

DTIC FILE COPY

②

AD-A221 711

MEMORANDUM REPORT BRL-MR-3834

BRL

PARALLEL NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS OF
AXISYMMETRIC PROJECTILE FLOWS
USING ZONAL-OVERLAPPED GRIDS

NISHEETH R. PATEL
WALTER B. STUREK

MAY 1990

DTIC
ELECTE
MAY 21 1990
S B D

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

U.S. ARMY LABORATORY COMMAND

BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

00 05 12 068

UNCLASSIFIED

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE May 1990		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final, Jul 86-Jul 88
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE PARALLEL NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS OF AXISYMMETRIC PROJECTILE FLOWS USING ZONAL-OVERLAPPED GRIDS			5. FUNDING NUMBERS 1L161102AH43 61102A 00 001 AJ	
6. AUTHOR(S) NISHEETH R. PATEL, and WALTER B. STUREK				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Ballistic Research Laboratory ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21005-5066			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER BRL-MR-3834	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) Recent developments in vector and parallel computer architectures provide the potential for achieving greatly enhanced computational speed in the execution of fluid dynamic flow solvers. In order to explore techniques for efficient utilization of these computer architectural features and to develop an improved capability for modeling highly irregular projectile geometries, the development of a zonal Navier-Stokes computational code was undertaken. This report documents the initial development and validation of this code. The code employs a multi-zone overlapped grid technique and utilizes MacCormack's explicit finite-difference numerical algorithm. Parallel execution features are incorporated within the code that permit implementation on both distributed and shared memory multiprocessors. The code has been applied to several challenging test problems, in particular, the application to a ramjet configuration with a highly complex internal flow is discussed in detail. The computational results are compared with experimental measurements. The code has been found to provide for efficient utilization of vector/parallel computer architectures. Also, the zonal flow field topology has proven to be well suited for configurations with irregular geometries.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Computational Aerodynamics, Compressible Flow, Navier-Stokes, and Parallel Computing			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 58	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

UNCLASSIFIED

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18
298-102

(THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS.....	1
III. GENERATION OF COMPUTATIONAL GRID.....	7
IV. SOLUTION ALGORITHM.....	8
1. NUMERICAL PROCEDURE.....	8
2. BOUNDARY AND INITIAL CONDITIONS.....	9
3. NUMERICAL DAMPING.....	10
4. ZONAL-OVERLAPPED GRIDDING.....	11
V. IMPLEMENTATION ON THE HYPERCUBE AND CRAY X-MP/48.....	12
VI. COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS.....	13
1. CONSTANT AND VARIABLE AREA SHOCK TUBE.....	13
2. TURBULAR PROJECTILE AT SUPERSONIC VELOCITIES.....	13
3. SOLID FUEL RAMJET (SFRJ).....	14
VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	17
REFERENCES.....	45
LIST OF SYMBOLS.....	47
APPENDIX A: NON-REFLECTING OUTER BOUNDARY CONDITION.....	49
DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	53



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

(THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Fully clustered grid for cowl region.....	17
2	Partly clustered partly uniform grid for cowl region.....	18
3	Zonal boundary conditions.....	19
4	Grids at the intersection of cowl and injector.....	20
5	One grid-cell overlap.....	21
6	Sixteen computational subdomains for a constant area shock tube....	22
7	Experimental supersonic tubular projectile model.....	23
8	A five-zone grid for the tubular projectile.....	24
9a	Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 1.7$ (Inviscid).....	25
9b	Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 1.7$ (Viscous).....	26
10	Wind tunnel Schlieren photograph, $M_\infty = 1.7$	27
11	Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 3.5$ (Inviscid).....	28
12	Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 3.5$ (Viscous).....	29
13	Wind tunnel Schlieren photograph, $M_\infty = 3.5$	30
14	Internal surface pressure distribution for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 1.7$	31
15	Internal surface pressure distribution for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 3.5$	32
16a	Schematic illustration of ramjet and boundary conditions.....	33
16b	Seven-zone grid for the ramjet.....	34
17	Mach number contours and internal surface pressure distribution for the ramjet with nozzle throat diameter of 1.42.....	35
18a	Mach number contours showing a strong oblique shock in the inlet region.....	36

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
18b	Mach number contours showing a normal shock in the inlet region....	36
18c	Mach number contours showing an attached normal shock at the cowl lip.....	37
18d	Mach number contours showing a detached bow shock.....	37
19	Grid for viscous computation.....	38
20	Internal surface pressure distribution for the ramjet with 1.54 inch nozzle diameter.....	39
21	Mach number contours for the ramjet with 1.54 inch nozzle diameter.....	40
22	Normalized pressure contours for the ramjet with 1.54 inch nozzle diameter.....	41
23	Mach number contours for the ramjet with 1.21 inch nozzle diameter.....	42
24	Internal surface pressure distribution for the ramjet with 1.21 inch nozzle diameter.....	43
A1	Non-reflecting outer boundary condition.....	51

I. INTRODUCTION

The challenge to solve flow problems involving complicated geometries has led to the exploration of zonal grid techniques using finite-difference methods. In the zonal grid approach, the global mesh for a computational domain is generated using different zones separated by common boundaries called zonal boundaries. On the other hand, large memory and substantial CPU time are required for many realistic problems. On a multiprocessor one divides up a program so that many sections of the code can be worked on simultaneously. Since further gain in computational speed of vector processors can only be achieved at high cost as upper limits on signal speed, packaging densities and heat dissipation are being approached, multiprocessors evolved as higher level architectures. The program can be run much more rapidly if the multiprocessor can transmit data between processors, synchronize processors and make global decisions efficiently. Multiprocessor architectures can be generally divided into two categories: (1) global or shared memory; and (2) local or distributed memory. The CRAY X-MP/48 can be considered as an example of a shared memory multiprocessor, while a hypercube can be considered as an example of distributed memory multiprocessor.

The purpose of this report is to document the principals and operation of a computer program that has been developed to solve the flow about complex aerodynamic shapes in a highly efficient manner. The computer code incorporates a parallel algorithm that can effectively utilize a distributed memory multiprocessor architecture and a zonal grid approach that allows one to provide the capability to conveniently accommodate complex boundary shapes.

The code is structured in such a way that the solution method is independent of zone coupling and parallel programming techniques. This allows execution of the code on sequential or vector computers when parallel programming extensions are not invoked. Also, incorporation of appropriate multi-tasking extensions of shared memory multiprocessors allows the code to execute efficiently on shared memory multiprocessors such as the CRAY X-MP/48.

