Turbulence drag modification with the Transpiration-Resistance Model
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A set of boundary conditions called the Transpiration-Resistance Model (TRM) are investigated in their ability to change the drag of turbulent flow by altering the near-wall conditions. The TRM has been previously proposed by Lacis \textit{et al.} (2020) as a means of representing the effect of surface micro-textures on flows. It encompasses conventional Navier-slip boundary conditions relating the streamwise and spanwise velocities to their respective shears through the slip lengths $l_x$ and $l_z$. In addition, it derives a transpiration condition accounting for the changes induced in the wall-normal velocity by expressing it in terms of variations of wall-parallel shear through the transpiration lengths $m_x$ and $m_z$. The transpiration is essential in capturing the behavior of drag-increasing surfaces such as roughness. Greater levels of drag increase occur when more transpiration takes place at the boundary, with the transpiration itself observed to be strongly coupled to the spanwise shear component. A virtual-origin framework proposed by Ibrahim \textit{et al.} (2021) and originating from the work of Luchini \textit{et al.} (1991) is leveraged to identify a regime of drag modification where near-wall turbulence retains a structure similar to that of canonical smooth-wall turbulence. The TRM is able to reproduce the effect of a homogeneous and structured roughness up to $k^+ \approx 18$. Moreover, a linear relation is found between the imposed transpiration lengths in the TRM and the roughness function, providing some promise for drag prediction of transitionally rough surfaces.

1. Introduction

Flows over surfaces are of engineering significance owing to their extensive technological applications. This has led to a vast corpus of studies dedicated to this subject, with particular attention given to turbulent flow over rough surfaces (Schlichting 1979; Perry, Henbest & Chong 1986; Panton 1999; Jiménez 2013). Within this large field, one may categorize surface roughness into textured (regular) and random (irregular) types, in which the former is the subject of this paper. In an early experimental study, Hanjalić & Launder (1972) affected roughness by mounting square bars (ribs) on a wall in a transverse orientation to the direction of the flow. This geometrical configuration, or simple variations of it, has since been recurrently used in many numerical studies of roughness effects on turbulence owing to its simplicity and efficacy (Leonardi, Orlandi, Smalley, Djenidi & Antonia 2003; Orlandi, Leonardi & Antonia 2006).

All of the aforementioned studies involve a geometrical representation of surface
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textures. In the case of numerical studies, this is necessary for capturing all of the flow physics down to the scale of the texture. In the context of drag-reducing surfaces, such as riblets, a different line of inquiry has been to characterize the effect of textured surfaces in terms of physically meaningful flow parameters and eschew the minute details of the flow within the region of the texture. Such was the effort undertaken by Luchini, Manzo & Pozzi (1991) where riblets were quantified in terms of a height difference between imaginary impenetrable walls perceived by the longitudinal and cross-stream flow components. An approach of a similar nature has been employed in modelling the effect of superhydrophobic surfaces using slip boundary conditions (Min & Kim 2004; Fukagata, Kasagi & Kounoutsakos 2006; Busse & Sandham 2012).

For laminar flows, one may derive generalized effective boundary conditions which can serve as surrogates for textured surfaces and even permeable substrates (Lācis & Bagheri 2017; Bottaro 2019; Sudhakar, Lācis, Pasche & Bagheri 2021). Assuming a creeping (or laminar) flow inside and over the textures, one may determine the full set of boundary conditions from analysing unit-cell problems that contain one periodic sample of the texture. This unit-cell approach, although successfully applied by Luchini, Manzo & Pozzi (1991) for riblets, is not a viable method for textured surface in the presence of turbulence. This is due to the fact that inertial and unsteady effects from the turbulence become significant, unless the texture is extremely small \( \left( k^+ \to 0 \right) \), where \( k^+ \) is the characteristic surface length in viscous units). However, as will be explored in this paper, these effective boundary conditions can be used semi-empirically for modeling the turbulence modification induced by small textures \( \left( k^+ \lesssim 20 \right) \).

The objective of the current work is to investigate the turbulence modification induced by a particular set of effective boundary conditions called the “Transpiration-Resistance Model”. These conditions – derived under creeping-flow assumption – encapsulate the effect of surface micro-textures and were proposed by Lācis, Sudhakar, Pasche & Bagheri (2020). The TRM is comprised of Robin boundary conditions, with Navier-slip type conditions for the wall-parallel velocities and a transpiration condition coupling the wall-normal velocity to the changes in shear of the other two velocity components. Specifically, the potential of the TRM on modeling the effect of small textured surfaces on the overall drag is quantitatively demonstrated. The main purpose of this work is to show that drag-increasing textured surfaces with a certain size can be modeled with TRM, thus providing a means for the efficient modeling of small roughness in turbulent flows.

1.1. The law of the wall and mean velocity shift

Wall-bounded turbulent flows are classically described using the logarithmic law as derived by von Kármán (1930), Prandtl (1932) and later expanded upon by Clauser (1956) and Coles (1956). The general form of the law for the logarithmic region of the mean velocity profile is

\[
U^+ = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln y^+ + B, \tag{1.1}
\]

where \( U \) is the mean velocity and \( y \) is the distance normal to the wall. The “+” sign indicates scaling in “inner units”; therefore \( U^+ = U/u_\tau \) and \( y^+ = y u_\tau / \nu \) with \( u_\tau \) being the friction velocity defined based on the fluid stress at the wall, \( u_\tau^2 = \tau_w / \rho \). The dimensionless constant \( \kappa \) is the the von Kármán number and \( B \) is an additive constant accounting for the offset of logarithmic region from the wall origin. The presence of small surface textures which do not exceed the thickness of the viscous sublayer amounts to a vertical shift of the mean velocity profile, \( \Delta U^+ \), in regions far away from the wall.
(Clauser 1956),

$$U^+ = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln y^+ + B + \Delta U^+. \tag{1.2}$$

A negative $\Delta U^+$ indicates a downward shift of the mean velocity profile which is observed for drag-increasing surfaces. The term itself is commonly referred to as the “roughness function”. Here, $\Delta U^+$ is considered to be the appropriate quantity in measuring drag change for small textures. As long as the characteristic texture size remains the same when scaled in inner units, its corresponding value of $\Delta U^+$ will also remain fixed regardless of Reynolds number (Spalart & McLean 2011; García-Mayoral, Gómez-de-Segura & Fairhall 2019).

