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Why do we need high-order schemes?

2\textsuperscript{nd} order schemes have been extremely successful, certainly for RANS. SU2 FV is used for many applications…
But...

For some applications 2\textsuperscript{nd} order accuracy may not be sufficient

Examples
- Wake and vortex flows
- Noise prediction
- LES/DNS

High-order solver is intended for high-fidelity modeling of the turbulence, i.e. LES (wall resolved and wall modeled) and DNS
Options to increase the order of accuracy

1: Increase the stencil combined with smoothness indicators => WENO-FV

$$x_i \bullet \bullet x_i \bullet x_i \bullet x_i \bullet x_i \bullet$$

2: Increase the polynomial degree inside the element => DG-FEM

Element $k$: $U(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_p} U_j^k \varphi_j^k(x_i)$
High-Order: SU2 Finite Volume

• Aim: Implementation of high-order schemes within the finite volume solver of SU2

• Objectives
  – 3rd order MUSCL limiters
    • Drikakis-Zoltak
    • Michalak & Ollivier-Gooch
  – Framework for Weighted Essentially Non-Oscillatory Schemes (WENO)
  – Use the Double Vortex Pairing Problem to assess the relative performance of these schemes
Description of Problem: Double Vortex Pairing

- Mixing layer formed by two co-flowing streams of water

- Initial velocity perturbations inflate forming two distinct vortices

- Vortices roll around each other eventually merging to form one vortical structure

- Chosen as test problem due to presence of fine structures and discontinuities
Double Vortex Pairing 256x256, $M=0.2$: Passive Scalar

- (a) WENO 11
- (b) SU2: Venkatakrishnan
- (c) SU2: Michalak-Ollivier Gooch
- (d) SU2: Drikakis-Zoltak
WENO Outline

- Difficult to achieve orders of accuracy above 3\(^{rd}\) order using MUSCL based approach on unstructured grids

- Aim: To create a high-order polynomial for target cell \(E_0\) which has the same cell averaged value as the reconstructed function \(u\)

- Reconstruction uses cell averaged value from target cell \(E_0\) as well as cell averaged values from multiple stencils consisting of neighboring cells

- Two types of stencils
  - Central
  - Directional

- Number of cells in the stencil scales with desired order of accuracy
  - \(K = \frac{1}{2} (r + 1)(r + 2) - 1\)
  - \(M = 2K\)
WENO Outline

\[ p_{\text{weno}} = \bar{u}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \tilde{a}_k \phi_k(\xi, \eta) \]

- Polynomials are constructed using data from each stencil

- “Essentially Non-Oscillatory” part stems from non-linear weights which are used to determine the smoothness of the solution in each stencil

- Central stencil given the largest bias since for smooth solutions the central stencil generally is the most accurate
Current Status

- Geometrical Preprocessing (Common/src/geometry_structure.cpp)
  - Check the mesh to determine which elements can have WENO reconstruction
  - Central + Directional stencil assembly for triangular elements
  - Obtain unique nodes (solution points) from stencil
  - Functions to handle assembly of mesh dependant parameters
  - LAPACK functions used to carry out matrix operations
  - Function to determine which two elements share a common edge

- Solution Reconstruction (SU2_CFD/src/solver_direct_mean.cpp)
  - MUSCL reconstruction used in region of the grid which cannot have WENO reconstruction
  - 3rd order WENO reconstruction done for remainder of domain

- Some Issues
  - Oscillations present at discontinuities
  - ~ 10 - 100 times slower than MUSCL scheme (depending on grid resolution)
Future Work

- Fully Functional in 2D
  - Quadrilateral elements
  - Hybrid grids

- Extension to higher-orders (4th, 5th etc)

- Full functionality in 3D
  - Requires additional steps in the geometrical preprocessing
  - Data structures require extension to handle the extra necessary information

- Add tunable parameters as options to be read from config file

- Parallel implementation

- Performance optimizations!
DG-FEM: the basic principles

System of PDE’s: Weak formulation

Element $k$:

$$U(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_p} U_j^k \varphi_j^k(x_i)$$

Integrals are computed with high enough accuracy to prevent instabilities due to aliasing errors. Computationally intensive!!

However: DG solver can be run very efficiently on modern hardware. Also hybridized DG techniques to reduce CPU requirements.
Current Capabilities

- Both 2D and 3D, just like SU2-FV
- All standard elements (tri, quad, tet, pyra, prism, hex)
- Curved elements of arbitrary order
- Polynomial order can differ in individual elements
- Symmetric Interior Penalty method for viscous fluxes
- Explicit time integration schemes (Runge-Kutta type)
- Time-accurate local time stepping via ADER-DG
- Preliminary implementation of LES models and shock capturing
Shock capturing

- Shock capturing relies on two components:
  - Sensing the discontinuity
  - Resolving the discontinuity
- Sensing the discontinuity:
  - Persson and Peraire: Modal decay
  - Clain, Diot and Loubere: MOOD
- Resolving the discontinuity
  - Limiter
  - Artificial viscosity / filtering
  - Sub-cell limiting
Shock capturing

- Shock capturing method in DG-FEM
  - Discontinuity sensor: Use the ratio of the norms of the highest and the lowest modal coefficients. (Extension of Persson’s shock sensor)
  - Resolving method: Use filtering method where the filtering strength is determined by sensor value.

