



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Large Scale Lattice-Boltzmann Simulations: Computational Methods and Applications

Kandhai, B.D.

Publication date
1999

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kandhai, B. D. (1999). *Large Scale Lattice-Boltzmann Simulations: Computational Methods and Applications*. [Thesis, fully internal, vg logic/info]. Universiteit van Amsterdam.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Chapter 4

Iterative Momentum Relaxation for Fast Lattice-Boltzmann Simulations

4.1 Introduction

Lattice-Boltzmann simulations are often used for studying steady-state hydrodynamics. In these simulations, however, the complete time evolution starting from some initial condition is computed due to the transient nature of the scheme. In this chapter * we present a refinement of body-force driven lattice-Boltzmann simulations that may reduce the simulation time significantly. This new technique is based on an iterative adjustment of the local body-force and is validated on three test cases, namely fluid flow around a spherical obstacle, flow in random fiber mats and flow in a static mixer reactor.

As most numerical algorithms, the standard lattice-Boltzmann scheme has its shortcomings. For instance, in a recently performed comparative study between the finite element and the lattice-Boltzmann method for simulating steady-state fluid flow in a SMRX static mixer reactor (see chapter 7), it became evident that the computational time (on a sequential machine) required by the lattice-Boltzmann method was higher than that of the finite element method for obtaining the same level of accuracy. The memory requirements on the other hand were lower for the lattice-Boltzmann simulations (details can be found in chapter 6 and Ref. [54]). It can be argued that the longer computational time of LBM is a direct consequence of the transient nature of this

*This chapter is based on the following publications:

- D. Kandhai, A. Koponen, A. Hoekstra, M. Kataja, J. Timonen, and P.M.A. Sloot, 'Implementation Aspects of 3D Lattice-BGK: Boundaries, Accuracy, and a New Fast Relaxation Method', *J. Comp. Phys.*, **150**, 482-501 (1999)
- D. Kandhai, A. Koponen, A. Hoekstra, and P.M.A. Sloot, 'Iterative Momentum Relaxation for Fast LBM Simulations' *High-Performance Computing and Networking 1999*, LNCS **1593**, Springer-Verlag, 311-319 (1999)

algorithmic scheme. In this chapter, we present a new technique, namely the Iterative Momentum Relaxation technique (IMR), which can significantly reduce the saturation time. In this technique the body force which is often used to drive a flow in lattice-Boltzmann simulations, is adjusted dynamically by calculating the average loss of momentum due to viscous forces.

We first describe the concept of the IMR technique. Next, we discuss the results obtained with the IMR technique and finally the conclusions are presented.

4.2 The Iterative Momentum Relaxation (IMR) technique

Generally, flow simulations require a consistent set of boundary conditions for the solid walls and the in- and outlets. In Lattice-Boltzmann simulations solid walls are often imposed by using the bounce-back method, while inlet and outlets can be implemented by using pressure/velocity boundaries or body-forces[34, 55]. In the case of pressure/velocity boundaries the particle densities f_i at the inlet and outlet are chosen such that they yield consistent values for the velocity or pressure. In the body-force approach, which is somewhat restricted to problems with periodic geometries, the flow is driven by adding a fixed amount of momentum along the flow direction at each lattice point. The overall effect is that a pressure gradient is imposed between the inlet and outlet. For low Reynolds number flows, it has been shown for several benchmark problems that in the stationary state the hydrodynamic behavior of both the body-force and pressure/velocity boundaries are similar[55].

According to Newton's second law, the net force acting on the fluid phase during the simulation is equal to the rate of change of the total momentum,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{P}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{T}(t), \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathbf{P}(t)$ is the total momentum, \mathbf{Q} is the total body-force and $\mathbf{T}(t)$ is the total viscous friction force due to the obstacles. In standard lattice-Boltzmann simulations the body-force is kept constant during the simulation, while the friction force depends on the velocity field and the geometry of the problem. A steady-state solution is reached when the total body force \mathbf{Q} acting on the fluid is completely cancelled by the viscous friction force \mathbf{T} due to the walls and obstacles. The main idea of the IMR technique is to reduce the saturation time by adjusting the applied body force during the iteration depending on the change of fluid momentum at the iteration step considered. For some fixed amount of iteration steps (considered as a time interval in IMR) the momentum loss is computed and used to calculate the friction force acting on the fluid during that time interval as follows,

$$\mathbf{T}(t) = \mathbf{Q}(t) - \frac{d\mathbf{P}(t)}{dt}. \quad (4.2)$$

The body-force for the next time interval is then set equal to this guess. Notice that in this formulation, the body-force is no longer constant. Moreover, this

strategy does not influence the explicit character of the Lattice-Boltzmann algorithm and thus its efficient and straightforward parallelization.

