A STABLE REGULARIZATION OF THE GRADIENT MODEL

F.X. Trias[1], **A. Gorobets**[2], **A. Oliva**[1]
[1] Heat and Mass Transfer Technological Center, Technical University of Catalonia
C/Colom 11, 08222 Terrassa (Barcelona)   E-mail: francesc.xavier.trias@upc.edu
[2] Keldysh Institute of Applied Mathematics, 4A, Miusskaya Sq., Moscow 125047, Russia

INTRODUCTION

In the last decades, many engineering/scientific applications have benefited from the advances in the field of Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD). Unfortunately, most of practical turbulent flows cannot be directly computed from the Navier–Stokes equations because not enough resolution is available to resolve all the relevant scales of motion. Therefore, practical numerical simulations have to resort to turbulence modeling. We may therefore turn to large-eddy simulation (LES) to predict the large-scale behavior of turbulent flows. In LES, the large scales of motions are explicitly computed, whereas effects of small scale motions are modeled. Since the advent of CFD many subgrid-scale models have been proposed and successfully applied to a wide range of flows. Eddy-viscosity models for LES is probably the most popular example thereof. Then, for problems with the presence of active/passive scalars (*e.g.* heat transfer problems, transport of species in combustion, dispersion of contaminants,...) the (linear) eddy-diffusivity assumption is usually chosen. However, this type of approximation systematically fails to provide a reasonable approximation of the actual SGS flux because they are strongly misaligned [1, 2]. This was clearly shown in our previous works [3, 4] where SGS features were studied *a priori* for a RBC at Ra-number up to 10^{11} (see $\boldsymbol{q}^{eddy}$ in Figure 1). This leads to the conclusion that nonlinear (or tensorial) models are necessary to provide good approximations of the actual SGS heat flux (see $\boldsymbol{q}$ in Figure 1). In this regard, the nonlinear Leonard model [5] or gradient model, which is the leading term of the Taylor series of the SGS flux, provides a very accurate *a priori* approximation (see $\boldsymbol{q}^{nl}$ in Figure 1). However, the local dissipation introduced by the model can take negative values; therefore, the Leonard model cannot be used as a standalone SGS flux model, since it produces a finite-time blow-up. In this context, we aim to shed light to the following research question: *can we a simple approach to reconcile accuracy and stability for the gradient model?*

DECONSTRUCTING THE GRADIENT MODEL

Let us firstly consider the following transport equation

$$\partial_t \phi + \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi) = \mathcal{D}\phi, \qquad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{u}$ denotes the advective velocity and ϕ represents a generic (transported) scalar field. The non-linear convective term is given by $\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi) \equiv (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\phi$ whereas the diffusive terms reads $\mathcal{D}\phi \equiv \Gamma \nabla^2 \phi$. Shortly, LES equations arises from


Figure 1: Left: alignment trends of the actual SGS heat flux. For details the reader is referred to our work [3]. Right: DNS of the air-filled RBC at $Ra = 10^{10}$ studied in Refs. [3, 6].

applying a spatial commutative filter, $\overline{(\cdot)}$, with filter length, δ,

$$\partial_t \overline{\phi} + \mathcal{C}(\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \overline{\phi}) = \mathcal{D}\overline{\phi} - \nabla \cdot \tau_\phi, \qquad (2)$$

where $\tau_\phi \equiv \overline{\boldsymbol{u}\phi} - \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\overline{\phi}$ is the subgrid scalar flux. Then, the gradient model follows from considering a Taylor-series expansion of the filter

$$\phi = \overline{\phi} + \phi' = \overline{\phi} - \frac{\delta^2}{24}\nabla^2\phi + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4), \qquad (3)$$

