensional, conservative form with Cartesian tensor notation,

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho u_j)}{\partial x_j} = 0, \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\partial(\rho u_i)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(\rho u_i u_j + p\delta_{ij})}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial\sigma_{ij}}{\partial x_j},\tag{2}$$

$$\frac{\partial(\rho e)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial[(\rho e + p)u_j]}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial q_j}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial(\sigma_{ij}u_i)}{\partial x_j}.$$
(3)

The total energy, viscous stress tensor and heat flux vector are, respectively, given as,

$$\rho e = \frac{p}{\gamma - 1} + \frac{1}{2}\rho u_k u_k,\tag{4}$$

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{\mu}{Re_f} \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_k} \delta_{ij} \right), \tag{5}$$

$$q_j = -\frac{\mu}{(\gamma - 1)Re_f Pr_f M_f^2} \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_j}.$$
(6)

The reference Reynolds number Re_{f} is based on the reference density ρ_{f}^{*} , velocity U_{f}^{*} , length L_{f}^{*} , and molecular viscosity μ_{f}^{*} and is given by $\operatorname{Re}_{f} = \rho_{f}^{*}U_{f}^{*}L_{f}^{*}/\mu_{f}^{*}$. $\operatorname{Pr}_{f} = \mu_{f}^{*}C_{p}/k^{*}$ is the reference Prandtl number. The superscript * denotes dimensional quantities. The above equation set is closed by the equation of state,

$$p = \frac{\rho T}{\gamma M_f^2},\tag{7}$$

where M_f is the reference Mach number, taken to be 1 in this work. The conservation equations can be cast in the matrix form

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{Q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{F}_i^a}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{F}_i^v}{\partial x_i} = 0, \tag{8}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \rho u_1 \\ \rho u_2 \\ \rho u_3 \\ \rho e \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (9)$$
$$\boldsymbol{F}_i^a = \begin{pmatrix} \rho u_i \\ \rho u_1 u_i + p\delta_{i1} \\ \rho u_2 u_i + p\delta_{i2} \\ \rho u_3 u_i + p\delta_{i3} \\ (\rho e + p)u_i \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (10)$$

$$\boldsymbol{F}_{i}^{v} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sigma_{i1} \\ \sigma_{i2} \\ \sigma_{i3} \\ -q_{i} + u_{k}\sigma_{ik} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(11)

Here Q is the vector of the conserved variables, while F_i^a and F_i^v are the advective and viscous flux vectors respectively, in the x_i direction.

2.2. Numerical methodology

This section briefly describes the staggered-grid Chebyshev multidomain method. For a more complete description of the method see [16, 18]. In this method, the computational domain, Ω , is divided into non-overlapping hexahedral sub-domains, D_k ,

$$\Omega = \sum D_k.$$
(12)

The sub-domains are mapped onto a unit hexahedron $D_k \leftrightarrow [0,1] \times [0,1] \times [0,1]$ by an isoparametric mapping [19]. Isoparametric mapping ensures that the spectral accuracy of the scheme is not affected by the domain boundary approximation. The staggered grid method uses two sets of grids, one for the solution (Chebyshev-Gauss grid) and one for computation of the fluxes (Chebyshev-Gauss-Lobatto grids). In one space dimension the Gauss and Gauss-Lobatto quadrature points are defined by,

$$X_{j+1/2} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 - \cos\left[\frac{(2j+1)\pi}{2N}\right] \right\}, \ j = 0, \dots N - 1,$$
(13)

and

$$X_j = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 - \cos\left[\frac{\pi j}{N}\right] \right\}, \ j = 0, \dots N,$$
(14)

respectively, on the unit interval [0, 1]. The Gauss grid in three-dimensions, henceforth referred to as the ggg grid, is the tensor product of the one-dimensional grid defined in Eq. (13). The solution vector, \tilde{Q} , where the tilde denotes mapped space, is approximated on the ggg grid, as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}^{ggg}(X,Y,Z) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}^{ggg}_{i+1/2,j+1/2,k+1/2} h_{i+1/2}(X) h_{j+1/2}(Y) h_{k+1/2}(Z), \quad (15)$$

where N-1 is the approximation order. Here $h_{i+1/2} \in \mathbf{P}_{N-1}$ is the Lagrange interpolating polynomial defined on the Gauss grid,

$$h_{i+1/2}(\xi) = \prod_{m=0, m \neq i}^{N-1} \left(\frac{\xi - X_{m+1/2}}{X_{i+1/2} - X_{m+1/2}} \right).$$
(16)

The fluxes in each direction \mathbf{F}_i are defined on the Gauss-Lobatto grids, shown in figure 1. The x-direction flux (\mathbf{F}_1) is evaluated at the Lobatto-Gauss-Gauss grid (lgg) denoted by open squares, $(X_i, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_{k+1/2}), i = 0, 1 \cdots N, j, k = 0, 1 \cdots N - 1$, the y-direction flux (\mathbf{F}_2) at the Gauss-Lobatto-Gauss grid (glg) denoted by open circles, $(X_{i+1/2}, Y_j, Z_{k+1/2}), j = 0, 1 \cdots N, i, k = 0, 1 \cdots N - 1$ and the z-direction flux (\mathbf{F}_3) at the Gauss-Lobatto grid (ggl) denoted by closed squares, $(X_{i+1/2}, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_k), k = 0, 1 \cdots N, i, j = 0, 1 \cdots N - 1$. The flux vectors are computed by reconstructing the solution at the Lobatto points through interpolations using polynomials of the type in Eq. (15). The interpolation operation is given as,

$$\boldsymbol{Q}^{lgg}(X_i, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_{k+1/2}) = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \frac{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{m+1/2, n+1/2, p+1/2}^{ggg}}{J_{m+1/2, n+1/2, p+1/2}} h_{m+1/2}(X_i) \times$$
(17)
$$h_{n+1/2}(Y_{j+1/2})h_{p+1/2}(Z_{k+1/2}),$$

in the X-direction, which reduces to a one-dimensional operation,

$$\boldsymbol{Q}^{lgg}(X_i, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_{k+1/2}) = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \frac{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{m+1/2, j+1/2, k+1/2}^{ggg}}{J_{m+1/2, j+1/2, k+1/2}} h_{m+1/2}(X_i),$$
(18)

due to the cardinal property of the Lagrange interpolating polynomial. Similarly for the Y and Z directions the interpolants are given by,

$$\boldsymbol{Q}^{glg}(X_{i+1/2}, Y_j, Z_{k+1/2}) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{i+1/2, n+1/2, k+1/2}^{ggg}}{J_{i+1/2, n+1/2, k+1/2}} h_{n+1/2}(Y_j),$$
(19)

$$\boldsymbol{Q}^{ggl}(X_{i+1/2}, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_k) = \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \frac{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}_{i+1/2, j+1/2, p+1/2}^{ggg}}{J_{i+1/2, j+1/2, p+1/2}} h_{p+1/2}(Z_k),$$
(20)

where, J is the Jacobian of transformation from the physical space to the mapped space. Once the solution values are interpolated to the Lobatto grid the advective fluxes are computed. The interface points will have different flux values due to discontinuity of solution values at the sub-domain boundaries. The patching of the advective fluxes is described later. The viscous fluxes are computed in two steps. The solution interpolant at the Lobatto grids must be continuous for an unique first derivative at the subdomain interfaces. This is ensured by a Dirichlet patching, or averaging of the solution on both sides of the interface. After the Lobatto interpolants for the solution values are patched, their derivatives are computed at the Gauss points. The gradients are then interpolated back to Lobatto points. The viscous fluxes are computed using the functional relations (5) and (6). The interface condition for viscous fluxes and any Neumann boundary condition are applied at this point. Finally, the total flux is obtained by adding the inviscid and viscous parts. Once the total fluxes are computed at the lgg, glg and ggl points, the flux interpolants are constructed as,

$$\tilde{F}_{1}(X,Y,Z) = \sum_{m=0}^{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \tilde{F}_{1m,n+1/2,p+1/2} l_{m}(X) h_{n+1/2}(Y) h_{p+1/2}(Z),$$
(21)

$$\tilde{F}_{2}(X,Y,Z) = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{p=0}^{N-1} \tilde{F}_{2m+1/2,n,p+1/2} h_{m+1/2}(X) l_{n}(Y) h_{p+1/2}(Z),$$
(22)

$$\tilde{F}_{3}(X,Y,Z) = \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{p=0}^{N} \tilde{F}_{3m+1/2,n+1/2,p} h_{m+1/2}(X) h_{n+1/2}(Y) l_p(Z).$$
(23)