In summary, the IMR technique can be described by the following algorithm. First a flow is initialized. After every t_{step} time steps, the following iterative procedure (where k denotes the iteration counter of the IMR-loop) is repeated:

1. Calculate the momentum change $(\Delta P)_k$ of the fluid phase in the direction of the body force during the next time step.
2. Calculate the average momentum loss $T_k = Q_k - (\Delta P)_k$ (Q_k is the total body force at the iteration step k) of the fluid due to the viscous forces during this time step.
3. Choose a new body force as $Q_{k+1} = T_k$.

The new body force Q_{k+1} accelerates the fluid during t_{step} time steps before returning to step 1. The simulation is carried out until the body force Q and the total momentum reaches an acceptable degree of convergence, similar to the heuristical approach for the convergence criteria used in standard lattice-Boltzmann simulations.

4.3 Simulation results

To validate the IMR technique, we simulated 3 benchmark problems, namely fluid flow around a spherical obstacle, flow in a random fiber mat (see chapter 8) and flow in an SMRX static mixer reactor (see chapter 7). We included the last benchmark, as it is one of the very few cases of fluid flow in complex geometries with well documented results from traditional numerical methods and experimental data.

In our first benchmark the sphere radius was $a_0 = 5.5$ lattice points and the lattice dimensions were $100 \times 100 \times 100$ lattice spacings. We performed simulations at two Reynolds numbers, namely $Re = 0$ (Stokes flow) and $Re = 1$. In both cases the IMR method was extremely efficient. One percent accuracy in the velocity and pressure fields was already obtained after 5000 time steps, whereas the constant body-force method would have required 180000 time steps (data not shown).

In our second test-case we computed the permeability k (a measure for the fluid conductivity through a porous material) of a random fiber web. The permeability can be computed from the expression $k = (\phi P \nu \rho) / (m q)$ where P is the total fluid momentum in the direction of the body force, m is the total mass of the fluid, ρ is the fluid density, and q is the body-force density in the fluid phase. In Figure 4.1.a we show the time evolution of the fluid momentum in a $400 \times 400 \times 60$ lattice with a porosity of $\phi = 0.94$, when a constant body force (solid line) or the IMR method (dashed line) is used. It is evident that with the IMR method the momentum is saturated very quickly. An accuracy of 1% in the permeability




Figure 4.1: Left: the time evolution of the fluid momentum $P(t)/P(t=\infty)$ when a constant body force (solid line) or the IMR method (dashed line) is used. Right: the time evolution of the web permeability $k(t)/k(t=\infty)$ when a constant body force (solid line) or the IMR method (dashed line) is used. Permeability $k(t)$ has been computed using the body force and total fluid momentum at time step t .

(and thus also in the body force Q) is reached in 7000 time steps, while the constant body-force method requires more than 18000 time steps for reaching the same level of accuracy (see Figure 4.1.b).

Our last test-case was fluid flow in a static mixer reactor. The SMRX static mixer reactor is a technology introduced 15 – 20 years ago, which has gained more and more in popularity within the chemical industry over recent years. It is a plug-flow type reactor filled with a series of SMRX static mixer elements turned at 90 degrees with respect to each other. The mixer element consists of specially designed stationary obstacles which promotes mixing of fluid flowing through it. Its mixing mechanism relies on splitting, stretching, reordering and recombination of the incoming fluid streams. We focus on only one SMRX element. Due to usually rather complex flows and geometries, only few 3D numerical simulations of flow through static mixers were performed in the past [56]. We have taken this application as a benchmark, since it is one of the very few cases of fluid flow in complex geometries with well documented results from traditional numerical methods and experimental data.

The time evolution of the body-force and the total momentum along the flow direction for the lattice-Boltzmann simulations with a constant body-force and the IMR technique is shown in Figure 4.2. These simulations were performed for an element discretization of $56 \times 56 \times 56$ lattice points and the relaxation parameter τ was equal to 1. It is clear that the damping of the oscillatory behavior of the momentum is enhanced by the IMR technique. This is a result of the




Figure 4.2: Left: Body-force as a function of the time iteration. Right: the time evolution of the total x-momentum along the SMRX reactor for the standard LBGK algorithm and the IMR technique is shown. $\tau = 1$ and the element dimensions are $56 \times 56 \times 56$ lattice points.

feedback of the flow field on the body-force. Moreover, both approaches clearly converge to the same value for the total momentum.