where ϕ' is the filter residual. Then, applying this to $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}\phi}$ and $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\overline{\phi}$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\boldsymbol{u}\phi} &\approx \boldsymbol{u}\phi + \frac{\delta^2}{24}\nabla^2(\boldsymbol{u}\phi) \\
&= \boldsymbol{u}\phi + \frac{\delta^2}{24}(\nabla^2\boldsymbol{u})\phi + \frac{\delta^2}{12}\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\nabla\phi + \frac{\delta^2}{24}\boldsymbol{u}\nabla^2\phi,
\end{aligned} \qquad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}\,\overline{\phi} &\approx \left(\boldsymbol{u} + \frac{\delta^2}{24}\nabla^2\boldsymbol{u}\right)\left(\phi + \frac{\delta^2}{24}\nabla^2\phi\right) \\
&= \boldsymbol{u}\phi + \frac{\delta^2}{24}(\nabla^2\boldsymbol{u})\phi + \frac{\delta^2}{24}\boldsymbol{u}\nabla^2\phi + \frac{\delta^4}{24^2}\nabla^2\boldsymbol{u}\nabla^2\phi.
\end{aligned} \qquad (5)$$

Figure 2: Location of the eigenvalues for the matrix $\mathsf{CF} - \mathsf{FC}$ (left) and $\mathsf{C}^{UP}\mathsf{F} - \mathsf{FC}^{UP}$ (right). Results correspond to a 4×3 Cartesian with a random divergence-free velocity field.

Finally, plugging this into the definition of τ_ϕ and discarding high-order terms leads to the standard form of the gradient model

$$\tau_\phi \approx \tau_\phi^{grad} = \frac{\delta^2}{12} \nabla \boldsymbol{u} \nabla \phi. \qquad (6)$$

Alternatively, it can be expressed in terms of regularized (smoother) forms of the convective operator as follows

$$\nabla \cdot \tau_\phi^{grad} = \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi) + \overline{\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi)} - \mathcal{C}(\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \phi) - \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \overline{\phi}), \quad (7)$$

where

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi)} - \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi) = \frac{\delta^2}{24} \nabla^2 \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{u}\phi) = \frac{\delta^2}{24} \nabla \cdot (\nabla^2 (\boldsymbol{u}\phi)), \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{C}(\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}, \phi) - \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi) = \frac{\delta^2}{24} \nabla \cdot ((\nabla^2 \boldsymbol{u})\phi), \qquad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \overline{\phi}) - \mathcal{C}(\boldsymbol{u}, \phi) = \frac{\delta^2}{24} \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{u}\nabla^2 \phi). \qquad (10)$$

The alternative form given in Eq.(7) is simply based on the non-linear convective operator and the linear filter; therefore, its implementation is straightforward. Moreover, it avoids the interpolations required if the standard gradient model given in Eq.(6) is directly implemented. Finally, it facilitates the analysis of the gradient model, neatly identifying those terms that may cause numerical instabilities. This is addressed in the next section.

STABILIZING THE GRADIENT MODEL

Following the notation used in Ref. [7], the novel form of the gradient model given in Eq.(7) would be discretized as follows

$$\mathsf{M}\tau_{\phi,h}^{grad} = \mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{u}_s)\,\phi_c + \mathsf{FC}(\boldsymbol{u}_s)\,\phi_c - \mathsf{C}(\mathsf{F}\boldsymbol{u}_s)\,\phi_c - \mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{u}_s)\,\mathsf{F}\phi_c, \qquad (11)$$

where $\boldsymbol{u}_s$ and ϕ_c are respectively the discrete velocity field defined at the faces and the cell-centered scalar field. Moreover, M, $\mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{u}_s)$ and F are matrices representing the discrete divergence, convective and filter operators. For details, the reader is referred to Ref. [7]. This discrete form of τ_ϕ^{grad} can be expressed in matrix-vector form as follows

$$\mathsf{M}\tau_{\phi,h}^{grad} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{I} \\ \mathsf{F} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{u}_s) - \mathsf{C}(\mathsf{F}\boldsymbol{u}_s) & -\mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{u}_s) \\ \mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{u}_s) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{I} \\ \mathsf{F} \end{pmatrix} \phi_c. \qquad (12)$$

