Multi-fidelity uncertainty quantification using RANS and DNS
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Multi-fidelity uncertainty quantification using RANS and DNS for turbulent flow is explored. The objective is to achieve statistical results of higher quality than obtainable through RANS simulation but with significantly lower cost than by using DNS. The novelty of this work is that previous research on multi-fidelity modeling for uncertainty quantification in CFD has only investigated the use of partially converged or coarser mesh solutions as lower-fidelity models. This ensured a high correlation and low bias between the two models. A multi-fidelity solution combining RANS and DNS is potentially more beneficial but also more difficult to achieve. The use of two models with such large conceptual differences makes the correlation between the models more challenging. We therefore investigate two recent methods for model combination: a multi-grid approach of nested optimal Gaussian sparse grids and weighted regression favoring high-fidelity collocation points. The results show that a beneficial connection between the two models is indeed difficult, because the correlation between the responses is overall low. However, there are quantities for which the correlation is high enough and others for which a sufficiently high correlation can be achieved using trust-region correction methods.

1. Introduction

Real-world engineering systems are always affected by a range of uncertainties. In this work, we focus on geometrical variation that is caused by manufacturing errors, assembling inaccuracy, or in-service degradation. Various authors have shown that the impact of small geometrical profile variations can become disproportionately large under turbulent conditions. For example, Schnell et al. (2014) found that manufacturing errors reduce compressor efficiency on average by 2%. The effect of random geometric variations on the final product can be quantified before manufacturing using CFD. Such robust design methods make possible the production of more efficient blades and airfoils. One problem with this approach is, however, that the reliability of CFD predictions for geometrically changing geometries is difficult to validate. While various authors have performed uncertainty quantification (UQ) for geometric uncertainty using RANS simulations already, it remains difficult to evaluate to what degree their statistical predictions were affected by modeling errors. The problem is that even the most efficient propagation of aleatory uncertainty (parameter uncertainty, like geometric profile variations) becomes meaningless if epistemic uncertainty (model-form uncertainty) is too large. Dow & Wang (2011) therefore calibrate the RANS simulation using an adjoint method to efficiently solve an inverse problem from DNS data.

In this research, the RANS model is not calibrated. Instead, we compare statistics propagated using RANS simulations with statistics from nine DNS simulations. Then, we investigate how DNS and RANS can be combined into a multi-fidelity framework. In
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Figure 1. (a) Computational domain. (b) Parametric random variation of domain.

In this way, we provide the first insight into how model-form errors of RANS simulations affect the shape of probability distributions under turbulent flow conditions, although be it at a Reynolds number much too low to be of industrial importance. The low Reynolds number is unavoidable, however, to obtain a sufficiently high number of DNS simulations to perform uncertainty quantification.

As test case we consider flow over periodically arranged hills at a Reynolds number of 700 (Figure 1(a)), as described for example in Marquillie et al. (2008). This scenario is chosen because a highly reliable experimental and computational database is available, see, for instance, Breuer et al. (2009). The flow separates from the curved surface of the hill, recirculates in its downstream side and reattaches at the flat channel bottom. Although this is a simple scenario, lower-fidelity CFD methods still struggle with predicting the point of reattachment. Important for this work is that the shape of the curved surface strongly affects the reattachment position. Hence, large model-form uncertainty can be expected from RANS simulations if geometrical uncertainty is present. We introduce geometric uncertainty by parametrizing the hill shape with two parameters: the hill height \( h \) and the hill skewness \( s \) as shown in Figure 1(b). The mean height is chosen at 75\% of the reference case and the hill shape is skewed by asymmetrically stretching and compressing the upstream and downstream sides of the hill. For example, \( s = 0.3 \) means that the upstream part of the hill is stretched by a factor of 1.3, whereas the downstream side is compressed by a factor of 0.7. The two normal distributions \( N(\mu, \sigma^2) \) for the height and skewness are defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
h & \sim N(0.75, 0.25^2) \\
\quad s & \sim N(0, 0.3^2).
\end{align*}
\]

Much of the research done in UQ focuses on more efficient uncertainty propagation methods. Due to the use of DNS, we also require an efficient uncertainty propagation framework to keep the number of model runs at a minimum. We therefore use polynomial chaos methods to expand the system response into a series of orthogonal polynomials, which are optimally determined from the input probability density functions (PDFs) of the stochastic geometry parameters. For a small number of random parameters and a smooth model response this results into a convergence speedup of the statistical quantities that is several orders of magnitudes faster than using Monte Carlo sampling. To avoid interfering with the DNS and RANS codes, we use only non-intrusive methods, in which the projection of the model response is approximated through numerical integration (quadrature), as described by Ng & Eldred (2012), or determined through linear regression (point collocation), as detailed by Palar et al. (2016).

