





Introduction to the Collaborative Testing Challenge

C. L. Rumsey

NASA Langley Research Center



Copyright 2022 United States Government as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. No copyright is claimed in the United States under Title 17, U.S. Code. All Other Rights Reserved. Published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. with permission.

Motivation

- Traditional RANS is known to be inadequate for reliable prediction of separated and other “difficult” flows
- Much work is ongoing in the research community to attempt to improve RANS models using data-driven techniques
 - By their very nature, these improvements are typically only applicable to cases that are very similar to those they were trained for
 - We seek improved turbulence models that can be used more generally and confidently in predictive situations <- this is ultimately what is needed
 - (Imagine trying to apply the model to a high-lift aircraft configuration!)
- Our own attempts to achieve a broadly-applicable model enhancement using FIML methodology (AIAA 2022-0937):
 - **Unsuccessful**
 - Improving one flow inevitably made some other flow much worse
 - Inappropriate or inadequate feature selection?
 - Insufficient coverage of the training data? (a common complaint)




Motivation, cont'd

- The “Collaborative Testing Challenge” was conceived as an integral part of this symposium
 - Get broad range of experts to try to achieve data-driven turbulence models that work well for a broad range of simple test cases
 - Nonthreatening, noncompetitive, friendly environment
 - We know this is a difficult challenge!
 - There is no right answer
 - We seek to encourage discussion, ideas, future collaborations
- Ground Rules: Each participant to apply their best turbulence model scheme (framework) derived from a data-driven (or other) approach to a range of flows specified by the conference organizers



Test Cases

- To be a valid entry, the same turbulence model must be applied to each of the following cases (use the same grids employed for the results shown on the Turbulence Modeling Resource (TMR) website if possible):
 - **2DZP**: 2D Zero Pressure Gradient Flat Plate Validation Case
 - Show (1) C_f vs. x and (2) u^+ vs. $\log(y^+)$ at $x=0.97$; compare with theory
 - **2DFDC**: 2D Fully-Developed Channel Flow at High Reynolds Number Validation Case
 - Show u^+ vs. $\log(y^+)$ at $x=500$; compare with theory
 - **ASJ**: Axisymmetric Subsonic Jet
 - Show (1) u/U_{jet} vs. x/D_{jet} , (2) u/U_{jet} vs. y/D_{jet} at 5 specified stations, and (3) $u'v'/(U_{jet}^2)$ vs. y/D_{jet} at 5 specified stations; compare with experiment
 - **2DWMH**: 2D NASA Wall-Mounted Hump Separated Flow Validation Case
 - Show (1) C_p vs. x/c , (2) C_f vs. x/c , (3) u/U_{inf} vs. y/c at 7 specified stations, and (4) $u'v'/(U_{inf}^2)$ vs. y/c at 7 specified stations; compare with experiment
 - **2DN00**: 2D NACA 0012 Airfoil Validation Cases (4 separate cases)
 - Angles of attack = 10, 15, 17, and 18 deg.
 - Show (1) C_L vs. α , (2) C_D vs. C_L , (3) C_p vs. x/c , and (4) C_f (upper surface) vs. x/c ; compare with experiment (except for C_f)





2DZP








2DFDC








ASJ



2DWMH







2DN00






Our Personal Experience Along These Lines

- Our personal experience with somewhat different cases (AIAA 2022-0937) :
 - Neural Network (NN) training done on 4 simple cases (simultaneously):
 - ZPG-APG plate
 - ZPG plate
 - NASA hump
 - NACA 0012 at one AoA






- Then...

... applied to wide variety of flows NOT in the training



Worse than standard SA in 4 out of the 6 cases tested!



X Worse
✓ Better
— Wash

Challenge Participants (as of 07/13/2022)

- **Yuan Fang** (University of Melbourne)
- **Yuanwei Bin and Jiaqi Li** (Penn State University)
- **Soufiane Cherroud** (Arts et Metiers Paristech)
- **Richard Dwight** (TU Delft)
- **Eric Parish** (Sandia National Labs)
- **Michael Stoellinger** (University of Wyoming)
- **Venkat Viswanathan** (Carnegie Mellon University)
- **Koushik Marepally** (University of Maryland)

What's Next for the Challenge part of Symposium

- 8 talks total
 - 5 of them are combination “symposium talks” + “challenge method/results” (1/2 hr each)
 - 3 of them are solely on “challenge method/results” (15 min each)
- 1 hour general discussion about the Challenge at the end

Questions to ask/think about

- If the usual machine learning techniques were used, what cases were used in the training? (all? some?)
- How “good” were the results compared to each theory/experiment?
- Were the results “better”/”similar”/”worse” than existing traditional RANS turbulence models (e.g., SA, SST, SSGLRR-RSM)?
- What would happen if the trained model were used on a completely different TMR case?
- Could others implement this model in their RANS codes?
- Does the model consist of codable equations, or is it a NN or black box?