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Abstract
Cable subsystems characterized by one or more extremely long, slender and flexible structural elements are featured in numerous engineering systems including parachutes, suspension bridges, marine drilling risers, and aerial refueling equipment. In each one of these systems, interaction between the cable and its surrounding fluid is inevitable. However, the nature and consequences of such Fluid-Structure Interactions (FSI) have received relatively little attention in the computational mechanics open literature possibly due to an inherent complexity associated with resolution of the multiple scales present in problems of this type. This work proposes an embedded boundary approach for simulating the FSI of cable subsystems, in which the dynamics of the solid cable is captured by a discretization of the cable centerline using conventional beam elements which are typically available in commercial and open source finite element structural codes, while the geometry of the cable is represented within the fluid domain using a discrete – for instance, triangulated – embedded surface. The proposed approach is built on: master/slave kinematics between beam elements (master) and the embedded surface (slave); a highly accurate algorithm for computing the embedded surface displacement based on the beam displacement; and an energy-conserving method for transferring distributed forces and moments acting on the nodes of the discrete surface to the beam elements. Hence, both the flow-induced forces on the cable and the effect of the structural dynamic response of the cable on the nearby flow are taken into account. Moreover, the proposed model can be readily incorporated into the Eulerian computational framework, which enables handling of the large deformations of the cable subsystem. The effectiveness of the proposed approach is demonstrated using a model aerial refueling system and a challenging supersonic parachute inflation problem.

1. Introduction

Cable subsystems appear in a wide range of engineering and scientific applications, such as the suspension lines in parachutes and other atmospheric decelerators \cite{1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, offshore drilling and production risers \cite{8,9,10} and airborne refueling systems \cite{11,12,13,14}. When immersed in a flow, cable structures can be responsible for strong fluid-structure interactions that may significantly affect the performance of the system to which they are attached. For example, in the case of supersonic parachute inflation, fluid-structure interactions involving the suspension lines give rise to a significant drag reduction due to disturbance of the front bow shock, while fluid-structure interactions involving marine drilling risers can lead to vortex-induced vibration and fatigue damage of offshore systems. Consequently, the capability to accurately and affordably model such phenomena has the potential to be a valuable tool for the design and maintenance of these and other related systems.

In computational fluid dynamics (CFD), the local fluid cable subsystem interactions consist of two parts: flow-induced forces on the cable and effect of the structural dynamic response of the cable on the nearby flow. Several efforts have been made to account for one or both of these contributions. Strip theory
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in which computations are conducted on several cross sections, was applied to analyze vortex-induced vibrations of deepwater risers. One-way coupling was applied in [2] using empirical flow-induced load formulae for parachute suspension lines accounting for a dependence on the normal velocity and tabulated drag coefficients. The effect of suspension lines on the fluid flow was modeled by adding source terms based on the inertial and elastic forces of the structure in [7, 15]. A “brute force” approach [8] was able to resolve complex phenomena due to the presence of a cable; however, the computational cost of this approach can be overwhelming, particularly when the size of the cross section is small compared to the characteristic length of the cable subsystem.

In addition to the aforementioned computational complexity issue, the task at hand presents a number of challenges. First and foremost, the task of transferring information between structural and fluid meshes is complicated by the fact that from a structural dynamics viewpoint, the geometry of a cable is typically modeled using one-dimensional line elements. For body-fitted CFD meshes, a “dressing” approach based on phantom surface elements and massless rigid elements was proposed in [16] to address this issue. While it can also be used in non body-fitted CFD frameworks [3], this approach has computational disadvantages that are identified and discussed in this work. For this reason, an alternative approach is proposed here for computing cable-driven fluid structure interactions. This approach is more robust than the “dressing” approach and is characterized by a superior computational performance. It is based on: master/slave kinematics between the line representing the geometry of a cable typically found in finite element structural models, and a discretization of its true surface that is utilized by the CFD flow solver; a highly accurate algorithm for computing the cable surface displacement based on the cable centerline displacement and rotation; and an energy-conserving method for transferring distributed forces and moments acting on the nodes of the discrete surface to the nodes of the discrete line enclosed by that surface.

Another challenge for modeling the fluid cable subsystem interactions is the potential for large deformations due to the large length-to-diameter ratio and/or high intrinsic flexibility of the cables. To relieve this issue, embedded or immersed boundary methods (EBMs or IBMs) [17, 18, 19, 20, 21] are used in the present study, which are effective for highly nonlinear FSI problems with large deformations. Both the “dressing” approach and the alternative master/slave kinematic approach are incorporated into the in-house Eulerian computational framework FIVER [21, 22, 23, 24] – Finite Volume method with Exact two-material Riemann Problems. To track the boundary layers around the cable subsystem, adaptive mesh refinement [25] is applied to ensure reasonable mesh resolution in the vicinity of the cable subsystem.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. First, the “dressing” approach is described in section 2. Then, the alternative master/slave kinematic approach is introduced and its properties are discussed in section 3. Next, the embedded framework and governing equations are briefly overviewed in section 4. The performance of the two approaches is assessed in section 5 by comparing their results on an idealized airborne refueling system and a challenging supersonic parachute inflation problem. Finally, conclusions are offered in section 6.