These fluxes are differentiated and evaluated at the Gauss-Gauss-Gauss grid, to give pointwise derivatives,

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{1}(X_{i+1/2}, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_{k+1/2})}{\partial X} = \sum_{m=0}^{N} \tilde{F}_{1}(X_{m}, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_{k+1/2}) \frac{\partial l_{m}(X_{i+1/2})}{\partial X}$$
(24)

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{2}(X_{i+1/2}, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_{k+1/2})}{\partial Y} = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \tilde{F}_{2}(X_{i+1/2}, Y_{n}, Z_{k+1/2}) \frac{\partial l_{n}(Y_{j+1/2})}{\partial Y}$$
(25)

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{3}}(X_{i+1/2}, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_{k+1/2})}{\partial Z} = \sum_{p=0}^{N} \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{3}}(X_{i+1/2}, Y_{j+1/2}, Z_p) \frac{\partial l_p(Z_{k+1/2})}{\partial Z}.$$
 (26)

Finally the semi-discrete equation for the solution unknowns at the Gauss-Gauss-Gauss grid is given by,

$$\left[\frac{d\tilde{\boldsymbol{Q}}}{dt}\right]_{i+1/2,j+1/2,k+1/2} + \left[\frac{\partial\tilde{\boldsymbol{F}}_{i}}{\partial\boldsymbol{X}_{i}}\right]_{i+1/2,j+1/2,k+1/2} = 0,$$
(27)

which is advanced in time using a 4th-order low storage Runge-Kutta scheme.

2.3. Interface and boundary treatment

Interpolation of the solution by Eqs. (18)-(20) leads to different solution values at the sub-domain interface points, one from each of the contributing sub-domains. The solution

is therefore discontinuous. The coupling between sub-domains is enforced by a continuous advective and viscous fluxes at the interface points. Enforcing flux continuity yields a conservative method. The inviscid fluxes are computed using an approximate Riemann solver. Formally, given the two solution states \mathbf{Q}_N^{k-1} and \mathbf{Q}_0^k (the superscript denotes the sub-domain number and the subscript denotes the node number within a sub-domain), the flux in each spatial direction, with the assumption that waves are normal to the interface, can be written as,

$$\Gamma^{a}(\boldsymbol{Q}_{N}^{k-1},\boldsymbol{Q}_{0}^{k}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\boldsymbol{F}^{a}(\boldsymbol{Q}_{N}^{k-1}) + \boldsymbol{F}^{a}(\boldsymbol{Q}_{0}^{k}) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{R} |\lambda| \boldsymbol{R}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{Q}_{0}^{k} - \boldsymbol{Q}_{N}^{k-1}),$$
(28)

where \mathbf{F}^{a} is the vector of advective fluxes. \mathbf{R} is the matrix of the right eigenvectors of the Jacobian of \mathbf{F}^{a} , computed using Roe-average of \mathbf{Q}_{N}^{k-1} and \mathbf{Q}_{0}^{k} . For imposing inviscid boundary conditions, the physical boundary can be viewed as an interface between the external state and the computational domain. The Riemann solver is applied between the external specified flow solution and internal solution vector.

The viscous fluxes are determined as outlined in the previous sub-section. Continuity of the viscous fluxes is established by averaging the viscous flux vector from both sides of the interface

$$\Gamma_0^{v,k} = \Gamma_N^{v,k-1} = \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{F}_0^{v,k} + \boldsymbol{F}_N^{v,k-1}).$$
⁽²⁹⁾

The Neumann boundary conditions are imposed at the boundary points at this stage.

3. LES FORMULATION

3.1. Filtered Navier-Stokes equations

The LES method presented here solves the filtered Navier-Stokes equations. By applying a spatial low-pass (in frequency domain) convolution filter to the Navier-Stokes equations, the turbulence scales are separated. The filter in physical space is represented by the following convolution product,

$$\overline{f}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \int_{\Omega} f(\boldsymbol{x}',t) G(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{x}') d\boldsymbol{x}', \qquad (30)$$

where G is the filter kernel and Ω represents the flow domain. We apply the Favre, density weighted filtering operation, typical for LES of compressible turbulence

$$\widetilde{f} = \frac{\overline{\rho f}}{\overline{\rho}},\tag{31}$$

where overbar denotes the filtering operation.

Applying this filter yields the following filtered conservation equations,

$$\frac{\partial \overline{\rho}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\overline{\rho} \widetilde{u}_j)}{\partial x_j} = 0, \qquad (32)$$

$$\frac{\partial(\bar{\rho}\tilde{u}_i)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(\bar{\rho}\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}_j + \bar{p}\delta_{ij})}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial\tau_{ij}^{sgs}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial(\bar{\sigma}_{ij} - \tilde{\sigma}_{ij})}{\partial x_j},\tag{33}$$

$$\frac{\partial(\overline{\rho e})}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial[(\overline{\rho e} + \overline{p})\tilde{u}_j]}{\partial x_j} = -\frac{\partial\tilde{q}_j}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial(\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}\tilde{u}_i)}{\partial x_j} - \frac{1}{(\gamma - 1)M_f^2} \frac{\partial q_j^{sgs}}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial(\overline{q}_j - \tilde{q}_j)}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial(\tilde{u}_j[\overline{\sigma}_{jk} - \tilde{\sigma}_{jk}])}{\partial x_k} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\bar{\rho}(\widetilde{u_k u_k u_j} - \tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_k \tilde{u}_j - \tau_{kk}^{sgs} \tilde{u}_j).$$
(34)

The filtering leads to several terms in Eqs. (33) and (34) that require closure. τ_{ij}^{sgs} is the sub-grid scale stress tensor and q_j^{sgs} is the sub-grid turbulent heat flux. The sub-grid terms physically represent the effect of the unresolved (sub-grid) scales on the resolved scales. The second unclosed term in the filtered momentum equation is $(\overline{\sigma}_{ij} - \widetilde{\sigma}_{ij})$, which results from Favre filtering of the viscous stresses. The filtered energy equation has three more unclosed terms in addition to the sub-grid heat flux: the term $\frac{\partial(\overline{q}_j - \overline{q}_j)}{\partial x_j}$ which results from Favre filtering of the diffusive heat flux; the term $\frac{\partial(\overline{u}_j[\overline{\sigma}_{jk} - \widetilde{\sigma}_{jk}])}{\partial x_k}$ which is analogous to the sub-grid scale viscous dissipation; and finally the divergence of turbulent diffusion, $\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \overline{\rho}(\widetilde{u_k u_k u_j} - \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{u}_j - \tau_{kk}^{sgs} \widetilde{u}_j)$. The modeling of the unclosed terms is discussed in Section 3.2.