- Current status
  - 2D triangular elements up to $p = 3$
  - Filtering strength can be modified with one input parameter
Shock capturing

- Transonic flow over NACA0012 airfoil
  - $p = 1$ | 7,990 triangles | 119 elements on each surface | 238 DOFs on each surface
Shock capturing

- Transonic flow over NACA0012 airfoil
  - $p = 1$ | 7,990 triangles | 119 elements on each surface | 238 DOFs on each surface

C$_p$ distribution, $p_{\text{space}} = 1$, $M_\infty = 0.80$, AoA = 1.25 deg

Lax-Friedrich, DG

C$_p$ distribution, $p_{\text{space}} = 1$, $M_\infty = 0.80$, AoA = 1.25 deg

Roe, FVM, Venkatakrishnan Slope Limiter
LES Models

- **SGS Models**
  - Constant Smagorinsky
    \[ \nu_{sgs} = C_s^2 \Delta^2 |\bar{S}| \]
  - Wall-Adapting Local Eddy Viscosity (WALE)
    \[ \nu_{sgs} = (C_w \Delta)^2 \frac{(S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{3/2}}{(\bar{S}_{ij} \bar{S}_{ij})^{5/2}} + (S_{ij}^d S_{ij}^d)^{5/4} \]
  - More sophisticated models to be implemented in future
    - Dynamic Smagorinsky, etc.

- **Wall Models**
  - One-dimensional Equilibrium BL Equations

Implementation of wall models within the context of DG-FEM solvers. A. Frère, C. de Wiart, K. Hillewaert, P. Chatelain, G. Winckelmans, Phys of Fluids, Jul 2017
Development of Wall-Models

- One-Dimensional Equilibrium Model (1DEQM) of Larsson / Kawai / Bodart
  - Mixing length model with wall-damping used for turbulent viscosity
    \[
    \frac{d}{dy} \left( (\mu - \mu_t) \frac{d\bar{u}_||}{dy} \right) = 0
    \]
    \[
    \frac{d}{dy} (\bar{p}) = 0
    \]
    \[
    \frac{d}{dy} \left[ \bar{u}_|| (\mu + \mu_t) \frac{d\bar{u}_||}{dy} + \left( \frac{\mu c_p}{Pr} + \frac{\mu_t c_p}{Pr_t} \right) \frac{dT}{dy} \right] = 0
    \]
- Exchange location permitted in large-scale parallel computations:
  - On any element type on the surface (hexa, tetra, pyramid, prism)
  - Not necessarily on first element on the surface
- Full parallel search capability (ADT based), all necessary communication, and implementation of equilibrium WM have now been completed and being tested
- ADER-DG time-step requirements respected in partitioning / search
Wall-Model Validation: Plane Channel Flow

- Plane Channel simulations conducted with RANS and with resolved LES for comparison with WMLES
  - Flow $Re_{\tau} = 590$
  - Friction length $l_\tau = 1.7 \times 10^{-10}$ m
  - Friction velocity $u_\tau = 2.53$ m/s
  - Channel half-height $\delta = 0.1$ m
  - Domain size = $2\pi\delta \times 2\delta \times \pi\delta$

- Debugging/testing of plane channel flow with SU2 DG-FEM wall-modeled LES underway

RANS Simulation
Mesh: 30x60x30

Resolved Plane Channel
Implicit LES - No Wall Model
$Re_{\tau} = 590$
Iteration: 0

Resolved LES Simulation
Mesh: 22x22x22
$P = 3$

Results still converging
Performance optimization (with Intel)

• First implementation was very inefficient (< 5% peak on Xeon)

• Collaboration with Intel to improve efficiency
  - Specialized matrix multiplication software (MKL, LIBXSMM)
  - Explicit unrolling of small loops (specialized 2D, 3D code)
  - Vectorization direction matrix multiplication: 128 byte aligned
  - Element-wise operation fusion for vectorization
  - Gemm calls: \( \approx 60\% \) peak on Xeon

• Performance entire code: \( \approx 35-40\% \) peak on Xeon (single core)

• Hybrid MPI-OpenMP to increase flexibility (about to start)
Performance analysis tools (Intel)

Elapsed Time: 545.030s
- CPU Time: 543.560s
  - Total Thread Count: 1
  - Paused Time: 0s

Top Hotspots
This section lists the most active functions in your application. Optimizing these hotspot functions typically results in improving overall application performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>CPU Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cblas_dgemm</td>
<td>libmkl_intel_lp64.so</td>
<td>351.361s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFEM_DG_NSSolver::ADER_DG_AliasedPredictorResidual_3D</td>
<td>SU2_CFD</td>
<td>48.980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFEM_DG_NSSolver::Volume_Residual</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.790s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cblas_dgemv</td>
<td>libmkl_intel_lp64.so</td>
<td>19.270s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFEM_DG_EulerSolver::ADER_DG_PredictorStep</td>
<td>SU2_CFD</td>
<td>13.500s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Others]</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.659s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA is applied to non-summable metrics.

Effective CPU Utilization Histogram
This histogram displays a percentage of the wall time the specific number of CPUs were running simultaneously. Spin and Overhead time adds to the Idle CPU utilization value.
Performance analysis tools (Intel)
Higher-order Grids with Curved Elements (with Pointwise, work of Steve Karman)

In-house capability to generate higher-order grids for simple cases.

Pointwise V18.2 will have degree elevation and mesh curving capabilities. Available end of September 2018.
Access the code

- *feature_hom* branch on GitHub is the main branch for the DG solver. It is about to be merged with develop.
- Several other development branches exist
Future Work DG-FEM

- Finish Shock Capturing and LES wall models
- LES statistics (common to DDES and URANS)
- Improve boundary conditions (non-reflective)
- Improve time step estimates by eigenvalue analysis of the Jacobian matrix (computed with CodiPack)
- Parallel performance optimization, including OpenMP
- Entropy variables
- Hybridized techniques, e.g. Embedded Discontinuous Galerkin (EDG), to reduce computational requirements
- Implicit algorithms
- Discrete adjoint version
- Verification and Validation (Manufactured solutions)
Results, viscous
Implicit LES, SD 7003 (Reynolds = 60,000)

$p = 4, \text{hexahedra}$