

# **ANSYS Fluid Dynamics Verification Manual**



ANSYS, Inc. **Release 14.0** Southpointe **August 2011** 2011 275 Technology Drive Canonsburg, PA 15317 ANSYS, Inc. is ansysinfo@ansys.com http://www.ansys.com (T) 724-746-3304 (F) 724-514-9494



### **Copyright and Trademark Information**

© 2011 SAS IP, Inc. All rights reserved. Unauthorized use, distribution or duplication is prohibited.

ANSYS, ANSYS Workbench, Ansoft, AUTODYN, EKM, Engineering Knowledge Manager, CFX, FLUENT, HFSS and any and all ANSYS, Inc. brand, product, service and feature names, logos and slogans are registered trademarks or trademarks of ANSYS, Inc. or its subsidiaries in the United States or other countries. ICEM CFD is a trademark used by ANSYS, Inc. under license. CFX is a trademark of Sony Corporation in Japan. All other brand, product, service and feature names or trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

#### **Disclaimer Notice**

THIS ANSYS SOFTWARE PRODUCT AND PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION INCLUDE TRADE SECRETS AND ARE CONFID-ENTIAL AND PROPRIETARY PRODUCTS OF ANSYS, INC., ITS SUBSIDIARIES, OR LICENSORS. The software products and documentation are furnished by ANSYS, Inc., its subsidiaries, or affiliates under a software license agreement that contains provisions concerning non-disclosure, copying, length and nature of use, compliance with exporting laws, warranties, disclaimers, limitations of liability, and remedies, and other provisions. The software products and documentation may be used, disclosed, transferred, or copied only in accordance with the terms and conditions of that software license agreement.

ANSYS, Inc. is certified to ISO 9001:2008.

#### **U.S. Government Rights**

For U.S. Government users, except as specifically granted by the ANSYS, Inc. software license agreement, the use, duplication, or disclosure by the United States Government is subject to restrictions stated in the ANSYS, Inc. software license agreement and FAR 12.212 (for non-DOD licenses).

#### **Third-Party Software**

See the legal information in the product help files for the complete Legal Notice for ANSYS proprietary software and third-party software. If you are unable to access the Legal Notice, please contact ANSYS, Inc.

Published in the U.S.A.

## **Table of Contents**





<span id="page-4-0"></span>**Verification Test Case Descriptions**

## <span id="page-6-0"></span>**Chapter 1: Introduction**

The Verification Manual presents a collection of test cases that demonstrate a representative set of the capabilities of the **ANSYS Fluid Dynamics** product suite. The primary purpose of this manual is to demonstrate a wide range of capabilities in straightforward problems which have "classical" or readilyobtainable theoretical solutions and in some cases have experimental data for comparison. The close agreement of the **ANSYS** solutions to the theoretical or experimental results in this manual is intended to provide user confidence in the **ANSYS** solutions. These problems may then serve as the basis for additional validation and qualification of ANSYS capabilities by the user for specific applications that may be of interest.

The **ANSYS** software suite is continuously being verified by the developers (ANSYS, Inc.) as new capabilities are added to the programs. Verification of **ANSYS** products is conducted in accordance with written procedures that form a part of an overall Quality Assurance program at ANSYS, Inc. This manual represents a small subset of the Quality Assurance test case library which is used in full when testing new versions of **ANSYS FLUENT** and **ANSYS CFX**. This test library and the test cases in this manual represent comparisons of **ANSYS** solutions with known theoretical solutions, experimental results, or other independently calculated solutions. Since **ANSYS FLUENT** and **ANSYS CFX**are programs capable of solving very complicated practical engineering problems having no closed-form theoretical solutions, the relatively simple problems solved in this manual do not illustrate the full capability of these **ANSYS** programs.

<span id="page-6-1"></span>In order to solve some test cases will require different product licenses; **ANSYS CFD**, **ANSYS FLUENT** or **ANSYS CFX**. If you do not have the appropriate licenses, you may not be able to reproduce the results.

## **1.1. Expected Results**

The test cases in this manual have been modeled to give reasonably accurate comparisons with a low number of elements and iterations. In some cases, even fewer elements and/or iterations will still yield an acceptable accuracy. The test cases employ a balance between accuracy and solution time. An attempt has been made to present a test case and results that are grid independent. If test results are not grid independent, it is due to the need to limit the run time for the test to be in the manual. Improved results can be obtained in some cases by refining the mesh but requires longer solution times.

The ANSYS solutions in this manual are compared with solutions or experimental data from textbooks or technical publications. In some cases, the target (theoretical) answers reported in this manual may differ from those shown in the reference. In several fluid flow simulation problems where experimental results are available in the form of plots of the relevant parameters, the simulation results are also presented as plots so that the corresponding values can be compared on the same graph.

Many of the fluid dynamics simulation methods have to make use of data available from experimental measurements for their verification primarily because closed form theoretical solutions are not available for modeling the related phenomena. In this manual several test cases for **ANSYS FLUENT** and **ANSYS CFX** make use of experimental data published in reputed journals or conference proceedings for verification of the computational results. The experimental measurements for fluid flow systems are often presented in the form of plots of the relevant parameters. Hence the published experimental data for

those cases and the corresponding simulation results are presented in graphical format to facilitate comparison.

Experimental data represent the "real world" physics reproduced in a controlled manner and provides more complex details of the flow field than theoretical solutions. The test cases in this manual have been modeled to give reasonably accurate comparisons with experimental data wherever applicable, with a low number of elements and iterations.

Different computers and operating systems may yield slightly different results for some of the test cases in this manual due to numerical precision variation from machine to machine. Solutions that are nonlinear, iterative, or have convergence options activated are among the most likely to exhibit machinedependent numerical differences. Because of this, an effort has been made to report an appropriate and consistent number of significant digits in both the target and the ANSYS solution. If you run these test cases on your own computer hardware, be advised that an ANSYS result reported in this manual as 0.01234 may very well show up in your printout as 0.012335271.

## <span id="page-7-0"></span>**1.2. References**

The goal for the test cases contained in this manual was to have results accuracy within 3% of the target solution. The solutions for the test cases have been verified, however, certain differences may exist with regard to the references. These differences have been examined and are considered acceptable.

It should be noted that only those items corresponding to the given theoretical solution values are reported for each problem. In most cases the same solution also contains a considerable amount of other useful numerical solution data.