Within the efficient framework of polynomial chaos expansions we investigate multifidelity approaches combining RANS with DNS to compute the output statistics with the accuracy of DNS but at lower computational cost. DNS is chosen because it provides the highest fidelity possible in CFD. RANS is chosen because it is much cheaper and the
current standard in the industry. The concept of exploiting multiple levels of fidelity has only recently entered the field of UQ. Giles (2008) proposed to speedup the solution of stochastic partial differential equations using multi-level Monte Carlo sampling. Following this work, Ng & Willcox (2014) implemented a multi-level Monte Carlo method for engineering models. Within the field of polynomial chaos, two authors recently developed new methods: Ng & Eldred (2012) developed an approach using different levels of sparse grids and Palar et al. (2016) developed an approach using a multi-level point collocation. Slight variations of the methods by Ng & Eldred and Palar et al. are employed in this work for multi-level RANS and DNS combinations. Unlike Ng & Willcox (2014) we use sparse grids based on optimal Gaussian quadrature points, which are generally not nested. However, a nested approach was developed by the authors in a previous work, see Ahlfeld et al. (2016). We reuse the optimal Gaussian collocation points for the second approach of weighted linear regression, where we assign higher priority to them. The weights are derived from the model correlation coefficient $R^2$ introduced by Palar et al. (2016).

2. Numerical modeling and flow parameters

The governing equations are the forced incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} = -\nabla p - \frac{1}{2} \left[ \nabla (\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}) + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} \right] + \nu \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{f}$$

(2.1)

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,$$

(2.2)

where $p(x,t)$ is the pressure field (for a fluid with a constant density $\rho = 1$), $\mathbf{u}$ the velocity field and $\nu$ the kinematic viscosity of the fluid. The high-fidelity 3D simulations presented in this study and shown in Figure 2 were performed for a computational domain $9h \times 3.036h \times 4.5h$, where $h$ is the height of the hill, discretized on a Cartesian mesh with $512 \times 257 \times 128$ mesh nodes. The mesh is slightly refined in the $y$ direction near the walls. The spatial resolution is as good as the ones found in previous numerical studies for the same Reynolds number. The time step is equal to $0.0005h/U_b$, where $U_b$ is the bulk velocity. For all calculations, turbulent statistical data have been collected on a time period $T = 150h/U_b$, with a spatial average in the span-wise direction in order to reach a statistical convergence. The coordinate system is orthonormal, with coordinate $x$ in the streamwise direction, $y$ in the vertical direction and $z$ in the span-wise direction. The boundary conditions are of periodic type in the streamwise and span-wise directions and zero-velocity type in the vertical direction. The initial condition for the velocity field is a Poiseuille profile $1 - (y/h)^2$, where $h$ is half the height of the channel. First, the simulations are launched without any hill in order to get a fully developed flow. In order to drive the flow, a pressure gradient is adjusted dynamically at each time step to maintain a constant mass flow rate through the channel. In our setup, the reference mass flow rate is computed from the Poiseuille profile and is equal to

$$\dot{m} = \rho \frac{1}{2h} \int_{-h}^{h} 1 - \left( \frac{y}{h} \right)^2 \, dy.$$

(2.3)

In our setup we get $\dot{m} = 2/3$ as $\rho = 1$ and $h = 1$. This parameter is kept constant for all the simulations. Then the hill is introduced into the computational domain and the data are collected only after a transitional period when the flow is fully developed again.

ANSYS Fluent is used for the 2D RANS simulations, as suggested by Iaccarino (2001). The SST $k-\omega$ turbulence model developed by Menter et al. (2003) is chosen because of
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Figure 2. Instantaneous DNS visualization of the vorticity modulus (for $|\mathbf{W}| = 5U_c/h$) colored by the streamwise velocity. (a) side view (b) angles view of domain.

its suitability for separated flows. The mesh is constructed from curvilinear blocks with 192 $\times$ 120 nodes as illustrated in Figure 1(b). This high resolution is necessary for an accurate comparison of the bubble height and length scale with DNS; otherwise, the same configurations are used as in DNS.

