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Large eddy simulations of spatially evolving planar jets have been performed using the standard Smagorinsky, the dynamic Smagorinsky, and the dynamic mixed models and model performance evaluated. Computations have been performed both at a low Reynolds number, $Re_L=3000$, in order to make comparisons with a previous DNS at the same Reynolds number, and at a higher value, $Re_L=30000$, to compare with high Reynolds number experiments. Model predictions with respect to the evolution of jet half-width, centerline velocity decay, mean velocity profiles, and profiles of turbulence intensity are evaluated. Some key properties of the SGS models such as the eddy-viscosity constant and the subgrid dissipation are also compared. It is found that the standard Smagorinsky model is much too dissipative and severely underpredicts the evolution of the jet half-width and centerline velocity decay. The dynamic versions of the Smagorinsky model and the mixed model allow for streamwise and transverse variation of the constant in the eddy-viscosity expression which results in much better performance and good agreement with experimental and DNS data. The mixed model has an additional scale-similarity part which, in a priori tests against filtered jet DNS data, is found to predict the subgrid shear stress profile. Although the subgrid shear stress obtained by the dynamic Smagorinsky model is substantially smaller than that obtained in the a priori tests using the jet DNS data, surprisingly, in the a posteriori computations, the dynamic Smagorinsky model performs as well as the dynamic mixed model. Analysis of the mean momentum equation gives the reason for such behavior: the resolved stress in computations with the dynamic Smagorinsky model is larger than it should be and compensates for the underprediction of the subgrid shear stress by the Smagorinsky model. The numerical discretization errors have been quantified. The error due to noncommutativity of spatial differentiation and physical space filtering on nonuniform grids is found to be small because of the relatively mild stretching used in the present LES. The modeling error is found to be generally smaller than the discretization error with the standard Smagorinsky model having the largest modeling error.

I. INTRODUCTION

Jets in complex configurations are typically encountered in different practical engineering applications such as combustors, cooling of energy conversion devices, and exhaust of aerospace vehicles, as well as in environmental problems. It is then important to understand the physics related to modeling a simple jet to improve prediction methods in more complex flows. The purpose of this study is to investigate the ability of large eddy simulation (LES) to predict the overall field quantities in the plane jet and the evolution of the two initial shear layers upstream to the jet.

Many experimental studies and results are available on jets.$^{1-13}$ Characteristics in the near field of the jet nozzle as well as in the self-preservation region have been investigated. Large statistical structures are seen, especially in the near field, that include a Von Karman vortex street and roll-like structures. The works of Antonia et al.$^1$ and Thomas and Prakash$^7$ have shown that, near the nozzle, the structures are predominantly symmetrical for a flat exit profile. After the merging of the shear layers, asymmetric structures appear in the fully developed region of the jet. The self-preserving region of the jet is characterized by linear growth of its thickness, quadratic decay of the centerline velocity, and constant values of the centerline turbulence intensities, when normalized by the centerline velocity. The ability of LES to give quantitatively correct predictions of these quantities is of interest.

Many jet numerical simulations have also been performed but most of them have involved temporally evolving jets as well as a round geometry. Fewer simulations have been performed of spatially evolving jets because of the high computational cost. A large eddy simulation of a round jet has been performed by Urbin and Metais$^{14}$ that focuses on the coherent vortex dynamics. Coannular jets discharging into a sudden expansion region have been studied by Akselvoll and Moin.$^{15}$ Recent large eddy simulations of a plane jet have also been performed by Dai et al.$^{16}$ and Weinberger et al.$^{17}$ to investigate the influence of the inlet conditions on
the jet. Both simulations were restricted to the standard Smagorinsky model.

In direct simulations, the Navier–Stokes equations are solved and all dynamically important scales of turbulence are computed. Such computations are very accurate but require very refined meshes and small time steps. In large eddy simulation only the largest scales are simulated and the effect of small scales on the large resolved scales is modeled. LES requires less computational effort and can simulate flows at higher Reynolds number than direct numerical simulation (DNS). An accurate DNS of a spatially evolving jet with a low co-flow (strong jet) has been performed by Stanley and Sarkar. The simulation studies the evolution of the initial shear layers at the jet edge, their merging at the end of the potential core, and, finally, the well-developed jet. The DNS results are in good agreement with experimental results.

In the present work, large eddy simulation of a planar jet is performed. Unlike the previous LES studies of the plane jet, the dynamic Smagorinsky model and the mixed model are used in addition to the Smagorinsky model and their performance evaluated. Furthermore, the LES results are validated against both DNS and experiments. In the first part of the study, computations at the same Reynolds number as the direct numerical simulation are performed in order to compare the results and validate the method. In the second part, the Reynolds number of the jet is increased and compared with higher Reynolds number experiments.

II. GOVERNING EQUATIONS

A. Navier–Stokes equations

The flow is governed by the Navier–Stokes equations, representing mass conservation,

\[ \partial_t \rho + \partial_i (\rho u_i) = 0, \]

momentum conservation,

\[ \partial_t (\rho u_i) + \partial_j (\rho u_j u_i) = -\partial_j p + \frac{1}{Re} \partial_j \tau_{ij}, \]

and energy conservation written as an evolution equation for the pressure field,

\[ \partial_t p + u_i \partial_i p + \gamma p \partial_i u_i = \frac{\gamma}{Pr} \partial_i (k \partial_i T) + \frac{\gamma - 1}{Re} \partial_j \tau_{ij} \partial_i u_j. \]

The tensor \( \tau_{ij} \) represents the viscous stress:

\[ \tau_{ij} = \mu (\partial_i u_j + \partial_j u_i) - \frac{2}{3} \mu \delta_{ij} \partial_i u_k. \]

In the above equations, \( Re \) is the Reynolds number and \( Pr \) the Prandtl number. Although the compressible Navier–Stokes equations are used for future generalization to high-speed flow, the jet Mach number, \( M_j = 0.3 \), is sufficiently small that compressibility effects may be neglected.