3.2. Sub-grid scale model

The unclosed terms in the filtered equations require modeling. We first consider the modeling of the unclosed terms in the momentum equation (Eq. (33)). The term $(\overline{\sigma}_{ij} - \widetilde{\sigma}_{ij})$ is neglected following [20, 21]. The sub-grid term $\tau_{ij}^{sgs} = \overline{\rho}(\widetilde{u_i u_j} - \widetilde{u_i}\widetilde{u_j})$ is modeled using the modification of the Germano model [22] for compressible flows (given by Moin et al. [8]). The expression for τ_{ij}^{sgs} is accordingly given as

$$\tau_{ij}^{sgs} = -2C_s\overline{\Delta}^2\overline{\rho}|\widetilde{S}|\left(\widetilde{S}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\widetilde{S}_{mm}\delta_{ij}\right) + \frac{1}{3}\tau_{kk}^{sgs}\delta_{ij}.$$
(35)

The trace of the sub-grid stress tensor τ_{kk}^{sgs} cannot be included in the modified pressure in compressible flow, and thus has to be modeled separately. Different models of τ_{kk}^{sgs} have been proposed (see [23, 24]). However, the study by Squires [25] demonstrated that there is no difference in the LES results of compressible isotropic turbulence at low Mach number when τ_{kk}^{sgs} is neglected. Vreman et al. [26] confirmed the above findings with their simulation of 3D compressible mixing layers at a mean convective Mach number of 0.2. In their *a priori* test, the SGS model that neglects τ_{kk}^{sgs} was found to be in better agreement with DNS results. Moreover, simulations conducted with a dynamic model for τ_{kk}^{sgs} were often unstable for the cases studied by Vreman et al. [26]. So, in LES of low Mach number flow, neglecting the trace of sub-grid stress tensor will not introduce large errors. We will therefore neglect the term here. The details of the dynamic procedure to obtain the estimate for $C_s\overline{\Delta}^2$ are provided in Section 3.3.

The sub-grid term

$$q_j^{sgs} = \overline{\rho} \left(\widetilde{Tu_j} - \widetilde{T}\widetilde{u_j} \right) \tag{36}$$

is described according to the derivation in [6] and is modeled using the eddy-viscosity hypothesis and a turbulent Prandtl number. The modeled expression is,

$$q_j^{sgs} = \frac{\overline{\rho}C_s\overline{\Delta}^2 |\widetilde{S}|}{Pr_t} \frac{\partial \widetilde{T}}{\partial x_j}.$$
(37)

The turbulent Prandtl number Pr_t is evaluated using the dynamic procedure (see Section 3.3). A priori analysis of the magnitude of various terms in the filtered energy equation by Vreman et al. [20] has shown that the fourth and fifth terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (34) are small compared to the sub-grid heat flux vector and can be neglected, especially at low and moderate Mach numbers. Finally, the last term in the filtered energy equation (Eq. (34)) is similar to turbulent diffusion of sub-grid scale kinetic energy. The contribution of this term is again small compared to other sub-grid terms (see [6]), although there has been some attempts to model it (e.g. Okong'o et al. [27]). We neglected the term here.

3.3. Dynamic procedure

We employ a dynamic procedure to evaluate the constants in the modeled sub-grid terms. The dynamic model [22] is based on self-similarity of the inertial range of the turbulence energy spectrum at different length scales. Therefore, the same functional form for the subgrid quantities can be assumed at the grid length scale $\overline{\Delta}$, representative of the computational mesh, and at a larger test filter length scale $\widehat{\Delta}$. The application of the test filter to the grid filtered Navier-Stokes equation (Eq. (33)) leads to a residual stress at the test filter level,

$$T_{ij} = \widehat{\overline{\rho u_i u_j}} - \frac{\widehat{\overline{\rho u_i \rho u_j}}}{\widehat{\overline{\rho}}}.$$
(38)

Similarly, applying the test filter to the residual stresses at the grid filter level (τ_{ij}^{sgs}) gives,

$$\widehat{\tau}_{ij}^{sgs} = \widehat{\overline{\rho u_i u_j}} - \frac{\widehat{\overline{\rho u_i \rho u_j}}}{\overline{\rho}}.$$
(39)

The difference between Eqs. (38) and (39) leads to the Germano's identity,

$$L_{ij} = T_{ij} - \hat{\tau}_{ij}^{sgs} = \overline{\rho}\widetilde{u_i}\widetilde{u_j} - \frac{\overline{\rho}\widetilde{u_i}\overline{\rho}\widetilde{u_j}}{\overline{\rho}}.$$
(40)

Assuming that the same functional form (Smagorinsky model) could be used for the residual stresses at both levels, we have the modeled forms as,

$$T_{ij} = -2C_s \widehat{\bigtriangleup}^2 \widehat{\overline{\rho}} |\widehat{\widetilde{S}}| \left(\widehat{\widetilde{S}}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\widehat{\widetilde{S}}_{mm}\delta_{ij}\right) + \frac{1}{3}T_{kk}\delta_{ij}, \tag{41}$$

$$\tau_{ij}^{sgs} = -2C_s\overline{\Delta}^2\overline{\rho}|\widetilde{S}|\left(\widetilde{S}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\widetilde{S}_{mm}\delta_{ij}\right) + \frac{1}{3}\tau_{kk}^{sgs}\delta_{ij}.$$
(42)

Substituting the above two expressions into Eq. (40) we obtain the modeled expression for L_{ij} ,

$$L_{ij}^{mod} = C_s \overline{\bigtriangleup}^2 M_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} \tau_{kk}^{sgs} \delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{3} T_{kk} \delta_{ij}.$$

$$\tag{43}$$

where M_{ij} is defined as,

$$M_{ij} = 2\overline{\rho}|\widetilde{S}|\left(\widetilde{S}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\widetilde{S}_{mm}\delta_{ij}\right) - 2\frac{\widehat{\Delta}^2}{\overline{\Delta}^2}\widehat{\rho}|\widehat{\widetilde{S}}|\left(\widehat{\widetilde{S}}_{ij} - \frac{1}{3}\widehat{\widetilde{S}}_{mm}\delta_{ij}\right),\tag{44}$$

where typically $\frac{\widehat{\Delta}}{\overline{\Delta}} = 2$ is assumed. Here, we neglect both τ_{kk}^{sgs} and T_{kk} . Finally, using Lily's [28] least square minimization procedure we obtain,

$$C_s\overline{\bigtriangleup}^2 = \frac{L_{ij}M_{ij}}{M_{kl}M_{kl}},\tag{45}$$

where L_{ij} is explicitly given by Eq. (40). This procedure gives a local time-dependent estimate of $C_s\overline{\Delta}^2$, which is updated at each time iteration. It is worthwhile to note that the above procedure computes the Smagorinsky length scale $C_s\overline{\Delta}^2$ directly without the need to specify the grid filter width $\overline{\triangle}$. This is advantageous in the current context considering that for unstructured hexahedral grid it is difficult to provide a general expression for the filter width $\overline{\triangle}$.

Since the solution, \tilde{Q} , is discontinuous, the value of $C_s \overline{\Delta}^2$ is also discontinuous across the sub-domains. The sub-grid length scale is used to evaluate the sub-grid momentum flux (Eq. (35)), on which we impose continuity by averaging neighboring flux vectors. This is consistent with the flux continuity of the multidomain method.

