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1. Motivation and objectives

The need for LES wall models comes from the strict near-wall-resolution requirements of a wall-resolved LES (Chapman 1979; Choi & Moin 2012), the limited computational power and the need for high-fidelity numerical solutions in real-world engineering practices. Conducting large-eddy simulations (LES) implies the use of LES filters, whose sizes are commensurate with the local LES grid spacing. For wall-modeled LES (WMLES), where the grid spacing in the wall-normal direction scales with the boundary layer height, the near-wall turbulence is not resolved and is filtered. Because of this filtering, the no-slip condition does not apply at the wall; and the wall boundary conditions are supplied by LES wall models.

In general, wall models for a WMLES can be of Dirichlet, Neumann or Robin type (see Piomelli & Balaras (2002) for a review of commonly used LES wall models). A Dirichlet-type wall model provides a slip velocity $u_w$ at the (virtual) wall (Bazilevs & Hughes 2007; Chung & Pullin 2009). With the slip velocity and a non-vanishing eddy viscosity at the (virtual) wall, the calculation of the shear stress at the wall is no different from that in the bulk region. Neumann-type models directly provide the wall shear stress. The velocity at the wall is not explicitly modeled. This type of model is probably the most intuitive and most commonly used in WMLES. Neumann-type models include the algebraic equilibrium wall models (Schumann 1975; Porté-Agel et al. 2000), the algebraic integral wall model (Yang et al. 2015), the equilibrium and non-equilibrium zonal wall models (Balaras & Benocci 1994; Park & Moin 2014) and a number of models that rely on optimal control and data mining (Nicoud et al. 2001; Templeton et al. 2006). Recently, Bose & Moin (2014) proposed to use a Robin-type wall closure

$$u_i - l_p \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial y} = 0,$$

(1.1)

where $u_i$ is a non-zero slip velocity at the wall, the subscript $i = 1, 2, 3$ denotes the streamwise, wall-normal and spanwise directions, respectively and $l_p$ is a length scale. As was rigorously proved in Bose & Moin (2014), the slip-wall formalism conforms with the use of the differential filter in LES (see Bose & Moin (2014) for a discussion on the differential filter). It is not clear, however, how the physics is captured by the slip-wall model.

In this work, we provide a physics-based interpretation of this slip-wall closure. We show first that the Robin-type wall closure in Eq. (1.1) is compatible with any LES filter, and second that the slip-wall model formalism can also be motivated physically with RANS-type equilibrium arguments. The possibility of explicitly accounting for the non-equilibrium effects is briefly discussed. The model performance is then compared with that of the algebraic wall model and the integral wall model in the context of turbulent channel flows. In addition to the mean flow and the variance, we compare the probability density function (PDF) of the wall shear stress in the WMLES with that
from a filtered direct numerical simulation (DNS). Throughout the article we use \( x, y, z \) for the streamwise, wall-normal, and spanwise directions and \( u, v, w \) for the streamwise, wall-normal and spanwise velocities.

2. A physics-based interpretation of the slip-wall model

The Robin-type LES wall closure takes the following form

\[
\left[ u - l_p \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right]_{y=0} = 0. \tag{2.1}
\]

In this section, we provide a physics-based interpretation of this LES wall closure. We begin with the log law

\[
\frac{\langle u \rangle}{u_\tau} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left( \frac{y}{y_o} \right), \tag{2.2}
\]

where \( \kappa \) is the Karman constant, \( y_o \) is the viscous/roughness length scale, \( u_\tau \) is the friction velocity and \( \langle \cdot \rangle \) denotes ensemble averaging. The algebraic equilibrium wall model imposes this log scaling locally and instantaneously. Imposing the log scaling at the first (or second, third, etc, depending on the implementation (Kawai & Larsson 2012)) grid point away from the wall leads to

\[
u_T \frac{\partial u_{\text{LES}}}{\partial y} = u_\tau^2, \tag{2.4}\]

where \( u_{\text{LES}} \) is the LES velocity, \( \Delta_y \) is distance of the LES grid point from the wall. Imposing the log law instantaneously, the non-equilibrium effects are neglected as a consequence, resulting

\[
u_T \frac{\partial u_{\text{LES}}}{\partial y} = u_\tau^2, \tag{2.4}\]

where \( \nu_T \) is the eddy viscosity. Substituting Eq. (2.3) with Eq. (2.4), we have

\[
u_T \frac{\partial u_{\text{LES}}}{\partial y} = 0. \tag{2.5}\]