B. Filtered equations

In DNS, Eqs. (1)–(3) are directly solved without further modeling. To reduce the required numerical resolution, the Navier–Stokes equations in the LES approach are filtered. Therefore, the small scales are not directly solved for in LES but modeled. In this paper, the top-hat filter with a filter width \( \Delta \) is used. Three filter sizes are tested: \( \Delta = h \) where \( h \) represents the grid spacing, \( \Delta = 2h \), and \( \Delta = 4h \). A filtering operation weighted by the density \( \rho \) is used following the approach used by Favre for compressible flows:

\[ \tilde{f} = \bar{\rho} f / \bar{\rho}. \]

The filtered Navier–Stokes equations, that have been, for example, developed in Lesieur and Comte, are as follows:

\[ \partial_t \bar{\rho} + \partial_j (\bar{\rho} \bar{u}_j) = 0, \]

\[ \partial_j (\bar{\rho} \bar{u}_i) + \partial_j (\bar{\rho} \bar{u}_j \bar{u}_i) = \frac{1}{Re} \partial_j (\bar{\tau}_{ij}) - \partial_j \bar{q}_{ij} + R_m, \]

\[ \partial_j \bar{p} + \bar{u}_i \partial_i \bar{p} + \gamma \bar{p} \partial_i \bar{u}_i = \frac{\gamma}{Re Pr} \partial_j (k \partial_j \bar{T}) + \frac{\gamma - 1}{Re} \bar{\tau}_{ij} \partial_j \bar{u}_j + R_p, \]

where \( q_{ij} \) is the subgrid stress (SGS) tensor.

\[ q_{ij} = \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j, \]

\( R_m \) represents the subgrid terms resulting from the nonlinearity of the viscous terms and \( R_p \) the subgrid terms in the pressure equation. The subgrid stress \( q_{ij} \) is the dominant subgrid term. The term, \( R_m \), and the subgrid term, \( R_p \), in the mean pressure equation can be neglected for the low Mach numbers considered here.

C. Subgrid models

1. Smagorinsky model

The Smagorinsky model is an eddy-viscosity type model given by:

\[ q_{ij} - \frac{1}{3} q_{ii} \delta_{ij} = -C_s^2 \Delta^2 \left[ \overline{S_{ij}} \right] \text{ with } \left| \overline{S} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{3} \left[ \overline{S_{pq} S_{pq}} \right] \]

and

\[ S_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} \right) - \frac{1}{3} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i} \delta_{ij} \]

is the deviatoric part of the rate of strain tensor. The constant \( C_s \) depends on the particular flow and different values have been proposed. Although simple, the Smagorinsky model is known to be excessively dissipative in transitional flows as well as flows with strong coherent structures and to have poor correlation with the exact subgrid stress tensor in \textit{a priori} studies. Here, \( C_s = 0.13 \) which corresponds to the average value obtained in the dynamic Smagorinsky model LES by Vreman et al. of the shear layer.

The gradient of the term, \( q_{ii} \delta_{ij}/3 \), is absorbed in the pressure gradient for incompressible flows. For the jet studied here, the gradient of \( q_{ii} \delta_{ij}/3 \) is found to be small in the mean momentum balance and neglected.

2. Mixed model

Another model, the scale-similarity model, which is not based on an eddy-viscosity hypothesis, has been formulated by Bardina et al. that, among other advantages, allows backscatter of energy from subgrid scales to resolved scales.
It is built on the assumption that filtering at different levels results in subgrid stresses with similar structure and is given by

\[ q_{ij} = \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j. \]  

(12)

The correlation of this model with the subgrid stress tensor is known to be much better than in the case of the Smagorinsky model. Although less dissipative than the Smagorinsky model in the transitional zone, it sometimes does not provide enough dissipation in fully turbulent flows for numerical stability. In the mixed model, the scale-similarity model is added to the Smagorinsky model to exploit the advantages of both models,

\[ q_{ij} = -C_\lambda S_{ij}^3 + \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j. \]  

(13)

The recent study of Shao et al. shows that there is a physically based reason for the two parts of the mixed model. The scale-similarity part is better suited to account for mean flow effects on the SGS energy transfer and anisotropy, while the Smagorinsky model is appropriate for representing the classical, dissipative energy cascade from the grid scales to the subgrid scale motion.

3. Dynamic eddy-viscosity model

A modification of the Smagorinsky model has been proposed by Germano et al. to correct the excessive dissipation of this model and avoid ad hoc flow-dependent changes to the coefficient. The square of the constant \( C_\lambda^2 \) is replaced by a coefficient \( C_d \) which is dynamically computed and depends on the local structure of the flow. The Smagorinsky eddy-viscosity formulation is retained:

\[ q_{ij} = -C_d S_{ij}^3 + \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j. \]  

In order to compute \( C_d \), a test filter, denoted by a hat and corresponding to a filter width larger than that of the LES, is introduced. The consecutive \( \Delta \) application of these two filters defines a filter with a filter width of \( \alpha \Delta \). For the top-hat filter, the optimum value \( \alpha = \sqrt{S} \), which corresponds to a test filter width of \( 2\Delta \), was found in a recent study of the mixing layer. The dynamic constant is calculated with a least squares approach according to:

\[ C_d = \frac{\langle M_{ij} L_{ij} \rangle}{\langle M_{ij} M_{ij} \rangle}. \]  

(15)

\[ L_{ij} = \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j. \]  

(16)

\[ M_{ij} = (\kappa \Delta)^2 S_{ij}^3 + \Delta^2 S_{ij}^3. \]  

(17)

To prevent numerical instability caused by negative values of \( C_d \), the numerator and denominator are averaged in the homogeneous directions. The constant \( C_d \) is artificially set to zero during the few instances when it is still negative.

