Modeling the Effects of a Backward-Facing Step on Boundary-Layer Transition

Nathaniel Hildebrand, Preethi V. Mysore, & Meelan M. Choudhari CASB, NASA Langley Research Center, VA

> Balaji S. Venkatachari & Pedro Paredes National Institute of Aerospace



FD-47: Stability and Transition VIII

AIAA AVIATION Conference

August 6, 2021







- Quantify effects of step excrescences to specify manufacturing tolerances for laminar flow surfaces
- Linear Stability Analysis
 - In-house finite-difference flow solver
 - Laminar basic states with a Backward-Facing Step (BFS)
 - LST, PSE, & HLNSE to model TS waves
 - Compare transition locations to experiments (Wang & Gaster 2005)
- RANS-Based Transition Models
 - FUN3D 13.7 finite-volume code
 - SST2003 turbulence model (Menter, Kuntz, & Langtry 2003)
 - LM2009 transition model (Langtry & Menter 2009)
 - OVERFLOW 2.3d finite-difference code
 - SA turbulence model (Spalart & Allmaras 1994)
 - > AFT2019b transition model (Coder 2019)
 - Skin-friction contours
- Conclusions and Future Work



- Quantify effects of step excrescences to specify manufacturing tolerances for laminar flow surfaces
- Linear Stability Analysis
 - In-house finite-difference flow solver
 - Laminar basic states with a Backward-Facing Step (BFS)
 - LST, PSE, & HLNSE to model TS waves
 - Compare transition locations to experiments (Wang & Gaster 2005)
- RANS-Based Transition Models
 - FUN3D 13.7 finite-volume code
 - SST2003 turbulence model (Menter, Kuntz, & Langtry 2003)
 - LM2009 transition model (Langtry & Menter 2009)
 - OVERFLOW 2.3d finite-difference code
 - SA turbulence model (Spalart & Allmaras 1994)
 - > AFT2019b transition model (Coder 2019)
 - Skin-friction contours
- Conclusions and Future Work



2D Laminar Basic States

- Flow conditions match experiments (Wang & Gaster 2005)
 - $\circ \rho_{\infty} = 1.206 \text{ kg/m}^3 \& T_{\infty} = 292.7 \text{ K}$
 - $U_{\infty} = 20-34$ m/s, $Re_{\infty} = 1.33-2.26e6$ 1/m, & $\delta^* = 8.17-6.26e-4$ m
- Smooth BFS with max slope $\theta = 75^{\circ}$ and heights h = 0-1 mm
- Nonuniform grid with 5001×351 points and $y^+ = 0.1$



Spatial Growth Rates of TS Instability

- LST & PSE to model flat-plate cases
- LST & HLNSE to model BFS cases
 - o Growth rates from BFS cases match flat-plate cases outside of step region
- LST slightly overpredicts the growth rate in BFS region
 - Does not account for nonparallel effects



N-factor Envelopes

- LST (dashed) & HLNSE (solid) agree well
 - LST has upward shift with increasing step height
- N_{tr} calibrated with exp. transition location of flat-plate case at $U_{\infty} = 34$ m/s
 - $x_{tr} = 1.016 \text{ m or } (x_{tr} x_s) / \delta^* = 1215 \text{ from (Wang & Gaster 2005)}$
 - $N_{tr} = 7.32$ for LST and $N_{tr} = 7.40$ for HLNSE



Transition Locations

- LST (red dashed-dotted lines) & HLNSE (blue dashed lines) have same behavior
 - LST transition locations are further upstream
- HLNSE agrees with experiments* (black solid lines) for moderate step heights
 - Disagreement at large step heights and freestream velocities
 - Discrepancy at h = 0.25 mm



*Experimental transition locations from (Wang & Gaster 2005)



- Quantify effects of step excrescences to specify manufacturing tolerances for laminar flow surfaces
- Linear Stability Analysis
 - In-house finite-difference flow solver
 - Laminar basic states with a Backward-Facing Step (BFS)
 - LST, PSE, & HLNSE to model TS waves
 - Compare transition locations to experiments (Wang & Gaster 2005)
- RANS-Based Transition Models
 - FUN3D 13.7 finite-volume code
 - SST2003 turbulence model (Menter, Kuntz, & Langtry 2003)
 - LM2009 transition model (Langtry & Menter 2009)
 - OVERFLOW 2.3d finite-difference code
 - SA turbulence model (Spalart & Allmaras 1994)
 - > AFT2019b transition model (Coder 2019)
 - Skin-friction contours
- Conclusions and Future Work