Recalling that the discrete convective and filter operator should be respectively represented by a skew-symmetric matrix, $\mathsf{C} = -\mathsf{C}^T$, and a symmetric matrix, $\mathsf{F}=\mathsf{F}^T$, the contribution of the gradient model to the time-evolution of the

L2-norm of ϕ_c is given by

$$-\phi_c \cdot \mathsf{M}\tau_{\phi,h}^{grad} = \phi_c \cdot (\mathsf{CF} - \mathsf{FC})\,\phi_c. \qquad (13)$$

Hereafter, for simplicity, $\mathsf{C} = \mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{u}_s)$. Therefore, stability of the gradient model is determined by the sign of the Rayleigh quotient of the matrix $\mathsf{CF} - \mathsf{FC}$. Therefore, if $\mathsf{C} = -\mathsf{C}^T$, as it should be from a physical point-of-view,

$$\phi_c \cdot \mathsf{CF}\phi_c = \phi_c \cdot (\mathsf{CF})^T \phi_c = \phi_c \cdot \mathsf{F}^T \mathsf{C}^T \phi_c = -\phi_c \cdot \mathsf{FC}\phi_c. \quad (14)$$

In this case, there is no guarantee that the eigenvalues of the matrix $\mathsf{CF} - \mathsf{FC}$ will lie on stable half-side and, therefore, the gradient model will be eventually unstable. This is clearly shown in Figure 2 (left) where the locations of the eigenvalues is displayed for a 3×4 Cartesian mesh with a random divergence-free velocity field.

Nevertheless, at this point, we have neatly identified the discrete operators that lead to unstable modes. Hence, they must be modified if we aim to solve the problem. A very simple solution consists on using an upwind for the convective terms in Eq.(13); namely, replacing C by C^{UP} in the off-diagonal terms in Eq.(12), leading to an overall contribution to the time-evolution of the L2-norm of ϕ_c given by

$$-\phi_c \cdot \mathsf{M}\tau_{\phi,h}^{grad} = \phi_c \cdot \left(\mathsf{C}^{UP}\mathsf{F} - \mathsf{FC}^{UP} \right) \phi_c, \qquad (15)$$

where C^{UP} corresponds to a first-order upwind discretization of the convective term. In this way, all the eigenvalues lie on the stable half-side (see Figure 2, right). A formal proof together with both *a priori* and *a posteriori* tests will be presented.

REFERENCES

[1] C. W. Higgins, M. B. Parlange, and C. Meneveau. The heat flux and the temperature gradient in the lower atmosphere. *Geophysical Research Letter*, 31:L22105, 2004.

[2] S. G. Chumakov. "*A priori* study of subgrid-scale flux of a passive scalar in isotropic homogeneous turbulence. *Physical Review E*, 78:036313, 2008.

[3] F. Dabbagh, F. X. Trias, A. Gorobets, and A. Oliva. A priori study of subgrid-scale features in turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard convection. *Physics of Fluids*, 29:105103, 2017.

[4] F. Dabbagh, F. X. Trias, A. Gorobets, and A. Oliva. Flow topology dynamics in a three-dimensional phase space for turbulent Rayleigh-Bénard convection. *Physical Review Fluids*, 5:024603, 2020.

[5] A. Leonard. Large-eddy simulation of chaotic convection and beyond. *AIAA paper*, 97-0304, 1997.

[6] F.X. Trias, F.Dabbagh, A.Gorobets, and C.Oliet. On a proper tensor-diffusivity model for large-eddy simulation of buoyancy-driven turbulence. *Flow, Turbulence and Combustion*, 105:393–414, 2020.

[7] F. X. Trias, O. Lehmkuhl, A. Oliva, C.D. Pérez-Segarra, and R.W.C.P. Verstappen. Symmetry-preserving discretization of Navier-Stokes equations on collocated unstructured meshes. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 258:246–267, 2014.