4. Dynamic mixed model

The dynamic mixed model is still the sum of the similarity model and the Smagorinsky model but the constant of the Smagorinsky part is dynamically computed. This model takes advantage of the correct dissipation produced by the dynamic eddy-viscosity part while the similarity part allows other effects such as the backscatter of energy from subgrid scales to resolved scales and anisotropic energy transfers between grid and subgrid scale motion. The mixed SGS model is given by

\[ q_{ij} = -C_d S_{ij}^3 + \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - C_d S_{ij}^3. \]  

(18)

The dynamic model coefficient is obtained by:

\[ H_{ij} + C_d M_{ij} = L_{ij}, \]  

(19)

where \( M_{ij} \) and \( L_{ij} \) are defined by Eqs. (16)-(17), respectively, and \( H_{ij} \) is as follows:

\[ H_{ij} = \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - (\bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j - \bar{u}_i \bar{u}_j). \]  

(20)

The dynamic model coefficient is obtained with the least-squares approach:

\[ C_d = \frac{\langle M_{ij} L_{ij} - H_{ij} \rangle}{\langle M_{ij} M_{ij} \rangle}. \]  

(21)

III. NUMERICAL METHOD

The numerical method of the recent DNS by Stanley and Sarkar of the plane jet which is based on their earlier studies is used here and summarized below for completeness.

A. Spatial integration method

The spatial derivatives are computed using a nonuniform fourth-order compact scheme based on the uniform scheme of Lele. Nonuniform third-order compact expressions based on those of Carpenter et al. are used on the boundaries. In order to damp the high wave number spurious oscillations created at the boundaries, a fourth-order nonuniform compact filter is applied to the field at each iteration. The parameter \( \alpha \) of the filter is optimized in order to keep the influence of the filter as weak as possible and is set equal to 0.4983. The value \( \alpha = 0.5 \) corresponds to no filtering. The resulting scheme has overall fourth-order spatial accuracy on stretched grids.

B. Time integration

The fourth-order Runge–Kutta scheme of Carpenter et al. is used for the time integration of the convective terms. It is a five-stage scheme for which the fifth stage is added to improve the stability. To save computational time, the viscous terms are advanced using a first-order scheme. This is implemented by advancing the Euler terms using the fourth-order Runge–Kutta scheme and then evaluating and advancing the viscous terms in time using a first-order scheme. Treating the viscous terms in this way is found to have a negligible impact on the solution accuracy because those terms are small compared to the convective terms for the conditions of the jets simulated here. All the simulations have been performed using a constant CFL number of 1.5.
C. Boundary conditions

The principal difficulty in the simulation of unsteady flows in a truncated open computational domain is the formulation of suitable boundary conditions to take into account all the information passing inward and outward across the boundaries while minimizing spurious reflections. Such nonreflecting boundary conditions have been proposed previously, for example, Thompson\(^{30}\) and Giles.\(^{31}\)

For the outflow as well as the upper and lower sidewall boundaries, the nonreflecting conditions of Thompson,\(^{30}\) based on the characteristic equations, are used. These boundary conditions are allowed to switch between inflow and outflow at each point depending on the instantaneous local normal velocity. The corner points are treated as nonreflecting in planes 45 degrees from the adjacent boundaries. At the nonreflecting outflow points an additional pressure correction term, proposed by Rudy and Strikwerda,\(^{32}\) is used to maintain the pressure near a specified free-stream pressure.

At the inflow boundary, the time variation of the incoming characteristic variables is specified while the equation for the outgoing characteristic variable is solved using internal biased derivatives. This approach allows the proper specification of the incoming characteristic waves at this boundary. Moreover, to isolate the interior of the domain from the effects of the boundary conditions, a buffer zone based on the approach of Hu\(^{33}\) is used on the nonreflecting boundaries. The buffer zone is a numerical construct that consists of a stretched grid with additional nodes placed around the computational domain where exponential damping terms are added to the governing equations.

Periodic boundary conditions are used in the \(z\) direction.

D. Inflow conditions

The longitudinal mean velocity profile at the inflow is a top-hat profile with smooth edges. A hyperbolic tangent profile is used:

\[
U = \frac{U_1 + U_2}{2} + \frac{U_1 - U_2}{2} \tanh \left( \frac{y}{2\theta} \right),
\]

where \(\theta\) is the momentum thickness, \(U_1\) designates the longitudinal velocity in the middle of the jet and \(U_2\) is the co-flow velocity. The co-flow velocity is small, \(U_2/\Delta U = 0.1\), so that, for the streamwise distances considered here, the evolution is similar to that of a jet with no co-flow. The mean lateral velocity is initialized as \(V = 0\) while the density and the pressure are uniform.

A broadband forcing representative of isotropic turbulence is utilized at the inflow. The three-dimensional energy spectra of the velocity fluctuations at the inflow is

\[
E(k) = \frac{k^4}{16} \exp\left[ -2(k/k_0)^2 \right],
\]

where the peak frequency \(k_0\) is set to the most unstable mode for the hyperbolic tangent shear layer. The lateral shape, across the jet, is such that the fluctuation intensity peaks in the shear layers on either side of the jet.