The turbulent Prandtl number (Eq. (37)) is evaluated using a dynamic procedure similar to the one described above. A heat flux vector at the test filter level is defined analogous to the heat flux at the grid filter level (Eq. (36)),

$$Q_j = \widehat{\overline{\rho u_j T}} - \frac{1}{\widehat{\overline{\rho}}} \widehat{\rho T} \widehat{\overline{\rho u_j}}.$$
(46)

Applying the test filter on the sub-grid heat flux (Eq. (36)) and subtracting the resulting expression from the test filter heat flux gives an expression analogous to the Germano's identity (Eq. (40)),

$$K_j = Q_j - \widehat{q_j^{sgs}} = \overline{\bar{\rho}\tilde{T}\tilde{u_j}} - \frac{\overline{\bar{\rho}\tilde{T}\bar{\rho}\tilde{u_j}}}{\overline{\bar{\rho}}}.$$
(47)

The same eddy diffusivity model is used for the heat flux at the test filter level,

$$Q_j = \frac{-C_s \widehat{\overline{\rho}} \widehat{\Delta}^2 |\widetilde{\widetilde{S}}|}{Pr_t} \frac{\partial \widetilde{\widetilde{T}}}{\partial x_j}.$$
(48)

Therefore, substituting Eqs. (37) and (48) into Eq. (47), the modeled form for K_j is obtained as,

$$K_j^{mod} = \frac{C_s \overline{\Delta}^2}{Pr_t} \left[\widehat{\bar{\rho}} | \widehat{\tilde{S}} | \frac{\partial \widetilde{T}}{\partial x_j} - \hat{\bar{\rho}} \frac{\widehat{\Delta}^2}{\overline{\Delta}^2} | \widehat{\tilde{S}} | \frac{\partial \widehat{\tilde{T}}}{\partial x_j} \right].$$
(49)

Finally, following the procedure for computing the sub-grid viscosity, a least square minimization technique is used for evaluating the sub-grid Prandtl number,

$$Pr_t = \frac{2N_i N_i}{K_j N_j} (C_s \overline{\bigtriangleup}^2), \tag{50}$$

where N_i is given by,

$$N_i = \bar{\rho} |\tilde{S}| \frac{\partial \tilde{T}}{\partial x_i} - \hat{\rho} 4 |\tilde{S}| \frac{\partial \tilde{\tilde{T}}}{\partial x_i}, \qquad (51)$$

assuming $\frac{\widehat{\Delta}}{\overline{\Delta}} = 2$ and $C_s \overline{\Delta}^2$ is given by Eq. (45).

3.4. Element level filtering

The dynamic procedure requires the definition of an explicit, low pass filter for the test filtering operation. Spectral filtering can be constructed using either discrete polynomial transform (DPT) or interpolant-projection (see [11]) over each element. DPT filtering can be conveniently applied for methods with modal basis. For methods with nodal basis, the solution has to be first transformed to modal basis before the DPT filter can be applied. Projection filtering on the other hand can be constructed directly on the nodal basis. Since it does not require an extra transformation, interpolant-projection filtering is more efficient than DPT for methods with nodal basis. Therefore, for our nodal basis we use an interpolant-projection filter.

In the interpolant-projection filtering procedure, the filtered variable of degree N is obtained by projecting the variable back and forth to a lower order approximation of degree M defined on a subset of the original nodal values. As a first step the original function is interpolated from a polynomial degree, N, to a polynomial of lower degree, M,

$$Q'(x_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} L_j(x_i) Q(\bar{x}_j),$$
(52)

where x_i, \bar{x}_j are the nodes corresponding to \mathbf{P}_M and \mathbf{P}_N , respectively. $L_j \in \mathbf{P}_N$ is the Lagrange interpolating polynomial. The above operation can be cast in terms of matrix-vector product,

$$Q_i' = I_{ij}^{int} Q_j, (53)$$

where

$$I_{ij}^{int} = \prod_{k=0, k \neq j}^{N} \frac{x_i - \bar{x}_k}{\bar{x}_j - \bar{x}_k}, \ i = 0, \cdots, M, \ j = 0, \cdots, N.$$
(54)

In the second step the function Q'(x) is projected back to the polynomial space N giving the filtered function,

$$Q^{filt}(\bar{x}_e) = \sum_{f=0}^{M} L_f(\bar{x}_e) Q'(x_f).$$
(55)

Again, the above can be cast in matrix-vector form,

$$Q_e^{filt} = I_{ef}^{pro} Q_f', ag{56}$$

with

$$I_{ef}^{pro} = \prod_{k=0, k \neq f}^{M} \frac{\bar{x}_e - x_k}{x_f - x_k}, \ e = 0, \cdots, N, \ f = 0, \cdots, M.$$
(57)

In the staggered grid method, this interpolation-projection operation could be applied to both the nodal sets (Gauss-Gauss and Gauss-Lobatto nodes). We apply the filter on the Gauss-Lobatto basis since it preserves the end values of the original function and ensures C_0 continuity.

4. TESTING THE LARGE-EDDY SIMULATION METHOD

We test the performance of the staggered grid, multidomain large-eddy simulation method for two different classes of turbulent flows. The first case study is on an isotropic decaying turbulence, and enables a first order investigation of the characteristics of the LES method, since the flow doesn't involve turbulence shear production and specification of boundary conditions. Many sub-grid models have been calibrated with this flow (e.g. [22, 29]). Then, we perform a more complex test by simulating a plane, parallel channel flow at two different Reynolds numbers, that does involve boundary condition specification and shear production.

4.1. Decaying isotropic turbulence

Computation of the decaying isotropic turbulence is performed within a periodic box of size 2π . An initial correlated turbulence flow field is specified according to the procedure outlined by Rogallo [30] using a specified energy spectra. We take an initial energy spectrum that was modeled in Blaisdell et al. [31]. We refer to this spectrum and case as BMR93. The spectra are purely solenoidal (divergence free) and there is no fluctuation in the thermodynamic variables. The spectra are top hat and have non-zero contributions in the wavenumber range of $8 \le k \le 16$. The initial flow field for velocities (u, v, w), density (ρ) and temperature (T) are obtained on a uniform grid from the Fourier coefficients using a fast Fourier transform. The resultant flow field is correlated according to the top hat spectra. Finally, the initial flow field on the Chebyshev-Gauss points is obtained by interpolating from the Fourier grid using an eighth-order Lagrangian interpolation. The interpolation was shown to be adequately accurate even for low polynomial orders in [16]. The initial root mean square (rms) Mach number is 0.3 with a peak $Re_{\lambda} \approx 40$.

Resolution and spectra

We start by establishing resolution requirements for a resolved LES and the effect of

resolution on the accurate representation of the spectrum. To this end, we computed several cases with different h and p resolutions that are summarized in table I. The number of subdomains in x, y, and z direction is given by h_x , h_y and h_z , while p represents the order of polynomial in each sub-domain. LES-BASE is the base case with six domains in each directions and p=8. LES-RFNDp and LES-RFNDh have a finer resolution of p=10 and h=7, respectively. The DNS-RES and DNS-URES refer to a resolved and unresolved DNS without filtering.

The total energy spectra in figure 2 show that the resolved DNS (DNS-RES) is in good agreement with previously published BMR93 data. The sharp, matching drop-off in the spectra indicates that the DNS is resolved. The BMR93 case was computed with a Fourier-spectral method with 96³ grid points. DNS-RES uses comparable amount of degrees of freedom with h=6 domains in each direction and p=15, yielding h * (p + 2) = 102 Lobatto points in each direction, to resolve the flow. This is consistent with the validation study in [16].

