Ames Research Center

Mesh Effects on Flow Solutions for a 2-D Multi-Element Airfoil Using Structured Overset Methods

Andrew M. Chuen, William M. Chan

Advanced Modeling & Simulation (AMS) Seminar Series

NASA Ames Research Center

July 23rd , 2020

Ames Research Center

Overview


- Problem Summary
- Flow Solver and Mesh Generator Tools
- Mesh Generation Procedure
- Results
  - Mesh Parameter Study
  - Grid Convergence Study
  - Adaption Study
- Recent Results

Ames Research Center

Problem Summary


- Develop best-practice mesh from mesh-parameter study ($\alpha = 8°$) on 2D HLCRM cut to determine effect of mesh on solution.
- Perform grid-convergence study ($\alpha = 8°, 16°$)
- Perform adaptive mesh study ($\alpha = 8°, 16°$)
- Flow Parameters:

  M_∞: 0.2
  Re: 5.0x10^6
  c_{ref}: 1.0



Ames Research Center

Span-Wise Location of Cut



Ames Research Center

Chimera Grid Tools (CGT)

- Collection of software tools for pre- and post-processing of CFD simulations using structured overset grids
- Geometry/Grid Tools: geometry/grid processing, algebraic and hyperbolic surface and volume grid generation
- Analysis Tools: grid quality, aerodynamic loads, flow solution
- High Level Tools: OVERGRID graphical interface, Script Library (200+ macros)


Chan, W., “Advances in software tools for pre-processing and post-processing of overset grid computations,” 2004. URL https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=20050186738.
Chan, W. M., “Developments in strategies and software tools for overset structured grid generation and connectivity,” 20th AIAA Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference 2011, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Reston, Virigina, 2011. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2011-3051, URL http://arc.aiaa.org/doi/10.2514/6.2011-3051.


Ames Research Center


Mesh Generation Procedure

- Surface Processing
  - Convert IGES/STEP file to Plot3D format with fine resolution using Pointwise™
  - Redistribute points for initial curves in CGT
    - Cluster points at regions of high curvature, trailing edges

Fine Plot 3D File









Redistributed curve

Ames Research Center

Mesh Generation Procedure


- Volume Mesh Generation
  - Near-body hyperbolic grids generated in CGT
  - Off-body Cartesian grids generated in OVERFLOW
- Domain Connectivity
  - X-ray hole-cutting using OVERFLOW





OVERFLOW

- Implicit Finite-Difference on Structured Overset Grids
  - 3rd Order HLLC scheme with Koren Limiter
  - SSOR solver, non-time accurate time-stepping
  - Multi-level off-body box mesh generation, X-ray based domain connectivity
- Spalart-Allmaras Turbulence Model Verification
  - 2D Airfoil Near Wake – 500c Far-Field Extent




Nichols, R. H., Tramel, R. W., and Buning, P. G., "Solver and turbulence model upgrades to OVERFLOW 2 for unsteady and high-speed applications," Collection of Technical Papers - AIAA Applied Aerodynamics Conference, Vol. 1, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Reston, Virigina, 2006, pp. 91–124. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2006-2824, URL http://arc.aiaa.org/doi/10.2514/6.2006-2824.

Ames Research Center

Mesh Parameters

- Best practice mesh based on:
  - A priori knowledge of physics (shear layers, wakes, etc.)
  - O vs C mesh topology
  - Mesh parameter study




Mesh Parameter	Values
$\Delta\theta_{LE}$ (Leading Edge Max Turning Angle)	$0.125°$, $0.25°$, $0.5°$, $\mathbf{1}°$, $2°$
n_{pTE} (# of pts. on trailing edge)	3, 5, **9**, 11, 17, 21
Stretching Ratio	1.05, 1.1, **1.15**, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4
Δs_{max} (% of c_{ref}, Max tangential wall spacing)	1.0, 1.33, 2.0, **3.0**, 4.5
Δs_{wall} (Wall spacing)	4.323×10^{-6}
Δs_{wgTE} (Wake-grid spacing at trailing edge)	$5\Delta s_w$
Δs_{SL} ($\times\Delta s_w$, Shear-layer spacing)	25, 50, **100**, 200, 400
h_{SL} (Shear-layer center offset)	0.028
Near-Body Mesh Topology	O mesh
Far-Field Distance	$1000c_{ref}$

Ames Research Center

Shear-Layer Spacing

- Resolve wake of forward elements





Spacing applied to slat to add resolution for the shear layer in cove


Rogers, S. E., “Progress in high-lift aerodynamic calculations,” Journal of Aircraft, Vol. 31, No. 6, 1994, pp. 1244–1251. https://doi.org/10.2514/3.46642, URL http://arc.aiaa.org/doi/10.2514/3.46642.