<span id="page-7-1"></span>Different computers and different operating systems may yield slightly different results for some of the test cases in this manual, since numerical precision varies from machine to machine. Because of this, an effort has been made to report an appropriate and consistent number of significant digits in both the target and the **ANSYS** solution. These results reported in this manual are from runs on an Intel Xeon processor using Microsoft Windows XP Professional. Slightly different results may be obtained when different processor types or operating systems are used.

## **1.3. Using the Verification Manual and Test Cases**

You are encouraged to use these tests as starting points when exploring features in these products. Geometries, material properties, loads, and output results can easily be changed and the solution repeated. As a result, the tests offer a quick introduction to new features with which you may be unfamiliar.

The test cases in this manual are primarily intended for verification of the ANSYS programs. An attempt has been made to include most significant analysis capabilities of the ANSYS products in this manual. Although they are valuable as demonstration problems, the test cases are not presented as step-bystep examples with lengthy data input instructions and printouts. The reader should refer to the online help for complete input data instructions.

Users desiring more detailed instructions for solving problems or in-depth treatment of specific topics should refer to the suite of to the **ANSYS FLUENT** Documentation. **ANSYS FLUENT** Tutorials and **ANSYS CFX** Tutorials are also available for various specific topics. These publications focus on particular features or program areas, supplementing other **ANSYS** reference documents with theory, procedures, guidelines, examples, and references.

## <span id="page-8-0"></span>**1.4. Quality Assurance Services**

For customers who may have further need for formal verification of the ANSYS, Inc. products on their computers, ANSYS, Inc. offers the Quality Assurance Testing Agreement. The user is provided with input data, output data, comparator software, and software tools for automating the testing and reporting process. If you are interested in contracting for such services, contact the ANSYS, Inc. Quality Assurance Group.

## <span id="page-8-1"></span>**1.5. Index of ANSYS Fluid Dynamics Test cases**

#### **Dimensionality Column Key**:

- $2 2-D$
- $3 3 D$
- **A** -- 2-D Axisymmetric





### Index of **ANSYS Fluid Dynamics** Test cases



## <span id="page-12-0"></span>**VMFL001: Flow Between Rotating and Stationary Concentric Cylinders**

## **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Steady laminar flow between two concentric cylinders is modeled. The flow is induced by rotation of the inner cylinder with a constant angular velocity, while the outer cylinder is held stationary. Due to periodicity only a section of the domain needs to be modeled. In the present simulation a 180° segment (half of the domain shown in *[Figure 1](#page-12-1)* [\(p. 9\)\)](#page-12-1) is modeled. The sketch is not to scale.

### <span id="page-12-1"></span>**Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. The tangential velocity at various sections can be calculated using analytical equations for laminar flow. These values are used for comparison with simulation results.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**



### **Table 1 Comparison of Tangential Velocity in the Annulus at Various Radial Locations**

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Tangential Velocity in the Annulus at Various Radial Locations**



## <span id="page-14-0"></span>**VMFL002: Laminar Flow Through a Pipe with Uniform Heat Flux**

### **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Laminar flow of Mercury through a circular pipe is modeled, with uniform heat flux across the wall. A fully developed laminar velocity profile is prescribed at the inlet. The resulting pressure drop and exit temperature are compared with analytical calculations for Laminar flow. Only half of the 2–D domain is modeled due to symmetry.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady and incompressible. Pressure drop can be calculated from the theoretical expression for laminar flow given in Ref. 1. Correlations for temperature calculations are given in Ref. 2.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Pressure Drop and Outlet Temperature**



## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

### **Table 2 Comparison of Pressure Drop and Outlet Temperature**



## <span id="page-16-0"></span>**VMFL003: Pressure Drop in Turbulent Flow through a Pipe**

## **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Air flows through a horizontal pipe with smooth walls. The flow Reynolds number is 1.37 X 10<sup>4</sup>. Only half of the axisymmetrical domain is modeled.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**



The figure is not to scale.



## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Pressure drop can be calculated from analytical formula using friction factor f which can be determined for the given Reynolds number from Moody chart. The calculated pressure drop is compared with the simulation results (pressure difference between inlet and outlet).

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Pressure Drop in the Pipe**



## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

### **Table 2 Comparison of Pressure Drop in the Pipe**



## <span id="page-18-0"></span>**VMFL004: Plain Couette Flow with Pressure Gradient**

## **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Viscous flow between two parallel plates is modeled. The top plate moves with a uniform velocity while the lower plate is fixed. A pressure gradient is imposed in a direction parallel to the plates.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady and laminar. Periodic conditions with specified pressure drop are applied across the flux boundaries.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**





## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**





### <span id="page-22-0"></span>**VMFL005: Poiseuille Flow in a Pipe**

### **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Fully developed laminar flow in a circular tube is modeled. Reynolds number based on the tube diameter is 500. Only half of the axisymmetric domain is modeled.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. A fully developed laminar velocity profile is prescribed at the inlet. Hagen-Poiseuille equation is used to determine the pressure drop analytically.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Pressure Drop in the Pipe**



## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

## **Table 2 Comparison of Pressure Drop in the Pipe**



## <span id="page-24-0"></span>**VMFL006: Multicomponent Species Transport in Pipe Flow**

## **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Fully developed laminar flow in a circular tube, with two species is modeled. Species A enters at the inlet and species B enters from the wall. Uniform and dissimilar mass fractions are specified at the pipe inlet and wall. Fluid properties are assumed to be the same for both species, so that computed results can be compared with analytical solution.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. A fully developed laminar velocity profile is prescribed at the inlet. Species transport model is used.

## **Results Comparison**

<b>Axial location (m)</b>	<b>Target Calculation</b>	<b>ANSYS FLUENT</b>	<b>Ratio</b>
0.01	0.8225	0.8223	1.000
0.02	0.7308	0.7307	1.000
0.03	0.6593	0.6592	1.000
0.04	0.5992	0.5991	1.000
0.05	0.5469	0.5469	1.000
0.06	0.5006	0.5006	1.000
0.07	0.4589	0.4591	1.000
0.08	0.4212	0.4214	1.000
0.09	0.3869	0.3871	1.001
0.10	0.3555	0.3558	1.001

**Table 1 Comparison of Mass Fraction of Species A Along the Axis**

### <span id="page-26-0"></span>**VMFL007: Non-Newtonian Flow in a Pipe**

### **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Flow of a non-Newtonian fluid in a circular pipe is modeled. Viscosity is specified by power law equation.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Viscosity is specified using non-Newtonian power law equation.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Pressure Drop in the Pipe**



## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

## **Table 2 Comparison of Pressure Drop in the Pipe**



## <span id="page-28-0"></span>**VMFL008: Flow Inside a Rotating Cavity**



### **Overview**

## **Test Case**

<span id="page-28-1"></span>Flow in a cylindrical cavity enclosed with a lid that spins at **Ω** = **1.0** rad/s. The flow field is 2–D axisymmetric, so only the region bounded by the dashed lines in *[Figure 1](#page-28-1)* [\(p. 25\)](#page-28-1)needs to be modeled. The Reynolds number of the flow based on the cavity radius **R** and the tip-speed of the disk is **1800**.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is laminar. The problem is solved using rotating reference frame.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**





**Figure 3 Comparison of Distribution of Swirl Velocity Along a Section at X= 0.6 m**



## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

### **Figure 4 Comparison of Distribution of Radial Velocity Along a Section at X= 0.6 m**





**Figure 5 Comparison of Distribution of Swirl Velocity Along a Section at X= 0.6 m**

## <span id="page-34-0"></span>**VMFL009: Natural Convection in a Concentric Annulus**

## **Overview**



## **Test Case**

Natural convection inside a concentric annular domain. The inner wall is maintained at a higher temperature than the outer wall, thereby causing buoyancy induced circulation.

### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**



Only half of the domain is modeled due to symmetry.





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is symmetric and only half of the domain is modeled. Density is calculated based on incompressible ideal gas assumption. The flow is laminar.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

### **Figure 2 Comparison of Static Temperature Distribution on the Bottom Wall of Symmetry**




**Figure 3 Comparison of Static Temperature Distribution on the Top Wall of Symmetry**





# **VMFL010: Laminar Flow in a 90° Tee-Junction.**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

The purpose of this test is to compare prediction of the fractional flow in a dividing tee-junction with experimental results. The fluid enters through the bottom branch and divides into the two channels whose exit planes are held at the same static pressure.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**



**Table 1 Comparison of Flow Split from Tee**



### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady and incompressible. Pressure based solver is used. It is seen that with increasing flow rate in the main channel, less fluid escapes through the secondary (right) branch. For analysis of results, we calculate and compare the fractional flow in the upper branch.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Flow Split from Tee**







## **VMFL011: Laminar flow in a Triangular Cavity**

## **Overview**



### **Test Case**

<span id="page-42-0"></span>Laminar flow induced by the motion of the top wall of a triangular cavity (*[Figure 1](#page-42-0)* [\(p. 39\)](#page-42-0)). The side walls are stationary.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Pressure based solver is used. A hybrid mesh with triangular and quadrilateral cells is used to discretize the domain.

### **Results Comparison for FLUENT**

**Figure 2 Comparison of Distribution of Normalized X-Velocity Along a Vertical Line that Bisects the Base of the Cavity**



In this figure, X-velocity is normalized by the velocity of the moving wall.

**Figure 3 Comparison of Distribution of Normalized X-Velocity Along a Vertical Line that Bisects the Base of the Cavity**



In this figure also the X-velocity is normalized by the velocity of the moving wall.

## **VMFL012: Turbulent Flow in a Wavy Channel**

# **Overview**



### **Test Case**

<span id="page-46-0"></span>A periodic flow domain bounded on one side by a sinusoidal wavy wall and with a straight wall on the other side. Due to periodicity only a part of the channel needs to modeled. *[Figure 1](#page-46-0)* [\(p. 43\)](#page-46-0) depicts the channel geometry. Flow direction is from left to right.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





#### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Pressure based solver is used. Periodic boundaries are used. For analysis of results, velocity in the x-direction is normalized by the mean mainstream velocity,  $U = 0.816$  m/s, at mean channel height.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Figure 2 Comparison of Distribution of Normalized X-Velocity along Transverse Direction at the Wave Crest**





**Figure 3 Comparison of Predicted Normalized X-Velocity along Transverse Direction at the Wave Trough**

**Figure 4 Comparison of Distribution of Normalized X-Velocity along Transverse Direction at the Wave Crest**





#### **Figure 5 Comparison of Predicted Normalized X-Velocity along Transverse Direction at the Wave Trough**

### **VMFL013: Turbulent Flow with Heat Transfer in a Backward-Facing Step**

## **Overview**



# **Test Case**

The fluid flow and convective heat transfer over a 2–D backward-facing step is modeled. A constant heat-flux surface behind the sudden expansion leads to a separated and reattaching boundary layer that disturbs local heat transfer. Measured values of the distribution of the local Nusselt number along the heated wall are used to validate the CFD simulation.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

A Cartesian non-uniform 121 x 61 mesh is used. The flow is steady and incompressible. Fluid properties are considered constant. Pressure based solver is used. The inlet boundary conditions are specified using the fully-developed profiles for the U-velocity, k, and epsilon. The incoming boundary layer thickness is 1.1 H. Under the given pressure conditions, the Reynolds number,  $Re<sub>H</sub>$  is about 28,000 The RNG k- $\epsilon$ model with standard wall functions is used for accounting turbulence.

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

**Figure 2 Comparison of Predicted Local Nusselt Number Distribution Along the Heated Wall with Experimental Data**



# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Figure 3 Comparison of Predicted Local Nusselt Number Distribution Along the Heated Wall with Experimental Data**



### **VMFL014: Species Mixing in Co-axial Turbulent Jets**

# **Overview**



## **Test Case**

A propane jet issues into a co-axial stream of air. There is turbulent mixing between the species in the axisymmetric tunnel. Only half of the domain is considered due to axial symmetry.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Species mixing is modeled with the three species; propane, oxygen, and nitrogen. There is no reaction.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Figure 2 Comparison of Distribution of Propane Along Axis of the Jets**





**Figure 3 Comparison of Distribution of X-Velocity Along Axis of the Jets**

#### **Figure 4 Comparison of Distribution of Propane Along Axis of the Jets**



**Figure 5 Comparison of Distribution of X-Velocity Along Axis of the Jets**



### **VMFL015: Flow Through an Engine Inlet Valve**

## **Overview**



### **Test Case**

<span id="page-58-0"></span>Flow in an idealized engine cylinder with a straight inlet port and a valve lift of 10 mm (the distance from the top of the cylinder to the bottom of the valve). The configuration of the inlet port, valve, and cylinder is shown in *[Figure 1](#page-58-0)* [\(p. 55\)](#page-58-0).