2. Background: the “dressing” approach

Cable subsystems are generally modeled as one-dimensional beam elements or special-purpose variants referred to as cable elements. This is due to their large length-to-diameter ratio; beam elements have vastly superior computational efficiency than their three-dimensional solid counterparts in such cases provided certain simplifying assumptions are appropriate – for example, that planar sections initially normal to the longitudinal axis remain planar and normal to the axis. However, the fluid subsystem is generally modeled with three-dimensional elements such as tetrahedra, hexahedra and/or triangular prisms. In either a body-fitted or embedded boundary framework, certain challenges are associated with this type of mixed discretization coupling elements with disparate spatial dimensions. For instance, in the case of the embedded framework detection of the one-dimensional elements and the definition of associated geometric characteristics such as surface normals may be difficult or even ambiguous in this scenario. Hence, it is not necessarily convenient to capture the local fluid-structure interaction of the cable subsystem using existing techniques developed for other well-known FSI problems such as aircraft wings, turbine blades and blood flow in arteries. Inspired by the so-called fish-bone aeroelastic models, the “dressing” approach introduces an equivalent
Superelement (see Fig. 1-left), consisting of a one-dimensional flexible beam element located at the centerline of the cable, a cylindrical assembly of massless discrete surface elements $\Sigma_p$ located on the outer surface of the cable, and clusters of massless rigid beam elements connecting each node on the centerline to the adjacent nodes on the outer surface. The discrete surface represents the true geometry of the cable, where the fluid-structure interaction occurs and as such it can be used directly for coupling with a boundary surface associated with a fluid domain – either body-fitted or embedded – using a matching procedure [26] which is common for handling non-conforming fluid/structure interfaces in aeroelastic computations. Specifically, the flow-induced forces are evaluated on this surface or its matched counterpart, and the effect of the cable on the flow is also enforced here through the transmission boundary conditions. The massless rigid beam elements couple the degrees of freedom of the discrete surface with the flexible structural components using algebraic constraint equations which can be enforced using the Lagrange multiplier method and solved together with the semi-discrete equations of motion by the structural solver as a differential-algebraic equation (DAE). Besides modeling cable subsystems, equivalent superelements are widely used to construct simplified models for other applications, such as very flexible aircraft [27, 28] and turbine blades [29, 30].

The “dressing” approach is a very general purpose modeling technique able to treat in a consistent manner the fluid-cable subsystem interaction. The mesh generating procedure, although tedious, can be automated. However, the number of structural degrees of freedom is increased by an order of magnitude and even if this is relatively insignificant compared to the cost of solving the fluid subsystem, it is by no means desirable. Furthermore, the mass matrix entries corresponding to the nodes on the outer surface are zero, due to the massless assumption. This poses a problem for explicit time-integration schemes that require a positive definite mass matrix. Explicit schemes are commonly used for highly nonlinear fluid-structure interaction problems, such as those involving contact and/or damage propagation. Even in the context of an implicit time-integration scheme, the constraint equations underlying the rigid beams introduce a destabilizing effect in the dynamic system that requires numerical dissipation or an alternative strategy to combat [31]. Both of these issues and the increased computational overhead can be addressed by an alternative approach based on master/slave kinematics which is presented in the following section.

3. Alternative master/slave kinematic approach

The issues and inconveniences associated with the “dressing” approach can be resolved through an alternative matching procedure in which the flexible beam elements are matched directly with a boundary surface associated with the fluid domain, representing the outer surface of the cable. As in the case of the the “dressing” approach the boundary surface can either be a body-fitted or an embedded one; however due to the inherent advantages of the embedded framework for FSI problems involving large structural motions, we focus here on the case of an embedded boundary. In the current scenario, the structure solver solves only the dynamics of the one-dimensional beam elements, while from the point of view of the fluid solver only the discrete surface $\Sigma_p$ is visible. To bridge the dynamics of the one-dimensional beam elements and the discrete surface, a master-slave kinematics coupling treatment is applied. The position of the slave surface follows that of the master beam, while the loads computed on the slave surface are instantaneously transferred to the master beam. The detailed load and motion transfer algorithm is as follows:

- Match each slave node $S^j_i$ on the embedded surface with a master point $M_i$ on some beam element using the closest point projection. The superscript $j$ of $S^j_i$ indicates that this matching procedure might be a many-to-one map. The distance vector between these two locations in the initial configuration is denoted by $d^j_i$, which is written as

$$x^0_{S^j_i} = x^0_{M_i} + d^j_i.$$  

- At each time step, the displacement $u_{S^j_i}$ and velocity $\dot{u}_{S^j_i}$ of the slave node $S^j_i$ are formulated as

$$u_{S^j_i} = u_{M_i} + R(\theta_{M_i})d^j_i - d^j_i \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{u}_{S^j_i} = \dot{u}_{M_i} + \omega_{M_i} \times R(\theta_{M_i})d^j_i,$$  
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Figure 1: Schematics of a cable superelement using the “dressing” approach (left) and the “matched” beam from the alternative master/slave kinematic approach (right). The discrete surface $\Sigma_p$, representing the true cable geometry, encloses the one-dimensional beam elements (red). They are connected by the massless rigid beam elements (green) in the “dressing” approach (left).

where $u_M$ and $\theta_M$ are the displacement and rotation freedoms of the matched beam point, while $\dot{u}_M$ and $\omega_M$ are its velocity and angular velocity, respectively. $R$ is the rotation matrix at the matched beam point, which depends on the rotation freedoms $\theta_M$.