2.1. Numerical method for DNS

In this work, we use a customized immersed boundary method, which is based on a forcing field $f(x,t)$ in order to take into account the 2D hill inside the computational domain. Note that the convective terms are written in skew-symmetric form. This form reduces aliasing errors while remaining energy conserving for the type of spatial discretization considered here. To solve the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, we use the high-order flow solver Incompact3D, which is based on sixth-order compact schemes for spatial discretization on a Cartesian mesh and a third-order Adams-Bashforth scheme for time advancement. To treat the incompressibility condition, a fractional step method is used to solve a Poisson equation. For efficiency reasons, this equation is solved in spectral space using appropriate 3D fast fourier transforms (FFT). In order to have a strict equivalence between finite-difference operators in physical space and spectral operators, we use the concept of modified wave number introduced by Lele (1992), which reduces the accuracy of the spectral operators to sixth-order accuracy. Note that the divergence free condition is ensured up to machine accuracy. The pressure mesh is staggered from the velocity mesh by half a mesh to avoid spurious pressure oscillations. The modeling of the hill is performed with a customized immersed boundary Method based on a direct forcing approach that ensures a zero-velocity boundary condition at the wall of the hill. More details about the present code and its validation, especially the original treatment of the pressure in spectral space, can be found in Laizet & Lamballais (2009). Because of the size of the simulations, the parallel version of Incompact3d has been used for this numerical work. Based on a highly scalable 2D decomposition library and a distributed FFT interface, it is possible to use it on thousands of computational cores. More details about this efficient parallel strategy can be found in Laizet & Li (2011).

3. Polynomial chaos expansions

The concept of polynomial chaos is to expand a stochastic model output $f(\tilde{\xi})$, dependent on a vector of $d$ independent stochastic input random variables $\tilde{\xi} = \xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_d$ with event space $\Omega$ as a linear combination of $N_P$ stochastic multivariate orthogonal
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polynomials \( \Psi_i(\xi) \) and deterministic coefficients \( \alpha_i \),

\[
f(\xi) \approx \sum_{i=0}^{N_P} \alpha_i (x) \psi_i (\xi).
\] (3.1)

In case a full tensor product is used, the number of linear combination terms \( N_P \) for a polynomial expansion of order \( p \) is truncated to \( N_P = \frac{(d+p)!}{d!p!} \). The multivariate orthogonal polynomials \( \Psi_k \) are calculated as products of univariate orthogonal or orthonormal polynomials \( \psi_k \)

\[
\Psi_k(\xi) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} \psi^{(i)}(\xi_i), \quad k \in \overline{1,N_P},
\] (3.2)

and for them holds

\[
\int_{\xi \in \Omega} \psi_k(\xi) \psi_l(\xi) w(\xi) d\xi = \delta_{kl} \quad \forall k,l = 0, \ldots, N.
\] (3.3)

To achieve exponential convergence, the \( \psi_k \) should be chosen as orthogonal polynomials belonging to the optimal Gaussian quadrature rule corresponding to the individual input random variables. For example, the Hermite polynomials are optimal orthogonal for the normal distribution and are used in this work. The polynomial chaos coefficients can then be obtained by computing

\[
\alpha_k = \frac{\langle f(\xi), \psi_k(\xi) \rangle_w}{\langle \psi_k(\xi), \psi_k(\xi) \rangle_w}.
\] (3.4)

In this work, we use optimal Gaussian numerical quadrature based on sparse grids and weighted linear regression in the sparse grid collocation points. The latter choice of collocation points is referred to as probabilistic collocation and was successfully applied by Loeven et al. (2008) to investigate geometric airfoil uncertainty.

3.1. Nested optimal Gaussian sparse grids

The details of the nested Gaussian sparse quadrature formulation can be found in Ahlfeld et al. (2016), and the method to combine multiple grids to obtain polynomial chaos coefficients is described in Ng \\& Eldred (2012). Unlike Ng \\& Eldred (2012), we use sparse grids based on optimal Gaussian quadrature points, which are generally not nested. However, a nested approach was developed by Ahlfeld et al. (2016). Following this work, the sparse quadrature is calculated using an adaptive and anisotropic version of Smolyak's rule

\[
A(d + l, d) = \sum_{\substack{|i|+1 \leq \xi \leq \xi_d \leq \xi_{d+l} \leq \xi \leq \xi_d \leq \xi}} (l - 1)^{|i|+d-|i|} \left( \frac{d - 1}{l + d - |i|} \right) \otimes_{k=1}^{d} U^{i k},
\] (3.5)