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady, isothermal and incompressible. The standard k-ε model with standard wall functions is used. The length of the cylinder is chosen to be large enough that it will not affect the flow in the cylinder.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

<span id="page-59-0"></span>*[Figure 2](#page-59-0)* [\(p. 56\)](#page-59-0) and *[Figure 3](#page-60-0)* [\(p. 57\)](#page-60-0) compare ANSYS FLUENT's results with the experimental data (zcomponent of velocity at different heights).

#### **Figure 2 Z-Velocity Component at Z= -5mm**



#### <span id="page-60-0"></span>**Figure 3 Z-Velocity Component at Z = +10mm**



# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

**Figure 4 Z-Velocity Component at Z= -5mm**





#### **Figure 5 Z-Velocity Component at Z = +10mm**

# **VMFL016: Turbulent Flow in a Transition Duct**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Turbulent flow through a circular-to-rectangular transition duct having the same inlet and outlet crosssectional areas is modeled. The curvature of the duct walls induces a strong pressure-driven cross-flow that develops into a counter-rotating vortex pair near the short side walls of the duct. Due to symmetry of the flow field, only one fourth of the duct is modeled (as shown in *[Figure 1](#page-62-0)* [\(p. 59\)\)](#page-62-0). Station 5 is located 23 m downstream of the inlet.

#### <span id="page-62-0"></span>**Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Reynolds Stress Model (RSM) is used to model turbulence.

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**







**Figure 3 Comparison of Pressure Coefficient Along Centerline of the Duct**





### **VMFL017: Transonic Flow over an RAE 2822 Airfoil**

## **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Flow over an RAE 2822 airfoil at a free-stream Mach number of 0.73. The angle of attack is 2.79°. The flow field is 2D, compressible (transonic), and turbulent. The geometry of the RAE 2822 airfoil is shown in *[Figure 1](#page-66-0)* [\(p. 63\).](#page-66-0) It is a thick airfoil with a chord length, c, of 1.00 m and a maximum thickness, d, of 0.121 m. The domain extends 55c from the airfoil, so that the presence of the airfoil is not felt at the outer boundary.

#### <span id="page-66-0"></span>**Figure 1 Geometry of the RAE 2822 Airfoil**







#### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The implicit formulation of the density-based solver is used. The SST  $k-\omega$  turbulence model is used to account for turbulence effects. The problem is solved in steady state mode.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Coefficients**



# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Coefficients**



### **VMFL018: Shock Reflection in Supersonic Flow**

# **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Supersonic flow from a nozzle that represents the exhaust nozzle of a supersonic combustion ramjet (SCRAMJET) is modeled. Jet from the nozzle is issued into a domain which is bounded on one side by an afterbody wall which is parallel to the centerline of the nozzle. Shocks propagating from the nozzle exit reflect from the afterbody. Measured values of (i) the distribution of wall pressure and (ii) heat transfer rate along the afterbody are used to validate the CFD simulation.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





#### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Specific heat is defined as a linear function of temperature. Density based solver is used. Under the given pressure conditions, the inlet Mach number is about 1.66.

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Figure 2 Comparison of Predicted Static Pressure Distribution on the Afterbody with Experimental Data**



#### **Figure 3 Comparison of Predicted Total Heat Flux Along the Afterbody with Experimental Data**








#### **Figure 5 Comparison of Predicted Total Heat Flux Along the Afterbody with Experimental Data**

# **VMFL019: Transient Flow near a Wall Set in Motion**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Flow near a wall suddenly set into motion is modeled. The start up flow is modeled as a transient problem with a constant wall-velocity at t (time) > 0. The flow is highly viscous and the velocity is 0 at  $t= 0$ .

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The density based solver is used in ANSYS FLUENT. Pressure boundaries are specified to model the driving head in the direction of flow. The fluid is at rest initially  $(t = 0)$ . The similarity parameter is defined as:

 $\eta(y, t) = y / (2\sqrt{vt})$ 

Where  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity.

### **Results Comparison using ANSYS FLUENT**





# **Results Comparison using ANSYS CFX**





# **VMFL020: Adiabatic Compression of Air in Cylinder by a Reciprocating Piston**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

<span id="page-78-0"></span>Air undergoes adiabatic compression due to the movement of a piston inside a rectangular box, representing a cylinder geometry in 2–D as shown in *[Figure 1](#page-78-0)* [\(p. 75\).](#page-78-0) The Top Dead Center (TDC) corresponds to a crank angle of 360°. The piston moves back after reaching TDC.

#### **Figure 1 In-Cylinder Piston Description**

crank angle ϑ

#### **Figure 2 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The compression within the cylinder is assumed to be adiabatic. The Spring-based smoothing method with local remeshing is used for modeling the dynamic mesh motion.

# **Results Comparison**









# **VMFL021: Cavitation over a Sharp-Edged Orifice Case A: High Inlet Pressure**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

<span id="page-82-0"></span>A steady, axisymmetric, multiphase (water/steam) flow, with phase change taking place. Due to sudden contraction a low pressure region occurs near the sharp edge which results in cavitation. *[Figure](#page-82-0) [1](#page-82-0)* [\(p. 79\)](#page-82-0)depicts the orifice geometry. Flow direction is from left to right.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





The flow is steady and incompressible. Pressure based solver is used. Standard k-ε model with standard wall functions is used for turbulence. The Zwart-Gerber-Belamri cavitation model is applied together with mixture multiphase model.

For analysis of results, we calculate and compare the discharge coefficient with the experimental data.

The coefficient of discharge,  $C_{d}$ , is the ratio of the mass flow rate through the nozzle to the theoretical maximum mass flow rate:

 $C_d = \frac{m}{A\sqrt{2\rho(P_1 \mathbf{v}$   $\mathbf{v}$   $\mathbf{$  $-r$   $1 - 2$ 

In the above equation,  $m$  is the mass flow rate as calculated by the CFD solver.

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Discharge Coefficient**



#### **Figure 2 Contours of Liquid (Water) Volume Fraction**



# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Discharge Coefficient**



# **VMFL022: Cavitation over a Sharp-Edged Orifice Case B: Low Inlet Pressure**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

<span id="page-86-0"></span>A steady, axisymmetric, multiphase (water/steam) flow, with phase change taking place. Due to sudden contraction a low pressure region occurs near the sharp edge which results in a weak cavitation. *[Figure](#page-86-0) [1](#page-86-0)* [\(p. 83\)](#page-86-0) depicts the orifice geometry. Flow direction is from left to right.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





The flow is steady and incompressible. Pressure based solver is used. Standard k-ε model with standard wall functions is used for turbulence. The Zwart-Gerber-Belamri cavitation model is applied together with mixture multiphase model.