The governing equations in general curvilinear coordinates are discussed in Section II. In Section III, a brief summary of an algebraic grid generator is presented. The solution algorithm, with details of implementation, is described in Section IV. Comments on the implementation of the code and the speed-up achieved through parallel processing on an INTEL IPSC hypercube and a Cray X-MP/48 are given in Section V. The computational code has been exercised for three flow field problems: constant and variable area shock tube; tubular projectile; and ramjet projectile. Examples of computational results are discussed and compared to experimental data in Section VI.

II. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

The compressible, turbulent Navier-Stokes equations for axisymmetric and two-dimensional flow can be expressed in the following strong conservation form where the dependent variables ρ , u , v , e are mass averaged, with e being the specific total energy, T the temperature, ρ and p being mean density and pressure, respectively, and t is time:

$$\frac{\partial Q'}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial E'}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial F'}{\partial y} + \left(\frac{F'}{y} + \frac{H'}{y} \right) \beta = 0 \quad (1a)$$

where

$$Q' = \begin{bmatrix} \rho \\ \rho u \\ \rho v \\ \rho e \end{bmatrix} \quad E' = \begin{bmatrix} \rho u \\ \rho u u + p - \tau_{xx} \\ \rho u v - \tau_{xy} \\ (\rho e + p)u - \tau_{xx}u - \tau_{xy}v + \dot{q}_x \end{bmatrix}$$

$$F' = \begin{bmatrix} \rho v \\ \rho u v - \tau_{xy} \\ \rho v v + p - \tau_{yy} \\ (\rho e + p)v - \tau_{xy}u - \tau_{yy}v + \dot{q}_y \end{bmatrix} \quad (1b)$$

$$H' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -p + \sigma_+ \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\tau_{xx} = -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \nabla \cdot \underline{V} + 2(\mu + \epsilon) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}$$

$$\tau_{xy} = (\mu + \epsilon) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right)$$

$$\tau_{yy} = -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \nabla \cdot \underline{V} + 2(\mu + \epsilon) \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}$$

$$\sigma_+ = -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \nabla \cdot \underline{V} + 2(\mu + \epsilon) \frac{v}{y}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \underline{V} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + \left(\frac{v}{y} \right) \beta$$

$$\dot{q}_x = -C_p \left(\frac{\mu}{Pr} + \frac{\epsilon}{Pr_t} \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}$$

$$\dot{q}_y = -C_p \left(\frac{\mu}{Pr} + \frac{\epsilon}{Pr_t} \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial y}$$

where μ is molecular viscosity, ϵ is eddy viscosity and $\beta = 1$ or 0 for axisymmetric or two-dimensional cases, respectively.

The air was assumed to be a perfect gas for both internal and external flows, satisfying the equation state

$$p = \rho RT$$

where R is the gas constant ($1716 \text{ ft}^2/\text{sec}^2 - ^\circ\text{R}$ for air). For the dependence of laminar viscosity on temperature, Sutherland's law was used:

$$\mu = 2.270 \frac{T^{3/2}}{T + 198.6} \times 10^{-8} \frac{\text{lb} - \text{sec}}{\text{ft}^2} \quad (2)$$

The laminar and turbulent Prandtl numbers, Pr and Pr_t , were assumed constant with values of 0.72 and 0.9 , respectively. The ratio of specific heats, γ , was also assumed constant and equal to 1.4 . C_v and C_p are specific heat capacities at constant volume and constant pressure, respectively.

$$(C_v = 4290 \text{ ft}^2/\text{sec}^2 - ^\circ\text{R} \text{ and } C_p = 6006 \text{ ft}^2/\text{sec}^2 - ^\circ\text{R} \text{ for air}).$$

The total energy per unit mass, e , is given by:

$$e = C_v T + (1/2) (u^2 + v^2).$$

In the $\xi - \eta$ computational plane, Equation (1a) is transformed to the conservation law form represented by:

$$\frac{\partial \bar{Q}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \bar{E}}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \bar{F}}{\partial \eta} + \frac{1}{J} (\bar{F}' + \bar{H}') \beta = 0 \quad (3a)$$

where

$$J = \xi_x \eta_y - \xi_y \eta_x \quad (3b)$$

$$U = \xi_x u + \xi_y v$$

$$V = \eta_x u + \eta_y v$$

$$\bar{Q} = \frac{q'}{J}$$

$$\bar{E} = \frac{1}{J} (\xi_x E' + \xi_y F')$$

$$\bar{F} = \frac{1}{J} (\eta_x E' + \eta_y F')$$

The governing equations are formed in such a way that either 2-D or axisymmetric flow with inviscid, thin layer Navier-Stokes or full Navier-Stokes options can be chosen. After some algebraic manipulations Equation (3a) can be transformed into the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial \eta} + \frac{1}{Jy} (F' + H')\beta = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} S_1(Q, Q_\xi) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} S_2(Q, Q_\eta) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} G_1 \\ + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} T_1(Q, Q_\xi) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} T_2(Q, Q_\eta) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} G_2 \end{aligned} \quad (4a)$$

where

$$Q = \frac{1}{J} \begin{bmatrix} \rho \\ \rho u \\ \rho v \\ \rho e \end{bmatrix} \quad E = \frac{1}{J} \begin{bmatrix} \rho U \\ \rho u U + \xi_x p \\ \rho v U + \xi_y p \\ (\rho e + p) U \end{bmatrix} \quad (4b)$$

$$F = \frac{1}{J} \begin{bmatrix} \rho V \\ \rho u V + \eta_x p \\ \rho v V + \eta_y p \\ (\rho e + p) V \end{bmatrix} \quad S_1 = \frac{1}{J} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ B_1 u_\xi + B_2 v_\xi \\ B_2 u_\xi + B_3 v_\xi \\ B_1 u u_\xi + B_2 (v u_\xi + u v_\xi) + B_3 v v_\xi + B_4 T_\xi \end{bmatrix}$$

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{J} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ C_1 u_\eta + C_2 v_\eta \\ C_3 u_\eta + C_4 v_\eta \\ C_1 u u_\eta + C_2 u v_\eta + C_3 v u_\eta + C_4 v v_\eta + C_5 T_\eta \end{bmatrix} \quad (4c)$$

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{J} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ C_1 u_\xi + C_3 v_\xi \\ C_2 u_\xi + C_4 v_\xi \\ C_1 u u_\xi + C_2 v u_\xi + C_3 u v_\xi + C_4 v v_\xi + C_5 T_\xi \end{bmatrix}$$

$$T_2 = \frac{1}{J} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ D_1 u_n + D_2 v_n \\ D_2 u_n + D_3 v_n \\ D_1 u u_n + D_2 (v u_n + u v_n) + D_3 v v_n + D_4 T_n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$G_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \xi_x (v/y) \\ -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \xi_y (v/y) \\ -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \xi_x (v/y)u - 2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \xi_y (v^2/y) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$G_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \eta_x (v/y) \\ -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \eta_y (v/y) \\ -2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \eta_x (v/y)u - 2/3 (\mu + \epsilon) \eta_y (v^2/y) \end{bmatrix}$$