where \( \{U^{ij}\}_{j=1, \ldots, d} \) are \( d \) sequences of one-dimensional quadrature rules, \( l \) is the level and the term \( |i| \) is the sum of a row of the index matrix \( I_{d+l,d} \). The operator \( S_{q,d} \) is introduced to describe a sparse quadrature approximation of the \( d \)-dimensional polynomial chaos expansion, as described in Eq. (3.5), where \( q = d + l \) is used to shorten the notation. The multi-grid combination between RANS and DNS is set up by evaluating the RANS model response \( f^{RANS} \) more frequently on a higher-order grid of level \( q \), whereas the DNS response \( f^{DNS} \) is evaluated less frequently on a lower-level grid of reduced level \( q - r \). The sparse quadratures are defined as

\[
f^{RANS}(\xi) \approx S_{q,d} [f^{RANS}(\xi)] \quad f^{DNS}(\xi) \approx S_{q-r,d} [f^{DNS}(\xi)],
\] (3.6)
where the lower-order grid is a subset of the higher-level grid, that is, \( S_{q-r,d} \subset S_{q,d} \).

In this framework, the DNS response can be approximated through the multi-fidelity approximation

\[
\tilde{f}_{DNS}(\bar{\xi}) \approx S_{q,d}[f_{RANS}(\bar{\xi})] + S_{q-r,d}[f_{DNS}(\bar{\xi}) - f_{RANS}(\bar{\xi})].
\]

(3.7)

Figure 3(a) illustrates this concept, where the DNS points are obtained from a level 1 grid and the RANS points from a level three grid. The DNS points are also contained in the RANS grid, but only influence the first three polynomial chaos coefficients. In the form of polynomial chaos expansions, the multi-fidelity correction becomes

\[
S_{q,d}[f_{RANS}(\bar{\xi})] = \sum_{i \in I_{q,d}} \alpha_{RANS,i} \psi_i(\bar{\xi}) \quad \quad \quad \quad S_{q-r,d}[C(\bar{\xi})] = \sum_{i \in I_{q-r,d}} \alpha_{C,i} \psi_i(\bar{\xi}),
\]

(3.8)

where \( C \) represents the correction function introduced in Eq. (3.7). The polynomial chaos multi-fidelity approximation of \( f_{DNS} \) then becomes

\[
\tilde{f}_{DNS}(\bar{\xi}) \approx \sum_{i \in I_{q,d}} (\alpha_{RANS,i} + \alpha_{C,i}) \psi_i(\bar{\xi}) + \sum_{i \in I_{q,d} \setminus I_{q-r,d}} \alpha_{RANS,i} \psi_i(\bar{\xi}).
\]

(3.9)

3.2. Weighted regression (point collocation) polynomial chaos

The concept of point-collocation non-intrusive polynomial chaos is to obtain the polynomial chaos coefficients by solving a linear system of equations

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\psi_1(\xi_1) & \cdots & \psi_1(\xi_d) \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\psi_{N_p}(\xi_1) & \cdots & \psi_{N_p}(\xi_d)
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_0 \\
\vdots \\
\alpha_{N_p}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
f(\bar{\xi}_0) \\
\vdots \\
f(\bar{\xi}_{N_p})
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(3.10)

The full details of this point collocation approach are described in Palar et al. (2016). Reasonable accuracy can be achieved if this system is oversampled and a linear regression approach is used to find \( \hat{\alpha} = \arg\min \left[ \hat{\alpha}^T \Psi(\bar{\xi}) - f(\bar{\xi}) \right]^2 \). Unlike Palar et al. (2016) we do not use quasi-random samples. To keep the computational costs low, we reuse the DNS collocation points. More details about such a probabilistic collocation approach can be found in Loeven et al. (2008). In addition, we introduce a weighted linear regression to
solve for the polynomial coefficients
\[
\hat{\alpha} = (\Psi^T w \Psi)^{-1} \Psi^T w \bar{Y}.
\] (3.11)

The weights are derived from the model correlation coefficient \(R^2\) shown in Eq. (4.1) that Palar et al. (2016) introduce. DNS measurements receive weight 1 and RANS measurements receive the calculated correlation coefficient as weight. Hence, higher priority is assigned to RANS if it captures the DNS trend well. In the limiting case that it captures the trend perfectly, both models receive the same weight.