IV. LOW REYNOLDS NUMBER SIMULATIONS

A. The jet parameters

The case presented here corresponds to three-dimensional simulations of a “strong” jet. The jet is called strong since the co-flow velocity \(U_2\) is weak compared to the jet centerline velocity, resulting in a strong shear layer at the jet edges. The ratio of the velocity between the low- and high-speed streams is 0.09. The ratio of the jet slot width to the inflow momentum thickness, \(d/\theta = 20\).

The jet Reynolds number of this simulation is \(Re_d = \rho \Delta U d/\mu = 3000\), where \(\Delta U\) is the velocity difference between the two streams at the inflow and \(d\) is the jet slot width. The Reynolds number has been chosen to be the same as those of the direct numerical simulation of Stanley and Sarkar\(^{18}\) and is sufficiently small to enable an accurate DNS that resolves all relevant spatio-temporal scales on the computational mesh. The Reynolds number based on the initial shear layer momentum thickness is \(Re_\theta = 150\).

The Mach number of the high-speed stream is 0.35 and the convective Mach number of the shear layer is \(M_c = 0.16\). At such Mach numbers, the physical characteristics of the flow are similar to those of an incompressible flow.

The subgrid modeling in LES of this flow can then be regarded as incompressible, which implies that the subgrid stress tensor \(q_{ij}\) is the only subgrid term which needs to be modeled.

Broadband inflow conditions obtained by filtering the inflow perturbations in the DNS were used with a maximum fluctuation intensity of \(q/\Delta U = 0.1\) in the shear layer.

B. Computational parameters in the DNS

A \(205 \times 189 \times 60\) computational grid is utilized in the DNS.\(^{18}\) The computational domain of interest has the following dimensions: \(L_x = 12, L_y = 15\), and \(L_z = 4\). All the meshes have been nondimensionalized by the jet slot width \(d\). These dimensions do not include the additional buffer zones at the jet exit and sides. The mesh is uniform in the \(x\) direction with \(h_x = 0.0666\). In the \(y\) direction, it is uniform in the center of the jet from \(y = 8\) to \(y = 12\) (where \(y = 8\) represents the center of the jet) with a grid spacing \(h_y = 0.0666\) and then is slightly stretched until the side buffer zones. The mesh is then mirrored across the centerline of the domain. In the spanwise direction, the mesh is also uniform with \(h_z = 0.0666\). This mesh is thus almost uniform and homogeneous in all the directions with a grid spacing \(h = 0.0666\). This accuracy has been found to be satisfactory and the results compare well with the experimental results.

C. Description of the LES

For the LES, a \(61 \times 105 \times 16\) computational grid (Figs. 1–2) has been constructed with a domain size equal to that of the DNS. The mesh has approximately a factor of 22 fewer points than the DNS grid. We have tried to keep the grid as uniform as possible in the LES. In the \(x\) direction, the grid is relatively fine between 0 and 1 with \(h_x = 0.1\) in order to have adequate numerical resolution of the inflow region. Between \(x = 2\) and \(x = 12\) the grid is uniform with a grid spacing \(h_x\).
=0.25 and a short transition zone between \( x = 1 \) and \( x = 2 \). In the \( y \) direction, the grid is relatively fine between \( y = 7 \) and \( y = 9 \) with \( h_y = 0.06666 \) in order to resolve the initial shear layer and then a slight stretching is used until the side buffer zone. In the \( z \)-direction the grid is uniform with \( h_z = 0.25 \).

A computation was attempted on the LES grid without any LES model. This computation was unstable which confirms the necessity of a LES model.

Subsequently, the Smagorinsky, the dynamic Smagorinsky, and the dynamic mixed models are tested. Three filter sizes are also tested: \( \Delta = h \), \( \Delta = 2h \) and \( \Delta = 4h \), where \( h \) is the local grid spacing.

For the dynamic mixed model, it is found necessary to introduce a small damping coefficient with magnitude between 0 and 1 that multiplies the similarity part of the model in the initial region \( 0 < x < 1 \). If this damping is not present, the numerical viscosity produced by the Smagorinsky part is not strong enough to stabilize the computation. The similarity part is then fully active downstream of \( x = 1 \).

### D. Deardorff correction

In order to compare the turbulent intensities obtained in the LES with corresponding DNS results we have the choice to either filter the DNS results on the coarse grid as proposed in Vreman et al., or to take into account the energy of the modeled subgrid scales to correct the LES solution for the turbulent intensities. The second solution is preferred because it involves a factor of \( \frac{h}{C_s} \). The Deardorff correction is thus applied to the fluctuations of the velocity:

\[
\text{rms}(u) = \text{rms}(u) + 2/3 (\nu / C_s \Delta)^2,
\]

where \( C_s = 0.1 \). The effect of this correction is to slightly increase the turbulent intensities calculated from LES.

### E. Influence of the filter size

Different filter sizes are now tested and compared in order to determine the optimal choice. For the filter size \( \Delta = 4h \) only, the spanwise size of the domain is increased in the \( z \)-direction because the 16 nodes available in the previous mesh leads to problems during the numerical implementation of the ‘test’ filter in the dynamic procedure. The mesh is kept unchanged in the \( x \) and \( y \) directions. The dimensions of the new computational domain are \( L_x = 12 \), \( L_y = 15 \), and \( L_z = 8 \), while the number of grid points is \( 61 \times 105 \times 32 \).