The objective of modeling rough walls in turbulence is thus to find a parameterization of $\Delta U^+$ in terms of the geometrical parameters of the surface. However, general principles for determining $\Delta U^+$ given the geometry of textured surface are lacking. In fact, determining $\Delta U^+$ even after having performed simulations and experiments of the flow over the physical surface has turned out to be non-trivial. The problematic aspect is choosing an appropriate wall-normal coordinate origin for a given rough surface; an ambiguity which does not exist for a smooth-wall. Setting the wall-normal origin at different positions can result in different slopes of the logarithmic region (Clauser 1956) and seemingly in different values for $\kappa$ (see for example Jackson 1981, Mizuno & Jiménez 2011 and Rosti & Brandt 2017). Experimentally, the approach is to carry out a fit of the measured velocity profile against a variation of (1.2) while retaining empirically determined universal values of $\kappa$ and $B$. Numerically, this problem has been resolved for small surface textures using the virtual origin framework. It is also within this framework that the TRM will be assessed in terms of its ability to model turbulence modification. However, before describing the virtual origin framework, it is instructive to discuss the early studies that were the precursors of it.

### 1.2. Protrusion heights, virtual origins and slip lengths

Bechert & Bartenwerfer (1989) studied the drag-reducing effect of riblets experimentally and established that their influence on the longitudinal flow was as if it perceived a plain wall at a depth below the riblet tips and called this distance “protrusion height”. Bechert, Bartenwerfer & Hoppe (1990) later experimentally measured a similar protrusion height for the cross-flow. Luchini et al. (1991) demonstrated that for the drag-reducing case of riblets, the protrusion height of the cross-flow, $h_\perp$, is always less than that of the longitudinal flow, $h_\parallel$. In other words, the former perceives a shallower virtual origin than the latter. The only pertinent parameter for characterising drag change then becomes their difference, $\Delta h$.

Jiménez (1994) conducted DNS of opposition control experiments in which artificial virtual walls were imposed for the cross-flow at different positions above and below the position of the actual no-slip wall, $y^+ = 0$. He observed that this had the effect of translating the entire profile of the cross-flow velocity fluctuations, with this behaviour extending to the other velocity fluctuations as well. Jiménez (1994) also observed that the change in friction was proportional to the offset of the virtual spanwise no-slip wall from the regular longitudinal no-slip wall, $\Delta c_f/c_{f_0} = -1.09 \Delta y^+ \approx -\Delta y^+$, with drag reduction being achieved for cases where the former was located at positions above the latter.

Many numerical studies carried-out in the context of turbulent flow over superhydrophobic surfaces, such as those of Min & Kim (2004); Fukagata et al. (2006) and Busse & Sandham (2012), utilized Navier-slip boundary conditions in mimicking the drag changing behaviour of such surfaces. All of them demonstrated that the effect of
spanwise slip is to degrade (increase) drag while the streamwise slip decreases it. Fukagata et al. (2006) and Busse & Sandham (2012) in taking the imposed slip lengths to the limit of infinity, \((l_x^+, l_z^+) \to \infty\), observed a drag-saturation effect for both, with it occurring earlier for the spanwise slip.

The concepts of slip lengths and protrusion heights are actually equivalent (Luchini 2015; García-Mayoral et al. 2019). Both are predicated upon the principle that the near-wall region of turbulent flow behaves asymptotically as shear-driven laminar flow. The connection between the two was established quite late, which led to two different interpretations of how the near-wall structure of turbulence becomes altered.

The observation made by Jiménez (1994) regarding the translation of the turbulent flow field due to the imposition of virtual walls, implied that flow turbulence was undergoing little to no structural change. Contrary to this, in the studies of Min & Kim (2004); Fukagata et al. (2006) and Busse & Sandham (2012), it was inferred that increased turbulent skin friction when having a finite spanwise slip velocity at the boundary was due to the strength of the quasi-streamwise vortices becoming enhanced (figure 1a). This conclusion was reinforced by flow-field visualisations which showed enhanced levels of turbulent activity relative to a smooth-wall flow at the same wall-normal positions. This appeared to be at odds with the results of Jiménez (1994), but was later shown not to be the case and the two different observations are reconcilable within the virtual-origin framework.

1.3. The virtual origin framework

Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral (2020), taking inspiration from the work of Luchini et al. (1991), investigated methods for imposing virtual origins on the different velocity components of turbulent flow. They ultimately settled upon Robin boundary conditions of Navier-slip form for all three velocity components,

\[
    u = l_x \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=0}, \quad w = l_z \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=0}, \quad v = l_y \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=0}.
\]

(1.3)

Studies of turbulent flow over roughness (Orlandi & Leonardi 2006; Orlandi et al. 2006), established that greater levels of drag are driven by a pronounced presence of wall-normal velocity fluctuations within the roughness region. Based on this understanding, Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral (2020) postulated that the saturation effect observed by Fukagata et al. (2006) and Busse & Sandham (2012) was due to maintaining the impermeability condition for the wall-normal velocity at the boundary. This limits the proximity of the quasi-streamwise vortices to it as they cannot induce wall-normal motion close to an impermeable boundary. The removal of the impermeability
constraint weakens this limitation and permits the quasi-streamwise vortices to undergo a downward displacement. This vortex displacement effect (figure 1b) implies that the structure of turbulence remains unchanged. Indeed, Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral (2020) demonstrated that the near-wall turbulence perceives a virtual origin, $l_T^+$, which falls between the virtual origins perceived by the wall-normal and spanwise velocity fluctuations ($l_u^+ < l_T^+ < l_w^+$). Once the origin for the wall-normal coordinate is set at $y^+ = -l_T^+$ and $u_\tau$ is calculated for this origin, the resulting mean velocity profile mirrors that of a smooth-wall turbulent flow and is offset from it by $\Delta U^+ = l_U^+ - l_T^+$. In a recent work, Ibrahim et al. (2021) essentially demonstrate that $l_T^+ = l_{uv}^+$, i.e. that the virtual origin of the turbulence is that of the Reynolds shear stress. This is perhaps unsurprising when considering that for the mean flow, the stress terms which appear in the momentum equation are those of viscous and Reynolds shear with the latter being zero at the position of the wall. This associates the wall for canonical smooth-wall turbulence with the condition that $u'v' = 0$. It follows from this line of reasoning that if the mean and turbulent components of the flow undergo displacements but remain otherwise smooth-wall like, then the proper choice of wall-normal origin will be $y^+ = -l_{uv}^+$ where $u'v'^+ = 0$ such that the resulting friction velocity provides a scaling equivalent to that over a smooth-wall (Luchini 1996).

