

Course Name: Turbulence Modelling

Professor Name: Dr. Vagesh D. Narasimhamurthy

Department Name: Department of Applied Mechanics

Institute Name: Indian Institute of Technology, Madras

Week - 9

Lecture – Lec49

49. Realizability constraints in eddy-viscosity models – II

Let us look at an issue. So, before that let us frame the question. Are eddy viscosity models realizable? That means physical? So, we will take an example and see what it looks like. So, one issue is coming from Boussinesq itself. That was the origin; the closure for your Reynolds stresses came from Boussinesq.

So, we look at a limitation of Boussinesq. This issue is also called irrotational strain issue. So, we will see what happens here. So, if you recall Boussinesq, it is essentially $\overline{u_i' u_j'} = 2\nu_t \overline{S_{ij}} - \frac{2}{3} k \delta_{ij}$.

$$-\overline{u_i' u_j'} = 2\nu_t \overline{S_{ij}} - \frac{2}{3} k \delta_{ij}$$

This is the turbulence closure using Boussinesq. Now, I would like to take one of the normal stresses because I already said normal stresses must stay positive. It is a square term. So, I would like to take one normal stress. Let us say let i equal to j equal to 1.

That will give me $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$. So, this must stay positive. So, this I can write it as $\frac{2}{3} k \delta_{11}$ of course, which is $\frac{2}{3} k$ minus $2\nu_t S_{11}$ average ok. So, what does this give me actually here? This gives me $\frac{2}{3} k$ minus $2\nu_t$, this is nothing but half of $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ by $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ plus $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ by $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ plus $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ by $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ plus $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ by $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$. So, this essentially becomes, so this is equal to your $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$, $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ is therefore equal to $\frac{2}{3} k$ minus $2\nu_t \overline{u_1' u_1'}$.

$$\overline{u_1' u_1'} = \frac{2}{3} k \delta_{11} - 2 \nu_t \overline{S_{11}} = \frac{2}{3} k - 2 \nu_t \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1} \right)$$

$$\therefore \overline{u_1' u_1'} = \frac{2}{3} k - 2 \nu_t \frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$$

Now, is there a chance that this Reynolds stresses this Reynolds particular Reynolds stress go negative? There is a chance here right. So, it must always stay positive then only it is realizable or physical. Now, according to Boussinesq there is a chance $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ can become negative and when does that happen? When this particular value takes large value. if this becomes a very large value that means large strain, irrotational strain. It is a $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$ is an irrotational strain, it is not a rotational part, volumetric strain.

So, large irrotational strain. So, turbulent is vertical flow. One of the definitions I told you is that turbulence is characterized by three-dimensional vorticity fluctuations. So, it is rotation dominant flow, not this volumetric strain, ok, but here we have a situation where there can be a large irrotational strain that is $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$ becoming sorry becoming very, very large. if this happens then you are ok, you can say for a large irrotational strain this $\overline{u_1' u_1'}$ can become negative right, normal stress becoming negative according to Boussinesq in a given flow where such a thing can exist where you have a large irrotational strain and therefore, this is unrealizable or unphysical.

So, by default, the model can give wrong result. Similarly, this can happen for the other two normal stresses $\overline{u_2' u_2'}$, $\overline{u_3' u_3'}$, ok. So, this is one situation where you can have a large irrotational strain large positive value here of course, large positive value right. This can lead to normal stress going negative. We can also have an example for this where something like this can happen and which is commonly occurring in many flows.

I take an example; I can consider another situation or an example here, an unrealizable flow example, or I can say in a stagnation zone. So, this kind of a flow you would have seen, or we will encounter is flow. Let us say you have a flow over a bluff body. Let us say I have a bluff body and then you have flow over it. So, this is your stagnation zone, right? The stagnation point here such a type of a flow or you can have get a region like this.

Let us say you have a plate and then you have flow impingement flow impinging on a plate. This kind of situations can occur right. So, we can have the coordinate system for this as let us say x_1 , x_2 . This is x_1 , x_2 same coordinate system. Again, you have a stagnation zone here.

So, around that you will have locally a stagnation zone flow is stagnating. So, in that kind of a situation what will happen in this stagnation zone? What will happen to the irrotational strain? This. So, in such stagnation zones, what would happen to let us say, $\overline{u_1}$ bar by $\overline{u_1}$ x 1? What will this be $\frac{\partial \overline{u_1}}{\partial x_1}$? The $\overline{u_1}$ on the wall here, nearly 0 around it and little bit away from it, it is very large. So, this is a large negative value, right? So, $\frac{\partial \overline{u_1}}{\partial x_1}$ here $\frac{\partial \overline{u_1}}{\partial x_1}$ is a large negative value that is large negative value irrotational again. So, if I have this a very negative $\frac{\partial \overline{u_1}}{\partial x_1}$.