- Meanwhile, the force $f_M$ and moment $p_M$ on the master point $M_i$ are induced from the nodal force $f_{S_j}$ of the slave node as follows,

$$f_{M_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} f_{S_j}$$

and

$$p_{M_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} R(\theta_{M_i})d_j \times f_{S_j},$$

(3)

where $n_i$ is the number of slave nodes that are matched to $M_i$.

The master-slave procedure effectively decouples the freedoms of the slave nodes from the structural solver, avoiding the zero mass singularities and other destabilizations arising in the “dressing” approach and reducing the computational overhead of the structural solver. It is worth mentioning that, although decoupled, the aforementioned procedure guarantees conservativity. Consider a virtual displacement field $\delta u^F$ of the flow on the fluid-structure boundary $\Sigma_p$. The virtual work of the fluid traction acting on $\Sigma_p$ can be written as

$$-\delta W^F = \int_{\Sigma_p} (-p n + \tau n) \cdot \delta u^F d\Sigma_p,$$

and

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n_M} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} f_{S_j} \cdot \delta u_{S_j},$$

(4)

where $p$ and $\tau$ are the pressure and stress tensor of the flow, $n$ is the outward normal of $\Sigma_p$, $n_M$ is the number of master points, and the conservative load transfer algorithm [29] is applied to compute the nodal
force $f_{S_i^j}$ at each slave node. Substituting eq. (2) and eq. (3) into eq. (4) leads to

$$-\delta W^F = \sum_{i=1}^{n_M} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} f_{S_i^j} \cdot \left( \delta u_{M_i} + \delta \theta_{M_i} \times R(\theta_{M_i}) d_{i_j}^j \right),$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n_M} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} f_{S_i^j} \cdot \delta u_{M_i} + \left( R(\theta_{M_i}) d_{i_j}^j \times f_{S_i^j} \right) \cdot \delta \theta_{M_i},$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n_M} f_{M_i} \cdot \delta u_{M_i} + p_{M_i} \cdot \delta \theta_{M_i},$$

(5)

Finally, noting that eq. (5) is the virtual work $\delta W^S$ of the one-dimensional beam structure, the energy is conservative in the decoupled master-slave procedure. Moreover, the master-slave kinematics does not require the matched master point $M_i$ to be coincident with a beam node. In such cases the conservative load transferred algorithm in [26] needs to be applied. Although we focus on cable subsystems with circular cross-sections in the present work, this procedure can also be generalized for more complicated surfaces, such as bridges [32], turbine blades and flexible aircraft.

4. Embedded computational framework

The aforementioned cable-subsystem modeling approaches are particularly suitable for utilization in an Eulerian framework equipped with an Embedded or Immersed boundary method (EBMs or IBMs) [33, 34, 35, 36, 20, 18, 19, 21, 22, 37], also known as the fictitious domain method [38] and the Cartesian method [39, 40]. These methods effectively handle FSI applications featuring large structural deformations and/or topological changes [41, 21, 42], and therefore are an attractive option for cable subsystems characterized by large length-to-diameter ratios which generally undergo large deformations. Arbitrary Eulerian-Lagrangian (ALE) methods [43, 44] incorporating mesh motion algorithms or remeshing techniques [32, 10, 8] have also been applied to explore cable subsystem dynamics. In the present work, we focus mainly on the Eulerian framework. However, the cable subsystem modeling approaches discussed above can be readily incorporated into the ALE framework for problems with small or moderate displacements.

4.1. Governing equation

Let $\Omega^F$ denote the fixed fluid domain in the Eulerian computational framework, the conservative form of the Navier-Stokes equations can be written as

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F}(W) = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{G}(V, \nabla V),$$

in $\Omega^F$, (6)

where $V$ and $W$ are the vectors of the primitive and conservative variables describing the fluid state, respectively. $\mathbf{F}(W)$ and $\mathbf{G}(V, \nabla V)$ are respectively the inviscid and viscous flux tensor functions. Specifically,

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \mathbf{v} \\ p \end{pmatrix}, \quad W = \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \rho \mathbf{v} \\ E \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{F}(W) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho \mathbf{v} \\ \rho \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v} + p \mathbf{I} \\ (E + p) \mathbf{v} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{G}(V, \nabla V) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \tau \\ \tau \cdot \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{q} \end{pmatrix},$$

(7)

where $\rho$, $\mathbf{v}$, $p$, and $E$ denote the density, velocity, static pressure, and total energy per unit volume of the fluid, respectively. The velocity and total energy per unit volume are given by:

$$\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3)^T \text{ and } E = \rho c + \frac{1}{2} \rho (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2),$$

(8)
where $e$ denotes the specific (i.e., per unit of mass) internal energy. In the physical inviscid flux tensor $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is the identity matrix. In the viscous flux tensor $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathbf{\tau}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ denote the viscous stress tensor and heat flux vector, respectively, and are defined as:

$$
\mathbf{\tau} = \mu \left( \nabla^T \mathbf{v} + \nabla \mathbf{v} \right) + \left( \mu_v - \frac{2}{3} \mu \right) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathcal{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{q} = -\kappa \nabla T,
$$

(9)

where $\mu$ is the dynamic shear viscosity, $\mu_v$ is the bulk viscosity, $\kappa$ is the thermal conductivity, and $T$ is the temperature. The dynamic shear viscosity can be constant or varying. In the varying case, it is modeled using Sutherland’s viscosity law:

$$
\mu = \frac{\mu_0 \sqrt{T}}{1 + \frac{T_0}{T}}
$$

where $T_0$ is the reference temperature and $\mu_0$ is the corresponding viscosity.