The coefficients B_i , C_j , D_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 4$; $j = 1, 2, \dots, 5$) appearing in the viscous terms of Equation (4c) are defined as follows:

$$B_1 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_y^2 + 4/3 \xi_x^2)$$

$$B_2 = (\mu + \epsilon) (1/3 \xi_x \xi_y) \quad (4d)$$

$$B_3 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_x^2 + 4/3 \xi_y^2)$$

$$B_4 = C_p \left(\frac{\mu}{Pr} + \frac{\epsilon}{Pr_t} \right) (\xi_x^2 + \xi_y^2)$$

$$C_1 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_y \eta_y + 4/3 \xi_x \eta_y)$$

$$C_2 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_y \eta_x - 2/3 \xi_x \eta_y)$$

$$C_3 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_x \eta_y - 2/3 \xi_y \eta_x)$$

$$C_4 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_x \eta_x + 4/3 \xi_y \eta_y)$$

$$C_5 = C_p \left(\frac{\mu}{Pr} + \frac{\epsilon}{Pr_t} \right) (\xi_x \eta_x + \xi_y \eta_y)$$

$$D_1 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\eta_y^2 + 4/3 \eta_x^2)$$

$$D_2 = (\mu + \epsilon) (1/3 \eta_x \eta_y)$$

$$D_3 = (\mu + \epsilon) (\eta_x^2 + 4/3 \eta_y^2)$$

$$D_4 = C_p \left(\frac{\mu}{Pr} + \frac{\epsilon}{Pr_t} \right) (\eta_x^2 + \eta_y^2) .$$

It should be noted that the viscous terms in Equation (4a) have been split into terms which contain derivatives of flow variables in only one direction (either ξ or η). Vectors G_1 and G_2 represent additional terms due to inclusion of an option for axisymmetric 2-D viscous flow. When the source term $(F' + H')$ and vectors G_1 and G_2 are set to zero, one obtains a planar 2-D formulation. It is interesting to note that Equation (4a) retains a form similar to that of the Cartesian counterpart Equation (1a).

The source term $(F' + H')$ of Equation (4a) can be split into inviscid and viscous terms. The viscous terms in turn can be split into terms involving derivatives in ξ and η directions.

$$(F' + H') = (\text{INVISCID} - \text{VISCOUS}) \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{INVISCID} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho v \\ \rho u v \\ \rho v v \\ (\rho e + p) v \end{bmatrix} \quad (5b)$$

$$\text{VISCOUS} = \begin{bmatrix} AV_{11} + AV_{21} \\ AV_{12} + AV_{22} \\ AV_{13} + AV_{23} \\ AV_{14} + AV_{24} \end{bmatrix} \quad (5c)$$

where AV_{ij} ($i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, 4$) are defined as follows:

$$AV_{11} = 0.0$$

$$AV_{12} = (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_y u_\xi + \xi_x v_\xi) \quad (5d)$$

$$AV_{13} = 2(\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_y v_\xi)$$

$$AV_{14} = C_p \left(\frac{\mu}{Pr} + \frac{\epsilon}{Pr_t} \right) \xi_y T_\xi + (\mu + \epsilon) (4/3 \xi_y v v_\xi - 2/3 \xi_x v u_\xi) + (\mu + \epsilon) (\xi_y u u_\xi + \xi_x u v_\xi)$$

$$AV_{21} = 0.0$$

$$AV_{22} = (\mu + \epsilon) (\eta_y u_\eta + \eta_x v_\eta)$$

$$AV_{23} = 2(\mu + \epsilon) (\eta_y v_\eta - v/y)$$

$$AV_{24} = C_p \left(\frac{\mu}{Pr} + \frac{\epsilon}{Pr_t} \right) \eta_y T_\eta + (\mu + \epsilon) (4/3 \eta_y v v_\eta - 2/3 \eta_x v u_\eta - 2/3 v^2/y) + (\mu + \epsilon) (\eta_y u u_\eta + \eta_x u v_\eta).$$

This completes the derivation of the governing equations which allows a choice between 2-D and axisymmetric cases with inviscid, thin-layer or full Navier-Stokes options.

III. GENERATION OF COMPUTATIONAL GRIDS

As described in Section II, the governing equations have been expressed in terms of general boundary conforming coordinates in order to facilitate the treatment of arbitrary flow configurations. The technique employed in the construction of coordinate systems is based on algebraic transformations. The grid generation code reads in a discrete number of user defined boundary points. The code uses a cubic-spline function to define boundary shapes and an analytic function to distribute the boundary points. The interior grid points are distributed using Vinokur's¹ clustering function based on a hyperbolic tangent. This clustering function gives smooth changes in grid line spacing and provides sufficient control of grid line spacing at the boundaries. This grid generation procedure does not provide control over grid line orthogonality. However, the procedure gives the desired degree of flexibility for the problems under consideration. The non-orthogonal feature of the procedure turns out to be beneficial in that the problem is not overly constrained by the orthogonality condition, which would necessarily destroy boundary conforming grids in areas of sharp or highly concave/convex corners.

Furthermore, the grid distribution in the streamwise and radial directions are independent, allowing desired clustering at all boundaries. Also, the procedure permits the generation of partially clustered and partially uniform grids in either direction. As will be shown later, this feature is useful for some zonal grid overlapping. Two examples which demonstrate the capabilities of this simple grid generation technique are illustrated in Figures 1 and 2. Grid clustering on the right and upper boundaries is shown in Figure 1. An example where clustering is varied in two regions of a zone in the vertical direction and a smooth variation in axial distribution achieved with different left and right increments is shown in Figure 2.

IV. SOLUTION ALGORITHM

1. NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

MacCormack's² explicit and unsplit method is utilized for numerical integration of the governing equations (4) in time from an assumed initial condition until a steady solution is obtained. The finite-difference method for the one-dimensional equation:

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial \xi} = 0 \quad (6)$$

is given by the following predictor - corrector steps:

$$\overline{Q_{i,j}^{n+1}} = Q_{i,j}^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta \xi} (E_{i,j}^n - E_{i-1,j}^n) \quad (7a)$$

$$Q_{i,j}^{n+1} = 1/2 [Q_{i,j}^n + \overline{Q_{i,j}^{n+1}} - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta \xi} (\overline{E_{i+1,j}^{n+1}} - \overline{E_{i,j}^{n+1}})] \quad (7b)$$

where $\overline{E_{i,j}^{n+1}}$ implies that the terms are evaluated using $\overline{Q_{i,j}^{n+1}}$ and so forth. After completion of the above described two steps, first derivatives of the governing equations are approximated by second-order accurate central differences. As explained in Reference 3, second derivatives of the viscous terms were also effectively centrally differenced.