Ames Research Center

Wake Refinement Block








★ **Wake Distance = $2c_{ref}$**

Ames Research Center

Wake Refinement Block




Height expanded for alpha-sweeps required for mesh-parameter study

Ames Research Center

C vs O mesh


- Can potentially avoid cons of O mesh through overset-framework and wake-grid

	Pros	Cons
O Mesh	• No explicit wake boundary • Good BL clustering for finite-thickness TE	• Poor downstream wake resolution
C Mesh	• Natural clustering at TE • Fine wake resolution	• Explicit boundary in wake • Only good for single AoA/excessive tight spacing far downstream • Poor aspect ratio for finite-thickness TE





Ames Research Center

C vs O mesh



TE Cap Grid






	O Mesh	C Mesh	Diff ($\times 10^4$)
Total C_l	3.22486	3.22499	1.23
Total C_d	0.04002	0.03960	-4.22
Total C_m	-0.52188	-0.52175	1.27
Slat C_l	0.28456	0.28486	2.96
Slat C_d	-0.28522	-0.28567	-4.53
Slat C_m	0.08262	0.08271	0.90
Main C_l	2.51266	2.51238	-2.77
Main C_d	0.03906	0.03915	0.95
Main C_m	-0.28350	-0.28339	1.09
Flap C_l	0.42765	0.42775	1.03
Flap C_d	0.28617	0.28611	-0.64
Flap C_m	-0.32100	-0.32107	-0.72

Ames Research Center

Hole-Cutting

- DCF-XRAYS used to set overlap between meshes
- Hole-Cutting Goals:
  - Minimize overlap, restrict overlap to cells of similar size & orientation
- Hole-cutting approach slightly deviates from typical best-practice
  - Off-Body (OB) & Near-Body (NB)
    - Use 8th outer-most shell from NB grids
  - Near-body & Near-Body
  - Wake Grid & Near-Body




Ames Research Center

Hole-Cutting (cont'd.)

Overlap between wake and respective NB-grid occurs at outer edges of wake grid


Wake grid cut like respective NB-mesh



Wake grid wraps tightly around finite-thickness trailing edge

Wake Grid & Near-Body

Near-body & Near-Body




Overlap occurs generally along dotted lines


Ames Research Center

Mesh Parameter Study


Params.	Baseline Values
n_{pTE}	9
$\Delta\theta_{LE}$	1.0
SR	1.2
Δs_{max}	$0.03c_{ref}$
Δs_{SL}	$100\Delta s_w$




Fine ← Coarse



Fine ← Coarse







Ames Research Center

Mesh Parameter Study

Baseline parameter values






Ames Research Center

Mesh Parameter Study

Params.	Baseline Values
n_{pTE}	9
$\Delta\theta_{LE}$	1.0
SR	1.2
Δs_{max}	$0.03c_{ref}$
Δs_{SL}	$100\Delta s_w$

Fine ← Coarse Fine ← Coarse



Ames Research Center

Mesh Convergence Study

- Successive halving of each grid-spacing parameters (except for wall-spacing), SR = 1.15
- $\alpha = 8°, 16°$

Refinement Level	n_{pTE} (# of pts. at T.E.)	$\Delta\theta_{LE}$ (deg) (L.E. Max Turning Angle)	$\Delta s_{\max}\left(\times c_{ref}\right)$ (Max tangential wall spacing)	$\Delta s_{SL}(\times \Delta s_w)$ (Shear Layer Spacing)	$\Delta s_{wgTE}(\times \Delta s_w)$ (Wake-grid spacing at T.E.)	Node Count
L1	5	2.0	0.06	200	10	129980
L2	**9**	**1.0**	**0.03**	**100**	**5**	**262209**
L3	17	0.5	0.015	50	2.5	686587
L4	33	0.25	0.0075	25	1.25	2166259

Ames Research Center

Mesh Adaption Study

- Sensor: second undivided differences in conservative variables (q)
- Adaption performed with 2, 3, and 4 levels of refinement
- Starting mesh : coarse with only BL clustering; sans shear-layer spacing, wake grids

$$S = \max_{i=j,k,l} \left\{ \max_{\vec{Q}} \left[\left(\frac{q_{i-1} - 2q_i + q_{i+1}}{2q_{ref}} \right)^2 \right] \right\}$$


Mesh Parameter	$\Delta s_w \left(\times c_{ref}\right)$	n_{pTE}	$\Delta\theta_{LE}$ (deg)	$\Delta s_{max} \left(\times c_{ref}\right)$	SR
Value	4.323×10^{-6}	3	2.0	0.045	1.2

Buning, P. G., and Pulliam, T. H., “Cartesian off-body grid adaption for viscous time-accurate flow simulation,” 20th AIAA Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference 2011, 2011. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2011-3693.
Buning, P. G., and Pulliam, T. H., “Near-body grid adaption for overset grids,” 46th AIAA Fluid Dynamics Conference, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics Inc, AIAA, 2016. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2016-3326.