The system of equations (6) is closed by assuming that the gas is ideal and calorically perfect:

$$
p = \rho RT \quad \text{and} \quad e = \frac{R}{\gamma - 1} T,
$$

(10)

where $R$ and $\gamma$ are the gas constant and specific heat ratio, respectively.

The governing equations of the dynamic equilibrium of the structure, including the cable subsystem, are written in the Lagrangian formulation with Einstein notation

$$
\rho_0^S \partial_t^2 \mathbf{u}_i = \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}_{im} S_{mj}}{\partial X_j} + \rho_0^S b_i \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_0^S,
$$

(11)

where $\Omega_0^S$ denotes the initial configuration with material coordinates $X_i$, $\rho_0^S$ denotes the structural material density, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ denotes the displacement vector, $F_{ij}$ denotes the deformation gradient tensor, $S_{ij}$ denotes the second Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor, and $b_i$ is the vector of body forces acting on $\Omega_0^S$. Given a structural material of interest, the closure of eq. (11) is performed by specifying a constitutive law that relates the second Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor to the symmetric Green strain tensor

$$
E = \frac{1}{2} \left( F^T F - 1 \right).
$$

Dirichlet and/or Neumann boundary conditions are applied to the Dirichlet and Neumann part of the boundary of $\Omega_0^S$, as required by the problem of interest.

In addition to eq. (6), eq. (11) and their associated boundary conditions, the FSI problem resulting from the embedding of the structural system in $\Omega^F$ is governed by the transmission conditions

$$
v_i = \dot{u}_i \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma_p,
$$

(12)

and

$$
-p \mathbf{n}_b + \mathbf{\tau} \mathbf{n}_b = J^{-1} F S F^T \mathbf{n}_b \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma_p,
$$

(13)

where $\mathbf{n}_b$ is the outward unit normal to the deformed configuration of the material interface $\Sigma_p$, and $J = \det(F)$. Since the fluid is assumed to be viscous, additional boundary conditions are specified on $\Sigma_p$: these are the adiabatic or isothermal boundary conditions, and the appropriate boundary conditions for the turbulence model equations when these are presented.

4.2. Semi-discretization of the governing equations

In this work, the governing system of fluid equations eq. (6) is semi-discretized away from the material interface by a combined vertex-based Finite Volume/Finite Element (FE) method [45], in which the convective (inviscid) terms are handled in a finite volume fashion, and the viscous terms are handled in a finite
element manner. Let \( \Omega^F_h \) denote the discretization of \( \Omega^F \) into \( N_i \) mesh nodes, and \( N_e \) primal elements. Around each node \( i \in \Omega^F_h \), a control volume \( C_i \) is constructed such that
\[
\Omega^F_h = \bigcup C_i = \bigcup \Omega^e_F,
\]
where \( \bigcup C_i \) constitutes a dual mesh, and \( \Omega^e_F \) denotes a primal element of this mesh. The control volume, also called the median-dual control volume, is formed by connecting the centroids, face, and edge-midpoints of all cells sharing the particular node (see fig. 2). Note that \( \partial C_i \) denote the boundary of the control volume \( C_i \), and \( n_i \) denote the unit outward normal to \( \partial C_i \).

Using the standard characteristic function associated with each control volume \( C_i \), the standard piecewise linear test function \( \psi_i \) associated with each node \( i \), and the equivalence between the two functional spaces generated by the two sets of such functions [45], the weak and semi-discrete form of eq. (6) reads
\[
\| C_i \| \frac{d W_i}{d t} + \sum_{j \in K(i)} \int_{\partial C_{ij}} F(W) \cdot n_{ij} ds + \int_{\partial C_i \cap \partial \Omega^F_\infty} F(W) \cdot n_\infty ds + \sum_{\Omega^e_F \ni i} \int_{\Omega^e_F} \nabla \psi^e_i \cdot G(V, \nabla V) dV + \int_{\Gamma_{F/S}} \sum_{\partial \Omega^F_\infty} G(V, \nabla V) \cdot n_b \psi^e_i ds = 0.
\] (14)

Here, \( \| C_i \| \) denotes the volume of \( C_i \), \( W_i \) denotes the average values of \( W \) in \( C_i \), and \( \partial C_{ij} = \partial C_i \cap \partial C_j \) with unit outward normal \( n_{ij} \), \( K(i) \) denotes the set of nodes connected by an edge to the node \( i \), \( \partial \Omega^F_\infty \) denotes the far-field boundary of the fluid domain with outward unit normal \( n_\infty \), \( \Gamma_{F/S} \) denotes the wall boundary of the fluid domain with outward unit normal \( n_b \), and \( \psi^e_i \) denotes the restriction of \( \psi_i \) to \( \Omega^e_F \).