The downstream evolution of the jet half-width for the different filter sizes is presented in Fig. 3 for the dynamic Smagorinsky model. When the filter size increases, the growth rate of the jet decreases. The downstream evolution of the centerline fluctuation intensity \( u_{rms} \) for the different filter sizes are presented in Fig. 4. The results show significant deterioration when the filter size is chosen to be \( \Delta = 4h \) as indicated by substantial underprediction of the turbulence intensity. The next figures present the dynamic constant (Fig. 5) and the subgrid viscosity (Fig. 6) obtained at one section \( (x = 10d) \) for the different filter sizes with the dynamic Smagorinsky model. It can be seen that, when the filter size increases, the value of the constant slightly decreases. However, the subgrid viscosity increases with filter size because it involves a factor of \( \Delta^2 \). This increase in subgrid viscosity with filter size is larger than it should be since, as shown in Fig. 3, the jet growth rate is diminished with respect to experimental results for \( \Delta = 4h \). Although results are presented here for only the dynamic Smagorinsky model, the preceding remarks are also true for the dynamic mixed model.
In the following, only the results produced with a filter size of $2\Delta$ are presented. This size has been chosen because the importance of the subgrid stress in the balance of the momentum equations is higher than for the filter size of $\Delta$ without deterioration of the results.

F. Influence of the nonuniformity of the grid

In the $x$ and $z$ directions, the grid is uniform except for a slight stretching between $1<x<2$. But in the $y$ direction, to resolve the initial shear layer instabilities, the grid is as fine as the DNS grid in the center of the jet ($7<y<9$) and then a slight stretching is used until the buffer zone. The nonuniformity of the grid requires the use of filters with a variable filter width. The use of such filters invalidates the standard derivation of the basic equations for the filtered fields since the filtering operation, in general, does not commute with the operation of differentiation. This problem has been studied by several authors (Ghosal and Moin, Geurts, Vasilyev et al.) and additional terms in the LES equations or modified filters have been proposed.

In our computation, where the stretching is small, we try to estimate the error due to the noncommutativity of the filtering operation with the differentiation using a formula proposed by Ghosal and Moin:

$$\frac{d\bar{\phi}}{dx} = \frac{d\phi}{dx} - \alpha \left( \frac{h'}{h} \right) \frac{d^2\phi}{dx^2} + O(ke)^4$$

with

$$\alpha = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \xi^2 G(\xi) d\xi,$$

where $G$ represents the filter function, which is in our case the “top-hat” filter. The error is first computed on the averaged profile of the longitudinal velocity at the section $x = 10d$ and then on an instantaneous profile at the same section. In Fig. 7, the error for the longitudinal velocity at the section $x = 10d$ is presented. The gradients of the averaged and instantaneous longitudinal velocity are also plotted in Fig. 8 to compare with the error term.

As expected, the error is larger on the instantaneous field than on the mean field. In the center of the jet, the error is equal to zero because the mesh is uniform. The region of stretching begins at the border of the jet but the error though nonzero is very small. The local extrema, even in the instantaneous error, are less than 0.2% of the corresponding values of the velocity derivative.

G. Separation between modeling and numerical errors

Large eddy simulations are performed on grids that are just fine enough to resolve the important large-scale flow structures and numerical discretization errors on such grids can have considerable effects on the simulation results. This problem has been recently discussed in the
literature—Vreman,38 Salvetti and Beaux,39 Kravchenko and Moin.40 The difference between LES and DNS is referred to as the total error. It is the sum of two terms: a modeling error arising from the subgrid model and the discretization error caused by the numerical method. A method to separate those two errors has been proposed by Vreman38 based on the expectation that the discretization error in the LES decreases when the resolution is increased with the filter width kept constant.

A new LES is then performed on a finer grid keeping the same filter width. The grid step has been divided by two in the $x$ and $z$ directions. In the $y$ direction, the same grid step is kept because in the center of the jet, it is as fine as the DNS grid.

The difference between those two LES represents the effects of the numerical error:

$$ err_{\text{num}} = err_{\text{LES}} - err_{\text{fine grid LES}} $$

(29)

and the differences between the fine grid LES and the DNS represents the modeling error:

$$ err_{\text{mod}} = err_{\text{fine grid LES}} - err_{\text{DNS}} $$

(30)

Figure 9 shows the effects of those two errors on the evolution of the jet half-width. The discretization error is generally smaller than the modeling error. The modeling error associated with the Smagorinsky model is much larger than that produced by the dynamic Smagorinsky model indicating the superiority of the dynamic procedure. The discretization error and the modeling error have opposite signs which implies that the discretization error assists the subgrid model and that the total error is then smaller than the modeling error. This observation suggests that, for this example, grid refinement may not necessarily give rise to smaller total errors. Nevertheless, both modeling and discretization errors are small with the dynamic Smagorinsky model. Interestingly, Vreman38 also observed opposite signs of numerical and modeling errors in the temporally-evolving mixing layer.

H. Computational results

1. Evolution of the mean flow

The profiles of the longitudinal velocity obtained with the dynamic Smagorinsky model (Fig. 10) and with the dynamic mixed model (Fig. 11) are first presented. Similarity coordinates are used with the transverse $y$ direction normalized by the local jet half-width $d_{0.5}$ and the jet velocity difference with respect to the small co-flow normalized by its value at the centerline, $\Delta U_c$.

The longitudinal mean velocity profile at the inflow is flat and then, for $x>6$, develops rapidly to self-preserving profiles. We can see that for $x=2$ the self-preserving profiles are not yet established and that for $x>8$ the agreement with the experimental results is good for both models.