Comparison of the energy and dissipation spectra between DNS-URES, LES-BASE and the resolved DNS-RES (figure 2), reveals that LES is clearly capturing the drop-off in the spectra better than the under-resolved DNS. A zoom-in on the high-frequency part ($k \ge 7$) of the spectrum in figure 3 underscores the improved capturing. LES-BASE resolves the flow up to $k\approx 20$ while the increase of the spectrum for $k\geq 12$ of the coarse DNS indicates an inaccurate solution. The dashed-dashed line in the figure highlights the point up to which there is agreement between the BMR93 spectra and DNS-URES, while the dashed-dot line shows the same for LES-BASE. Clearly the sub-grid model in LES is correctly modeling the dissipative effect of the small scale on the turbulence, that leads to the steep drop-off of the spectrum at high wavenumbers. While in a resolved DNS these small scales are accurately captured, in the under-resolved DNS insufficient resolution is unable to accurately compute the highfrequency spectrum. Instead, the numerical errors determine the behavior at the small scale. In a numerical method with very small dissipation like the multi-domain spectral method, the numerical errors are not dissipated like in dissipative method (e.g. upwind schemes). Rather, the numerical errors pile up at high wavenumbers, as seen in the spectra. In LES, the scales up to k = 20 are numerically resolved. At $k \ge 12$ the LES sub-grid model accurately models the dissipative term to the filtered equations.

Comparison of the turbulence kinetic energy (tke) decay rate for DNS-RES, DNS-URES and LES-BASE in figure 4, confirms the improved dissipation modeling. At t = 2,75% of the initial energy has decayed. The decay rate determined with LES is in closer agreement with DNS-RES than the rate determined with DNS-URES. DNS-URES under-predicts the decay rate. The additional dissipation provided by the sub-grid model in LES increases the turbulence dissipation and improves comparison with DNS-RES. In the inset of figure 4 we plot the percentage relative error, defined as $(tke_{DNS-RES} - tke)/tke_{DNS-RES} \times 100$, for LES-BASE and DNS-URES. On average, the magnitude of error for the coarse DNS is twice of the LES case.

We assess the resolution requirement for LES with multidomain Chebyshev method from the cutoff wavenumber ($k_c = 20$). The total number of Lobatto points in each direction is 60 (6 sub-domains times 10 Lobatto points). This implies that in order to resolve the spectrum till k = 20, 3 points are needed per wavelength. The value is further confirmed by the refined LES case (LES-RFNDp), where the total number of Lobatto points is 72 (6 sub-domains times 12 Lobatto points) and the flow is resolved up to k = 27 (the cut-off is marked by solid line). Therefore, again 72/27 \approx 3 points are required per wavelength. This resolution is consistent with the requirements reported in [16].

Dilatational and thermodynamic field

Decomposition of the velocity spectrum into solenoidal (figure 5(a)) and dilatational spectrum (figure 5(b)), shows that the dilatational spectrum is two orders of magnitude less than the solenoidal spectrum, which is in agreement with BMR93. The solenoidal velocity is associated with vorticity [32]. The vortical mode can generate both larger length scales, through vortex merging and smaller scales, through vortex stretching. Therefore, the initial tophat solenoidal spectrum smoothes out at both low and high wavenumbers in time.

The dilatational velocity is associated with the acoustic and entropy mode [32]. In the acoustic mode small length scales are generated through non-linear steepening of pressure waves, but there is no direct mechanism for generation of larger length scales like in the solenoidal mode. Since the simulation is started with zero fluctuations in dilatational velocity and thermodynamic fields, the acoustic fluctuations were created through non-linear production from the solenoidal velocity field. For small turbulent Mach numbers the length scale of the acoustic fluctuations generated from the vorticity fluctuations is much larger than the length scale of vortical turbulence [16, 31]. In time the acoustic length scales grow to become comparable to the size of the simulation box and hence cannot be resolved. As a result

the dilatational velocity spectra has a very flat character at low wavenumbers. Case DNS-RES shows good agreement for the dilatational spectrum upto k = 15, but the sharp drop-off at high wavenumbers as in BMR93 is not observed. Since the dilatational spectrum is two orders of magnitude less than the solenoidal spectrum, a much higher resolution is required to capture the drop-off. This is evident from figure 5(b), where the spectrum for a DNS case with p = 20 and h = 6 shows better agreement with BMR93. However, the dilatational spectrum has very small contribution to the total spectrum and therefore the case DNS-RES, which accurately resolves the solenoidal spectrum is considered as the resolved DNS. The dilatational spectra for case LES-BASE is closer to BMR93 than DNS-URES (coarse DNS). The normalized fluctuations of pressure and density are shown in figure 6 for cases DNS-RES, DNS-URES and LES-BASE. Both pressure and density fluctuations initially grows with time as energy is drained from the velocity field. After attaining peaks, which are approximately same for both the quantities, they start decaying. The figure shows that LES-BASE predicts a more accurate decay than DNS-URES.

Test filter effect

The Lagrange interpolant-projection filtering requires two sets of Lobatto grids (section 3.4). The polynomial space of degree N is fixed by the polynomial approximation used within each subdomain for the flow computation , i.e. N = 10 when p = N - 2 = 8. On the other hand, the size of the lower-degree grid of order, M, used for the interpolation can be varied independently and determines the strength of the test filter. With decreasing M, the strength and consequently the effect of the filter is larger. To investigate how the degree M of the lower-order grid affects the flow, LES results based on two test filters are compared, listed as LES-BASE and LES-FILT in table I. The lower-order grid for the test filter of LES-BASE is of degree M = (N + 1)/2, while the test filter in LES-FILT is of degree M = N - 2.

The decay of turbulence kinetic energy for the two LES cases are compared with DNS-RES in figure 7. The percentage relative errors are shown in the inset of the figure. LES-BASE has a lower error for t < 1, while for t > 1 the error magnitude is lower for LES-FILT. For both cases the predictions are within 5% of the reference case, indicating that the choice of the filter strength has small influence on the decay of turbulent kinetic energy, since the sub-grid viscosities are nearly equal in both cases. Decays of normalized fluctuations of pressure and density (shown in figure 8), however, show considerable differences. For both quantities, the decay rate for LES-FILT has larger deviation from the reference DNS case (DNS-RES), as compared to LES-BASE. This indicates that the modeled sub-grid quantities in LES-BASE is able to reproduce the cascade of energy in acoustic and entropy mode accurately. Therefore, we conclude that when the effect of the test filter is larger, more small scale acoustic waves are modeled.

h/p resolution study

One of the distinguishing aspects of spectral/hp element methods is the feature of controlling the spatial resolution at two different levels. The resolution can be altered either by changing the number of sub-domains (*h*-refinement) or by changing the order of the polynomial within each sub-domain (*p*-refinement).

Here, we study the effect of independently changing the h and p resolutions on the LES results. Cases LES-BASE and LES-RFNDp have the same h-grid but different polynomial orders, while cases LES-BASE and LES-RFNDh have the same polynomial order but different h-grids. The total number of Lobatto points for cases LES-RFNDp and LES-RFNDh are 72 and 70, respectively, which is comparable. The total energy spectra for cases LES-BASE, LES-RFNDp and LES-RFNDh is shown in figure 9. As the polynomial order is increased from p = 8 (LES-BASE) to p = 10 (LES-RFNDp), the maximum resolved wavenumber increases from k = 20 (the cut-off is marked by dashed-dashed line) to k = 27 (the cut-off is marked by solid line). Whereas, increasing the number of sub-domains in each direction from h = 6 (LES-BASE) to h = 7 (LES-RFNDh), the maximum resolved wavenumber increases to k = 25 (the cut-off is marked by dashed-dot line). This indicates that p-refinement resolves the flow better than h-refinement, which is consistent with the h/p spectral convergence [9].

