New approaches for efficient computation of low Mach number unsteady flows with sound propagation
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Abstract: This paper deals with the new method to compute very low mach number flow and sound propagation at same time. The new method is shown effective both steady and unsteady flows.
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1 Introduction
In some applications, such as combustion in liquid rocket engine combustor, sound in unsteady low Mach number flow plays significant role. The authors recently proposed all speed numerical flux function, named SLAU[1], that can compute from very low (<0.1) to high (>10) flows accurately without parameter adjustment. It has been shown it can compute low Mach number flows and sound at the same time by explicit time integration. This paper deals with new efficient implicit time integration methods for SLAU in low Mach number regime.

2 Formutation
The three point backward Euler method for finite volume method for Navier-Stokes equation in delta form forms linear system as follows introducing the entropy variable W as working variables.

\[ \frac{1}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{V_i} \sum_j S_{i,j} \left( \frac{D}{2} + \tilde{\mu} \right) \Delta W_j = -M_i H_i^i \]

where \( M \) is the transformation matrix from conservative to entropy variabel and \( H \) contains explicit residual and difference between inner iterations when Newton method is considered. By this transformation, Jacobian \( B \) is simplified. Our effort will be concentrated on solving this linear system. For computational efficiency, implicit numerical dissipation \( D \) is assumed to have diagonal form as;

\[ D = \text{diag}[d_p, d_u, d_s, d_u, d_s] \]

where \( d_p, d_u, d_s \) are the dissipations for pressure, velocity and entropy. Approximate form of the dissipation corresponds to that of SLAU can be written as follows with the consideration for avoiding zero dissipation at stagnation;

\[ d_p = \|V_u\|^2 c \quad d_u = \|V_u\|^2 c(1 - \chi')c \quad d_s = \|V_u\|^2 (1 - \tilde{M})^2 \quad \tilde{M} = \min \left( 1.0, \sqrt{\frac{u^2 + v^2 + w^2}{c^2} + Mc^2} \right) \]

where \( V_u, c \) and \( Mc \) are convective velocity normal to cell face, speed of sound and cutoff Mach number. This set of implicit numerical dissipations does not make positive definite numerical Jacobians which is necessary for use of SGS. Thus this matrix system has to be solved by modern algorithm such as GMRES. FGRMRES\( k \)[3], where \( k \) is the dimension of Krylov subspace, is used in this study. On the other hand, following modification ensures positive definiteness;

\[ d_p = \|V_u\|^2 c \quad d_u = d_u = \|V_u\|^2 (1 - \chi')c \]

The SGS iteration using these dissipations is named as TC-PGS(Time Consistent Preconditioned GS)1, because it can be shown that it has close relation with low Mach number preconditioning of Weiss&Smith.[2] TC-PGS1 is also used as the matrix pre-conditioner for FGMRES.
3 Results

Numerical experiments, such as computations of unsteady separated flow around a cylinder, showed that:

- Rather small $k$ of FGMRES gave good overall efficiency and FGMRES(4) is chosen.
- FGMRES(4) and TC-PGS1 showed comparable efficiency, when only fluid motion is of interest. Also both have similar performance to time derivative preconditioning for steady flows.

As an example of sound propagation, 1D pressure propagation with $Mc=0.01$, which is suitable for low Mach number flows, is computed by TC-PGS1 and FGMRES(4) with various Newton iterations. Cases are shown in Table 1, and results of FGMRES(4) and TC-PGS1 are shown in Fig.1. For acceptable accuracy, FGMRES(4) is over 10 times more efficient than TC-PGS1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>Non-linear Iteration</th>
<th>Relative CPU Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCPGS 1</td>
<td>TCPGS1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPGS 2</td>
<td>TCPGS1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPGS 3</td>
<td>TCPGS1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>33.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPGS 4</td>
<td>TCPGS1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGMRES 1</td>
<td>FGMRES(4,1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGMRES 2</td>
<td>FGMRES(4,1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGMRES 3</td>
<td>FGMRES(4,1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pressure distribution in one dimensional sound propagation. Results by FGMRES(4.1) in the left(a) and by TC-PGS1 in the right(b).](image)

3 Conclusion

Two methods for unsteady compressible flow in low Mach number was shown. TC-PGS1 is essentially a implicit time integration with low Mach number preconditioning in simple form, and also FGMRES using TC-PGS1 as a matrix pre-conditioner is shown. When only flow dynamics is in interest, simpler TC-PGS1 which is simpler and has comparable performance to FGMRES will be beneficial. When sound is computed at the same time, FGMRES is over 10 times more efficient.
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