The integral of the convective term in eq. (14) is approximated using Roe’s (or any other similar) approximate Riemann solver [46] equipped with a MUSCL technique [47] and a slope limiter. The far-field boundary term in eq. (14) is approximated by a standard far-field boundary flux [48, 49]. As a linear test function has a constant gradient in each primal element \( \Omega^e_F \), the viscous integral in eq. (14) can be approximated as
follows

$$\sum_{\Omega_e^F \ni i} \int_{\Omega_e^F} \nabla \psi^e_i \cdot G (V, \nabla V) \, dV \approx \sum_{\Omega_e^F \ni i} \|\Omega_e^F\| \nabla \psi^e_i \cdot G (V^e, \nabla V^e),$$  

(15)

where $\|\Omega_e^F\|$ is the volume of the element $\Omega_e^F$ and the terms $V^e$ and $\nabla V^e$ are defined as

$$V^e = \frac{1}{N^e_n} \sum_{k=1}^{N^e_n} V_k \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla V^e = \sum_{k=1}^{N^e_n} \nabla \psi^e_k V_k,$$

where $N^e_n$ denotes the number of nodes attached to the element $\Omega_e^F$.

The governing system of structural equations (11) is semi-discretized by the FE method using the total Lagrangian method. The resulting semi-discrete equations of equilibrium can be written as

$$M_h \ddot{u}_h + f^{\text{int}} (u_h, \dot{u}_h) = f^{\text{ext}},$$  

(16)

where $M_h$ denotes the symmetric positive definite FE mass matrix, $u_h$ denotes the vector of semi-discrete structural displacements, $f^{\text{int}}$ and $f^{\text{ext}}$ denote the vectors of semi-discrete internal and external or flow-induced generalized forces, respectively, and a dot designates a time derivative.

### 4.3. Imposition of the transmission condition

Imposition of the transmission conditions eqs. (12) and (13) in the Eulerian computational framework is the key factor that distinguishes one embedded boundary method from another. This paper focuses on the in-house Eulerian computational framework – The Finite Volume method with Exact two-material Riemann Problems (FIVER) method [50, 21, 51, 23, 24]. It tracks the fluid-structure interface using a robust intersector capable of handling not only closed surfaces and underresolved enclosed volumes, but also open thin shell surfaces. This framework has been extensively verified and validated for complex multi-material problems, including FSI problems with large deformations [52], turbulent flows [22], and dynamic fracture [53].

#### 4.3.1. No-slip boundary condition

The no-slip boundary condition eq. (12) embodies the structure to fluid coupling, i.e. the effect of the structure on the nearby fluid, which is enforced weakly near the fluid-structure interface, due to the non-conformal mesh. Its implementation in FIVER consists of two parts: the treatments for the inviscid flux, and the viscous flux near the fluid structure interface.

To compute the inviscid flux between an active node $j$ in the fluid computational domain and an inactive node $i$ covered by the structure computational domain, a local fluid-structure Riemann problem is formulated and solved at the fluid structure interface [21], which gives the approximated fluid state at the interface. This guarantees the characteristic theory and captures well the shock wave or rarefaction wave near the interface. The approximated state is used to compute the numerical flux through the surrogate interface (control volume boundary of cell $j$). The procedure is as follows (see fig. 3),
1. Reconstruct the fluid state vector on the material interface at $B$,
   first-order reconstruction: $W_jB = W_j$;
   second-order reconstruction: $W_jB = W_j + \nabla W_j \cdot (x_B - x_j)$.

2. Compute the fluid state vector $W^*_jB$ by solving a local, one-dimensional (1D), exact, half Riemann problem to enforce the no-penetration (slip) boundary condition,
   - project the fluid velocity vector and structure displacement vector on the normal direction of the material interface $v_{jB} = v_{jB} \cdot n_b$ and $u = u \cdot n_b$
   - solve a 1D, exact half Riemann problem (piston problem) along the direction of $n_b$, parameterized by $\xi$, by assuming the speed of the structure $\dot{u}$ is constant during this time step, to get the near wall 1D fluid conservative state variables $w(\xi,t) = w(\rho, v, p), \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial F(w)}{\partial \xi} = 0 \quad \xi \in [ut, \infty)$,
   - $w(\xi,0) = w_{jB} \quad \xi \in [0, \infty)$,
   - $v(ut,t) = \dot{u}$,
   where $w_{jB} = w(\rho_{jB}, v_{jB}, p_{jB})$. The solution consists of two constant parts (see fig. 3), which are separated by either a rarefaction wave or a shock wave. It is worth mentioning the velocity of the near-wall part is equal to that of the structure, which fulfills the non-penetration (slip) boundary condition.
   - add the tangential velocity to expand to a 3D velocity vector $v^*_jB = \dot{u} \cdot n_b + (v_{jB} - v_{jB} \cdot n_b)$.

   The fluid state vector at the fluid-structure interface becomes $W^*_jB = W(\rho^*_jB, v^*_jB, p^*_jB)$.

3. Interpolate or extrapolate to the surrogate boundary at $M$
   first-order reconstruction: $W^*_j = W^*_jB$
   second-order reconstruction: $W^*_j = \alpha_j W_j + (1 - \alpha_j) W^*_jB$,
   where $\alpha_j$ is the interpolation or extrapolation parameter.

4. Compute the numerical flux on the surrogate interface using Roe’s (or any other similar) approximate Riemann solver,
   $\Phi_{ji} = F(W_{ji}, W^*_j, n_{ji})$.
   where $W_{ji}$ is the reconstructed state variable at the surrogate interface from the $j$ side.