For analysis of results, we calculate and compare the discharge coefficient with the experimental data.

The coefficient of discharge,  $C_{d}$ , is the ratio of the mass flow rate through the nozzle to the theoretical maximum mass flow rate:

 $C_d = \frac{m}{A\sqrt{2\rho(P_1 \mathbf{v}$   $\mathbf{v}$   $\mathbf{$  $-r$   $1 - 2$ 

In the above equation,  $m$  is the mass flow rate as calculated by the CFD solver.

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Discharge Coefficient**



#### **Figure 2 Contours of Liquid (Water) Volume Fraction**



# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Discharge Coefficient**



# **VMFL023: Oscillating Laminar Flow Around a Circular Cylinder**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

The purpose of this case is to validate the ability of ANSYS FLUENT and ANSYS CFX to predict the flow structure as well as the reattachment length and Strouhal number against experimental results. The present calculations are confined to the low-Reynolds-number regime (Re = 100), which encompasses unsteady asymmetric flow.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**



#### **Table 1 Materials, Geometry, and Boundary Conditions**



The flow is laminar, and unsteady. An FFT analysis of the lift coefficient on the cylinder wall is presented to determine the frequency of oscillations. The Strouhal number corresponding to the maximum magnitude of oscillations is presented in the Table below.

## **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

The formula for the Strouhal number is S = (N \* D)/U<sub> $\infty$ </sub>, where N is the frequency, D is the diameter of the cylinder, and  $U_{\infty}$  is the freestream velocity.

#### **Table 2 Predicted Strouhal Number for Re = 100**



### **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 3 Predicted Strouhal Number for Re = 100**



# **VMFL024: Interface of Two Immiscible Liquids in a Rotating Cylinder**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Laminar interface between two immiscible liquids, water and silicon oil, inside a vertical cylinder which is set in rotation starting from a state of rest. The silicone oil layer rests on top of the water due to its lower density. The cylinder is sealed at the top. The vessel is set to rotate with a constant angular velocity.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**



#### **Table 1 Materials, Geometry, and Boundary Conditions**





The flow is laminar, unsteady and axisymmetric. Non-dimensionalized swirl velocity, defined as **Swirl velocity / (Rotational speed X Cylinder radius)** is used to validate the results.

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

**Table 2 Comparison of the Non-Dimensional Swirl Velocity at Various Radial Locations (for a Given Axial Location, X = 20mm) at Time t = 80 s**



# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

**Table 3 Comparison of the Non-Dimensional Swirl Velocity at Various Radial Locations (for a Given Axial Location, X = 20mm) at Time t = 80 s**



## **VMFL025: Turbulent Non-Premixed Methane Combustion with Swirling Air**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Air and Methane enter as separate streams into an annular chamber. Air issues as a swirling jet and also as a separate co-flowing stream with axial velocity. Both the air streams are free of methane. Species mixing and combustion take place in the axisymmetric chamber. Radiative heat transfer is taken into account.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







The flow is steady. Realizable k-ε is used to model turbulence. Discrete ordinates method used to model radiation. The walls are treated as adiabatic. Non-premixed combustion model is used to model reactions.

### **Results Comparison ANSYS FLUENT**









#### **Figure 4 Comparison of Temperature at X = 40mm**





**Figure 5 Comparison of Mass Fraction of CO at X = 40mm**

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**







**Figure 7 Comparison of Swirl Velocity at X = 40mm**

**Figure 8 Comparison of Temperature at X = 40mm**







### **VMFL026: Supersonic Flow with Real Gas Effects inside a Shock Tube**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Transient flow inside a hydrogen filled shock tube is modeled. A diaphragm separating regions of high and low pressures ruptures at  $t = 0$  thereby creating a shock wave in the tube.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







The flow is compressible and unsteady by nature. Real gas effects are significant in the pressure range considered here.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**





**Figure 3 Comparison of Static Pressure Along Centerline of the Tube**



# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Figure 4 Comparison of Static Temperature Along Centerline of the Tube**





### **Figure 5 Comparison of Static Pressure Along Centerline of the Tube**
### **VMFL027: Turbulent Flow over a Backward-Facing Step**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Turbulent flow over a backward facing step is modeled. The flow separates at the step and reattaches on the wall downstream, enclosing a region of recirculation. The inlet is at 4 H upstream and the outlet at 30 H downstream from the location of the step, where H is the step height. Reynolds number based on the step-height is about 28,000.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**



#### **Table 1 Materials, Geometry, and Boundary Conditions**



### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Realizable k-ε model was used to model turbulence.









### **VMFL028: Turbulent Heat Transfer in a Pipe Expansion**

# **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Fully developed turbulent flow through an axisymmetric pipe expansion is modeled. The flow reattaches to the pipe wall downstream of the expansion, enclosing a zone of recirculation. The pipe wall downstream of the expansion is heated at a constant rate. Inlet to the computational domain is placed at 1 step height upstream of the expansion and the outlet at 40 step-heights downstream.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Steady flow in axisymmetric domain. The wall upstream of expansion is adiabatic.





**Figure 3 Nusselts Number Variation along the Heat Wall**



#### **VMFL029: Anisotropic Conduction Heat Transfer**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Heat conduction in a solid with anisotropic thermal conductivity is modeled. A square domain is considered. Two opposite walls are maintained at uniform temperatures. Conductivity of the solid material is specified using matrix components to account for the anisotropy. The simulation results are compared with analytical solution for temperature distribution.

#### **Figure 1 Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Steady state conduction. Anisotropic conductivity modeled by specified matrix components for the solid conductivity.

# **Results Comparison**



#### **Figure 2 Comparison of Temperature Distribution at X = 0.5 m**

### **VMFL030: Turbulent Flow in a 90° Pipe-Bend**

# **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

Turbulent flow through a 90° circular pipe bend is modeled. The flow separates and reattaches around the bend. Due to symmetry of the flow field only half of the domain is modeled. Velocity profile at an angle of 75° (as measured from the inlet) is used to validate the simulation.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. RNG  $k$ -  $\varepsilon$  is used to model turbulence along with non-equilibrium wall functions.