Ames Research Center


Meshes Generated From Adaption

$(\alpha = 8°)$




Starting Mesh

Final Mesh with Four Levels of Refinement




Ames Research Center

Meshes Generated From Adaption





Ames Research Center

Meshes Generated From Adaption



$(\alpha = 8°)$






Ames Research Center


Wall-Normal Spacing

- Specified wall spacing: $\Delta s_w = 4.323\times10^{-6}$ $(y^+ \approx 1)$

Actual wall spacing $(\times \Delta s_w)$




y+ from computed solution




Ames Research Center

Chordwise Spacing

Best-Practice Mesh ($\Delta s_{max} = 0.03 c_{ref}$)




Adaptive Mesh, 2 Refinement Levels ($\Delta s_{max} = 0.045 c_{ref}$)




Ames Research Center

Stretching Ratio

- Specified max $SR = 1.15$



Tangential




Normal



Ames Research Center


Convergence of Aerodynamic Coefficients

$\alpha = 8°$



Grid Convergence Study Adaptive Meshes

$\alpha = 16°$




Grid Convergence Study Adaptive Meshes


Ames Research Center

Surface Pressure Coefficient ($\alpha = 8°$)

Grid Convergence Study




Adaptive Mesh




Ames Research Center

Surface Pressure Coefficient ($\alpha = 16°$)

Grid Convergence Study




Adaptive Mesh



Ames Research Center


Surface Skin Friction Coefficient




Ames Research Center


Velocity Profiles


x/c = 0.15 (aft of suction peak)



x/c = 1.0 (flap mid-chord)








Ames Research Center


Alpha Sweep — Total




Ames Research Center


Alpha Sweep


Slat







Main





Flap







Ames Research Center

Flow Characteristics

$\alpha = 8°$




$\alpha = 16°$




Ames Research Center


Possible Source of Discrepancies in Adaptive Meshes



Starting Adaptive Mesh



Adaptive Mesh with 4 Levels of Refinement



Level 3 Grid Convergence Mesh

Only BL clustering refined

Spacing is finer in both directions

Ames Research Center


Effect of LE Refinement on Adaptive Meshes

- Two factors to consider
  - Fixed-grid convergence results
  - Other adaption results presented at conference
- Investigated effect of using finer LE tangential spacing ($\Delta\theta_{LE}$) in initial mesh on final solution
  - $\Delta\theta_{LE} = 2.0°, 1.0°, 0.5°, 0.25°$
  - Adaption levels: 2-5
- Also investigated effect of prescribed refinement in LE regions in both tangential and normal directions coupled with adaption
  - $\Delta\theta_{LE} = 2.0°, 1.0°, 0.5°$
  - Adaption levels: 2-4

Ames Research Center

Adapted Mesh with Prescribed LE Refinement


Prescribed refinement regions



$(\Delta\theta_{LE} = 2.0°, \alpha = 8°, 4\ levels)$


Ames Research Center

Comparisons of Adaptive Meshes




Ames Research Center

Meshes Generated From Adaption



Refined wakes

Prescribed
Refinement Region



Refined boundary layers


Refined cove regions

Refined boundary layers


Ames Research Center

Force Comparisons

$\alpha = 8°$




$\alpha = 16°$



Ames Research Center


Section Pressure Coefficients

$\alpha = 8°$



Increased suction on solutions with pre-scribed LE adaption

$\alpha = 16°$



Ames Research Center

Summary and Conclusions

- Lessons learned:
  - Key features to resolve: Shear layers, wakes, suction regions
  - Solutions are sensitive to wake resolution downstream of configuration
  - C mesh and O mesh can produce similar results with proper TE and wake treatment
  - Solutions are sensitive to normal spacing in near body grids, and trailing-edge resolution
  - Mesh convergence study show solutions converge asymptotically
  - Prescribing leading-edge refinement can assist with accuracy of adaptive solutions in OVERFLOW

Ames Research Center

Summary and Conclusions

- Recommended Best Practices
  - Use fine normal spacing to resolve wakes/shear layers from upstream elements
  - Wake should be refined up to a certain distance downstream of configuration
  - May be beneficial to explicitly refine LE in adaption solutions
  - Add wake grids if using O grid for near body meshes
- Future Investigations
  - Differences in current best-practice mesh and adjoint-based result presented at conference
  - Determine what is a sufficiently defined wake

Ames Research Center

Acknowledgements

Funding

NASA Transformative Tools, and Technologies (TTT) Project

Revolutionary Vertical Lift Technology (RVLT) Project

Computational Resources

NASA Advanced Supercomputing (NAS) facility

Dr. Thomas Pulliam, for insightful discussions on adaption in OVERFLOW