Equation (2.5) conforms with the form of a Robin boundary condition and we have

\[
l_p = \frac{\ln(\Delta_y/y_o) \nu_T}{\kappa u_\tau}. \tag{2.6}\]

For a typical WMLES, in which the first LES grid point is in the log region, invoking the mixing length model for the eddy viscosity,

\[
\nu_T = \kappa \Delta_y u_\tau, \tag{2.7}\]

Eq. (2.6) leads to

\[
l_p = \Delta_y \log(\Delta_y/y_o). \tag{2.8}\]

Equations (2.5)-(2.6) physically justify the use of a Robin-type condition in a typical WMLES.
3. The slip-wall model

3.1. Equilibrium slip-wall model

The interpretation in Section 2 can be tested in a WMLES context. To do that we impose

\[ u - l_p \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = 0, \quad w - l_p \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} = 0, \quad v = 0 \]  

(3.1)

at the wall with \( l_p \) from Eq. (2.8) and \( \nu_T = \kappa u_T \Delta y \). This Robin-type wall model imposes a non-penetration condition, therefore, the momentum loss at the wall is entirely due to \( \nu_T \partial u / \partial y \). This is quite different from Bose & Moin (2014), in which a penetration condition is used and part of the momentum loss is due to a non-zero Reynolds stress at the wall. As discussed before, this work provides a physical basis for the Robin-type boundary condition in general, so we do not necessarily need to conform with the exact form used in Bose & Moin (2014).

3.2. Accounting for non-equilibrium effects

The discussion in Section 2 was based on equilibrium considerations. The non-equilibrium effects can be explicitly accounted for by including explicitly a non-equilibrium correction to the modeled wall shear stress according to

\[ \tau_{w,x}^{NE} = \tau_{w,x}^E + \tau_{w,x}^c. \]  

(3.2)

The subscript \( x \) denotes the stress in the \( x \) direction. The superscript \( E \) denotes equilibrium and \( NE \) denotes non-equilibrium. The wall stress in the spanwise direction can be corrected in the same manner. Following Yang et al. (2015), the non-equilibrium correction \( \tau_{w,x}^c \) is

\[ \tau_{w,x}^c = r \left[ \int_{y=0}^{\Delta y} - \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} - \frac{du}{dt} \frac{dy}{\Delta y} \right], \]  

(3.3)

where \( d \cdot /dt \) is the material derivative, \( p \) is the dynamic pressure, the pre-factor \( r \) matches the time scale of the resolved eddies (of scale \( \Delta y \)) and the time scale of the filtered wall shear stress. Following Yang et al. (2015), we take

\[ r = \frac{T_c}{T_w}, \]  

(3.4)

where \( T_c = \Delta y / u_{LES} \) is the convective time scale, \( T_w = \Delta y / (\kappa u_T) \) is the time scale for the disturbance at \( y = \Delta y \) to reach \( y = 0 \). Because of the use of LES filters, the LES flow field is resolved by the grids. Hence, \( u \approx u_w + (u_{LES} - u_w) y / \Delta y, p \approx p_w + (p_{LES} - p_w) y / \Delta y \) for \( 0 < y < \Delta y \); besides, because \( \Delta y \) does not depend on \( t, x, y, z \), the temporal and spatial derivatives can be taken out of the integral. The integration in Eq. (3.3) is trivial. This is rather different from Yang et al. (2015). In Yang et al. (2015), the LES filter did not act on the wall-normal direction and the subgrid flow field needed to be reconstructed. As a result, integrating the filtered momentum equation is quite non-trivial for Yang et al. (2015).