To summarize, the virtual origin framework amounts to determining the virtual origins of turbulence and the mean flow, to obtain the roughness function,

$$\Delta U^+ = l_U^+ - l_{uv}^+. \quad (1.4)$$

Following a procedure similar to that of Abderrahaman-Elena, Fairhall & Garcia-Mayoral (2019), the above relation can be obtained from the time and space averaged mean momentum equation (see appendix A). In this work, the virtual origin framework will be used in conjunction with the TRM, which is described in the following section.

2. The Transpiration-Resistance Model (TRM)

The TRM was proposed by Lacis et al. (2020) as a means of reproducing the macro-scale effect of a textured surface upon bulk fluid flow without having to resolve the micro-scale flow within the textured region itself. It is comprised of the following Robin boundary conditions for the three velocity components:

$$u = l_x \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=0}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$w = l_z \frac{\partial w}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=0}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$v = - m_x \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \bigg|_{y=0} - m_z \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} \bigg|_{y=0}. \quad (2.3)$$

The boundary conditions for the streamwise and spanwise velocities are the familiar Navier-slip condition. What is distinctive, is the boundary condition for the wall-normal velocity, i.e. the transpiration boundary condition. The “resistance” part of the TRM refers to tangential slip conditions since surface textures impose a reduced resistance on the overlying flow (compared to a smooth surface).

Sudhakar et al. (2021) performed an asymptotic expansion for Stokes flow ($Re \ll 1$) over a surface with small textures and showed that the “transpiration” part of the TRM appears as a $O(\epsilon^2)$ term, whereas the tangential slip components are $O(\epsilon^1)$ terms. Here, $\epsilon \ll 1$ is the ratio between the length scales of the surface and the system or overlying
Figure 2: Conceptual illustration of the mass conservation argument for transpiration generation. Transpiration arising due to differences in in-going and out-going streamwise fluxes of the control volume (a); Displacement of quasi-streamwise vortices due to relaxation of both spanwise no-slip and wall-normal impermeability (b).

flow. However, the transpiration term in the TRM can also be derived from a mass conservation argument, without any use of asymptotic expansions.

The physical picture depicting the relation between these boundary conditions, as described by Lacis et al. (2020), is shown in figure 2(a), where a control volume containing two textures is bounded by the dashed line. The argument being that due to mass conservation in this control volume, the varying slip velocity experienced by the flow as it moves over the textured surface must be balanced by transpiration.

A picture more relevant for turbulence near a wall is sketched in figure 2(b), where two counter-rotating quasi-streamwise vortices and a control-volume (dashed rectangle) are shown in the cross plane. The slip condition for the spanwise velocity component results in a flux through the vertical faces of the control volume due the presence of the vortices; the difference between these fluxes must be compensated by a flux through the horizontal face of the control volume, giving rise to a wall-normal velocity.

The boundary condition for the wall-normal velocity (2.3) can be rewritten by replacing the wall-parallel velocities with their respective slip boundary conditions (2.1-2.2), giving

$$v = -m_x l_x \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x \partial y} \bigg|_{y=0} - m_z l_z \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial z \partial y} \bigg|_{y=0}.$$  (2.4)

In this form, the transpiration velocity’s definition as being due to the variation of shear-rates of the wall-parallel velocities becomes explicit. We refer to $m_x$ and $m_z$, in analogy to the slip lengths $l_x$ and $l_z$, as the transpiration lengths. In flow terms, they represent the distance below the interface to which wall-normal fluid motion can penetrate. From the virtual origin perspective, a weakening of both spanwise viscous dissipation and impermeability leads to a displacement of the near-wall turbulence structures and a net downward translation of the near-wall turbulent flow (figure 2b).

As the TRM is derived under the assumption of a Stokes flow regime, its applicability to wall-bounded turbulent flow involving textured surfaces abides by the same arguments employed by Luchini et al. (1991) in their quantification of protrusion heights for riblets. Fairhall, Abderrahaman-Elena & García-Mayoral (2019) estimated the slip generated by superhydrophobic surfaces in turbulent flows using laminar flow simulations. They showed that the Stokes flow analysis only provides accurate estimates for textures with characteristic lengths of $L^+ \leq 5$, which corresponds to slip lengths $l^+ \leq 2$. For larger textures, advective effects start to become significant and a full laminar analysis becomes necessary. This extends the range of validity to $L^+ \leq 15$; beyond this the length becomes large enough that non-linear interactions with the turbulent flow will take place and the homogenized slip lengths predicted using laminar flow analysis will no longer be valid.
These observations were made for the slip experienced by the mean flow. For cross-flow induced slip, both Stokes and full laminar simulations fail to provide accurate predictions beyond $L^+ \leq 5$. A similar situation was demonstrated by Abderrahaman-Elena 	extit{et al.} (2019) for turbulent flows over roughness.

![Figure 3: Mean velocity (a) and Reynolds shear-stress (b) profiles; ---, smooth-wall; --•--, geometry-resolved; -■-, TRM (using parameters listed in table 1).](image)

**Table 1:** Comparison of calculated slip and transpiration lengths using Stokes analysis to those used in a turbulent channel flow DNS with TRM which reproduces the drag change of the geometry resolved DNS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>$l^+$</th>
<th>$m^+$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stokes (Lacis 	extit{et al.} 2020)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel flow with TRM</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, previous studies suggest that laminar simulations involving a periodic element (i.e. unit-cell approach) of the surface roughness provide accurate estimates for structured roughness of size $k^+ \leq 15$ with advective effects having a noticeable presence even for roughness elements as small as $k^+ \approx 6$.

The aforementioned studies were only concerned with predicting the slip caused by textured surfaces and not any transpiration. Lacis 	extit{et al.} (2020) also employed Stokes analysis in estimating both the slip and transpiration lengths appearing in (2.1-2.3). Similar to Abderrahaman-Elena 	extit{et al.} (2019), they employed unit-cell simulations and estimated such lengths for a rough surface consisting of cuboids with no directionality (more specifications of the surface may be found in figure 11 and table 5 of Lacis 	extit{et al.} (2020)). The estimations followed a homogenization approach; with straightforward spatial averaging of the velocity at the interface plane for the slip lengths, while the transpiration lengths were obtained by dividing the volume averaged flow below the interface by the slip lengths.