For the viscous flux, the ghost node method \[53, 22\] is applied. The primitive state variables associated with inactive nodes, such as $V^q_i$, are populated first. Generally, the ghost fluid state is unique at each time instance, which is populated either by mirroring or an average of constant and linear extrapolations of the state variables from the neighboring active fluid nodes (see fig. 4). Therefore, the usage of ghost state variables mixes the information on both sides, namely, the computation of the viscous flux $G(V^e, \nabla V^e)$ in the element $\Omega^e_{ijk}$ relies on state variables $V_m$ of node $m$, since $V^q_i$ depends on $V_m$. This can cause instability when the structure corner is underresolved by the fluid mesh, for example the sharp trailing edge of an airfoil or a cable with relatively small diameter. To relieve this issue, local ghost state variables are proposed. Specifically, several local ghost fluid state variables associated with each inactive node are constructed. Each local ghost fluid state variable $V^{q,e}_{i}$ is related to one particular primal element $\Omega^e_{ijkl}$, and is constructed based on the active nodes in that element and subsequently used only in the same element. Finally, using these populated local ghost fluid values, FIVER computes the viscous fluxes and source terms of the governing semi-discrete equations \[15\] as usual.
4.3.2. Load computation

The force equilibrium condition eq. (13) embodies the fluid to structure coupling, i.e. the effect of the flow on the structure. The flow-induced load on the embedded surface is generally evaluated first on each Gauss quadrature point \( g_i \) of surface elements (see fig. 5) and then these forces are assembled to give nodal forces. However, each Gauss quadrature point \( g_i \) is generally located within fluid a primal cell that contains inactive nodes (that is, nodes which are covered by the structure). Extrapolation is therefore required to obtain the flow-induced load, and this can lead to non-physical oscillations. Inspired by procedures in [24], modifications are proposed to avoid oscillations in these quantities. Specifically, shifted quadrature points are introduced by shifting each Gauss point \( g_i \) in the direction of the outward normal \( n \) to the wall, to the point \( g'_i \) (see fig. 5) defined by

\[
g'_i = g_i + h n
\]

where \( h \) is the characteristic mesh size of the fluid primal cell containing the Gauss point \( g_i \). The the shifted Gauss point \( g'_i \) is generally located in a primal cell.

Figure 5: Evaluation of force loads on \( \Sigma_p \). \( g_i \) and \( g'_i \) are the Gauss point and the shifted Gauss point associated to a structure boundary or fluid structure interface element.
The normal force is computed based on the pressure value at the shifted Gauss point

\[ p(g_i) = p(g_i') + O(h^2), \]  

where the \( O(h^2) \) term is derived from the Taylor expansion of the pressure field at \( g_i \) and the fact \( \frac{\partial p}{\partial n} \approx 0 \), obtained from the wall normal momentum conservation equation. The pressure at the shifted Gauss point \( g_i' \) is obtained by interpolation in the fluid primal cell containing it. With regards to the shear force, the shear stress tensor depends on the velocity gradient, which is written in the local coordinates \((x'_1, x'_2, x'_3)\) with \( x'_3 \) corresponding to the wall normal direction and \( x'_1 \) and \( x'_2 \) corresponding to the other two tangential directions, as follows

\[ \nabla_{x'} v(g_i) = \left( \frac{\partial v}{\partial x'_1}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial x'_2}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial x'_3} \right). \]  

The components corresponding to the derivatives in the tangential directions are computed based on the finite element approximation

\[ \frac{\partial v(g_i)}{\partial x'_\alpha} \approx \frac{\partial v(g_i')}{\partial x'_\alpha} = \sum_{k \in e} v_k \frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial x'_\alpha} \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \]  

where \( e \) is the primal cell that contains the shifted Gauss point, and \( \phi_k \) is the standard piecewise linear test function associated with each fluid node \( k \). The wall normal derivative, which is generally dominant, is approximated directly

\[ \frac{\partial v(g_i)}{\partial x'_3} = \frac{v(g_i') - \dot{u}(g_i)}{h} \]  

where \( \dot{u}(g_i) \) is the structure velocity at \( g_i \). When necessary, the wall normal derivative can be obtained from a wall model. Note that the evaluation of the velocity gradients also requires only interpolations.

### 4.4. Adaptive mesh refinement

When the structure undergoes large deformations, maintaining reasonable boundary layer resolution around the structure requires special effort in the Eulerian framework. Therefore, adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) \cite{55, 56, 57, 58, 59} is required. FIVER is equipped with a local refinement and coarsening algorithm based on the newest vertex bisection (NVB) \cite{56, 57, 25}, which enables the boundary layer and flow features to be efficiently tracked using the wall distance and a Hessian error indicator, respectively. However, for the cable subsystem, fully resolving its boundary layer is generally unaffordable, especially when the cable has large length-to-diameter ratio. To obtain a minimally acceptable resolution we propose a new criterion for marking edges for refinement which constitutes a lightweight alternative to the wall distance criterion proposed in \cite{25}. Specifically, when an edge of the fluid mesh is intersected twice by the cable’s outer surface – which indicates that the cable is underresolved in this proximity – the edge is selected for refinement and subsequently bisected. This criterion leads to an affordable mesh, and enables the effect of the structural dynamic response of the cable on the nearby flow to be captured. This new refinement strategy is referred to in what follows as the doubly-intersected edge criterion, and its effectiveness is demonstrated in section 5.2.