Similarity profiles of the transverse velocity (not shown here) for the dynamic Smagorinsky model and for the dy-
dynamic mixed model are compared with experimental results. The overall agreement with the experimental data is also good.

The downstream evolution of the jet half-width (Fig. 12) and the centerline velocity excess (Fig. 13) are now presented together with the DNS results. The experimental data from Thomas and Chu for a jet with Re_d=8300 and from Browne et al. for a jet with Re_d=7620 are also plotted. The excessive dissipation of the standard Smagorinsky model is confirmed and the evolution of the jet half-width and center-line velocity excess are severely unpredicted by this model. The two other models both give reasonable results compared with the DNS and experimental results. From the poor prediction of the Smagorinsky model, it is clear that the dynamic approach is required when it is applied to the jet.

When self-similar, the planar jet grows linearly, d_{0.5} \propto x, while the jet velocity excess \Delta U_c = U_c - U_2 decreases as \Delta U_c \propto x^{-1/2}. Note that the jet velocity \Delta U_j \gg \Delta U_c, the coflow velocity, so that jetlike behavior is expected without the wakelike evolution expected for large coflow velocities. Figure 12 shows the evolution of the jet half-width while Fig. 13 shows the evolution of the inverse square of the jet velocity excess; both should show linear evolution if self-similar conditions are achieved. The self-similar behavior of the jet half-width can be fitted to \delta_{0.5} = K_1 d(x/d + K_2).

The DNS evolution in the region 7 \leq x/h \leq 12 is well-described by a linear curve with K_1 = 0.094 and K_2 = 0.904. The dynamic Smagorinsky model gives K_1 = 0.094 and K_2 = 1.38 while the dynamic mixed model gives K_1 = 0.106 and K_2 = 0.4. The LES and DNS results are consistent with experimental data where the growth rate d\delta_{0.5}/dx = K_1 is found to vary between 0.1 and 0.11. The jet velocity in the self-similar region can be described as, \Delta U_j^2 = C_1 \Delta U_c^2(x/d + C_2), where \Delta U_c(x) is the jet velocity excess that decreases with x while \Delta U_j is the constant inflow jet velocity excess. The DNS results give C_1 = 0.208 and C_2 = -0.577 while the LES results give C_1 = 0.19 and C_2 = 0.89 with the dynamic Smagorinsky model, while C_1 = 0.22 and C_2 = 0.18 with the dynamic mixed model.
2. Comparison of the subgrid stress tensor

A few instantaneous DNS fields have been filtered on the LES grid, averaged in the spanwise direction, and then ensemble averaged to get an estimate of the Reynolds average $q_{ij}$ of the subgrid stress tensor defined by Eq. (11). The most important component is the subgrid shear stress, $q_{xy}$ (obtained by $z$ direction averaging and time averaging), which is compared with the DNS estimate in Fig. 14. The components $q_{xz}$ and $q_{yz}$ are negligible.

The dynamic mixed model compares much better with the DNS results than the dynamic Smagorinsky model. The Smagorinsky model is known to have a lower correlation level with the subgrid stress tensor than the similarity model and this finding is confirmed by the present results. The dynamic mixed model predictions of the diagonal components $q_{xx}$, $q_{yy}$, $q_{zz}$ are also in good agreement with the DNS results.

The $q_{xy}$ component of the Reynolds stress is decomposed into its Smagorinsky part and its Bardina part for the dynamic mixed model (Fig. 15). It can be seen that the contribution of the Bardina part is much larger than that of the Smagorinsky part. Also, the Smagorinsky part in the mixed model is similar in magnitude to the dynamic Smagorinsky model.

3. Balance of the momentum equation

To see the importance of the subgrid scale term compared to the other terms, the balance of the momentum equation is presented for the dynamic Smagorinsky model and for the dynamic mixed model.

The filtered momentum equation, Eq. (7), can be Reynolds averaged by averaging in the $z$-direction and time in the jet so that:

$$\partial_j(\langle p \rangle (\hat{u}_i \langle \hat{u}_j \rangle) + \partial_j(R_{ij}) + \partial_j(\langle q \rangle) - \frac{1}{Re} \partial_j(\hat{\tau}_{ij}) + \partial_j(q_{ij}) = 0,$$

where $\langle \rangle$ denotes Reynolds averaging. The terms on the left hand side represent mean convection, the resolved turbulent stress, the pressure gradient, the viscous stress, and the subgrid stress, respectively. Note that the resolved stress $\langle R_{ij} \rangle = \langle \hat{p} \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j \rangle$ represents the stress associated with the turbulent part of the resolved velocity field while $\langle q_{ij} \rangle$ represents the SGS stress associated with the unresolved, modeled part of the fluctuations. The contribution of these terms to the balance of mean streamwise momentum, $\langle p \rangle (\hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j)$, is shown in Figs. 16 and 17. The dominant balance is between mean convection and the transverse gradient of the resolved Reynolds shear stress $\partial_z(R_{12})$.

The contribution of the subgrid term is much larger in the case of the dynamic mixed model than in the case of the dynamic Smagorinsky model and increases with the filter size. However, the sum of the resolved stress term and the subgrid stress term is approximately the same (Fig. 18) for the two models which explains why the LES predictions of...
the mean flow evolution in Figs. 12–13 are similar despite the much better agreement of the mixed model subgrid stress with DNS. Thus, even though the subgrid shear stress in the dynamic Smagorinsky model is far too small relative to the exact value (see Fig. 14), the large resolved stress compensates for the small subgrid term in computations with the dynamic Smagorinsky model.