So, let us look at the Boussinesq again. So, I have $\overline{u_i u_i}$ is equal to the same formula. So, I have this $\frac{2}{3} k$ minus $\frac{2}{3} k \delta_{ij}$ minus $2 \nu t$ $\overline{S_{ij}}$ bar. So, here I take i equal to j equal to 2 now. Let us see what happens to that.

i equal to j equal to 2 gives me u_2 prime, u_2 prime average is $\frac{2}{3} k$ minus $2 \nu t$, minus $2 \nu t$ $\overline{u_2}$ bar by $\overline{u_2}$ x 2. just like the equation that we have seen here, $\frac{2}{3} k$ minus $2 \nu t$ $\overline{u_1}$ bar by $\overline{u_1}$ x 1 above, this will be one equation let us say. Similarly, I have i equal to j equal to 3, I get u_3 prime, u_3 prime average is $\frac{2}{3} k$ minus $2 \nu t$ $\overline{u_3}$ bar by $\overline{u_3}$ x 3. Now, if I add these two.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{u_i u_i} &= \frac{2}{3} k \delta_{ij} - 2 \nu t \overline{S_{ij}} \\ i=j=2 &\Rightarrow \overline{u_2 u_2} = \frac{2}{3} k - 2 \nu t \frac{\partial \overline{u_2}}{\partial x_2} \quad \rightarrow \textcircled{1} \\ i=j=3 &\Rightarrow \overline{u_3 u_3} = \frac{2}{3} k - 2 \nu t \frac{\partial \overline{u_3}}{\partial x_3} \quad \rightarrow \textcircled{2} \end{aligned}$$

Adding 1 and 2. So, equation 1 plus 2 will give me u_2 prime u_2 prime average plus u_3 prime u_3 prime average equal to $\frac{4}{3} k$ minus $2 \nu t$ $\overline{u_2}$ bar by $\overline{u_2}$ x 2 plus $\overline{u_3}$ bar by $\overline{u_3}$ x 3. Now, I can use continuity here. So, this gives me $\frac{4}{3} k$ minus $2 \nu t$ of minus $\overline{u_1}$ bar by $\overline{u_1}$ x 1 using continuity here. Substituting this part by minus $\overline{u_1}$ bar by $\overline{u_1}$ x 1. So, the formula here becomes $\frac{4}{3} k$ plus $2 \nu t$ $\overline{u_1}$ bar by $\overline{u_1}$ x 1.

$$\textcircled{1} + \textcircled{2} \Rightarrow \overline{u_2 u_2} + \overline{u_3 u_3} = \frac{4}{3} k - 2 \nu t \left(\frac{\partial \overline{u_2}}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial \overline{u_3}}{\partial x_3} \right) = \frac{4}{3} k - 2 \nu t \left(- \frac{\partial \overline{u_1}}{\partial x_1} \right)$$

But what is $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$? Here, large negative value, extremely large negative value. $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$ is large negative. So, this becomes very large negative. So, this becomes $\frac{4}{3}k$, k is always positive here. So, note k is positive, k is positive and your $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$ is large negative.

sorry not equal to 0, it is just its large negative value right, large negative value $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$. So, that means this is positive, and this is a large negative, making the entire equation that is the sum of these two as negative. So, this can imply that this implies $\overline{u'_2 u'_2} + \overline{u'_3 u'_3}$, the sum can go negative, the sum is going negative. I am looking into the total sum this plus this is equal to the right part. k becoming positive $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_1}{\partial x_1}$ is extremely large negative value and therefore, the sum of the two normal stresses becoming negative.

So, now, this does not mean that both are negative, there is a good chance that the both stresses can be negative or one is very negative compared to the other one either way it is unrealizable or unphysical because these two has to be positive correct. So, this means that one of them must be very large negative or I can write in the next slide. So, this means either $\overline{u'_2 u'_2}$ and $\overline{u'_3 u'_3}$, both are negative or one of them is very large negative value. Either way, it is unphysical, it is unphysical since normal stresses must stay positive, ok? So, we have seen an example where it can go. Completely unphysical your eddy viscosity model by default whichever model you are using will give you because you are using fundamentally Boussinesq.

Then you are deciding for eddy viscosity, you are deciding k epsilon, k omega, k omega SST so many variations right different types of models 1, 2, 3, 4 equation models, but this is an issue with the Boussinesq itself. So, this will lead to unphysical, unrealizable behaviour. We will see how we can fix this in the next class as well as look into other problems you will get from Boussinesq and also the solutions for that.