

The Center for Astrophysical Thermonuclear Flashes

Validation of the FLASH Code: Two- and Three-Dimensional Simulations of Shock-Cylinder Interactions

Greg Weirs

9th International Workshop on the Physics of Compressible Turbulent Mixing

19-23 July 2004



An Advanced Simulation & Computing (ASC) Academic Strategic Alliances Program (ASAP) Center at The University of Chicago





Acknowledgements

- LANL: Chris Tomkins, Mark Marr-Lyon, Bob Benjamin
- ANL: Mike Papka, Randy Hudson Brad Gallagher
- Vikram Dwarkadas, Tomek Plewa, Todd Dupont



What is the FLASH Code?

- Community code for Astrophysics Can solve a broad range of (astro)physics problems
- Designed for compressible reactive flows
- Block-structured, spatial adaptive mesh refinement (PARAMESH)
- Parallel (MPI), including I/O
- Has a modern CS-influenced architecture
- Portable: runs on many massively-parallel systems, linux boxes to ASCI machines
- Scales and performs well Gordon Bell prize
- □ Is available on the web: http://flash.uchicago.edu



Verification and Validation of FLASH

V & V at the Flash Center

- Automated test suite: standard problems run nightly on several platforms, web page to display, access results
- Verification of algorithms on problems with exact solutions; typically for components of the code base
- V&V paper: "On Validating An Astrophysical Simulation Code", Calder, et al., ApJS 143, Nov. 2002. Validation for Rayleigh – Taylor and three-layer Richtmeyer-Meshkov problems.



Los Alamos Shock-Cylinder Experiment



- A "cylinder" of Sulfur Hexaflouride (SF₆) falls through the air-filled test section; M_{SF6} ~ 5 M_{air}
- A Mach 1.2 shock traverses the cylinder and continues down the tunnel
- Indirect SF₆ visualization, by visible-light scattering water/glycol "fog"
- Direct SF₆ visualization, by Rayleigh-scattering off SF₆ molecules
- Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) with fog
- One image per experiment; time sequence can be constructed because of repeatability



Flowfield Development

Two phases of flowfield development:

- 1. Shock-interaction phase:
 - Misalignment of pressure and density gradients results in baroclinic vorticity deposition at the interface as the shock traverses the cylinder
 - Compressible, wave dominated
 - **G** Fast, < 50 μs
 - Highly sensitive to conditions before the shock arrives
- 2. Instability phase:
 - A counter-rotating vortex pair forms, and instabilities (Kelvin-Helmholtz) develop on the interface
 - Weakly compressible, dominated by viscosity, instabilities, vortex dynamics

Slow, ~800 μs

Highly sensitive to conditions established in phase 1



Flowfield Development



- Experimental time series, water/glycol SF₆ mole fraction.
- Images correspond to 50, 190, 330, 4 after shock impact
- Composite image does not preserve ti relationship





Earlier Results

Some things we looked at:

- Sensitivity to simulation parameters:
 - Resolution (numerical viscosity)
 - Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR)
 - Courant number
 - Mesh refinement criteria
- Velocity fields
- Double cylinder configuration
- □ Speculative 3D calculation
- ... others we could have:
- Shock strength
- Equation of state



Earlier Results

Issues/Obstacles:

Sensitivity to initial conditions:

- "Raw" RS experimental image of the initial SF₆ distribution vs. axisymmetric fit
- □ Initial maximum mole fraction, X_{SF6}

There is no viscosity model. Only resolution dependent numerical viscosity is present.

Validation metric. Visual comparison of experimental and computed morphology (eyeball norm)



New Results

Recent work focuses on:

- Initial conditions
- Better metrics
- Three-dimensional effects



Axisymmetric code (Todd Dupont):

- Motivation: Determine X_{SF6}
- Motivation: Initialize threedimensional flowfield
- Solve (single) species and momentum equations and elliptic equation for pressure
- Convection, gravity, constant viscosity, constant binary diffusion, variable density, isothermal
- Run until steady state is achieved





Axisymmetric code input parameters:

- Inlet velocity (parabolic profile) LANL estimate: 10 cm/s
- Inlet mass fraction of SF₆ LANL estimate: 1.0
- Simulation Parameters -Dimensions of domain, resolution, relative sizes and flow rates

Code output:

- SF₆ mole fraction profile Fit to experimental image
- X_{SF6} in the image plane LANL estimate: 0.8

Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 1.0$ Inlet $v_z = 10.0$ cm/s





Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 1.0$ Inlet $v_z = 25.0$ cm/s Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 0.9685$ Inlet $v_z = 23.43$ cm/s







Initial conditions in the experimental image plane are highly sensitive to inlet conditions



Looking for Better Metrics

- While visual comparisons were ok to start with, we need a better basis for comparison to experimental data. A new metric should be:
- Quantitative
- Well-defined
- Physically meaningful