### **VMFL031: Turbulent Flow Behind an Open-Slit V Gutter**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

The near-wake flow structure behind an open-slit V gutter at airflow speed of 20 m/s is modeled. The interaction between the flow penetrating through the open slit and the shear layer results in an asymmetric wake flow structure. The size of the entire recirculation zone shifts toward one of the two wings due to the Coand effect.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Steady, turbulent, incompressible flow. The standard k-ε model is used for turbulence.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

The x-velocity at  $x = 22$  mm downstream of the split-V-gutter, is compared with experimental data.





**Figure 3 The Coand Effect**







### **VMFL032: Turbulent Flow with Separation Along an Axisymmetric Afterbody**

#### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

Flow past an axisymmetric afterbody, representing the hull of ship. The flow separates on the rear face of the body.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The far-field boundary of the domain is set parallel to the axis and is modeled as velocity inlet. Fully developed profile is specified at the transverse velocity inlet.





**Figure 3 Comparison of Skin Friction Coefficient Along the Afterbody Wall**









**Figure 5 Comparison of Skin Friction Coefficient Along the Afterbody Wall**

### **VMFL033: Viscous Heating in an Annulus**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

<span id="page-128-0"></span>In this problem, we model the viscous heating and mass flow in a 2-D annulus induced by the rotation of one of the two walls (*[Figure 1](#page-128-0)* [\(p. 125\)](#page-128-0)). This problem can be solved analytically.

#### **Figure 1 Geometry**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is laminar and steady. Pressure based solver is used. A 2–D mesh with quadrilateral cells is used to discretize the domain.

Normalized velocity and temperature profiles are compared with the analytical solution provided by Bird et al (1960).

#### **Figure 2 Comparison of Velocity Profile**







**Figure 4 Comparison of Velocity Profile**



**Figure 5 Comparison of Temperature Profile**



*Release 14.0 - © SAS IP, Inc. All rights reserved. - Contains proprietary and confidential information* 128 *of ANSYS, Inc. and its subsidiaries and affiliates.*

### **VMFL034: Particle Aggregation inside a Turbulent Stirred Tank**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

A 2-D approximation of a stirred tank is simulated in order to verify the population balance model that operates in conjunction with its multiphase calculations to predict the particle size distribution within the flow field. The flow rate at the inlet is equal to that at the outlet, allowing the mean residence time to be calculated from the inlet flow rate (velocity x inlet area) and the "volume" (box area x unit depth) of the box. To simulate the agitation in the tank the top and bottom walls are assumed to move in the direction of the outlet. The flow is turbulent, steady, and incompressible. Multi-phase, with QMOM population balance model is used for particle aggregation. The standard k-ε model is used for turbulence.

#### <span id="page-132-0"></span>**Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The results of the ANSYS FLUENT simulation are compared to steady state analytical solution for the population balance in a stirred tank where aggregation takes place.

#### **Results Comparison**

In this table, moment of PBE for ANSYS FLUENT turbulent simulations is compared with analytical solution for aggregation alone at the outlet of the tank.

<b>Moment</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>ANSYS FLUENT</b>	<b>Ratio</b>
$m_0$	0.132	0.132	1.000
m <sub>1</sub>	0.225	0.226	1.004
m <sub>2</sub>	0.547	0.548	1.002
m <sub>3</sub>	1.910	1.910	1.000
$m_4$	9.073	9.133	1.007
m <sub>5</sub>	53.797	53.816	1.000

**Table 1 Comparison of Moment of PBE**

### **VMFL035: 3-Dimensional Single-Stage Axial Compressor**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

A 3-D model of a single-stage axial compressor is simulated. The flow through the rotor blades is computed in a rotating reference frame, while the flow in the stator blades in a stationary frame. The purpose of this case is to validate the performance of the pressure-based coupled solver for a compressible turbomachinery problem with a mixing plane. The flow is compressible, turbulent and steady.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Steady, turbulent, compressible flow. Ideal-gas law is used for density calculations and kinetic theory for fluid viscosity and thermal conductivity. The standard k-ε model is used for turbulence. Pressurebased coupled solver with a mixing plane at the rotor-outlet/stator-inlet interface.

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

The results of the pressure-based ANSYS FLUENT simulation are compared to the steady state solution from the density-based solver.

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Pressure and Mass Flow Rate**



### **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Pressure and Mass Flow Rate**



#### **VMFL036: Turbulent Round Jet**

#### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

A turbulent round jet is defined by a velocity inlet adjacent to a symmetry boundary, and exhausts into a rectangular domain or plenum. The domain is chosen large enough and the boundary does not interfere with the jet. The flow is turbulent and steady. The purpose of this case is to validate the performance of the Reynolds Stress Model for turbulence.

#### **Figure 1 Round Jet Geometry**





#### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Steady, turbulent, incompressible flow. The Reynolds Stress Model (RSM) is used for turbulence.

#### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**

The jet's spreading rate is compared to the Wilcox (1998) data for round jets. The scattering of the data is due to the coarse triangular grid that has been used in this study. A finer grid would have produced a much smoother computational curve.





#### **Figure 3 Comparison of Results for ANSYS CFX**



### **VMFL037: Turbulent Flow over a Forward Facing Step**

#### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

<span id="page-140-0"></span>Turbulent flow over a forward facing step is modeled. The flow undergoes separation and reattachment.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Pressure coefficient, Cp on the wall is calculated with reference to the pressure at point upstream of the step at coordinates as indicated in *[Figure 1](#page-140-0)* [\(p. 137\).](#page-140-0)








#### **VMFL038: Falling Film over an Inclined Plane**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Laminar flow of a fluid over an inclined plane, driven by the pressure difference due to gravity head is modeled. The flow channel is inclined at an angle  $\beta = 30^{\circ}$  with the horizontal direction.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The density based solver is used in ANSYS FLUENT. Pressure boundaries are specified to model the driving head in the direction of flow.









## **VMFL039: Boiling in a Pipe with Heated Wall**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Bubble formation and boiling near the heated wall of a vertical pipe are modeled. Outer wall of the pipe is heated with a constant heat flux.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







#### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. SST model is used for turbulence. RPI model for wall boiling is used with a value of 0.8 for the wall area fraction affected by vapor.

### **Results Comparison**





#### **VMFL040: Separated Turbulent Flow in Diffuser**

#### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

<span id="page-148-0"></span>The test case geometry is shown in *[Figure 1](#page-148-0)* [\(p. 145\)](#page-148-0). It consists of an axisymmetric diffuser with an internally mounted cylinder along the centre line. The curvature of the diffuser wall results in an adverse pressure gradient. A relatively short separation region was detected in the experiment.