The reason for using the unsplit method over time-split method is to save the number of accessions of the memory. In other words, for advancing one time-step, the unsplit method requires considerably less access to the memory than the time-split method. For the explicit method the time-step size must not exceed the maximum allowed by the CFL condition. An approximate linearized stability analysis for the inviscid equations yields the following:

$$\Delta t = \frac{1}{\frac{|U|}{\Delta \xi} + \frac{|V|}{\Delta \eta} + c \{ (\frac{\xi_x}{\Delta \xi} + \frac{\eta_x}{\Delta \eta})^2 + (\frac{\xi_y}{\Delta \xi} + \frac{\eta_y}{\Delta \eta})^2 \}^{1/2}} \quad (8)$$

where c is the speed of sound. Since the terms involving molecular and eddy viscosity stabilize the solution, the time-step size computed using the inviscid analysis was found stable for both inviscid and viscous applications. Equation (8) was multiplied by a factor (denoted as CFL) that is slightly less than one.

2. BOUNDARY AND INITIAL CONDITIONS

The boundary conditions for the governing equations can be categorized into five major types - freestream, downstream, wall, symmetric and no-reflection. A schematic illustration of the application of these boundary conditions for a projectile flow field is shown in Figure 3.

The freestream boundary conditions are held at the appropriate freestream values for the duration of the solution procedure. At the downstream boundary, the conventional zero-gradient boundary condition is applied. The flow variables are extrapolated based on the computed interior values. Along the body surface $\eta(x,y) = 0$ the boundary conditions are:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= 0 \text{ (No transparency)} \\ \frac{\partial U}{\partial \eta} &= 0 \text{ (Tangency or Slip)} \\ \frac{\partial T}{\partial \eta} &= 0 \text{ (Adiabatic Wall)} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

while, for viscous flow the no-slip condition is $U = 0$. The pressure on the body surface can be obtained by applying normal pressure boundary condition.

$$\nabla p \cdot \nabla \eta = 0 \quad (10)$$

Using the momentum equations, the normal pressure boundary condition is:

$$\begin{aligned} (\xi_x \eta_x + \xi_y \eta_y) p_\xi + (\eta_x^2 + \eta_y^2) p_\eta &= \rho [u(\eta_x)_t + v(\eta_y)_t] \\ &- \rho U(\eta_x u_\xi + \eta_y v_\xi) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The same relation has been used in viscous flow with $U = 0$. the flow properties along the symmetry line ($\eta = 0$) were specified by the no gradient conditions,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \eta} &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \eta} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

in addition to $v = 0$ being enforced.

The fifth category of boundary condition refers to the top boundary ($\eta = \eta_{\max}$). This boundary was established as a no reflection boundary. At the top boundary, waves generated in the interaction process in the vicinity of the wall must exit the computational domain. In order to prevent these waves from reflecting from the top boundary back into the computational domain and perhaps contaminating the solution, a no reflection boundary condition was developed. The boundary conditions are:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial u}{\partial I} &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial I} &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial I} &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial I} &= 0\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

where the derivative ($\partial/\partial I$) is taken in the direction of the outwards running Mach line. This condition is appropriate if the flow is locally supersonic (i.e., Mach lines exist), and if there is a single family of outward running Mach lines. A description of this boundary condition is given in more detail in Appendix A.

The boundary conditions are implemented in the code using second-order accurate finite-difference approximations in general.

For the present calculations, the initial conditions were prescribed using either the freestream or lower Mach number condition at all grid points in the computational domain. However, when available, previously computed solutions (obtained with different grids, etc.) were employed as initial conditions in subsequent calculations.

3. NUMERICAL DAMPING

Several types of nonlinear instability are encountered in the present calculation. The remedies for these have been discussed by MacCormack.⁴ One of them can be removed by adding a fourth-order pressure damping term to the right hand side of the predictor and corrector step. For the ξ direction the following expression is added to the flux $E_{i,j}^n$ in the predictor step

$$\alpha \frac{\{|U_{i,j}| + |(\xi_x^2 + \xi_y^2)^{1/2}| c_{i,j}\} \times |p_{i+1,j} - 2p_{i,j} + p_{i-1,j}| \times (Q_{i+1,j} - Q_{i,j})}{(p_{i+1,j} + 2p_{i,j} + p_{i-1,j})}$$

where α is a damping constant with values between 0.5 and 5.0. The damping term is of significance only in the vicinity of pressure oscillations. Also, this damping term is more compact than standard fourth-order smoothing terms in that it requires data at just three grid points instead of the usual five points. It will be shown later that, for zonal grids, this feature permits the employment of single grid cell overlap.

4. ZONAL-OVERLAPPED GRIDGING

A multi-zone overlapped gridding technique is used to extend the time dependent procedure to complex geometries. The computational domain is subdivided into several zones, each of which require a relatively simple grid generation technique.

The zonal gridding approach has a number of advantages over conventional wrap around techniques: (1) difficulties in handling sharp corners can be eliminated, as shown in Figure 4; (2) finer grids can easily be used in regions where rapid changes in the flow variables occur; (3) different types of equations, such as the Euler or Navier-Stokes, can be used in different zones. (4) memory storage problems can be conveniently overcome using appropriate data management techniques; and (5) a saving in CPU time can be achieved by discontinuing computations in the converged zones. The information exchange between zones must be consistent with the governing equations and lead to a stable and efficient time marching or iterative scheme. The zonal boundary conditions must be transparent to shocks and regions of flow separation. However, since zonal boundary conditions introduce additional computational overhead, care must be taken to insure that this extra work is significantly less than the overall computational work required by a solution algorithm. Several different techniques for zone coupling are discussed in References 5-8.

A simple zone coupling technique is used in the present work. In this technique zonal grids share one grid cell boundary with geometric continuity of at least one grid cell for overlapped zones. The coupling of zones is obtained by using one grid-cell overlap. This zonal-coupling is simple and transparent to shock-waves and regions of flow separation. The transparency of zonal-coupling is important because the initial conditions are very far from the steady state and, during the transient phase, shocks may travel through the overlapped boundaries. As shown in Figure 5, two zones coincide on a row of overlapped cells. The right-hand side boundary of zone A is contained within zone B and the left-hand side boundary of zone B is contained within Zone A. Since overlapped cells are of the same shape in both zones, this approach requires transfer of information from the field of zone A to the boundary of zone B and vice-versa.