Table 1 compares the estimated transpiration length by Lacis 	extit{et al.} (2020) with those of a turbulent channel flow DNS using the TRM which reproduces the effect of the geometry-resolved rough wall DNS (figure 3). The Stokes flow simulation of the unit-cell results in an under-predicted transpiration length. A probable explanation for this is neglecting unsteadiness and advection or both.

Caution should be advised when attempting to make comparisons between transpiration determined using Stokes analysis and that of an actual turbulent flow. The turbulent
flow phenomena incurred along the wall-normal direction which contribute to skin friction are the ejections and sweeps, events which transport momentum from regions farther away from the wall and are intermittent in space and time. These events subject the viscous sublayer to perturbations, causing it to deviate from laminar behavior. Therefore, a Stokes description of transpiration alone may be insufficient in adequately accounting for wall-normal fluid transport in the wall region.

3. Numerical method

The DNS solver used to carry out the turbulent channel flow simulations with the TRM solves the non-dimensional incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

\[
\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \frac{1}{Re} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u},
\]

(3.1)

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,
\]

(3.2)

where \( \mathbf{u} = (u, v, w) \) is the velocity vector consisting of the components in the streamwise \((x)\), wall-normal \((y)\) and spanwise \((z)\) directions; \( p \) is the kinematic pressure; \( Re \) is the bulk Reynolds number. The equations are discretized in a Cartesian coordinate system using second-order central finite differences in a staggered arrangement. A fractional-step pressure-correction method (Kim & Moin 1985) updates the solution at each time step of the simulation by first calculating an intermediate non-divergence free velocity field. The pressure filed is then updated by solving a Poisson equation using a computationally efficient FFT-based solver (Costa 2018). The updated pressure field then corrects the velocity field making it divergence free. Time advancement utilizes a third-order three-substep low storage Runge-Kutta method, with both advective and diffusive terms treated explicitly. Parallelization of the computational domain is achieved through a 2d pencil-like decomposition using the 2DECOMP&FTT library (Li & Laizet 2010) which utilizes MPI.

The computational domain has conventional dimensions of \( L_x = 2\pi \delta, L_y = 2\delta \) and \( L_z = \pi \delta \) where \( \delta \) is the channel half-height. The number of grid points are \( N_x = 192, N_y = 144 \) and \( N_z = 160 \); evenly spaced along \( x, z \) and unevenly along \( y \). The spatial resolutions in the horizontal directions are \( \Delta x^+ = 5.9 \) and \( \Delta z^+ = 3.5 \), while the wall-normal resolution varies from \( \Delta y^+ = 0.6 \) at the boundaries to \( \Delta y^+ = 4.3 \) at the channel center-line. All simulations were conducted at a friction Reynolds number of \( Re = u_\tau \delta/\nu = 180 \), with the flow driven by an imposed constant mean pressure gradient. Simulations were initialized using a statistically converged smooth-wall solution and advanced for 110 \( \delta/u_\tau \), with statistics gathered over at least 50 \( \delta/u_\tau \).

The boundary conditions along \( x \) and \( z \) are periodic while the TRM is imposed on the domain boundaries along \( y \). The coupling between the slip lengths and the wall-normal velocity gradients of \( u \) and \( w \) (2.1-2.2) are explicit within the solver, as are the transpiration lengths and double derivatives (2.4). Imposing the transpiration boundary condition however entails some consideration. If all three velocity components are modified concurrently, this will introduce discontinuities in the near-wall flow field. To avoid this, a iterative process takes place within the fractional-step loop where the solution is gradually relaxed to a state which satisfies both the transpiration boundary condition (2.4) and continuity (3.2) using a convergence criterion based on error minimization.
and no letter for turbulence displacement or alterations of a different nature. Modification and identify whether the effect is solely due to that of smooth-wall like slip lengths mean flow and Reynolds shear stress respectively which are obtained from DNS of turbulent channel flow with the TRM results are reported in appendix B.

The virtual-origin framework is used to highlight the contributing effects to drag validation of the numerical solver was done for a no-slip and impermeable boundary configuration. Grid convergence for the TRM simulations was checked by repeating certain simulations at a higher resolution of $N_x = 256$, $N_y = 252$ and $N_z = 256$ with corresponding grid spacings of $\Delta x^+ = 4.4$ and $\Delta z^+ = 2.2$, and $0.3 \leq \Delta y^+ \leq 2.7$. The results are reported in appendix B.

### 4. DNS of turbulent channel flow with the TRM

The TRM is examined through the cases in table 2 to investigate how it affects flow turbulence. Each case is denoted with L<<>M<<>, where the digit following L refers to the slip lengths $l_x^+$ while the letter and digit following M denote the direction and size of the transpiration lengths imposed (X for $m_x^+ \neq 0, m_z^+ = 0$ and Z for $m_x^+ = 0, m_z^+ \neq 0$ and no letter for $m_x^+ = m_z^+$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$Re_x$</th>
<th>$Re_z'$</th>
<th>$l_x^+$</th>
<th>$l_z^+$</th>
<th>$m_x^+$</th>
<th>$m_z^+$</th>
<th>$l_u^+$</th>
<th>$l_w^+$</th>
<th>$l_v^+$</th>
<th>$l_{uv}^+$</th>
<th>$\Delta U^+$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2M0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2M2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2MX2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2MZ2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2M5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2MX5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2MZ5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5M0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5M5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5MX5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5MZ5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of TRM simulations. $l_u^+$ and $l_{uv}^+$ are the virtual origins for the mean flow and Reynolds shear stress respectively which are obtained \textit{a-posteriori} from the simulation results; $l_u^+$ was calculated by extrapolation of the mean velocity profile to the $y^+$ position where $U^+ = 0$, while $l_{uv}^+$ was estimated by shifting the $-\overline{uv'}^+$ profile relative to that of a smooth-wall solution until a best fit is obtained in the region $10 < y^+ < 25$. $Re_x$ is based on the friction velocity at $y^+ = 0$ and $Re_z'$ on the friction velocity at $y^+ = -l_{uv}^+$ and $\delta' = \delta + l_{uv}^+$. $\Delta U^+$ is the mean velocity shift in the logarithmic region relative to the smooth-wall solution without any coordinate shift or re-scaling applied, i.e. based on the friction velocity at $y^+ = 0$. $l_u^+$, $l_v^+$ and $l_w^+$ are the virtual origins for the velocity fluctuations $u'^+$, $v'^+$ and $w'^+$ estimated from their r.m.s. profiles. Those of $u'^+$ and $w'^+$ were obtained using extrapolation, while that of $v'^+$ was estimated by fitting it to a smooth-wall solution due to its strong curvature in the immediate vicinity of the domain boundary (similar to $-\overline{uv'}^+$). Linear extrapolation was not used due to it not capturing the curvature effects of the profiles.
4.1. TRM with isotropic transpiration lengths

Cases with equal transpiration lengths are considered first (figure 4). This implies a contribution of equal proportion to transpiration by the streamwise and spanwise flows, i.e. no anisotropy in induced transpiration.