In this work, Eq. (3.3) is only used to supplement the slip-wall model (see Section 4), but it is potentially applicable to any equilibrium-type wall model, including the commonly used algebraic equilibrium wall model and the zonal equilibrium wall model. Testing such corrected models is beyond the scope of this work and is left to future investigations.
4. Wall-modeled LES

We present WMLES results in this section. The code used here is the open-source LES code LESGO (publically available on github). Details of this pseudo-spectral code can be found in Bou-Zeid et al. (2005) and Anderson & Meneveau (2011). The SGS model used in this study is the dynamic scale-dependent Lagrangian Smagorinsky model (Bou-Zeid et al. 2005). The WMLES results are found to be fairly insensitive to the sub-grid stress (SGS) model such as the dynamic Smagorinsky model (Germano et al. 1991), the dynamic Lagrangian Smagorinsky model (Meneveau et al. 1996) and the dynamic scale-dependent Lagrangian Smagorinsky model. These findings for the equilibrium wall model are presented in Figure 1 for the equilibrium wall model. Results for the algebraic integral wall model and the non-penetrating slip-wall model are similar and are not shown. For brevity, we present only the dynamic scale-dependent Lagrangian Smagorinsky model results. We compare the performance of four LES wall models, the algebraic equilibrium wall model (Moeng 1984), the integral wall model (Yang et al. 2015), the equilibrium slip-wall model (Eq. (3.1)) and the non-equilibrium slip-wall model (Eq. (3.2)). Both the algebraic equilibrium model and the integral wall model are readily available in the code. For equilibrium-type wall models, additional $x-z$ filtering is applied at $y = \Delta_y$ (see Moeng (1984) for a detailed discussion on the necessity of this additional filtering). We conduct this additional filtering for the algebraic wall models and the two Robin-type wall models.

4.1. LES setup

The flow configuration is a half-channel. We impose a constant pressure gradient. The friction velocity $u_\tau$ is known from $u_\tau = \sqrt{-1/\rho \partial \langle p \rangle / \partial x}$, where $\rho$ is the fluid density. A symmetric boundary condition is used on the top boundary. Spanwise and streamwise periodicities are imposed. The computational domain is of size $2\pi \times 1 \times 2\pi$ in the $x$, $y$, $z$ directions, respectively. The half-channel height is 1. To study the effects of grid resolution, we use two mesh sizes, $64^3$ and $128^3$. Uniform grid spacing is used in all directions. As will be clear from the following discussion, both the computational domain size and the grid size are reasonably large for the purpose of this work, although early LES studies by Stevens et al. (2014) suggested a domain size of $6\pi \times 1 \times 3\pi$ and a mesh size of $2048 \times 256 \times 1024$ for a faithful prediction of the variance.
Figure 2. (a) Mean velocity profiles plotted against the wall-normal distance. $\delta$ is the half-channel height. The log-law corresponds to $U/u_\tau = 1/\kappa \log(yu_\tau/\nu) + B$, with $\kappa = 0.4$. $B = 5$. Equil is the algebraic equilibrium wall model, Integral is the integral wall model, E-Slip-Wall is the equilibrium slip-wall model, NE-Slip-Wall is the non-equilibrium slip-wall closure and f-DNS is the filtered DNS. (b) Same as (a) but for the streamwise variance.

The flow is at a Reynolds number $Re_\tau = 4200$, where $Re_\tau = \delta u_\tau/\nu$ is the friction Reynolds number. A full-channel DNS database at this Reynolds number is publicly available (Lozano-Durán & Jiménez 2014). The viscous length scale in the wall model is $y_o = \nu/u_\tau \exp(-\kappa B)$, where $B = 5$, $\kappa = 0.4$.

4.2. Effects of wall models

In Figure 2(a), we plot the LES velocity profiles against the wall-normal distance on a semi-log scale. For all the LES in Figure 2, we have used a grid of size $128^3$. Both the equilibrium and non-equilibrium slip-wall models lead to slightly elevated mean velocity profiles. For various types of wall-bounded flows such as channel flows, pipe flows, boundary layers, etc., the mean profiles in the log region generally follow the log law closely; however, for the bulk region, the wake function (Coles 1956) depends quite a lot on the flow configuration (Marusic et al. (2013)). Hence, here we prefer to compare the LES results with the log law. As is seen from Figure 2, reasonable agreement with the log law is found for all wall models.

In Figure 2(b), we plot the variance of the streamwise velocity fluctuations against the wall-normal distance. At high Reynolds number, the variance follows a logarithmic scaling in the log region. At this Reynolds number ($Re_\tau = 4200$), one can barely find a log region in the variance. The DNS results are therefore included for comparison. LES solves the filtered Navier-Stokes (NS) equation. For a fair comparison, $\langle u'^2 \rangle$ for the filtered DNS (coarse-grain DNS $\Delta x^+ \times \Delta y^+ \times \Delta z^+ \approx 200 \times 32.8 \times 200$) is included as well. In the near-wall region, $\langle u'^2 \rangle$ in WMLES is fairly comparable with the DNS data. The filtered DNS is less energetic. The DNS results and the filtered DNS results are quite similar in the bulk region. Differences between models can nevertheless be discerned. The results of Robin-type wall models align closely with the filtered DNS results. The integral wall model results, on the other hand, agree with the DNS data.