#### **Figure 1 Sketch of Flow Domain**



This figure is not to scale.



### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. SST model is used for turbulence.









### **VMFL041: Transonic Flow Over an Airfoil**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Transoinc flow over air foil RAE 2822 is modeled for an angle of attack of 3.19°. The flow domain spans over 100 Chord lengths in both stream-wise and transverse directions.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. The inlet flow Mach number is close to transonic range. Walls are assumed to be adiabatic.







#### **Figure 3 Comparison of Pressure Coefficient on the Airfoil**

#### **VMFL042: Turbulent Mixing of Two Streams with Different Density**

#### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

Mixing of two turbulent streams of fresh water and saline water is modeled. The two streams are parallel at the inlet and mixing proceeds downstream.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. SST model is used. Buoyancy turbulence production option is used.









#### **VMFL043: Laminar to Turbulent Transition of Boundary Layer over a Flat Plate**

#### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Laminar to turbulent transition of a boundary layer over a flat plate is modeled. The free stream turbulence intensity is 3.3%.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





#### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. SST model with Gamma Theta model for transitional turbulence is used. Langry Menter correlation was used for transition onset.









#### **VMFL044: Supersonic Nozzle Flow**

### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

Supersonic flow in a convergent-divergent nozzle is modeled. The flow is supersonic in the entire divergent section of the nozzle.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. The walls are assumed to be at constant temperature. Only a 3° sector of the domain is modeled due to symmetry.









#### **VMFL045: Oblique Shock over an Inclined Ramp**

#### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

Supersonic flow over a 15° ramp is modeled. The ramp leads to the formation of an oblique shock. Inlet Mach number is about 2.5. The flow is laminar. The ANSYS CFX values are taken at a Point 1 (x=0.38 m, y=0.14 m)

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady and laminar. The walls are assumed to be adiabatic.



#### **Table 1 Comparison of Properties Downstream of the Oblique Shock**

### **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Properties Downstream of the Oblique Shock**



#### **VMFL046: Supersonic Flow with Normal Shock in a Converging Diverging Nozzle**

#### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

Supersonic flow in a CD nozzle is modeled. The maximum Mach number is 2.2. A normal shock is formed in the divergent section. Mach number distribution in the nozzle is compared with analytical solution for nozzle flow.

#### **Figure 1 Flow domain**





## **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. The walls are assumed to be adiabatic. The flow is modeled as laminar.









#### **VMFL047: Turbulent Flow with Separation in an Asymmetric Diffuser**

#### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

Turbulent flow with gradual separation and reattachment is modeled in an asymmetric 2-D diffuser. The lower wall of the diffuser is divergent with an angle of 10° and expands to about 4.7 times the inlet height.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Steady turbulent flow.





**Figure 3 Comparison of X-Velocity at X = 24.4 m**



### **VMFL048: Turbulent flow in a 180° Pipe Bend**

#### **Overview**



#### **Test Case**

<span id="page-176-0"></span>Flow in a 3-D pipe bend as shown in *[Figure 1](#page-176-0)* [\(p. 173\)](#page-176-0).

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Symmetry condition is applied on one side of the pipe.





**Figure 3 Comparison of Velocity in the Axial Direction at a Section 1.555 m upstream of the Outlet (after the bend)**


### **VMFL049: Combustion in an Axisymmetric Natural Gas Furnace**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Non-premixed combustion in a natural gas fired furnace is modeled. The axisymmetric flow field is modeled by a 3° cylindrical domain. Fuel jet consists of natural gas modeled as 93% Methane and 7% Nitrogen by mass.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. Reactions modeled using Eddy Dissipation Model. The domain is axisymmetric.

















# **VMFL050: Transient Heat Conduction in a Semi-Infinite Slab**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Unsteady heat conduction in a thick copper plate is modeled. Initially (at  $t = 0$ ) the plate is at a uniform temperature of 293 K. It is suddenly exposed to a heat transfer at one surface with a constant heat flux of 3 X 10<sup>5</sup> W/m<sup>2</sup>. The temperature distribution after 2 minutes is considered for verification.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady transient. The dimensions considered her are adequate for the semi-infinite slab assumption. The domain is initialized with a uniform temperature of 293 K corresponding to the condition at time  $= 0$  sec.

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Temperature after 2 Minutes**



## **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Temperature after 2 Minutes**



### **VMFL051: Isentropic Expansion of Supersonic Flow over a Convex Corner**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Centered expansion of inviscid supersonic flow around a corner is modeled. The expansion results in a change in direction of the flow, a drop in static pressure, and increase in Mach number. The approaching flow is supersonic, with a Mach number of 2.5. The expansion process is reversible and adiabatic.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





### **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady and compressible. Inviscid and incompressible. Analytic expressions for isentropic expansion can be used to calculate the Mach number downstream of the corner.

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Mach Number Downstream of the Corner, after Expansion**



#### **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Mach Number Downstream of the Corner, after Expansion**



# **VMFL052: Turbulent Natural Convection inside a Tall Cavity**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Natural convection in the turbulent flow field of an enclosed cavity with a length-to-width ratio of 28.6 is modeled. The Rayleigh number is in the turbulent range. The two vertical walls are kept at different temperatures, while the horizontal walls are adiabatic.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain (not to scale)**





The flow is steady and is induced by natural convective heat transfer.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**







#### **Figure 3 Comparison of Temperature at Y/h = 0.05**

**Figure 4 Comparison of Vertical Velocity at Y/h = 0.05**







### **VMFL053: Compressible Turbulent Mixing Layer**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Two streams of air are mixed in a rectangular tunnel. The length of the computational domain is chosen such that the local Reynolds number at the exit of the test section, which is based on the velocity difference between the streams and the mixing layer thickness, is greater than 100,000. This is the Reynolds number needed for the complete development of the mixing layer.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







The flow is steady, turbulent, and compressible. The RNG *k-*ε model is used for turbulence.

### **Results Comparison**

The velocity profiles as the mixing layer evolves are compared with the experimental data.

#### **Figure 2 X Velocity Profiles at x = 50 mm**



### **VMFL054: Laminar flow in a Trapezoidal Cavity**

## **Overview**



# **Test Case**

<span id="page-194-0"></span>Laminar flow induced by the motion of the top wall of a trapezoidal cavity. The top and bottom walls move but the side walls are stationary. The height of the cavity *h* is 1 m. The widths of the top and bottom walls are 1 m and 2 m, respectively (*[Figure 1](#page-194-0)* [\(p. 191\)\)](#page-194-0).