4. Comparison of the turbulence intensities

The downstream evolution of the longitudinal centerline fluctuation intensities is presented in Fig. 19. The experimental results of Browne et al.6 and Thomas and Chu5 are also shown. The fluctuating quantities, consistent with experimental studies, develop much slower toward self-preserving profiles than the mean flow. The streamwise rms value increases slowly before $x = 2.5d$ and then increases rapidly to reach the similarity values after $x = 10d$. The excessive dissipation of the Smagorinsky model is again shown by the unrealistically small values of the streamwise turbulence intensity. This model will not be discussed further in the following plots. The two other models give the same results until $x = 5d$, then the dynamic Smagorinsky model predicts higher values.

The fluctuation intensity profiles $u_{rms}$ (Fig. 20) are compared with experimental data and DNS. The section $x = 11d$ is chosen because it is the region where self-similarity in the fluctuating quantities begins and is far from the outflow boundary. The overall agreement with the DNS and the experimental results is good. The dynamic Smagorinsky model prediction is perhaps slightly closer to the DNS prediction.

5. Key properties of the SGS models

The downstream evolution of the dynamic constant (Fig. 21) and the subgrid dissipation (Fig. 22) are first presented for the dynamic Smagorinsky model. The dynamic constant
is very small in the shear layer near the inflow, increases rapidly, and after \( x = 6 \) does not vary much with streamwise distance. The evolution of the subgrid dissipation is similar. It is very small near the inflow due to the small value of the constant and, after an initial transient, varies gradually in the streamwise direction. In the transverse direction, the Smagorinsky coefficient and subgrid dissipation increase from the centerline value, reach a peak, and then decay in the free-stream. These remarks on the evolution of the dynamic constant and the SGS dissipation are true for both dynamic models.

The dynamic constant (Fig. 23), the subgrid dissipation (Fig. 24), and the subgrid viscosity (Fig. 25) obtained for the different models at one section \( (x = 10d) \) are compared. The dynamic constant levels are similar between the dynamic Smagorinsky model and the dynamic mixed model with the same filter size. The level of the Smagorinsky constant \( C_d = C_s^2 = 0.017 \) is also plotted. It is higher than the constant predicted with the dynamic model with a filter size of \( \Delta = 2h \). However, \( C_d = C_s^2 = 0.017 \) is smaller than the values (not shown here) obtained with the dynamic models and a filter size of \( \Delta = h \). The baseline Smagorinsky model has no mechanism to adjust the constant level to the filter size. Moreover, the magnitude of the eddy-viscosity coefficient predicted by the dynamic model near the inflow is much smaller than its value in the fully developed region.

The subgrid dissipation is higher for the dynamic mixed model due to the contribution of the scale-similarity part. The eddy-viscosity contribution is similar for both the dynamic mixed and dynamic Smagorinsky models. For the dynamic mixed model, the two parts of the subgrid dissipation, the Smagorinsky part and the similarity part, are of the same order.

Concerning the subgrid viscosity, the difference between the dynamic Smagorinsky results and the dynamic mixed results is very small which is a consequence of the same level of the constant. The subgrid viscosity produced by the
Smagorinsky model without the dynamic procedure is much higher.

6. Temporal auto-spectrum

The auto-spectrum in time of the centerline longitudinal velocity fluctuation is shown in Fig. 26 for the dynamic mixed model. The spectrum develops rapidly from its initial form at $x = 2d$. Further downstream, the spectral shape for large frequencies ($f \delta_{0.5}/\Delta U > 0.3$) appear to collapse well while significant differences remain at lower frequencies. Large-scale coherent structures have been observed in experiments at the Strouhal number $St = f \delta_{0.5}/\Delta U = 0.11$. Although there is significant energy at $St = 0.11$ as shown in Fig. 26, a dominant discrete peak is not observed for the turbulent jet simulated here.

7. Isocontours of vorticity

Instantaneous isocontours of spanwise vorticity are now presented in an $xy$-plane. The contours of the $z$-component of vorticity obtained by the dynamic Smagorinsky model (Fig. 28) and the dynamic mixed model (Fig. 29) are presented and compared with the DNS contours (Fig. 27).

For $x < 5d$, the largest Kelvin–Helmholtz rollers of the two mixing layers at the jet edge appear clearly. These mixing layers develop symmetrically and start breaking down into small scales. After $x = 5d$, the two mixing layers merge, a rapid breakdown of the large structures with a growth of the small structures occurs, and the development of the jet becomes asymmetric. The instantaneous large-scale structures of the jet in the LES compares well with the DNS results. Although the LES qualitatively captures the large-scale structures in the DNS, the small-scale features are absent as would be expected.

V. HIGH REYNOLDS NUMBER COMPUTATIONS

A higher Reynolds number jet is now considered. The Reynolds number is set to $Re_d = 30,000$ corresponding to the experiment of Gutmark and Wygnanski.\(^7\) A strong influence of the Reynolds number is, however, not observed in experimental data for jets developing from turbulent initial conditions.