### 5. Applications

#### 5.1. Airborne refueling system

The first problem considered here is a model problem of an airborne refueling system \cite{12, 13, 14} which is designed to compare the “dressing” approach and the and alternative master/slave kinematic approach for modeling the cable subsystem in the context of an embedded framework CFD. A flexible hose that trails from the tanker aircraft is considered. Its setup is graphically depicted in fig. 6. The computational domain
is a cube of size $6 \times 4 \times 10$ m. The flexible hose is of length 8 m, and its length-to-diameter ratio is $L/D = 119.4$. The top end is pinned, i.e. all three translational freedoms are fixed, and the other end is free. Therefore, it is anticipated that the flexible hose will undergo large deformations when interacting with high speed flows, which motivates the usage of Eulerian (embedded) computational framework instead of the arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (body-fitted) framework. The detailed parameters of the hose material are listed in Table 1. The inflow conditions match the earth’s atmosphere at an elevation of 8 km above sea level, and are also listed in Table 1.

![Figure 6: Airborne refueling system: problem setup.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>8 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho^S$</td>
<td>Mass of unit length</td>
<td>0.38 kg m$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{out}$</td>
<td>Outer diameter</td>
<td>0.067 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{in}$</td>
<td>Inner diameter</td>
<td>0.051 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>Young’s modulus</td>
<td>17 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>Poisson’s ratio</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>Altitude</td>
<td>8 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_\infty$</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>0.58 kg m$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_\infty$</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>40000 Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_\infty$</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>240 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Ma_\infty$</td>
<td>Mach</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Airborne refueling system: material properties of the hose and the inflow conditions.

The hose is discretized by 100 beam elements, and its circular cross section is represented by a hexagon shape resulting in a discretization of the surface geometry by 1200 triangular elements. The fluid domain is initially (i.e. before adaption) discretized by 67,686 tetrahedra. To resolve the hose geometry, boundary layer and vortices, the fluid mesh is adaptively refined and coarsened by the newest vertex bisection algo-
The distance-based and Hessian-based mesh adaptation criteria are applied for boundary layer refinement and vortex refinement separately. The characteristic mesh size near the hose is about $4 \times 10^{-3}$ m, roughly $1/20$th of the diameter. The refinement of the vortices is initiated by a criterion based on the Hessian of the velocity magnitude with and terminated when a minimum edge length of $1.5 \times 10^{-2}$ m is reached.

Figure 7: Airborne refueling system: snapshots of the velocity magnitude field computed using the “dressing” approach (top) and the embedded boundary approach (bottom): $t = 0.01$ s, $t = 0.02$ s, $t = 0.03$ s, and $t = 0.04$ s (left to right).

The viscosity of air is modeled using Sutherland’s viscosity law with $\mu_0 = 1.458 \times 10^{-6}$ kg m$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$ and $T_0 = 110.6$ K. The Reynolds number based on the hose diameter is approximately $3.9 \times 10^5$. Hence, the flow is assumed to have transitioned to the turbulent regime, which is modeled here using the Spalart-Allmaras turbulence model [60]. Time discretization of the FSI problem is performed using the second-order, time-accurate, implicit-implicit fluid-structure staggered solution procedure developed in the work of [41], with a fluid-structure coupling time-step of $\Delta t_{F/S} = 2 \times 10^{-6}$ s. Both FSI simulations are initialized by an identical quasi-steady fluid state flow condition obtained from a simulation with a fixed rigid structure. The simulation physical time is $[0, 0.04]$ s. Figure 7 graphically depicts the time evolution of the adapted fluid mesh, the velocity magnitude of the fluid flow, and the hose displacement.

The hose drifts in response to the high-speed flow, and meanwhile interacts with the trailing vortices. The AMR effectively tracks the boundary layer and the flow features. It is worth mentioning that both approaches reproduce virtually identical flow features and structure displacement fields. The time histories of the drag force on the hose due to the fluid load and the x-displacements of the bottom node and the middle node obtained by both approaches are reported in fig. 8. Good agreements are achieved by both approaches.

5.2. Supersonic parachute inflation dynamics

Next, the inflation dynamics of a Disk-Gap-Band (DGB) parachute in the low-density, low-pressure supersonic Martian atmosphere is simulated [61, 62, 4]. The main purpose of this simulation is to understand the effects of the suspension line subsystem on the parachute performance during the deceleration process.
The DGB parachute system that successfully landed the NASA Curiosity Rover on the surface of Mars in 2012 (see fig. 9a) consists of three main components:

- the canopy, which is made of F-111 nylon,
- the suspension lines, which are made of Technora T221 braided cords, and
- the reentry vehicle [61].

Material properties and geometric parameters of the parachute system are listed in table 2. The simulation starts from the so-called line stretch stage with a folded parachute (see fig. 9b); an idealized analytical representation of the line stretch configuration and the corresponding prestress are employed for the structure initial state. The supersonic flow is incoming at $M_{\infty} = 1.8$, $\rho_{\infty} = 0.0067$ kg m$^{-3}$ and $p_{\infty} = 260$ Pa. Note that the specified freestream density and pressure conditions are similar to those observed in the standard Martian atmosphere.