From Figure 2, we conclude first that the physics-based interpretation in Section 2 is reasonable and second that Robin-type models are generally an alternative to the Neumann-type models for LES wall closure.
4.3. Effects of grid resolution

For the two grid resolutions investigated, i.e., grid sizes of $64^3, 128^3$ for a domain size of $2\pi \times 1 \times 2\pi$, we find no difference in the mean velocity. Results of the mean flow are therefore not shown for brevity. In figure 3(a–c), we plot the variance of the streamwise fluctuations against the wall-normal distance for the algebraic equilibrium wall model, the integral wall model and the equilibrium slip-wall model, respectively. With sufficient grid resolution (in this case, with a grid size of $128^3$), the results are fairly insensitive to the choice of the wall models, but with a coarse grid (in this case, $64^3$), the wall model makes a difference. The expected grid convergence for the variance is from $y = \delta$ to the wall. That is to say, as we refine the mesh, we expect that the variance in the bulk region converges first to the DNS result and then the log region. This is because for $\langle u'^2 \rangle$ at $y$, only eddies with their characteristic length scales larger than $O(y)$ are statistically significant (see Townsend (1976); Woodcock & Marusic (2015); Yang et al. (2016a,b) for detailed discussion). This is seen for the integral wall model and the equilibrium slip-wall model, but not for the algebraic equilibrium wall model, suggesting that for a coarse-grid WMLES the integral wall model and the slip-wall model have an edge over the algebraic equilibrium wall model.

4.4. Probability density function of the streamwise wall shear stress

In Figure 4, we plot the instantaneous wall shear stress from the filtered DNS and the WMLES. Although the streaky pattern exists independent of the wall closure used, the spatial distribution of the fluctuating wall stress depends very much on the choice of wall models.

In Figure 5 we compare the wall stress PDF. The PDF from the LES using the integral wall model is in near agreement with the wall stress PDF in the filtered DNS. This is not entirely unexpected considering the success of the integral wall model in the a priori test in Graham et al. (2016). Compared to the filtered DNS, the wall stress PDF resulting from the equilibrium wall model is slightly less peaked and the wall stress PDF resulting from the equilibrium slip-wall model is slightly more peaked. This is because for equilibrium wall model $\tau_{w,x} \sim u'^2 \sim u_{LES}^2$ and for the slip-wall model $\tau_{w,x} \sim \nu_T \partial u/\partial y \sim \nu_T u_{LES} \sim u_{LES}$; the PDF of $u_{LES}^2$ is certainly less peaked than that of $u_{LES}$. Last, by including the non-equilibrium effects, the wall stress PDF moves toward that of the filtered DNS. The wall stress PDF from the DNS is included for comparison; although it is not expected with typical LES resolutions, this PDF can be reproduced.
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Figure 4. Contour plots of the normalized instantaneous streamwise wall shear stress, $\tau_{w,x}/u_r^2$, from (a) the filtered DNS (b) the LES modeled by the equilibrium wall model (c) the integral wall model and (d) the non-equilibrium slip-wall model. All LES cases are run with a grid size of $128^3$.

Figure 5. The streamwise wall stress PDF from WMLES, DNS and filtered DNS. f-DNS is filtered DNS. The other legends are the same as those in figure 2.

5. Log-layer mismatch

The log-layer mismatch refers to the mismatch between the stress from a WMLES calculation and that from a DNS calculation. Kawai & Larsson (2012) blamed LES errors at the first grid point from the wall for this mismatch and they proposed to use the second (or third, fourth) grid point away from the wall for the RANS-LES matching location. In an earlier investigation, Bou-Zeid et al. (2005) pointed out that even in the absence of LES errors, the equilibrium wall models would still lead to an over-predicted wall stress because $\langle \tau_{w,\text{LES}} \rangle \sim \langle u^2 \rangle > \langle u \rangle^2 \sim \langle \tau_w \rangle$, where $u$ is the velocity at the first grid point and is assumed to be correctly modeled, $\tau_w$ is the real wall stress. To resolve this problem, Bou-Zeid et al. (2005) proposed to conduct a $2\Delta$ filtering at the first grid
point away from the wall. Both Kawai & Larsson (2012) and Bou-Zeid et al. (2005) were able to remove the log-layer mismatch.