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is steady. A pressure based solver is used. A triangular mesh of 4016 cells is used to discretize the domain.

The *u*-velocity profile at the vertical centerline of the cavity and the *ν*-velocity profile at the horizontal centerline of the cavity are compared to Darr and Vanka results. Velocity is normalized by velocity of the moving wall.



**Figure 2 Normalized** *u***-Velocity at the Horizontal Centerline of the Cavity**





# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

The *u*-velocity profile at the vertical centerline of the cavity and the *ν*-velocity profile at the horizontal centerline of the cavity are compared to Darr and Vanka results. Velocity is normalized by velocity of the moving wall.



**Figure 4 Normalized** *u***-Velocity at the Horizontal Centerline of the Cavity**

**Figure 5 Normalized** *v***-Velocity at the Vertical Centerline of the Cavity**



## **VMFL055: Transitional Recirculatory Flow inside a Ventilation Enclosure**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Flow inside an enclosure similar to a ventilated room is modeled. The flow field is transitional and dominated by recirculation. Reynolds number is based on the inlet dimension and is around 5000.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is modeled using transitional turbulence models.









### **VMFL056: Combined Conduction and Radiation in a Square Cavity**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Coupled conduction and radiation is modeled in a square enclosure. The material properties are set to model a condition corresponding to the Conduction-Radiation parameter  $N = 1.0$ . Scattering coefficient of the medium is 0. Steady state heat transfer is modeled. One wall of the square cavity is kept at a higher temperature than the other 3 walls.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





The material properties are set to model the desired conduction-radiation fraction. Radiative heat flux is only a small fraction of the total heat flux.

#### **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**









# **VMFL057: Radiation and Conduction in Composite Solid Layers**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Heat transfer by conduction and radiation is modeled in a composite solid domain consisting of two layers. Both the layers participate in radiation. The two layers are separated by a semi-transparent wall. The upstream and downstream sides of the domain are subjected to convective as well as radiative heat transfer.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







Transverse boundaries of the domain are modeled as planes of symmetry.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**





#### **VMFL058: Turbulent Flow in an Axisymmetric Diffuser**

# **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Fully developed turbulent flow is modeled in an axisymmetric diffuser. The flow is fully developed at the inlet to the diffuser.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Steady turbulent flow.

**Figure 2 Comparison of Pressure Coefficient along the Divergent Diffuser Wall**







# **VMFL059: Conduction in a Composite Solid Block**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Heat conduction in a plane wall formed as composite of two materials is modeled. One of the materials has a uniform volumetric heat generation source while the other material has an outer surface exposed to convective cooling.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







Contact resistance between the slabs is neglected.

# **Results Comparison**

#### **Table 1 Comparison Temperatures on the Side Walls**



#### **VMFL060: Transitional Supersonic Flow over a Rearward Facing Step**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Supersonic flow with an inlet Mach number 2.5 past a backward facing step is modeled. Key features of the flow field include sudden expansion, free shear layer, recirculation zone, and oblique shock. Reynolds number of the flow (based on step height) is in the transitional range.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is modeled using transitional turbulence models.





# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

**Figure 3 Comparison of Non-Dimensionalized Static Pressure along the Stepped Wall Downstream of the Corner**



# **VMFL061: Surface to Surface Radiative Heat Transfer between Two Concentric Cylinders**

# **Overview**



# **Test Case**

<span id="page-212-0"></span>Radiative heat transfer between two cylindrical surfaces forming a concentric annulus is modeled. There is no participating medium. Due to symmetry only the shaded portion of the domain in *[Figure 1](#page-212-0)* [\(p. 209\)](#page-212-0) is modeled.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**







Because there is no flow of mass, only the energy equation is solved. Radiation models are used for the simulation. Heat transfer is purely due to radiation between the two surfaces.

# **Results Comparison for ANSYS FLUENT**








# **VMFL062: Fully Developed Turbulent Flow Over a "Hill"**

# **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Flow over a "hill" geometry with separation and reattachment is modeled. Fully developed turbulent profile is specified at the inlet.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**









# **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**





### **VMFL063: Separated Laminar Flow over a Blunt Plate**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

The flow separation over a blunt leading edge in laminar flow is modeled. The flow separates and reattaches along the plate. The reattachment length predicted by the solvers is validated against experimental results. Due to symmetry, only half of the domain shown in *[Figure 1](#page-218-0)* [\(p. 215\)](#page-218-0) is modeled. The Reynolds number based on plate thickness is 227.

#### <span id="page-218-0"></span>**Figure 1 Flow Domain**





#### **Table 1 Comparison of Reattachment Length**



### **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Reattachment Length**



### **VMFL064: Low Reynolds Number Flow in a Channel with Sudden Asymmetric Expansion**

### **Overview**



### **Test Case**

Laminar flow in a channel with a backward facing step expansion is modeled. The channels section upstream of the expansion is long enough to ensure fully developed laminar profile. The reattachment length predicted by the solvers is validated against experimental results. Reynolds number based on D (equal to twice the channel height at inlet) is 200. The domain extends to about 40 times the stepheight upstream and over 20 times the step-height downstream.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**

Flow Direction



# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

The flow is fully developed before the step. Reattachment length is measured from the reversal of the sign of the wall shear along the flow direction.

#### **Table 1 Comparison of Reattachment Length**



### **Results Comparison for ANSYS CFX**

#### **Table 2 Comparison of Reattachment Length**



### **VMFL065: Swirling Turbulent Flow Inside a Diffuser**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Turbulent flow with a strong swirl component is modeled in an axisysmmetric diffuser. The swirl component of the velocity has a dominant effect on the flow field inside the diffuser.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

RS model is used for turbulence due to the strong swirl component.





### **VMFL066: Radiative Heat Transfer in a Rectangular Enclosure with Participating Medium**

### **Overview**



# **Test Case**

Two dimensional radiative heat transfer in an enclosure with one hot wall and three cold walls at equal temperature is modeled. The enclosure is a rectangular cavity with a length-to-width ratio of 5. For the problem being considered,  $\sigma^s L_y = 1.0$ , where  $\sigma^s$  is the scattering coefficient and  $L_y$  is the normal distance between the hot wall and the cold wall opposite to it.

#### **Figure 1 Flow Domain**





# **Analysis Assumptions and Modeling Notes**

Isotropic scattering and radiative equilibrium are assumed.

### **Figure 2**

#### **Comparison of Non-Dimensional Heat Flux along the Hot Wall**