4.2. Turbulent channel flow

Next, the LES methodology is tested for a three-dimensional, subsonic, plane, parallel channel flow. Presence of the wall significantly increases the complexity of the flow, the analysis and the LES implementation as compared to the isotropic turbulence case. Traditionally, the near wall region in LES of wall bounded flows is either resolved with a fine mesh like in DNS, or modeled [33]. Moin and Kim [34] performed LES of incompressible channel flow, with a Fourier spectral-finite difference scheme using a non-dynamic eddy viscosity model. Application of the dynamic Smagorinsky model to incompressible channel flow at high Reynolds numbers was studied by Piomelli [35], where a Fourier-Chebyshev pseudospectral collocation scheme was used. Wang and Pletcher [36] performed LES of low speed flows with significant heat transfer at the wall, using a low Mach number algorithm coupled to a dynamic eddy viscosity model. LES of compressible channel flow in both subsonic and supersonic regimes, at a bulk Reynolds number of 3000 was performed by Lenormand et al. [37]. They used fourth and second order finite difference to discretize the convective and diffusive terms, respectively. The subgrid scales were represented through Smagorinsky and scale similarity models. Channel flow was also used for validating LES methodologies with finite element (e.g. [5]) and spectral element (e.g. [11]) methods. In [5] it was shown that the finite element method gave better prediction of the normal Reynolds stresses over a second order central difference scheme. In their validation study, Blackburn and Schmidt [11] found that test filtering in Legendre basis gave best result for the mean velocity profile, while the projection filter provided best agreement with DNS for both normal and shear stress.

Computational model

A schematic of the computational domain is shown in figure 10. The domain extents are $L_x = 6$, $L_y = 2$, $L_z = 2$ in the streamwise, spanwise and wall normal directions, respectively. Periodic boundary conditions are employed in the streamwise and spanwise directions, while the conservative isothermal wall boundary condition of Jacobs et al. [38] is used for the bottom and top wall. The flow is simulated at bulk Reynolds number of $Re_f = 3000$ and $Re_f = 10,000$, based on channel half width and bulk velocity. The corresponding friction Reynolds numbers were $Re_{\tau} \approx 180$ and $Re_{\tau} \approx 570$, respectively. The Mach number is taken to be Ma = 0.4 based on bulk velocity and wall temperature (T_{wall}) . Following Lenormand et al. [37], a time dependent forcing term is included in the streamwise momentum equation in order to drive the flow. The velocity field is initialized with the laminar parabolic profile for u with a small random disturbance superimposed on it,

$$u(z) = -6\left[\left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{z}{2}\right](1+\epsilon), \ v = 0, w = 0,$$
(58)

where ϵ is a 10% random disturbance. The temperature is initially set to laminar Poiseuille profile,

$$T(z) = T_{wall} + \left\{ \frac{3(\gamma - 1)}{4Pr} \left[1 - (z - 1)^4 \right] \right\}.$$
 (59)

Here $T_{wall} = 6.25$ is the wall temperature and Pr = 0.72 is the Prandtl number. The density is

initially set as constant. The initial pressure is calculated from the constant density, the initial temperature and the ideal gas law. Previous studies [16, 39] have shown that at Ma = 0.4, plane parallel channel flow is pseudo-incompressible. Therefore, our simulation results are compared with incompressible DNS study of Moser et al. [40] and experimental measurements of Niedershulte et al. [41].

Low-Reynolds-number simulation

The first test case is for Re = 3000. This is close to the lowest Reynolds number at which a fully developed turbulent channel flow can be sustained without relaminarization. The computational domain (figure 10) is decomposed with 10 sub-domains in the streamwise (x) and spanwise (y) directions, while 16 sub-domains are taken in the wall normal (z) direction. The sub-domains in the wall direction are stretched out towards the center of the channel with a cosine distribution. The polynomial order within each sub-domain is taken as p = 6. The total number of Lobatto points for the above h/p grid is 819,200. The subgrid constant $C_s \overline{\Delta}^2$ and Pr_t are obtained by averaging right-hand side of Eqs. (45) and (50) along homogenous (x-y) planes within each sub-domain,

$$C_s\overline{\Delta}^2 = \left\langle \frac{L_{ij}M_{ij}}{M_{kl}M_{kl}} \right\rangle, \ Pr_t = \left\langle \frac{2N_iN_i}{K_jN_j} \right\rangle \left(C_s\overline{\Delta}^2\right). \tag{60}$$

where $\langle \rangle$ indicates averaging. This averaging technique was proposed by Zhao and Voke [42], and was shown to be more stable and give better agreement with the asymptotic behavior of turbulent length scales near the wall as compared to the Germano-Lily averaging approach [22]. The sub-grid viscosity is computed once in every time step.

The Favre averaged streamwise velocity normalized with the skin friction velocity, plotted in figure 11, is in close agreement with that in Moser et al. [40] near the wall. The maximum relative error of the LES prediction in the near wall region is 7%. So, the dynamic model is able to represent the near wall structures accurately. This observation is consistent with previous implementations of the dynamic Smagorinsky model with both finite difference and finite volume methods. The LES result is also compared to the "law of the wall" in the figure. The LES result matches with the linear $u^+ = z^+$ law in the viscous sub-layer ($z^+ \leq 5$). The agreement in the log-layer is also good, the maximum deviation from the reference data being only 3%. It can be concluded that the first order statistics are accurately recovered by LES, with approximately one-third the resolution of DNS by Jacobs et al. [16], which used the same Chebyshev spectral multidomain method, and Moser et al. [40] who used a pseudo-spectral code. The gain in computational time is slightly offset by the computational overhead of the sub-grid model. The cost of LES was 1.44 times that of the simulation without the sub-grid model on the same grid.

In figure 12, the resolved-scale Favre-fluctuating streamwise turbulent stress computed with LES, is compared to the DNS and the experiment. The results are normalized with u_{τ}^2 and plotted in wall coordinates. It is noted that although the usual practice in a *posteriori* testing is to compare the resolved-scale Reynolds stresses from LES directly with unfiltered DNS or experiment, the two quantities are not equivalent and therefore are not expected to match exactly. The location for the peak streamwise fluctuation is accurately represented by LES, although there is a 4% under-prediction in the magnitude of the peak. Except for the peak value, the resolved-scale stress from LES compares well with the DNS and experiment. The Favre-fluctuating spanwise ($\{v^{"}v^{"}\}^{+}$) and wall normal ($\{w^{"}w^{"}\}^{+}$) stresses are shown in figure 13 (a). The peak $\{v^{"}v^{"}\}^{+}$ and $\{w^{"}w^{"}\}^{+}$ values are under-predicted by 6% and 9%, respectively. The otherwise overall good agreement in the normal stresses indicates that the primary energy containing motions are resolved in the simulation. Finally, figure 13(b) shows that LES under-predicts the resolved-scale shear stress, with a maximum difference of 10% with the DNS. The experimental data shows a large scatter across the channel.

High-Reynolds-number simulation

LES is considered robust if it is stable and accurate at high Reynolds number with a coarse grid. Here, we demonstrate the robustness of our LES methodology by simulating the same channel configuration as in the previous section at a Reynolds number of $\text{Re}_{\text{f}} = 10,000$ ($\text{Re}_{\tau} \approx 570$). We keep the h-resolution the same as before, while increasing the polynomial order within each sub-domain to p = 8. The total number of Lobatto points is 1.6 million. The LES results are compared with DNS data of Moser et al. [40] for $\text{Re}_{\tau} \approx 590$.