The length of the computational domain is also increased so as to capture a larger extent of the jet development. Consequently, the height of the computational domain is also increased to account for the expansion of the jet. The dimensions of the new domain are: $L_x = 20$, $L_y = 32$, and $L_z = 6$. These dimensions do not include the buffer zone. For $y < 12d$, we have tried to keep the grid as close to the preceding grid as possible. The new grid has $93 \times 137 \times 16$ points. No DNS results are available because the Reynolds number is too high to resolve all scales of motion. The LES results are now compared with experimental results.
A. Evolution of the mean flow

The downstream evolution of the jet half-width is first presented for the two models together with experimental results (Fig. 30). For $x < 12$, the results are similar to those obtained on the preceding grid for the lower Reynolds number. Note that both the low and high Reynolds number simulations jets have turbulent inflow conditions. The coefficients of the linear curve fit to the jet half-width evolution are $K_1 = 0.094$ and $K_2 = 1.66$ for the dynamic Smagorinsky model and $K_1 = 0.091$, $K_2 = 1.97$ for the dynamic mixed model. The values of the growth rate $K_1$ are in good agreement with the values obtained in experiments.

B. Comparison of the turbulence intensities

Profiles of streamwise fluctuation intensity, $v_{rms}$, at a single section ($x = 19h$) are plotted in Fig. 31 and compared with the experimental data of Gutmark and Wygnanski\textsuperscript{7} and Ramaprian and Chandrasekhar\textsuperscript{3} The agreement with experimental results is good although the difference between the two models is larger at this section. Similar to the lower Reynolds number computations, the maximum of the fluctuation intensity for the dynamic mixed model is somewhat smaller than the dynamic Smagorinsky model. Profiles at various streamwise locations are then presented (Fig. 32) and it can be seen that, after $x = 14d$, the profiles approach self-similarity.

C. Key properties of the SGS model

The dynamic constant (Fig. 33) and the subgrid dissipation (Fig. 34) obtained by the two models are plotted and compared at the section ($x = 19d$). The dynamic constant obtained with the two models remains the same and is slightly smaller than the constant at the section $x = 8d$ in the simulation of the lower Reynolds number jet.

The subgrid dissipation compared to the molecular dissipation is much higher here than for the low Reynolds number case due to the decrease in the molecular dissipation. The dissipation produced by the dynamic mixed model remains higher than the Smagorinsky model due to the scale-similarity part.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper a posteriori tests of LES in the case of a spatially developing jet have been presented. The computa-
tion starts from the initial region of the jet with broadband inflow disturbances and captures its natural development from a turbulent inflow. Three different subgrid stress models are compared: the standard Smagorinsky model, the dynamic Smagorinsky model, and the dynamic mixed model. Different filter sizes corresponding to $\Delta = h$, $\Delta = 2h$, and $\Delta = 4h$ are also tested. A series of simulations at a low Reynolds number $Re_d = 3000$ is performed to enable comparisons with DNS data. Then the Reynolds number is increased and simulations are performed at a high Reynolds number, $Re_d = 30000$, more typical of engineering applications.

The quality of the LES model is determined by comparison with previous DNS\textsuperscript{18} and experiments.\textsuperscript{2–7} Computations performed on the LES grid without the LES model show numerical instability which confirms the necessity of a subgrid stress model. Comparison of different filter sizes shows that the filter size $\Delta = h$ and $\Delta = 2h$ give similar good results, while, with the filter size $\Delta = 4h$, the results are poorer. Subsequent results are presented and compared with a filter size $\Delta = 2h$. Moreover, this filter size has been suggested by Vreman et al.\textsuperscript{21} in the case of high-order finite difference simulations.

Predictions of the three models (standard Smagorinsky, dynamic Smagorinsky, and dynamic mixed) are compared. The standard Smagorinsky model is used with a coefficient $C_s = 0.13$ which, although lower than the value for isotropic turbulence, has been found to be better suited to shear flows. Even so, it is found that the subgrid dissipation given by the standard Smagorinsky model during the initial evolution of the jet is excessively high resulting in substantial underprediction of the jet width. It is clear that, when the Smagorinsky model is used, a dynamic procedure is required to predict the growth rate of the jet as well as its turbulence intensities. Concerning the overall prediction of the mean field and the Reynolds stress, the two other models are both in good agreement with experimental and DNS results. The evolution of the jet growth rate and the centerline velocity excess compares well and self-similarity profiles are obtained. The growth of the turbulence intensities is also relatively well predicted. The evolution and comparison of some quantities such as the dynamic constant, the subgrid viscosity, and the subgrid dissipation are also presented. There is substantial variation of the dynamic Smagorinsky coefficient across the jet and during the initial streamwise evolution. The subgrid dissipation associated with the dynamic mixed model is larger than that given by the dynamic Smagorinsky model.

From previous a priori tests, the dynamic mixed model is known to provide a much better representation of the subgrid stress tensor and that is confirmed by our a posteriori simulations. On the other hand, the dynamic Smagorinsky model severely underpredicts the magnitude of the subgrid shear stress but, surprisingly, provides satisfactory overall results concerning the mean flow. It is of interest to determine why LES with the dynamic Smagorinsky model is equally successful as the dynamic mixed model despite the poor prediction of the subgrid stress. After examination of the mean momentum balance, it is found that the sum of the resolved and subgrid shear stress is similar with both models, thus explaining their similar performance.

The second series of LES considers a jet at a much higher Reynolds number, $Re_d = 30000$, in a larger computational domain. No DNS results are available for comparison since the Reynolds number is too high to accurately resolve all the scales, but experimental results are available. Compared to the lower Reynolds number, $Re_d = 3000$ computations, no strong differences in the results appear which is consistent with the experimental data in jets starting with turbulent inflow conditions. The downstream evolution of the mean flow compares well with experimental data and similarity profiles are obtained for the intensities of velocity fluctuations. The subgrid dissipation compared to the molecular dissipation is much higher than that in the low Reynolds number case.
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