Circulation and self-induced vortex velocity both measure the vorticity deposited during the shock interaction

- Insensitive to small scale structure
- Insensitive to numerical (and physical) viscosity

These provide:

- 1. A way to probe the initial composition gradients (X_{SF6})
- 2. A necessary first step in correlating the vorticity deposited and the growth of secondary instabilities











□ Circulation is the integral of vorticity:

$$\Gamma = \iint \overline{\omega} \cdot dA$$

- U We consider only the z-component of vorticity
- We integrate over the lower-y half of the domain (lower half in the spanwise dimension)



Circulation: Effect of Initial SF₆ Mole Fraction







3D Simulations

Are three-dimensional effects important?

- SF₆ and air diffuse as the SF₆ flows through the tunnel, leading to vertically varying composition, and thus density, gradients
- Instability growth and small scale structure are generally threedimensional

We are just beginning to analyze 3D simulations.

- **Q** Run 1: 146 μ m, X_{SF6} = 0.97 in image plane, fixed frame
- **Q** Run 2: 146 μ m, X_{SF6} = 0.83 in image plane, fixed frame
- **Q** Run 3: 146 μ m, X_{SF6} = 0.69 in image plane, moving frame

We have left the validation program proper – no experimental data (yet)



3D Simulation: Circulation











 $X_{SF6} = 0.69$ t = 750 µs Note vertical tubes of positive z-velocity, associated with the two primary vortex cores

Spreading as the top wall is approached indicates acceleration











- Early validation for the shock-cylinder interaction was qualitative and focused on the influence of simulation parameters
- □ Work in progress:
 - Examines a range of initial conditions
 - Seeks quantitative, physically meaningful metrics
 - Examines 3D effects



What is the FLASH Code?

Target Applications:

- Compact accreting stars (white dwarf, neutron star)
- Reactive flows (DNS or subgrid model)
- □ Initial conditions close to hydrostatic equilibrium (self-gravity)
- Complex EOS (dense nuclear matter)

Example: Type Ia Supernova

- Massive white dwarf
- Subgrid model for nuclear flame
- Self-gravity
- Degenerate EOS



Raw Experimental Images





- Raw image (left) actually, an average of several images. Pixel values are measured intensity (Rayleigh scattering,) and range from 0 to 165. (We added the contours.)
- Residual after subtracting smooth, axisymmetric fit. Pixel values range from -10 to +10.



Axisymmetric Fit to Experimental Image

- Eventually a formula consisting of several Gaussians was developed
- Almost all of our previously published work was initialized with this fit.
- The maximum initial mole fraction of SF₆, X_{SF6}, must be assumed





Gravity Balances Diffusion

- If the inlet velocity is too low, the profile is too narrow (closer to the centerline than the experimental data): gravitational acceleration of SF₆ leads to necking
- If the velocity is too high, the profile is too steep: diffusion does not have enough time to act
- The inlet mass fraction affects the gravitational acceleration and the output X_{SF6}



Inlet $v_z = 15.0$ cm/s Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 1.0$



Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 1.0$ Inlet $v_z = 15.0$ cm/s Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 0.8$ Inlet $v_z = 15.0$ cm/s





Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 1.0$ Inlet $v_z = 15.0$ cm/s Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 1.0$ Inlet $v_z = 20.0$ cm/s





Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 0.95$ Inlet $v_z = 22.50$ cm/s Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 0.9315$ Inlet $v_z = 21.85$ cm/s





Inlet $Y_{SF6} = 0.9$ Inlet $v_z = 20.0$ cm/s





Circulation: Effect of Domain Size







Circulation: Effects of Resolution and Ref. Frame







Vorticity: Effects of Resolution and Ref. Frame



 $X_{SF6} = 0.69$ t=750 µs 146 µm, 73 µm, 37 µm Fixed frame (upper row) Moving frame (lower)





3D Simulation: Circulation



The University of Chicago





 $X_{SF6} = 0.69$ t = 750 µs Front of cylinder is smooth; instabilities are not apparent





 $X_{SF6} = 0.97$ t = 750 µs Instabilities are visible even on the front of the cylinder





 $X_{SF6} = 0.69$ t = 750 µs Mild structures are visible on the back of the cylinder





 $\begin{array}{l} X_{SF6} = 0.97 \\ t = 750 \ \mu s \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{l} \text{Well-developed} \\ \text{structures are visible} \\ \text{on the back of the} \\ \text{cylinder} \end{array} \end{array}$





 $X_{SF6} = 0.97$ t = 750 µs More structure is visible near the top wall than the bottom The top of the cylinder has a higher self-induced velocity, resulting in a slight tilt





 $X_{SF6} = 0.97$ t = 750 µs Note vertical tubes of positive z-velocity, associated with the two primary vortex cores