Each multi-zone solution was obtained by taking one time step in each zone and then exchanging boundary information between zones. This zone-coupling technique has been found to be very reliable and accurate. It is a very simple technique and well suited to ballistic projectile configurations. Examples describing the verification of the technique are discussed in Section VI.

V. IMPLEMENTATION ON THE HYPERCUBE AND CRAY X-MP/48

The hypercube is an ensemble of homogeneous SISD (Single Instruction Stream, Single Data Stream) or SIMD (Single Instruction Stream, Multiple Data Stream) machines in a loosely coupled (message passing), distributed (local) memory, MIMD (Multiple Instruction Stream, Multiple Data Stream) concurrent processing architecture with a hypercube interconnect topology. The word "hypercube" refers to the specific way they are interconnected. A hypercube is a generalization of the familiar three dimensional cube, and its topology is completely specified by it's "dimension." In general, for a hypercube of dimension "d," there are 2^d corners, and "d" edges. Each corner of a three dimensional cube is a computer, and each edge is a communication line between the computers at the two corners on each end of the edge. This is known as a three dimensional hypercube (a "d3"). It has eight "nodes" (computers), each with three nearest neighbors and three communication lines to those neighbors.

The INTEL IPSC hypercube is a "d7" with 128 nodes (2^7), and 7 communication lines per node. This hypercube requires an additional computer (cube manager or host) to get programs and data into the hypercube and results out.

A parallel algorithm was developed in such a way that each computational zone can be assigned to a separate node of a hypercube. In addition, all variables for each zone are local so that it can take advantage of the local memory architecture. This allows concurrent computation in each zone on separate hypercube nodes. When required, information can be exchanged between overlapped zones. This was done using separate routines that do zonal coupling and/or synchronization. Most of the parallel programming techniques for local memory architectures such as SEND/RECEIVE are incorporated in these routines.

The Cray X-MP/48 is a shared memory multiprocessor while the hypercube is a distributed memory multiprocessor. Thus, different multi-tasking techniques are required when implementing an algorithm on shared or distributed memory machines. Again, mapping of zones onto processors is an important issue for efficient implementation on shared memory machines. The partitioning across processors for the zonal application can be done in varying degrees of granularity. In a coarse granularity approach, one would map a zone or subregion of a zone on each processor. In general, the approach chosen will depend upon the applications. As number of zones and/or size of zones change from one application to another, the difficulty of uniformly distributing work among the processors may require a new mapping scheme. This load imbalance would result in processors remaining idle until the processor with the largest task completes its portion of the computation. For the eight-zone ramjet problem each zone was assigned to a processor. This was implemented using \$ PROCESS and \$ ALSO PROCESS directives described by Misegades.⁹ In going from one to four processors a speed-up of 2.3 was achieved on the Cray X-MP. In a medium granularity approach, all processors might work on a single zone in parallel. This parallelization consists of decomposing a zone to DO-LOOP level. Since no artificial boundaries are introduced on shared memory machines, this approach generally allows for better load balancing than a coarse granularity approach. On the Cray this can be implemented using microtasking directives such as DO GLOBAL. For the eight-zone ramjet application, this approach achieved speed-up of 3.55 in going from one to four processors. This speed-up

could be less than the maximum speed-up that can be obtained for the application because several computations such as boundary conditions and zonal conditions were not done in parallel.

VI. COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

In order to evaluate the code, a series of test problems were solved. It was necessary to check whether any perturbation was created in the flow field by the use of the zonal boundary conditions. Also, it was necessary to prove that zonal boundaries allow shocks to travel across the interfaces. This was required because, for many applications, the initial conditions are very far from the steady state and, while the solution is converging, shocks travel through the zonal interfaces.

1. CONSTANT AND VARIABLE AREA SHOCK TUBE

A simple constant area shock tube case was considered for inviscid 2-D and axisymmetric flow. The purpose of this initial test case was to evaluate the ability of the zonal boundary technique to pass disturbances across zonal boundaries without creating perturbations in the flow field. The purpose was not to give detailed comparison for a specific pressure ratio in terms of over pressure, etc.; but to compare the output of a single zone case with that of a multi-zone case at every time-step. Multi-zone cases ranging from two zones to 16 zones were considered (Figure 6). The results of each multi-zone test case matched the single zone case bit by bit. No perturbation was found and the shock traveled through the entire computational domain. Next, a variable cross-sectional area shock tube was considered as a test case. The shock tube had a variable diameter driver section, a convergent-divergent nozzle with a diaphragm at the throat and a constant area driven section. Again, under the same flow conditions, comparison between the results for a single zone and multi-zone cases (not shown) confirmed the validity of the zonal boundary technique.

2. TURBULAR PROJECTILE AT SUPERSONIC VELOCITIES

In order to evaluate the axisymmetric Navier-Stokes code, the flow in and around a tubular projectile was investigated. The tubular configuration is shown in Figure 7. As shown in Figure 8 the computational domain was subdivided into five overlapped zones. The total grid of 105×30 for the internal flow and 95×24 for the external flow was used for obtaining the solutions. Figures 9a and 9b show the computed Mach number contours for inviscid and viscous solutions, respectively, for the freestream Mach number of 1.7. The Reynolds number is 2.75×10^6 based on chord length for the laminar viscous case. A Schlieren photograph for the same case is shown in Figure 10. In both figures, a strong shock (choked flow) is visible at the leading edge. Figures 11 and 12 show computed Mach contours for inviscid and viscous solutions, respectively, for $M_\infty = 3.5$. Figure 13 shows a Schlieren photograph for the freestream Mach number of 3.5 and Reynolds number 5.67×10^6 . For this case, a weak oblique shock is seen at the leading edge. The pressure distribution as a function of axial position along the internal surface for both cases are shown in Figures 14 and 15, respectively. The pressure distribution is about the same for both inviscid and viscous flow. The difference in the

pressure distribution between Mach 1.7 and Mach 3.5 can be explained in view of the normal and oblique shock structures in the forebody. For $M_\infty = 3.5$, the pressure rise at the surface, near the exit of the tubular projectile is interesting. This complex behavior can be explained with the help of the Mach contour plot. In the forebody region, an oblique shock generated by the lip of the tubular projectile reflects off the axis. This reflecting shock interacts with flow that is expanding over an inverted wedge corner which is located at the center of the projectile. This shock boundary layer interaction is believed to be responsible for the pressure rise at the surface in the exit region of the tubular projectile. This problem was successfully implemented on the INTEL hypercube multiprocessor.