RANS-Based Transition Models

- LST & HLNSE can successfully predict transition for moderate step heights
 - Difficult for large step heights and freestream velocities
- RANS-based models are less computationally expensive and do not require any knowledge of hydrodynamic stability theory
 - Lack of transition physics
- RANS-based models solve additional transport equations

 SST2003-LM2009 & SA-AFT2019b
- FUN3D 13.7 (Biedron, Carlson, Derlaga et al. 2019)
- OVERFLOW 2.3d (Nichols & Buning 2019)
- Can existing RANS-based models accurately predict transition onset for moderate step heights without modification?
- If not, why?



SST2003-LM2009 Solutions

- $Tu = 0.37\% \& \mu_t / \mu = 5$ (match exp. transition locations for flat-plate cases)
- Transition location for h = 0.5 mm downstream of flat-plate value
 - Disagrees with experiments and stability analysis



 $U_{\infty} = 34 \text{ m/s}$

Skin-Friction Contours for SST2003-LM2009

- BFS transition locations close to flat-plate values
 - Except at $U_{\infty} = 34 \text{ m/s} \& h = 1 \text{ mm}$
- Transition locations from SST2003-LM2009 model disagrees with experiments and stability analysis for moderate step heights





SST2003-LM2009 Transition Prediction

- SST2003-LM2009 model does not account for any flow history effects
 *F*_{onset1} is a function of *Re*_{θ_c} & *Re*_v
- Re_v/Re_{θ_c} for h = 0.25, 0.4, 0.5, and 0.7 mm below flat-plate value after x_s
- Boundary-layer flow returns to unperturbed state after x_s for moderate h







SA-AFT2019b Solutions

- $Tu = 0.17\% \& \mu_t / \mu = 0.01$ (match exp. transition locations for flat-plate cases)
- Transition location for h = 0.5 mm downstream of flat-plate value
 - Disagrees with experiments and stability analysis



 $U_{\infty} = 34 \text{ m/s}$

Skin-Friction Contours for SA-AFT2019b

- BFS transition locations close to flat-plate values
 - Further downstream than SST2003-LM2009 model
- Transition locations from SA-AFT2019b model disagrees with experiments and stability analysis for moderate step heights



SA-AFT2019b Transition Prediction

- SA-AFT2019b model does account for some flow history effects
 - Transport of amplification factor
- Net decrease in the *N*-factor envelope across step region compared to flat plate







- Quantify effects of step excrescences to specify manufacturing tolerances for laminar flow surfaces
- Linear Stability Analysis
 - In-house finite-difference flow solver
 - Laminar basic states with a Backward-Facing Step (BFS)
 - LST, PSE, & HLNSE to model TS waves
 - Compare transition locations to experiments (Wang & Gaster 2005)
- RANS-Based Transition Models
 - FUN3D 13.7 finite-volume code
 - SST2003 turbulence model (Menter, Kuntz, & Langtry 2003)
 - LM2009 transition model (Langtry & Menter 2009)
 - OVERFLOW 2.3d finite-difference code
 - SA turbulence model (Spalart & Allmaras 1994)
 - > AFT2019b transition model (Coder 2019)
 - Skin-friction contours
- Conclusions and Future Work



Conclusions and Future Work

- LST & HLNSE can successfully predict transition for moderate BFS heights
 - Difficult for large step heights and freestream velocities
- SST2003-LM2009 and SA-AFT2019b models produce transition locations that disagree with experiments/stability analysis for moderate BFS heights
- SST2003-LM2009 model does not account for any flow history effects
- SA-AFT2019b model results in a net decrease of the *N*-factor envelope compared to a flat plate
- Further analyze why the RANS-based transition models cannot predict accurate transition locations for moderate BFS heights
- Improve the RANS-based transition models
- Model the effects of a forward-facing step on boundary-layer transition



Acknowledgments

The computations described in this presentation were carried out in support of the Revolutionary Computational Aerosciences (RCA) discipline under the Transformational Tools and Technologies (TTT) project of the NASA Transformative Aeronautics Concepts Program (TACP).