The slip-only case of L2M0 (not shown) is similar to those found in literature (Min & Kim 2004; Fukagata et al. 2006; Busse & Sandham 2012; Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral 2020) and leads to a reduction in drag as evident by the excess momentum it has relative to the smooth wall solution ($\Delta U^+ > 0$ in table 2). While the impermeability condition is maintained for this case and hence $v'^±$ is 0 at the boundary, it’s near-wall distribution undergoes a change through continuity owing to both $u'^±$ and $w'^±$ becoming modified by their imposed slip conditions (Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral 2020).

The addition of transpiration in case L2M2 leads to a substantial decrease in the drag reduction observed in case L2M0, neutralizing it almost entirely (figure 4a). Both $v'^±$ (figure 4b) and $-u'v'^±$ (figure 4c) now have finite values at the boundary plane, but the amount of Reynolds shear-stress present is not enough to overcome the drag reduction afforded by the mean flow slip. Increasing the transpiration lengths in case L2M5, such that they now exceed their corresponding slip lengths, amounts to a downward shift of the velocity profile and drag increase. Whereas drag increase was not observed in case L2M2, the increase in transpiration in case L2M5 and the resulting greater magnitude of Reynolds shear-stress at the boundary plane overcomes the beneficial effect of the mean velocity slip and leads to a momentum deficit of the flow ($\Delta U^+ < 0$).

Both the slip and transpiration lengths appear in (2.4) with their products being the coefficients of the transpiration boundary condition. Therefore, for case L5M5 the previous transpiration lengths have been kept but the slip lengths have been increased. This results in the same level of drag change that was observed for case L2M2 where the slip and transpiration lengths were similarly equal to one another.
Figure 5: Pre-multiplied two dimensional spectral densities of $u'^2$, $v'^2$, $w'^2$ and $-u'v'$: L5M5 (a–d); L2M5 (e–h); L2M2 (i–l). Shaded regions are the smooth-wall solution at $y^+ \approx 15$ and solid lines are the TRM cases at $y^+ + l_{uv}^+ \approx 15$ scaled using $u_\tau$ at $y^+ = -l_{uv}^+$.

Figure 6: Flow-field at the boundary plane ($y^+ = 0$) for case L2M5, conditionally averaged for positive (red) and negative (blue) velocity fluctuations of maximum magnitude: Wall-normal (a) and spanwise (b) velocity fluctuations.

The mean velocity profile of smooth-wall turbulence is recoverable for all of the cases considered thus far after accounting for the virtual-origin effect (figure 4d). It is only case L5M5 which exhibits slight deviations from smooth-wall turbulence in its velocity fluctuations within the vicinity of the boundary (figure 4e). To determine the extent of such differences the pre-multiplied energy spectra (figure 5) may be examined. Indeed, the spectra of case L5M5 exhibits the most difference, however, the overall distribution of energy is still smooth-wall like, which is why the change in drag is accounted for by a displacement of the turbulent flow-field.
Figure 7: Roughness pattern of the DNS case from Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019) chosen for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$Re^*_τ$</th>
<th>$Re_τ$</th>
<th>$ΔU^+*$</th>
<th>$ΔU^+$</th>
<th>$s_x/k$</th>
<th>$s_z/k$</th>
<th>$k^+$</th>
<th>$l_U^+$</th>
<th>$l_{uv}^+$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C06</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C09</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Characteristics of geometry resolved DNS cases along with their mean flow and Reynolds shear-stress virtual origins, as reported in Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019). Note: $Re^*_τ$ and $ΔU^+*$ are the original values reported in the cited work and are based on the mean flow virtual origin ($y^+ = -l_U^+$), while $Re_τ$ and $ΔU^+$ are re-scaled values based on the turbulence virtual origin ($y^+ = -l_{uv}^+$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$Re_τ$</th>
<th>$l_x^+$</th>
<th>$l_z^+$</th>
<th>$m_x^+$</th>
<th>$m_z^+$</th>
<th>$l_U^+$</th>
<th>$l_{uv}^+$</th>
<th>$ΔU^+$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M3</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M4</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M6</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M8</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.2M10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L0.5M8</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L0.7M7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.5M12</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1.9M15</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Summary of TRM simulations conducted for comparison with the rough-wall DNS of Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019). Parameter descriptions the same as those in table 2.
Figure 8: Reynolds shear stress and r.m.s. velocity fluctuations of cases L1.2M2 - L1.2M10. Direction of arrows indicate increasing transpiration. Origin at $y^+ = 0$ (a,c,d,e); origin at $y^+ = -l_{uv}^+$ and re-scaled with the corresponding $u_\tau$ (b,f,g,h). Symbols represent DNS case C12 from Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019).

Figure 6(a) shows instances of downward and upward $v^+$ at $y^+ = 0$. There are alternating patches of $v^+$ along the spanwise direction. The distance between two patches of similar sign is $\Delta z^+ \approx 100$, consistent with the spacing of the near-wall streaks (Kline et al. 1967). The spacing between consecutive regions of opposite sign is $50 \lesssim \lambda_x^+ \lesssim 60$, consistent with twice the diameter of a quasi-streamwise vortice (Kim et al. 1987). Also, in Figure 6(b) a change from $v^+ > 0$ to $v^+ < 0$ is accompanied by a patch of $w^+ < 0$ and vice-versa. These observations are in accord with the depiction in figure 2(b).