Figure 14 shows that the LES mean velocity profile in wall coordinates is in close agreement for $z^+ < 10$ with DNS like in the low Reynolds number channel flow. The linear law of the wall is well represented by LES. However, there are differences for $z^+ > 10$, where the LES under-predicts the mean velocity. The under-predication is attributed to under-resolution in the outer layer and the type of test filter used here. The number of grid points used for DNS is a factor of 20 times larger than the number of grid points used for LES. The effect of underresolution was investigated in several studies. In Bagget et al. [43] the resolution requirement for LES of shear flows using the dynamic Smagronsky model was studied through a series of channel flow simulations at high Reynolds number ($\text{Re}_{\tau} \approx 1000$). They varied the resolution in the outer-layer while keeping the near wall mesh the same, which essentially resolved the near wall structures. It was shown that the sub-grid shear stress predicted by the dynamic model in *posteriori* simulation, was less than the shear stress obtained using filtered DNS data. Such under-prediction in shear stress directly affects the averaged velocity profile. Using the data from [43], Jimenez and Moser [44] showed that the fractional error in prediction of mean velocity is roughly proportional to and is of the same order as the fraction of shear stress carried by the sub-grid model. Therefore, they concluded that the prediction in mean velocity can be improved by adjusting the resolution so that the amount of shear stress carried by the sub-grid model is small. Under-prediction in the averaged velocity was also observed by Blackburn and Schmidt [11], for their spectral element LES using interpolant-projection type filtering.

Figure 15 compares the resolved-scale Favre fluctuating streamwise turbulent stress, again normalized with u_{τ}^2 , from LES with Moser et al. The location of the peak is again accurately captured by LES, while the magnitude is under-predicted by 4%. In contrast to the low Reynolds number case, where an excellent agreement was seen, the LES stresses have slightly lower value for $z^+ > 70$, with a maximum under-prediction of 13% at $z^+ = 200$. The spanwise $(\{v^nv^n\}^+)$ and wall normal $(\{w^nw^n\}^+)$ turbulent stresses, shown in figure 16, on the other hand show a slight over-prediction for $z^+ < 300$. The maximum differences being 11% and 7%, respectively. The over-predicted stresses are attributed to under-resolution and the modeling of the sub-grid stresses. In a *posteriori* LES it is generally difficult to isolate the effect of grid resolution and the sub-grid model on the Reynolds stresses, especially for inhomogeneous flows. However, it was shown in [45] that the flow tends to be over-dissipative at marginal resolution resulting in an over-prediction of normal stresses. Such over-prediction of stresses across the channel was also observed in the spectral element simulation of Blackburn and Schmidt [11]. The resolved-scale shear stress (figure 16(b)) is also in good agreement with the DNS data. The values are over-predicted till $z^+ < 300$, with a maximum difference of 3.5%.

5. CONCLUSIONS

A robust, high-order, spectral element large-eddy simulation (LES) technique for compressible flow has been developed. The high-order Chebyshev approximation controls the numerical errors, while the flux based method ensures a conservative scheme. The sub-grid stress and subgrid heat flux are represented by dynamic models which, in combination with the unstructured multidomain method, facilitates a flexible methodology that is easily applied for complex flow geometries.

The evaluation of the LES code in a decaying isotropic case at $\text{Re}_{\lambda} \approx 40$ and $\text{Ma}_{\text{rms}} = 0.3$, reveals that the LES method computes the turbulence spectrum far more accurately than does the under-resolved DNS. Since the numerical method has very little dissipation, the numerical error generated in the under-resolved DNS computations increases the energy in the high-frequency part of the energy spectrum. The LES model correctly models the physical dissipation and agrees with the spectrum of a resolved DNS. The current LES method improves over lower-order LES methods that can have numerical dissipation, and so lower the energy in the high-frequency range. The rate of decay of turbulence kinetic energy and fluctuations in thermodynamic quantities is more accurate for LES than for coarse DNS. Lack of numerical dissipation in a higher-order LES method enables reliable analysis of the role of the sub-grid model and test filtering in a *posteriori* computation. From the cut-off wavenumbers for the LES cases, we deduce that the multidomain LES requires only 3 Lobatto grid points per resolved scale wavenumber, which is significantly less than lower-order LES requirements. The study of the effect of the test filter strength indicates that M = (N + 1)/2 results in better prediction of the decay of thermodynamic fluctuations than M = N - 2, where N is the degree of the Lobatto grid used for the solution, while M is the degree of the lower-order Lobatto grid used for constructing the test filter. Analysis of p and h convergence for LES demonstrates that p-refinement is more efficient than h-refinement, which is consistent with the h/p convergence theory.

LES tests on the turbulent channel flow with the near wall area resolved illustrates the success of the new LES methodology to predict wall bounded, inhomogenous turbulent flows at low and moderately high Reynolds numbers. LES of the channel flow at Re = 3000 shows that the method accurately computes the flow for $z^+ < 10$, consistent with the correct asymptotic

variation of the sub-grid length scale with the distance from the wall as enforced by the dynamic Smagorinsky model. LES under-predicts peak value of normal stresses, also consistent with the predictions of LES based on finite difference methods. Since the multidomain method is not dissipative, the under-prediction is attributed to the under-dissipative nature of the dynamic model.

The LES methodology was shown to be robust, i.e. it is able to predict high-Reynolds number flows with fair accuracy on a relatively coarse grid. Robustness was demonstrated by a simulation of the channel flow at Re = 10,000. The mean flow and the Reynolds stress are in fair agreement with the published DNS result. The dynamic model is known to under-predict the sub-grid shear stresses in turbulent channel flows, especially at high Reynolds numbers. This leads to error in the prediction of averaged velocity unless the resolution is increased sufficiently to reduce the proportion of the shear stress carried by the model. The marginal resolution in our simulation, results in under-prediction of the average velocity in the outer layer at $z^+ > 10$ and larger deviation of the Reynolds stresses compared to the low Reynolds number case.

With tests on the isotropic turbulence and the turbulent channel flow, the characteristics of the LES methodology have been exposed. Further research is currently underway to apply the methodologies presented here, for simulation of more complex flows like the flow over a backward-facing step, where the method is expected to improve over most other LES numerical schemes.

The multidomain spectral method is of the same type as the discontinuous Galerkin method and discontinuous finite element method. The conclusion and observations from this paper thus extend to this broader class of numerical methods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The support for this work was provided by the U.S. Office of Naval Research with Dr. G.D. Roy as the Program Officer. Computational time was provided in part by National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA).

REFERENCES

1. Ghosal S. An analysis of numerical errors in large-eddy simulations of turbulence. *Journal of Comput. Physics* 1996; **125**:187–206.