In this section, the issue of log-layer mismatch is further investigated and both fixes from Kawai & Larsson (2012) and Bou-Zeid et al. (2005) are tested for channel flows using the code Lesgo. It worth note that, for all previous LES, the derivatives at the first grid point were computed from the wall model in Lesgo: \( \frac{du_i}{dy} = \frac{u_\tau}{(\kappa \Delta y_1)} \times \frac{U_i}{U} \), where \( i = 1, 3 \), \( U_i \) is the LES velocity at the first grid point and \( U = \sqrt{U_1^2 + U_2^2} \). The common practice is, however, to compute those derivatives in the same way they are computed in the bulk. To conform with the common practice, we have included results from LES that use regular finite difference for the derivatives at the first grid point. The filtering used here is a 9-point top hat filtering.

In figure 6, the mean velocity profiles from various WMLES calculations are shown. All cases use a grid size of 64\(^3\). We find first that a log-layer mismatch presents for regular implementation of equilibrium wall models and the stress is under-predicted (the flow rate is over predicted), second that computing the derivatives at the first grid point using the finite difference method or using the log law makes no difference, third that both filtering and using 2nd point for the wall model remove the mismatch. It is worth noting that the log-layer mismatch here is an under-prediction of the wall shear stress, instead of an over-prediction suggested by Bou-Zeid et al. (2005). In fact, \( \langle \nu_1^2 \rangle / \langle U_1 \rangle^2 = 4.3\% \) for Nfil+FD, where there is a mismatch, and \( \langle \nu_2^2 \rangle / \langle U_2 \rangle^2 = 4.1\% \) for 2nd pt, where there is no mismatch. The subscript 1, 2 denotes 1st or 2nd grid point from the wall. Those observations cannot be explained using the arguments presented in Bou-Zeid et al. (2005), calling for further investigation of the mechanism underlying the success of the filtering technique.

### 6. Conclusions

In this work, a physics-based interpretation is provided for Robin-type LES wall closures. The slip-wall model, which is a direct consequence of using of the differential filter in LES, is not entirely incompatible with other LES filters. For a WMLES of a canonical boundary layer, physically, the non-penetrating slip-wall closure is consistent with the algebraic equilibrium wall model. WMLES results suggest that the interpretation in
Section 2 is reasonable and the Robin-type wall closure, with a properly picked length scale $l_p$, can be used as an alternative to the conventional wall models that directly supply the wall shear stress. The performance of the algebraic equilibrium wall model, the algebraic integral wall model and the Robin-type wall model is compared in the context of turbulent channel flows. With sufficiently high resolution, the mean and the variance of the streamwise velocity fluctuations do not depend crucially on the choice of LES wall models, while for coarse-grid LES, the integral wall model and the slip-wall model have an advantage over the algebraic equilibrium wall model. Correct prediction of the PDF of the wall shear stress, on the other hand, depends very much on the choice of wall models. The study here indicates that for a channel flow at the particular Reynolds number studied (Re$_\tau$ = 4200), the integral wall model provides a nearly perfect prediction for the PDF of the filtered wall stress (filtered at the corresponding LES resolution). Whether this holds for a different flow configuration, at a different Reynolds number and at a different resolution is not entirely clear and further investigations are needed. As for the slip-wall models, explicitly accounting for the non-equilibrium effects helps predict the PDF of the wall shear stress.

To conclude the discussion, we briefly discuss how the effects of sub-grid roughness can be modeled in a Robin-type LES wall closure. In the pioneering work by Bose & Moin (2014), it is assumed that there is no roughness. Because the effects of roughness are commonly modeled with a $-C_d U^2$ term in the momentum equation, accounting for sub-grid roughness is non-trivial without referring to the NS equation. In this work, as we have connected the Robin-type wall condition to the NS equation, the effects of roughness can be accounted for by adding the drag term to Eq. (2.4) or simply by using an effective roughness length $y_0$ in Eq. (2.5).
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