4.2. Applicability to geometrical roughness

The results so far have demonstrated that the TRM can affect the flow in such a way that changes in drag are achieved. In this section, the applicability of the TRM at reproducing the effect of a rough surface is probed. The candidate case chosen for this purpose is case C12 from Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019) which is a DNS of turbulent channel flow over a rough surface. The geometry of the roughness is depicted schematically in figure 7 and consists of a homogeneous distribution of cubes of height
$k$ with equal streamwise and spanwise pitches ($s_x = s_z$). The characteristics of case C12 are brought in table 3. Another aspect of importance is that Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019) remove the footprint of the roughness geometry from the flow turbulence using a spectral based decomposition. This makes their turbulence statistics more suitable for comparison as the TRM simulations likewise do not have any geometrical structures present.

The rough wall DNS cases of collocated cubes (figure 7) which have a $k^+ \gtrsim 12$, exhibit a near-wall turbulence structure which is no longer smooth-wall-like. Therefore, to assess the TRM in its ability to mimic a rough surface, case C12 ($k^+ \approx 12$) has been chosen as it is the largest roughness which retains a smooth-wall-like turbulence structure. This allows for a more straightforward evaluation to be done.

Owing to the homogeneous pattern of the roughness elements the slip lengths imposed using the TRM are set equal to that reported for the mean flow in table 3, i.e. $l_x^+ = l_z^+ = 1.2$. The transpiration lengths, $m_x^+ = m_z^+$, are incrementally increased until the Reynolds shear-stress undergoes enough displacement such that it results in $l_{uv}^+ \approx 3.2$. The simulations conducted for this purpose are cases L1.2M9 and L1.2M10 from Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019), demonstrating that the TRM is properly reproducing the effects of a rough surface. All of the cases fall within the regime of smooth-wall like turbulence displacement as evident by the excellent collapse of the Reynolds shear-stress profiles onto that of a smooth-wall when adjusted for $l_{uv}^+$ in figure 8(b). An excellent collapse for all the mean velocity profiles are also achieved as shown in figure 9(c). Aside from differences in the region closest to the boundary due to each of them experiencing a different virtual origin, the velocity fluctuations also collapse onto their smooth-wall counterparts.

Having demonstrated the applicability of the TRM to a homogeneous roughness structure, the aforementioned procedure carried out for case C12 is repeated for the other cases of Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019) which have different $k^+$. These would be cases C06, C09, C15 and C18 in table 3. The corresponding TRM simulations are L0.5M8, L0.7M7, L1.5M12 and L1.9M15 in table 4, which achieve similar levels of drag change and turbulence displacement. However, the latter two cases undergo a change in near-wall turbulence structure and are no longer smooth-wall-like, just as their respective rough wall cases of C15 and C18 are not either (as shown in figure 15 of Abderrahaman-Elena et al. 2019).
Figure 10: $l_{uv}^+$ (a), $-\Delta U^+ + U_{slip}^+$ (b) and $k^+$ (c) as functions of the transpiration coefficients: ●, L0.5M8; ▲, L0.7M7; ▼, L1.2M10; ■, L1.5M12; ⋆, L1.9M15. ---, linear fits $0.192(m_z^+l_z^+)$, $0.165(m_z^+l_z^+)$ and $7.27(m_z^+l_z^+)$ in (a), (b) and (c) respectively.

Figure 11: Mean velocity, r.m.s. velocity fluctuations and Reynolds shear-stress profiles: origin at $y^+ = 0$ (a-c); origin at $y^+ = -l_{uv}^+$ and re-scaled with the corresponding $u_\tau$ (d-f); ---, L2MX5; ---, L5MX5; ---, L2MZ5; ---, L5MZ5; ---, smooth-wall at $Re_\tau = 180$.

Figure 10 shows how the displacement of turbulence and the roughness function (reported here as $-\Delta U^+ + U_{slip}^+$ following Orlandi & Leonardi 2006 and Abderrahaman-Elena et al. 2019) scale with respect to the transpiration coefficients, $m_z^+l_z^+$ and $m_x^+l_x^+$, of (2.4). An overall linear proportionality is observed for both, although it is more robust for $l_{uv}^+$ (figure 10a) than $-\Delta U^+ + U_{slip}^+$ (figure 10b). A linear scaling is similarly observed for $k^+$ (figure 10c). Considering that the rough wall behaviour emulated using the TRM spans the regime of smooth-wall like turbulence and beyond, the proportionality observed here may be leveraged to predict what level of change in turbulence and drag will result from the transpiration condition required for a certain $k^+$. 
4.3. TRM with anisotropic transpiration lengths

To investigate how the different transpiration components in the boundary condition of (2.3) affect the flow, simulations were done where either \( m_x \) or \( m_z \) was set to 0, thus canceling the coupling between \( v \) and their corresponding terms. The turbulence statistics of cases L2MX5, L5MX5, L2MZ5 and L5MZ5 have been gathered in figure 11 while the others have been omitted for clarity.

Starting with case L2MX5, the coupling only to streamwise variations of the \( u \) velocity shear is kept. This makes it conform to the physical scenario of figure 2(a). The result is a weakening of impermeability and the occurrence of \( v^+ \) activity at the boundary (figure 11b), but no \( -u'v'^+ \) activity (figure 11c). A similar behaviour exists for case L2MX2 (not shown). Compared to the drag of slip-only case L2M0 (\( \Delta U^+ = 0.7 \)), slightly reduced drag is demonstrated in cases L2MX2 (\( \Delta U^+ = 0.8 \)) and L2MX5 (\( \Delta U^+ = 0.9 \)). Despite the transpiration length of case L2MX5 being double that of case L2MX2, the results for both are virtually the same. The virtual-origin effect accounts for the drag change of both cases.

Case L2MZ5 only retains the coupling to the \( w \) velocity component. A greater level of transpiration (figure 11b) along with the most \( -u'v'^+ \) activity at the boundary plane is achieved (figure 11c) out of all cases with slip lengths of \( l_x^+ = l_z^+ = 2.0 \). This results in a significant drag increase (\( \Delta U^+ = -1.4 \)), particularly with respect to case L2MZ2 (not shown) where the mean flow slip and Reynolds shear-stress balance each other and there is virtually no drag change with respect to a smooth-wall flow (\( \Delta U^+ \approx 0 \)). The turbulence statistics of case L2MZ5 also exhibit differences from those of smooth-wall turbulence, with a move towards isotropization being discernible from the weakening of \( w^+ \) and strengthening of both \( v^+ \) and \( w^+ \) in their respective r.m.s. profiles (figure 11b). This marks the departure from the smooth-wall turbulence regime, and indeed a suitable collapse with smooth-wall statistics is not obtained for the r.m.s. velocity fluctuations by accounting for the virtual-origin effect (figure 11e), unlike for case L2MZ2 (not shown).