### 4. Results of RANS/DNS multi-fidelity modeling

In order to achieve computational cost reductions using a multi-fidelity approach, the lower-fidelity model has to capture the general trends observed in the higher-fidelity model. To measure the correlation between RANS and DNS for quantities of interest, we use the \(R^2\) correlation, as suggested by Palar et al. (2016), to quantify the trend compatibility
\[
R^2 = \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( y_i^{[H]} - \bar{y}^{[H]} \right) \left( y_i^{[L]} - \bar{y}^{[L]} \right)}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( y_i^{[H]} - \bar{y}^{[H]} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( y_i^{[L]} - \bar{y}^{[L]} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}} \right]^2
\] (4.1)

and the mean absolute relative error \(|M|_{rel}\)
\[
|M|_{rel} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{|y_i^{[H]} - y_i^{[L]}|}{\bar{y}^{[H]}}
\] (4.2)

to quantify the offset between the two models. The results for various quantities of interest with regard to the size and length of the separation bubble are summarized in Table 1. In the comparison of probability distributions that follows, the DNS distributions are always computed by performing a Monte Carlo simulation on a linear interpolation between the DNS points. This is done to keep response surface shape assumptions at a minimum.

Since the bubble height shows a very high correlation between the two models, we apply the sparse multi-grid approach to it. The high correlation allows us to treat the RANS samples like DNS solutions within the trust region spanned by the DNS points. Therefore, the additional samples can be used to create a more accurate probability distribution. Figure 4 shows that the multi-fidelity grid combines the smoothness of the RANS PDF with the slightly more accurate trends contributed by the DNS. The maximum horizontal backflow velocity is found inside the bubble at the specified probe location \(x/h=2\). It
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Figure 4. (a) 81 RANS points. (b) Sampled linear interpolation of 9 DNS points. (c) Combined multi-grid of 24 RANS and 5 DNS points.

Figure 5. (a) 81 RANS points. (b) Sampled linear interpolation of 9 DNS points (c) Weighted regression of 81 RANS and 3 DNS points.

Figure 6. (a) 81 RANS points. (b) Sampled linear interpolation of 9 DNS points. (c) Weighted regression of 81 RANS and 3 DNS points.

is a good indicator of the overall strength of the separation bubble. Unfortunately, the correlation between the two model responses is fairly low at approximately 0.61. Nevertheless, a comparison of the response surfaces in all nine points in Figure 7(a) shows that the RANS follows the DNS trend reasonably well. To combine the models we use weighted regression, as it is the more efficient and more general approach. In addition, we use a linear plane as a correction function

\[
C(\xi_1, \xi_2) = f_{DNS}(\bar{\xi}) - f_{RANS}(\bar{\xi}) = C_0 + C_1\xi_1 + C_2\xi_2 
\]  

(4.3)

to correct the RANS response surface. The idea is that three DNS are the absolute minimum number to define a correction plane. When they are chosen at the corners, they span the full stochastic space and create a large trust region. Thus, only three DNS simulations are needed to significantly correct the distribution shape. The RANS weights for the regression are chosen equal to 0.61 and the DNS weights as 1. Figure 5 shows that the RANS PDF is incorrectly skewed to the left and its variance is too low. The
multi-fidelity PDF resembles the pure DNS PDF more closely and is also smoother due to the additional RANS collocation points.

For the reattachment point, the models show a reasonably high correlation of approximately 0.85. However, the RANS response surface in Figure 7(b) shows a sharp bend in the response surface. This is caused by the fact that the kω-SST model overpredicts the position of the reattachment location. As the investigated geometric uncertainty is large with respect to the domain size, the bubble growth is impeded by the next hill. This creates a in the RANS response surface a sharp bend that is not present in the DNS simulations. This defect materializes itself in the PDF of the multi-fidelity solution in Figure 6(c) in form of an incorrect skewness, even though mean and variance values are improved.

5. Conclusions

We investigated the possibility of using multi-fidelity uncertainty quantification combining RANS and DNS for turbulent flows. Due to the large conceptual differences of these models, we tested two methods for combination: a multi-grid approach of nested optimal Gaussian sparse grids and a weighted regression favoring high-fidelity collocation points. As a test case, we investigated flow over periodic hills with geometrically uncertain hill height and skewness. RANS simulations are known to struggle with predicting the size and length of the separation bubble for this case. Hence, we focused the uncertainty quantification on proxies of the size and position of the bubble. We found that, in general, the connection between RANS and DNS is low and a direct connection between the models using multi-fidelity approaches is difficult. Moreover, pure RANS methods can lead to significantly incorrect PDF shapes. This was shown using the example of the distribution of the reattachment point location. However, a beneficial connection between the two models can be achieved for specific parameters by using correlation and correction functions. Further investigation of correction and combination, which should be conducted at a higher Reynolds number, is a promising opportunity for further research.
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