- Kravchenko AG, Moin P. On the effect of numerical errors in large eddy simulation of turbulent flows. Journal of Comput. Physics 1997; 131:310–322.
- Bui TT. A parallel, finite volume algorithm for large-eddy simulation of turbulent flows. Computer and Fluids 2000; 29:877–915.
- Mahesh K, Constantinescu G, Moin P. A numerical method for large-eddy simulation in complex geometries. Journal of Comput. Physics 2004; 197:215–240.
- Jansen K. A stabilized finite element method for computing turbulence. Comput. Methods. Appl. Mech. Engrg 1999; 174:299–317.
- 6. Santhanam S, Lele SK, Ferziger JH. A robust high-order compact method for large-eddy simulation. Journal of Computational Physics 2003; **191**:392–419.
- Blaisdell GA, Spyropoulos ET, Qin JH. The effect of the formulation of nonlinear terms on aliasing errors in spectral methods. Appl. Numer. Math. 1996; 21:207.
- Moin P, Squires K, Cabot W, Lee S. A dynamic subgrid model for compressible turbulence and scalar transport. *Phys. Fluids A 3* 1991; 11:2746–2757.
- Karniadakis GEM, Sherwin S. Spectral/hp Element Methods for Computational Fluid Dynamics. Oxford University Press: New York, USA, 2005.
- Deville MO, Fischer PF, Mund EH. High-Order Methods for Incompressible Fluid Flow. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2002.
- Blackburn HM, Schmidt S. Spectral element filtering techniques for large eddy simulation with dynamic estimation. Journal of Computational Physics 2003; 186:610–629.
- Fischer PF, Mullen JS. Filter based stabilization of spectral element methods. Comptes Rendus a l'Academie des Sciences Paris, Ser. 1, Anal. Numer 2001; 332:265–270.
- Levin JG, Iskandarani M, Haidvogel DB. A spectral filtering procedure for eddy-resolving simulations with a spectral element ocean model. *Journal of Computational Physics* 1997; 137:130–154.
- Karamanos GS. Large eddy simulation using unstructured spectral/hp finite elements. PhD Thesis, Imperial College, London 1999.
- Karamanos GS, Karniadakis GE. A spectral vanishing viscosity method for large-eddy simulations. Journal of Comput. Physics 2000; 163:22–50.
- Jacobs GB, Kopriva DA, Mashayek F. Validation study of a multidomain spectral code for simulation of turbulent flows. AIAA Journal 2005; 43(6):1256–1264.
- Kopriva DA, Kolias JH. A conservative staggared-grid Chebyshev multidomain method for compressible flows. Journal of Comput. Physics 1996; 125:244–261.
- Kopriva DA. A staggared-grid multidomain spectral method for compressible Navier-Stokes equations. Journal of Comput. Physics 1998; 143:125–158.
- Jacobs GB. Numerical simulation of two-phase turbulent compressible flows with a multidomain spectral method. PhD Thesis, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago 2003.
- Vreman B, Guerts B, Kuerten H. Subgrid-modeling in LES of compressible flow. Appl. Sci. Res. 1995; 54:191–203.
- Vreman B, Guerts B, Kuerten H. Large-eddy simulation of turbulent mixing layers. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 1997; 339:357–390.
- Germano M, Piomelli U, Moin P, Cabot WH. A dynamic subgrid scale eddy viscosity model. Phys. Fluids A 3 1991; 7:1760–1765.
- Yoshizawa A. Statistical theory for compressible turbulent shear flows, with the application to subgrid modeling. *Physics of Fluids A* 1986; 29(7):2152–2164.
- Erlebacher G, Hussaini MY, Speziale CG, Zang TA. Toward the large-eddy simulation of compressible turbulent flows. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 1992; 238:155–185.
- Squires KD. Dynamic subgrid scale modeling of compressible turbulence. Annual Research Brief, Stanford University 1991.
- Vreman AW, Guerts BJ, Kuerten J. Direct and large-eddy simulation I. Kluwer academic publisher: Netherlands, 1994.
- Okong'o N, Knight DD, Zhou G. Large-eddy simulations using an unstructured grid compressible Navier-Stokes algorithm. International Journal of Computational Fluid Dynamics 2000; 13(4):303–326.
- Lily DK. A proposed modification of the Germano subgrid-scale closure method. Phys. Fluids A 4 1992; 3:633–635.
- Bardina J, Ferziger JH, Reynolds WC. Improved turbulence models based on large eddy simulation of homogeneous, incompressible, turbulent flows. *Report, Thermosciences Division, Dept. Mechanical Engineering TF-19*, Stanford University 1983.
- 30. Rogallo RS. Numerical experiments in homogeneous turbulence. NASA Report TM 81315, NASA 1981.
- Blaisdell GA, Mansour NN, Reynolds WC. Compressibility effects on the growth and structure of homogeneous turbulent shear flow. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 1993; 256:443–485.
- 32. Smits AJ, Dussage JP. Turbulent Shear Layers in Supersonic Flow. Springer: Springer, 2006.

- Piomelli U. Large-eddy simulation: achievements and challenges. Progress in Aerospace Sciences 1999; 35:335–362.
- Moin P, Kim J. Numerical investigation of turbulent channel flow. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 1982; 118:341–377.
- Piomelli U. High Reynolds number calculations using the dynamic subgrid-scale stress model. Phys. Fluids A 1993; 5(6):1484–1490.
- Wang WP, Pletcher RH. On the large eddy simulation of a turbulent channel flow with significant heat transfer. *Physics of Fluids* 1996; 8(12):3354–3366.
- Lenormand E, Sagaut P, Ta Phuoc T. Large eddy simulation of subsonic and supersonic channel flow at moderate Reynolds number. Int. J. Numer. Meth. Fluids 2000; 32:369–406.
- Jacobs GB, Kopriva DA, Mashayek F. A conservative isothermal wall boundary condition for the compressible Navier-Stokes equation. *Journal of Scientific Computing* 2007; 30(2):177–192.
- Ridder JP, Beddini R. Large eddy simulation of compressible channel flow. NASA Tech. Report NGT-50363, NASA 1993.
- 40. Moser R, Kim J, Mansour NN. Direct numerical simulation of turbulent channel flow up to $Re_{\tau} = 590$. Physics of Fluids 1999; **11**(4):943–945.
- Niederschulte MA, Adrian RJ, Hanratty TJ. Measurements of turbulent flow in a channel at low Reynolds numbers. Exp. Fluids 1990; 9:222–230.
- Zhao H, Voke PR. A dynamic subgrid-scale model for low-Reynolds number channel flow. International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids 1996; 23:19–27.
- Bagget JS, Jimenéz J, Kravchenko AG. Resolution requirements in large-eddy simulation of shear flows. Annual Research Briefs, Center for Turbulence Research, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 1997.
- 44. Jimenéz J, Moser RD. Large-eddy simulations: where are we and what can we expect? AIAA Journal 2000; 38(4):605–612.
- Najjar FM, Tafti DK. Study of discrete test filter and finite difference approximations for the dynamic subgrid-scale stress model. *Physics of Fluids* 1996; 8(4):1076–1088.

Case	$h_x \times h_y \times h_z$	р	М
DNS-RES	$6 \times 6 \times 6$	15	NA
DNS-URES	6 imes 6 imes 6	8	NA
LES-BASE	6 imes 6 imes 6	8	(N+1)/2
LES-RFNDp	6 imes 6 imes 6	10	(N+1)/2
LES-FILT	6 imes 6 imes 6	8	N-2
LES-RFNDh	$7 \times 7 \times 7$	8	(N+1)/2

Table I. Cases for decaying isotropic turbulence simulation.



Figure 1. Staggared arrangement of solution variable and fluxes, closed circles: ggg points, open squares: lgg points, open circles: glg points, closed squares: ggl points.



Figure 2. Comparison of (a) energy spectra and (b) dissipation spectra at t=3.2 for isotropic turbulence.



Figure 3. Same as figure 2, zoomed in on high wave-numbers.



Figure 4. Decay of turbulent kinetic energy for isotropic turbulence. Inset: relative error for cases LES-BASE and DNS-URES.



Figure 5. Comparison of decomposed energy spectra at t=3.2 for isotropic turbulence: (a) solenoidal spectrum (b) dilatational spectrum.



Figure 6. Decay of (a) pressure and (b) density fluctuations.



Figure 7. Decay of turbulent kinetic energy, for DNS and LES with different test filter strengths. Inset: relative error for cases LES-BASE and LES-FILT.



Figure 8. Decay of (a) pressure and (b) density fluctuations, for DNS and LES with different test filter strengths.



Figure 9. h/p resolution study: (a) energy spectra and (b) dissipation spectra.



Figure 10. Schematic of channel flow geometry (not to scale).



Figure 11. Mean normalized streamwise velocity plotted in wall coordinates for channel flow at $\mathrm{Re}=3000.$



Figure 12. Streamswise normal stresses for channel flow at Re = 3000.



Figure 13. (a) Normal stresses in the spanwise and wall-normal directions and (b) shear stress for channel flow at Re = 3000.



Figure 14. Mean normalized streamwise velocity plotted in wall coordinates for channel flow at Re = 10000.



Figure 15. Streamswise normal stresses for channel flow at Re = 10000.



Figure 16. (a) Normal stresses in the spanwise and wall-normal directions and (b) shear stress for channel flow at Re = 10000.