The envelope of \( -u'v'^+ \) for case L2MZ5 lies above that of the smooth-wall in the range of \( 0 < y^+ < 20 \) (figure 11c). This indicates generation of additional Reynolds shear-stress relative to that of canonical smooth-wall turbulence. Nevertheless, the effect from this is still weak enough that a suitable collapse of the mean velocity profile is obtained once the virtual-origin effect is accounted for, indicating that the majority of drag change is still predominately due to the displacement of turbulence. Indeed, it is only in the aforementioned region adjacent to the boundary, which only comprises a small range of \( y^+ \), that the distribution of \( -u'v'^+ \) differs from that of a smooth-wall while throughout the rest of the channel they remain similar (figure 11f).

For cases L5MX5 and L5MZ5, the previous transpiration lengths have been kept but the slip lengths have been increased. Similar to case L2MZ5, clear differences from smooth-wall turbulence are observed for case L5MZ5. For this case, there is a more noticeable decrease in the peak of \( u'^+ \) alongside increases in the magnitudes of both \( w'^+ \) and \( v'^+ \) in the region close to the boundary plane (figure 11b). The distribution of \( -u'v'^+ \) in this region develops an outward curvature which does not exist in a smooth-wall profile (figure 11c). This leads to a higher concentration of Reynolds shear-stress in the near-wall region of \( 0 < y^+ < 20 \) and an overall greater magnitude of \( -u'v'^+ \) at the boundary which contributes to drag increase (figure 11c).

Case L5MX5 exhibits behaviour very similar to that of L2MX5, in that they both result in a slight drag reduction relative to their respective slip-only cases (L5M0 and L2M0). There does however seem to be a dampening of \( w'^+ \) up to distances of \( y^+ \approx 50 \). The
overall magnitude of $-\overline{w'v'}^+$ also appears to be slightly less than that of a smooth-wall throughout the height of the channel (figure 11c). However, once the virtual origin effect is accounted for and the solution rescaled, a collapse with smooth-wall statistics is obtained (figures 11d, 11e and figures 11f). Transpiration is present at the boundary (figure 11b), but once again no Reynolds shear-stress (figure 11c). The level of transpiration is greater owing to the higher slip and transpiration lengths compared to case L2MX5, but it is an order of magnitude less than those observed in cases L2MZ5 and L5MZ5.

5. Discussion

The virtual origin framework has been leveraged in this work to identify when the TRM-induced changes fall within the regime of smooth-wall like turbulence displacement or not. It is apt to compare these to those of other studies (Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral 2020; Ibrahim et al. 2021) which have similarly used Robin-type boundary conditions for turbulence modulation along with the virtual origin framework for analysis.

For the cases in table 2 involving a transpiration boundary condition, the virtual origin of the Reynolds shear-stress falls in-between those of the spanwise and wall-normal velocities, $l_{uw}^+ < l_{uv}^+ < l_{v}^+$, an observation also made by Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral (2020). Ibrahim et al. (2021) observed that when either of $l_{w}^+$ or $l_{v}^+$ hold a minimum value, they act as lower bounds for $l_{uv}^+$. An explanation provided by Ibrahim et al. (2021) was that since the quasi-streamwise vortices induce a Couette-like flow, they are to a first order limited by how much the spanwise no-slip condition becomes weakened (the concept depicted in figure 1b). Thus, turbulence displacement will be limited by the shallowest of either $l_{w}^+$ or $l_{v}^+$. While this limiting behavior is not exhibited in the TRM simulations, the dominant component in inducing transpiration is observed to be $-m_z (\partial w/\partial z)|_{y=0}$ of (2.3), making spanwise shear variations of first-order significance in inducing transpiration. This is shown in figure 12, where cases L2MX2 and L2MZ2 both induce transpiration of a similar order of magnitude, albeit that of the latter case is much stronger. As both $m_z^+l_z^+$ and $m_x^+l_x^+$ are increased however, the differences grow to an order of magnitude more. The trends for both L<>MX<<> and L<>MZ<<> cases are quadratic. The initial evolution of the latter closely conforms to a linear scaling, which also happens to comprise the regime of smooth-wall like turbulence, before becoming non-linear. Cases involving both transpiration components, L<>M<<>, demonstrate overall
Figure 13: Pre-multiplied two dimensional spectral energy densities of $u'^+\!$, $v'^+\!$, $w'^+\!$ and $-\bar{u}'\bar{v}'^+$: L5MZ5 ($a$–$d$); L2MZ5 ($e$–$h$); L5MX5 ($i$–$l$); L2MX5 ($m$–$p$); shaded regions are the smooth-wall solution at $y^+\!\approx15$ and solid lines are the TRM cases at $y^+\!+l_{uv}^+\approx15$ scaled using $u_{\tau}$ at $y^+\!=-l_{uv}^+$.

qualitative similarity to the single-component simulations and emphasize the dominance of the spanwise component; as seen in figure 12 where the level of transpiration induced is closer to those of cases $L<\!\!\!\!\!<MZ<\!\!\!\!\!>\!$.

The streamwise velocity fluctuations, $u'^+$, undergo a change in their near-wall peak (figures 4b, 4e, 11b and 11e). Ibrahim et al. (2021) attributed this change to $u'^+$ “having more room to decay to zero” due to perceiving a virtual wall at a plane below the domain boundary. The change in peak may also be attributable to its generally observed Reynolds number dependent behaviour (De Graaff & Eaton 2000; Schultz & Flack 2013) as the Reynolds number based on $y^+\!=-l_{uv}^+$ and its associated friction velocity differ from that of the reference smooth-wall solution’s ($Re_{\tau}=180$). Ibrahim et al. (2021) also demonstrated a lack of any significant effect from changes in $u'^+$ on the other turbulent quantities by imposing different slips on the mean and fluctuating components of $u$. While this has not been investigated here, the results (values of $l_{v}^+$ and $l_{uw}^+$ in table 2) do show changes in $-u'\bar{v}'$ following those of $v'^+$ and not the other velocity fluctuations. These observations are primarily made for the regime of smooth-wall like turbulence displacement, as beyond this regime the mechanism governing flow turbulence in the region close to the boundary becomes different.
As greater levels of wall-normal turbulent activity take place at the boundary, viscous dominance grows weaker and the sub-layer deviates more from asymptotic laminar flow behaviour. This can be inferred by the virtual origin for $u^{'+}$, where in cases L2M2 and L2MZ2 it experiences a shallower virtual origin than it’s prescribed slip length due to the linear quality of it’s r.m.s. profile becoming degraded. Use of Robin boundary conditions for the express purpose of disrupting the near-wall cycle has been been done in the studies of Lozano-Durán & Bae (2016) and Bae & Lozano-Durán (2019), where the entire viscous sub- and buffer layers were negated using boundary conditions of the form of (1.3). Indeed, a lack of a sub-layer region is apparent in the mean velocity profiles of cases L5M5 and L5MZ5 (figures 4d and 11d).