The time evolution of the relative difference in the total momentum along the flow direction, $\frac{|\Delta P_x|}{|P_x|}(t)$ (ΔP_x is computed between two results of two successive IMR trials), for the standard LBGK algorithm and the IMR technique is shown in Figure 4.3. From this figure, it is evident that with the IMR method the relative difference converges faster to some level of tolerance.

In Figure 4.4 we show the relative difference in the mean velocity along the reactor (in %) for different time-steps, in the case of the standard LBGK method (on the left) and the IMR technique (on the right). As reference data we used the simulation results obtained after 1500 time-steps, as then the simulations were completely saturated in both cases. With the IMR technique 1% accuracy in the velocity and the pressure fields compared to the reference data, was already reached after 550 time steps, whereas the constant body-force method required around 1000 time steps to reach a similar accuracy. Moreover, the steady state solution of both approaches are very close to each other (data not shown). The relative difference in the mean velocity along the reactor, between the stationary state of both approaches, is smaller than 0.07% (see Figure 6.4). In Ref. [54] we have shown in detail that the results of the standard LBGK method are also in good agreement with Finite Element calculations and experimental data. Thus we can conclude that the results obtained by the IMR technique are also consistent with experimental data.




Figure 4.3: The relative difference (in %) in the total momentum along the flow direction, $\frac{|\Delta P_x|}{|P_x|}(t)$, as a function of time, for the standard LBGK algorithm and the IMR technique. $\tau = 1$ and the element dimensions are $56 \times 56 \times 56$ lattice points. In both cases the oscillatory behavior is due to a non-zero initial velocity field. In the case of the IMR technique more oscillations are present due to the iterative refinement of the body-force.

In this test case we used $t_{step} = 50$. Tests with some other values of t_{step} did not show significant improvements in the overall benefit gained by the IMR technique. Similar speedup results were also found for other Reynolds numbers provided that the flow is laminar.

4.4 Conclusions

In many lattice-Boltzmann simulations, the complete time evolution of the system is computed with a constant body force starting from some initial velocity and pressure fields. The number of time steps which is required to reach the steady state can then be very large in some cases. We presented a new technique for reducing the number of time steps that is needed to reach the steady state for body-force driven flows. This strategy does not influence the explicit character of the Lattice-Boltzmann algorithm and thus its efficient and easy parallelization. We conclude that at least in problems involving laminar flow, the IMR technique can be very efficient in decreasing the number of time steps needed to reach the steady state.




Figure 4.4: On the left the relative difference in the mean velocity (in %) of the standard LBGK method is shown for $t = 900$, $t = 950$ and $t = 1000$. On the right the relative difference in the mean velocity (in %) of the IMR technique is shown for $t = 500$, $t = 550$ and $t = 600$. In both cases the relative difference is computed with respect to the simulation result at $t = 1500$ time-steps (simulation is then completely saturated) and the mean velocity is computed at different cross-sections along the reactor. $\tau = 1$ and the element dimensions are $56 \times 56 \times 56$ lattice points. The relative error is higher at the inlet and outlet, because the mean-velocity is smaller at those locations.




Figure 4.5: The relative difference between the mean velocity obtained by the standard LBGK method and the IMR technique after 1500 time steps.



Figure 4: On the left the relative difference in the mean velocity in \mathcal{P} of the standard LBM method is shown for $\nu = 10^{-2}$ and $\tau = 100$. On the right the relative difference in the mean velocity in \mathcal{P} of the IMR method is shown for $\nu = 10^{-2}$ and $\tau = 100$. In both cases the relative difference is compared with respect to the analytical mean velocity. The time step is $\Delta t = 10^{-3}$ and the simulation box size is $50 \times 50 \times 50$ lattice points. The relative errors are higher at the first iterations because the mean velocity is smaller at these locations.

the relative error in the mean velocity is significantly smaller for the IMR method. Similar results were obtained for other values of ν and τ . We conclude that the flow is laminar.

4.4 Conclusions

In many lattice Boltzmann simulations the complex geometry of the system is approximated with a rectangular box. This approximation may lead to errors in the flow field. The numerical method used in this paper is based on the iterative momentum relaxation method. We show that this method is significantly more accurate than the standard LBM method. The relative error in the mean velocity is significantly smaller for the IMR method. Similar results were obtained for other values of ν and τ . We conclude that the flow is laminar.