3. SOLID FUEL RAMJET (SFRJ)

Finally, the flow in and around a solid fuel ramjet (SFRJ) configuration was considered. The design objective for the tubular ramjet powered projectile is to simulate the flight trajectory of a kinetic energy (KE) projectile. A schematic illustration of the SFRJ projectile along with the type of boundary conditions imposed are shown in Figure 16a. The internal configuration of the SFRJ consists of a diverging inlet formed by an axisymmetric cowl followed by a circular injector plate (or flame holder), a combustor and a nozzle. The combustor is located between the injector plate and converging-diverging nozzle. Solid fuel is located along the circular wall of the combustor. The external configuration consists of a tangent-ogive forebody followed by a straight circular afterbody.

A series of wind tunnel tests¹⁰ were initiated in order to provide data to help guide the development of computational modeling techniques for the SFRJ configuration and to provide guidance for the design of a prototype projectile. The wind tunnel test conditions were: freestream Mach Number = 4.0; freestream stagnation pressure = 14.36 psia; and freestream stagnation temperature = 480 R. The experimental data consisted of internal surface pressure measurements and flow visualization.

The objectives of this computational study were to: (1) simulate cold flow inside a standard SFRJ (nozzle diameter 1.54 inches and injector diameter 1.7 inches); (2) simulate a normal shock inlet condition by varying the nozzle throat diameter; and (3) study the internal flow using graphical flow visualization techniques in order to provide a better understanding of the experimentally determined internal surface pressure distributions. Modeling of the combustion process is of interest and will be addressed in the future.

Because of the complex internal geometry which involves several sharp corners, a zonal gridding approach was used. The computational domain was subdivided into eight zones (Figure 16a). In each zone, an algebraic grid was used. A single-cell overlap (Section IV) was used to couple neighboring zones. Preliminary runs with an eight-zone grid indicated sonic flow at the nozzle throat and under-expanded flow at the nozzle exit. Since the flow in the diverging section of the nozzle remained supersonic, the flow in the base area had very little upstream influence. To save CPU time, a substantial number of grid points were removed from zone four and zone seven, and zone eight was totally eliminated. Computations were performed for both Euler and

Navier-Stokes cases. Computational results are discussed below for four different nozzle throat diameters for an injector diameter of 1.7 inches.

Figure 16b shows a seven-zone grid for inviscid computations. The grid is almost uniform in the internal region. The outflow boundaries of zones four and seven were truncated. The grid size for zones one through seven was 15 x 35, 46 x 35, 15 x 21, 26 x 20, 7 x 25, 84 x 30, and 12 x 23, respectively. Inviscid computations for nozzle throat diameters greater than 1.45 showed an internal wall pressure level (P/P_∞) of less than four in both the cowl and combustor regions. As shown in Figure 17, for a nozzle throat diameter of 1.42 inches, the pressure level in the cowl area is close to the wind tunnel measurement (see Figure 20) for a nozzle throat diameter of 1.54 inches. For the wind tunnel measurement, the equivalent nozzle throat diameter is less than 1.54 inches because of the boundary layer displacement thickness. Although the inviscid computation captured the oblique shock and the pressure level in the inlet region quite well, it failed to obtain the measured pressure rise in the combustor. A Mach number contour plot (Figure 17) shows an oblique shock originating just behind the lip of the cowl.

Computations for the nozzle throat diameter of 1.28 inches showed an oscillatory shock behavior. Figures 18a and 18b show a strong oblique shock becoming normal at the cowl lip. However, this normal shock does not remain steady at the cowl lip. This normal shock starts moving out of the cowl and becomes a bow shock (Figures 18c and 18d). Again the bow shock shows unsteady behavior and it becomes a normal shock at the lip and a strong oblique shock. The above described behavior was found cyclic. In other words, the flow keeps going through a cycle of strong oblique to normal to detached bow shock and reversal of the sequence. The flow inside the cowl and combustor is subsonic for the normal and detached bow shock conditions. Existence of oscillatory entry shock phenomena was observed in aerodynamic range tests of a 20mm SFRJ (Reference 11).

Figure 19 shows a seven zone grid used for the Navier-Stokes computations. The grid size for zones one through seven was 20 x 64, 46 x 64, 20 x 25, 64 x 24, 10 x 32, 84 x 52, and 41 x 32, respectively. To resolve high gradients near walls the grid lines were clustered near walls. A laminar flow computation for a 1.54 inch nozzle indicated a constant wall pressure level of about five in the inlet and combustor sections. A Mach number contour plot showed supersonic core flow along the axis. Separated primary and secondary flows were noticed inside the inlet and combustor. A shock reflection pattern consisting of four normal shocks at the axis was observed. A detailed discussion of the separated inlet flow of the present computations can be found in Reference 12. For the laminar flow computation, the computed wall pressure in the inlet section was in fair agreement with data. However, the computed wall pressure for the laminar flow did not match the wind tunnel data in the combustor section. This case, with a nozzle throat diameter of 1.54 inches, was found to be highly sensitive to small changes in model throat diameter. This case is thought to be sensitive due to the following three conditions: (1) separated flow inside the combustor; (2) boundary layer displacement thickness at the nozzle throat; and (3) internal shock reflection pattern. A less than satisfactory prediction of these conditions was thought to be a potential reason for the discrepancy between computed and measured data in the combustor. As shown in Figure 20, this highly sensitive behavior is visible in experimental measurements for three different wind tunnel runs

for nozzle throat diameters of 1.54 inches and 1.534 inches (Reference 13). In an attempt to simulate the separated flow, a modified Baldwin-Lomax turbulence model¹⁴ was incorporated in the code. The computed wall pressure with this turbulence model showed a trend that is similar to one that was observed experimentally inside the combustor (Figure 20). Although, this modified model seems to help for this particular case, critical evaluation based on separated flow test cases will be required before making any specific conclusion about the model. A plot of Mach number contours (Figure 21) shows a series of shock reflections which coalesce into a normal shock in the middle of the combustor. The flow between this shock and the nozzle throat is essentially subsonic. A normalized pressure contour plot for the same case is shown in Figure 22. To obtain a normal shock at the lip of the inlet, a series of computations were made with gradual reduction in the nozzle throat diameter. At a nozzle throat diameter of 1.21 inches, a normal shock at the lip of the inlet was observed (Figure 23). The computed wall pressure level shown in Figure 24, is in fair agreement with wind tunnel data (not shown) for a nozzle throat diameter of 1.25 inches as shown in Figure 24, see Reference 10.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

A computer code has been developed that incorporates a zonal grid technique to handle complex flow configurations and a parallel algorithm to exploit new multiprocessor architectures. The code has been exercised on the Intel IPSC hypercube and CRAY X-MP/48 computers to verify the ability to perform parallel computations for realistic fluid dynamic problems.

The results of several test cases which demonstrated the ability of the zonal technique to compute highly complex flow cases have been discussed.