Since the Martian atmosphere is mainly composed of carbon dioxide, the viscosity of this gas is modeled using Sutherland’s viscosity law with $\mu_0 = 1.57 \times 10^{-6}$ kg m$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$ and $T_0 = 240$ K. The Reynolds number based on the canopy diameter is $4.06 \times 10^6$. Hence, the flow is assumed to have transitioned to the turbulent regime, which is modeled here using the Vreman turbulence model [64], with model constant $C_s = 0.07$. The embedding computational fluid domain of size $200$ m $\times$ $160$ m $\times$ $160$ m is initially discretized by a mesh.
composed of Kuhn simplices \[57, 25\]. Specifically, this initial tetrahedral mesh contains 2,778,867 vertices and 16,308,672 tetrahedra. Adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) \[65, 57, 25\] is applied to track the boundary layer and the flow features. The doubly-intersected edge criterion discussed in section 4.4 is applied on each suspension lines. The characteristic mesh sizes near the reentry vehicle, suspension lines and the canopy are 2.5 cm, 3 mm, and 5 cm, respectively, while the mesh size in the wake and near the shock is 10 cm.

The canopy of the DGB parachute consists of band gores and disk gores. These are discretized here by 279,025 geometrically nonlinear thin shell ANDES elements \[66\] (although the membrane stiffness of the fabric is significantly larger than its bending stiffness, both stiffnesses are considered here). The canopy is made of F-111 nylon with an 8% void fraction, and the permeability is modeled by the homogenized porous wall model proposed in \[67\]. There are 80 suspension lines, and each one of them is discretized by 500 geometrically nonlinear beam elements. Finally, the reentry vehicle is treated as a fixed rigid body which not included in the structure model but rather represented directly in the fluid model by a fixed embedded surface. Due to the massive self-contact of the parachute canopy during its inflation, the explicit central difference time integration scheme is used for the time discretization of the structure solver. Consequently, only the alternative master/slave kinematic approach described in section 3 is capable of modeling the fluid suspension line subsystem interactions. The cross-section geometry of suspension lines is assumed to be circle with radius \( r = 1.6 \) mm and is represented as a hexagon.

First, a quasi steady-state solution is computed for a fixed parachute configuration corresponding to the initial stretch position shown in fig. 9b. Next, the fluid state is initialized using this quasi steady-state flow solution, the deformable structure is initialized using its initial state described above, and the FSI problem associated with the inflation of the DGB parachute is simulated in the time interval \([0, 0.8]\) s, during which the inflation process is expected to have completed and several breathing cycles to have been captured. Time discretization of the FSI problem is performed using the second-order, time-accurate, implicit-explicit fluid-structure staggered solution procedure developed in the work of \[41\]. The fluid-structure coupling time-step is initialized to \( \Delta t_{F/S} = 10^{-5} \) s but is able to vary during the simulation to preserve stability of the
conditionally-stable explicit structural time-integration scheme.

Figures [10] graphically depict the time evolution of the parachute and the flow Mach number field. The bow shock in the front of the canopy, disturbed by the wake generated by the reentry vehicle, vibrates along with the breathing cycles of the canopy. Jet-like flow, ejected through the canopy vent and gaps between the band/disk gores, interact with the turbulent wake behind the canopy. The parachute is fully inflated at approximately $t = 0.23\ \text{s}$, and it starts breathing after that time.

Although the suspension lines are very slender, they increase geometric blockage in the front of the canopy region, which slightly reduces the flow speed. Moreover, in the interactions with the flow the suspension lines can generate shocks (see fig. [10-e]) that alter the wake behind the reentry vehicle, and even disrupt the bow-shock. This agrees with the observations in [5] from sub-scale parachute inflation experiments.

The time-histories of the drag force computed by post-processing the FSI simulation results are plotted in fig. [11]. Moreover, drag performance of a simulation without considering the effect of the suspension lines is also presented. Although the drag force on the suspension lines is negligible (roughly 1%), the shocks from the suspension lines create disturbances ahead of the canopy which in turn disrupt the parachute bow-shock, mix the high pressure and low pressure flows, and reduce the drag force. The drag force data [61] collected from the Curiosity Rover during its Mars landing is also presented in fig. [11]. The peak drag prediction is in good agreement with the measured landing data, with a relative error of less than 10%.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we have proposed a simple and practical embedded surface approach to model fluid cable subsystem interactions in engineering systems. This approach is based on master/slave kinematics with the master beam elements and a slave embedded surface, which represents its true geometry. The fluid solver sees only the slave embedded surface which is used to evaluate the load, while the structure solver sees only the master beam elements. Moreover, it is suitable for Eulerian computational framework. Hence, combined with adaptive mesh refinement techniques, the approach effectively handles large deformations of the cable subsystem. Its application to the simulation of a model airborne refueling system and a challenging supersonic parachute inflation problem has clearly demonstrated its practicality and reasonable computational efficiency. An interesting area for future work would be to apply the current model to other underresolved slender structures, such as turbine blades and aircraft fuselages.
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Figure 10: Time-evolution of the parachute and the flow Mach number.
Figure 11: Drag histories of the supersonic parachute inflation dynamics problem: Curiosity Rover data (blue), simulation without suspension line fluid interaction (orange), simulation with suspension line fluid interaction (green), suspension lines only (red)