It is felt that the parallel programming techniques are working very well and that the code has excellent potential for performing computations for complex configurations such as guided and non axisymmetric projectiles. Further development of the code is continuing with emphasis placed on extensions to three-dimensions and multi-tasking on the CRAY X-MP/48.




Figure 1. Fully clustered grid for cowl region






Figure 2. Partly clustered partly uniform grid for cowl region



Figure 3. Zonal boundary conditions




Wrap Around



Zonal

Figure 4. Grids at the intersection of cowl and injector



• SUBDOMAIN A

× SUBDOMAIN B

Figure 5. One grid-cell overlap




Figure 6. Sixteen computational subdomains for a constant area shock tube




Figure 7. Experimental supersonic tubular projectile model




Figure 8. A five-zone grid for the tubular projectile




Figure 9a. Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 1.7$ (Inviscid)




Figure 9b. Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_{\infty} = 1.7$ (Viscous)




Figure 10. Wind tunnel Schlieren photograph, $M_\infty = 1.7$




Figure 11. Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_{\infty} = 3.5$ (Inviscid)




Figure 12. Mach number contours for the tubular projectile, $M_{\infty} = 3.5$ (Viscous)




Figure 13. Wind tunnel Schlieren photograph, $M_\infty = 3.5$




Figure 14. Internal surface pressure distribution for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 1.7$





Figure 15. Internal surface pressure distribution for the tubular projectile, $M_\infty = 3.5$



ab - freestream	da - symmetric
bc - no reflection	ef - edge - wall
cd - downstream	

Figure 16a. Schematic illustration of ramjet and boundary conditions





Figure 16b. Seven-zone grid for the ramjet






Figure 18a. Mach number contours showing a strong oblique shock in the inlet region




Figure 18b. Mach number contours showing a normal shock in the inlet region




Figure 18c. Mach number contours showing an attached normal shock at the cowl lip




Figure 18d. Mach number contours showing a detached bow shock




Figure 19. Grid for viscous computation




Figure 20. Internal surface pressure distribution for the ramjet with 1.54 inch nozzle diameter





Figure 21. Mach number contours for the ramjet with 1.54 inch nozzle diameter






Figure 23. Mach number contours for the ramjet with 1.21 inch nozzle diameter




Figure 24. Internal surface pressure distribution for the ramjet with 1.21 inch nozzle diameter

(THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

REFERENCES

1. Vinokur, Marcel, "On One-Dimensional Stretching Functions for Finite-Difference Calculations," NASA CR 3313, Ames Research Center, 1980.
2. MacCormack, R.W., "The Effects of Viscosity in Hypervelocity Impact Cratering," AIAA Paper No. 69-354, 1969.
3. MacCormack, R.W. and Baldwin, B.S., "A Numerical Method for Solving the Navier-Stokes Equations with Application to Shock-Boundary Layer Interactions," AIAA Paper No. 75-1, 1975.
4. MacCormack, R.W., "Numerical Solution of the Interaction of a Shock Wave with a Laminar Boundary Layer," Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 8, 1972.
5. Rai, M.M., "A Conservative Treatment of Zonal Boundaries for Euler Equation Calculations," AIAA Paper No. 84-0164, 1984.
6. Benek, J.A., Steger, J.L. and Dougherty, F.C., "A Flexible Grid Embedding Technique with Application to the Euler Equations," AIAA Paper No. 83-1944, 1983.
7. Berger, M.J., "On Conservation at Grid Interfaces," ICASE Report No. 84-43, 1984.
8. Lombard, C.K. and Venkatapathy, E., "Implicit Boundary Treatment for Joined and Disjoint Patched Mesh Systems," AIAA Paper No. 85-1503, 1985.
9. Misegades, K.P., Private communication concerning microtasking on the CRAY X-MP/48, CRAY Research, Inc., Mendota Heights, MN.
10. Kayser, L.D., Yalamanchili, R.J., and Trexler, C.A., "Pressure Measurements on the Interior Surface of a 75mm Tubular Projectile at Mach 4," US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, BRL-MR-3725, December 1988.
11. Oskay, V., Private communication concerning aerodynamic range tests of the 20mm SFRJ, BRL, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.
12. Danberg, J.E. and Sigal, A., "Evaluation of Solid Fuel Ramjet Projectile Aerodynamics Characteristics," Proceedings of the 8th ADPA International Symposium on Ballistics, San Diego, CA, October 1987.
13. Yalamanchili, R.J., Private communication concerning wind tunnel measurements of the 75mm SFRJ, BRL, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.
14. Danberg, J.E. and Patel, N.R., "An Algebraic Turbulence Model for Flow Separation Caused by Forward and Backward Facing Steps," US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, BRL-MR-3791, December 1989.

(THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

LIST OF SYMBOLS

B_i	coefficient in Navier-Stokes equation
C_j	coefficient in Navier-Stokes equation
c	speed of sound
C_p	specific heat at constant pressure
C_v	specific heat at constant volume
D_i	coefficient in Navier-Stokes equation
E	flux vector in ξ direction
e	total energy per unit mass
F	flux vector in η direction
G_1, G_2	vectors of axisymmetric viscous terms
H	source term in Navier-Stokes equation
J	Jacobian of coordinate transformation
M	Mach number
Pr	molecular Prandtl number
Pr_t	turbulent Prandtl number
P	static pressure
Q	vector of dependent variables
R	gas constant
S_1, S_2	vectors of viscous terms
T	static temperature
T_1, T_2	vectors of viscous terms
t	time
u, v	Cartesian velocity components
U, V	contravariant velocity components
x, y	physical Cartesian coordinates
α	pressure damping coefficient

LIST OF SYMBOLS (Continued)

μ	molecular dynamic viscosity
ϵ	turbulent eddy viscosity
ξ, η	transformed coordinates
ρ	density

Subscripts

i, j	mesh indices
∞	free stream condition

APPENDIX A: NON-REFLECTING OUTER BOUNDARY CONDITION

This appendix describes the derivation of the nonreflecting outer boundary condition employed along the top boundary (Figure 3). The non-reflection boundary condition, like many other Neumann type boundary conditions, is an approximation. For appropriate supersonic flow applications, the use of non-reflection boundary conditions allows the outer boundary to be placed close to the body. This substantially reduces the number of grid points required for a given application and reduces both computer storage and CPU time requirements. This boundary condition is consistent when the following conditions are met.

- a. The local Mach number is greater than one at the boundary.
- b. There is a family of outward running Mach lines.

Consider a nonorthogonal coordinate system as shown in Figure A1. Through point x,y one can draw the velocity vector and Mach wave inclined at an angle μ with respect to the velocity vector. The velocity vector is at an angle measured with respect to Cartesian coordinate x . This gives

$$\mu = \sin^{-1} \frac{1}{M}$$

and

$$\omega = \tan^{-1} \frac{v}{u}$$

which leads to a total included angle

$$\theta = \mu + \omega$$

let

$$f = f(\rho, u, v, T)^T.$$

The non-reflection condition requires that the flow variables remain constant along the left running Mach lines.

$$f_{i,JL} = f_{x,y}$$

which gives

$$f_{x,y} = f_{k-1, JL-1} + \frac{A}{B(f_{K,JL-1} - f_{k-1,JL-1})}$$

where

$$x = \frac{(y_{k,JL-1} - y_{i,JL} + x_{i,JL} \tan \theta - x_{k,JL-1} \tan \psi)}{(\tan \theta - \tan \psi)}$$

$$y = y_{i,JL} + \tan \theta (x - x_{i,JL})$$

$$\Delta x = x_{k,JL-1} - x_{k-1, JL-1}$$

$$\Delta y = y_{k,JL-1} - y_{k-1, JL-1}$$

$$\psi = \tan^{-1} (\Delta y / \Delta x)$$

$$A = \{(x - x_{k-1, JL-1})^2 + (y - y_{k-1, JL-1})^2\}^{1/2}$$

$$B = (\Delta x^2 + \Delta y^2)^{1/2}$$




Figure A1. Non-reflecting outer boundary condition

(THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

<u>No of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Office of the Secretary of Defense OUSD(A) Director, Live Fire Testing ATTN: James F. O'Bryon Washington, DC 20301-3110	1	Director US Army Aviation Research and Technology Activity Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035-1099
2	Administrator Defense Technical Info Center ATTN: DTIC-DDA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6145	1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RD-CS-R (DOC) Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5010
1	HQDA (SARD-TR) WASH DC 20310-0001	1	Commander US Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL (Technical Library) Warren, MI 48397-5000
1	Commander US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCDRA-ST 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-0001	1	Director US Army TRADOC Analysis Command ATTN: ATAA-SL White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5502
1	Commander US Army Laboratory Command ATTN: AMSLC-DL Adelphi, MD 20783-1145	(Class. only) 1	Commandant US Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD (Security Mgr.) Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
2	Commander US Army, ARDEC ATTN: SMCAR-IMI-I Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000	(Unclass. only) 1	Commandant US Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CD-CSO-OR Fort Benning, GA 31905-5660
2	Commander US Army, ARDEC ATTN: SMCAR-TDC Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000	1	Air Force Armament Laboratory ATTN: AFATL/DLODL Eglin AFB, FL 32542-5000
1	Director Benet Weapons Laboratory US Army, ARDEC ATTN: SMCAR-CCB-TL Watervliet, NY 12189-4050		<u>Aberdeen Proving Ground</u>
1	Commander US Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: SMCAR-ESP-L Rock Island, IL 61299-5000	2	Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: AMXSY-D AMXSY-MP, H. Cohen
1	Commander US Army Aviation Systems Command ATTN: AMSAV-DACL 4300 Goodfellow Blvd. St. Louis, MO 63120-1798	1	Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: AMSTE-TD
		3	Cdr, CRDEC, AMCCOM ATTN: SMCCR-RSP-A SMCCR-MU SMCCR-MSI
		1	Dir, VLAMO ATTN: AMSLC-VL-D

No. of Copies	Organization	No. of Copies	Organization
8	Commander Armament RD&E Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: SMCAR-AET-A/Kline Chung Kahn Hudgins SMCAR-CCL-CA/Hirlinger O'Niell Miller SMCAR-FSP-A(1)/Bischer Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000	2	Ford Aerospace and Communications Corporation Aeronautronic Division ATTN: Charles White Bud Blair Ford Road Newport Beach, CA 92658
		1	NASA, Langley Research Center Transonic Aerodynamics Division ATTN: Dr. Michael J. Hemsch Hampton, VA 23665
2	Commander David W. Taylor Naval Ship ATTN: Dr. S. de los Santos Mr. Stanley Gottlieb Bethesda, MD 20084-5000	1	Applied Technology Associates ATTN: Mr. R.J. Cavalleri P.O. Box 19434 Orlando, FL 32814
2	Commander US Naval Surface Warfare Center ATTN: Code DK20/Clare Moore Dahlgren, VA 22448-5000	1	United States Military Academy Department of Civil and Mechanical Engineering ATTN: LTC Andrew L. Dull West Point, NY 10996
2	Director Sandia National Laboratories ATTN: Dr. W.L. Oberkampf Dr. F. Blottner Division 1636 P.O. Box 5800 Albuquerque, NM 87185	1	University of California, Davis Dept. of Mechanical Engineering College of Engineering ATTN: Prof. Harry A. Dwyer Davis, CA 95616
1	Massachusetts Institute of Technology ATTN: Tech Library 77 Massachusetts Avenue Cambridge, MA 02139		
2	Director NASA Ames Research Center ATTN: MS-202-1, Dr. T. Pulliam MS-258-1, Dr. L. Schiff Moffett Field, CA 94035		
1	Commandant USAFAS ATTN: ATSF-TSM-CN Fort Sill, OK 73503-5600		

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	National Tsing Hau University Department of Nuclear Engineering ATTN: Prof. Ching-Chang Chieng 855 Kuang Fu Road Hsinchu, Taian 300 R. O. C.
1	Defense Research Establishment Valcartier ATTN: Jon Evans P.O. Box 8800 Courcellette, Quebec Canada

(THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

USER EVALUATION SHEET/CHANGE OF ADDRESS

This Laboratory undertakes a continuing effort to improve the quality of the reports it publishes. Your comments/answers to the items/questions below will aid us in our efforts.

1. BRL Report Number BRL-MR-3834 Date of Report MAY 1990
2. Date Report Received _____
3. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which the report will be used.) _____

4. Specifically, how is the report being used? (Information source, design data, procedure, source of ideas, etc.) _____

5. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours or dollars saved, operating costs avoided, or efficiencies achieved, etc? If so, please elaborate. _____

6. **General Comments.** What do you think should be changed to improve future reports? (Indicate changes to organization, technical content, format, etc.) _____

CURRENT ADDRESS

Name

Organization

Address

City, State, Zip Code

OLD ADDRESS

Name

Organization

Address

City, State, Zip Code

7. If indicating a Change of Address or Address Correction, please provide the New or Correct Address in Block 6 above and the Old or Incorrect address below.

(Remove this sheet, fold as indicated, staple or tape closed, and mail.)

-----FOLD HERE-----

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5066
OFFICIAL BUSINESS



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS PERMIT No 0001, APG, MD

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

Director
U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratory
ATTN: SLCBR-DD-T
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-9989



-----FOLD HERE-----