If one considers the nominal thickness of the viscous sub-layer ($y^{+} \approx 5$) and the position ($y^{+} \approx 20$) and radius ($r^{+} \approx 15$) of the quasi-streamwise vortices (Kim et al. 1987), then it stands to reason that a large enough downward displacement of the vortices will perturb them enough such that they become disrupted. When such a disruption is incurred, the near-wall cycle (Jiménez & Pinelli 1999) changes and the structure of turbulence becomes different. This can be observed in the energy co-spectra of turbulence as demonstrated in the work of Ibrahim et al. (2021) and those of case L5MZ5 in figures 13(a), 13(b), 13(c) and 13(d). This disruption however does not lead to the cessation of turbulent activity and relaminarization. Instead, another mechanism emerges to take the place of the original with characteristics similar to that of the Kelvin-Helmholtz-type instability observed in flows over large riblets of certain shapes (García-Mayoral & Jiménez 2011; Endrikat et al. 2021), roughness which disrupt near-wall turbulence (Abderrahaman-Elena et al. 2019), porous structures which permit high levels of transpiration at their permeable surfaces (Jiménez et al. 2001; Breugem et al. 2006; Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral 2019) and canopy flows (Raupach et al. 1996; Finnigan 2000; Nepf 2012; Monti et al. 2020). This instability changes the distribution of turbulent kinetic energy, such that energetic scales over a streamwise range of $65 \lesssim \lambda_x^{+} \lesssim 290$ emerge for spanwise wavelengths of $\lambda_z^{+} \gtrsim 130$ (García-Mayoral & Jiménez 2011; Endrikat et al. 2021). Among the TRM simulations, this is most visible in the energy spectra of $v^{'+}$ for case L5MZ5 (figure 13b). The occurrence of a secondary mechanism of near-wall turbulence generation in the absence of quasi-streamwise vortices and velocity streaks was also mentioned in Jiménez & Pinelli (1999) and referred to as a “bypass mechanism”, but it was not investigated and may be distinct from the mechanism involved here.

For cases L5M5 and L5MZ5, the turbulence displacement lengths (virtual origins) are respectively $l_{uw}^{+} \approx 4.6$ and $l_{uw}^{+} \approx 5.9$, the former placing the vortices very close to the domain boundary while the later would place part of them beyond it. However, while case L5M5 remains smooth-wall like (figure 5), case L2MZ5 with $l_{uw}^{+} \approx 3.5$ exhibits divergences from smooth-wall turbulence, indicating an additional constraint aside from just a downward displacement of the vortices. Based on their simulations, Ibrahim et al. (2021) identified this constraint as being $l_{uw}^{+} \lesssim 2 - l_u^{+}$ for turbulence to remain smooth-wall like when $l_{uw}^{+} > l_U^{+}$. This also seems to be generally valid for the simulations of this study; with $l_{uw}^{+} - l_u^{+}$ being equal to 1.9, 1.7 and 2.3 for cases L2MZ5, L5M5 and L5MZ5 respectively.

Regarding the spanwise velocity fluctuations, changes in the transpiration boundary condition do not affect the near-boundary behaviour of $w^{'+}$, as the plane to which $w^{'+}$ decays ($l_w^{+}$) seems to be primarily a function of the imposed spanwise slip-length. This is not, however, indicative of a lack of change in overall $w^{'+}$ with changes in transpiration conditions. As is clearly evident from the r.m.s. profiles of cases L2MZ5 and L5M5 (figures 4b and 11b), $w^{'+}$ undergoes a definitive change in the near-boundary region.
Figure 14: $l_{uv}^+$ as functions of the transpiration coefficients. 3d plot with $m_z^+l_z^+$ and $m_x^+l_x^+$ on separate axes (a); 2d plot with $m_z^+l_z^+$ and $m_x^+l_x^+$ sharing the same axis (b); $-$, $-$ and $--$ are linear regressions $0.185(m_z^+l_z^+)$, $0.042(m_x^+l_x^+)$ and $0.127(m_z^+l_z^+ = m_x^+l_x^+)$. Symbols are the same as in figure 12.

Figure 15: $-\Delta U^+ + U_{slip}^+$ as functions of the transpiration coefficients. 3d plot with $m_z^+l_z^+$ and $m_x^+l_x^+$ on separate axes (a); 2d plot with $m_z^+l_z^+$ and $m_x^+l_x^+$ sharing the same axis (b); $-$, $-$ and $--$ are linear regressions $0.168(m_z^+l_z^+)$, $0.042(m_x^+l_x^+)$ and $0.110(m_z^+l_z^+ = m_x^+l_x^+)$. Symbols are the same as in figure 12.

Therefore, caution should noted when it comes to relying upon the quantities $l_{uv}^+$, $l_{v}^+$, and $l_{w}^+$ for analysis of changes in turbulence.

The behaviour observed in cases $L_{<::>}MX_{<::>}$, where transpiration occurs at the boundary but is not accompanied by any Reynolds shear-stress, does not seem to have an analogue in any actual passive surface that the authors are aware of. Considering that the wall-normal mixing of fluid in the near-boundary (or more generally the near-wall) region is due to the quasi-streamwise vortices which redistribute momentum along the spanwise and wall-normal directions, explicitly coupling $v'^+$ to just $u'^+$ will inhibit this redistribution from taking place at the boundary plane. The minute amounts of $v'^+$ are inactive motions induced by the streamwise streaks ($u'^+$) and hence neutral in generating $-u'^+v'^+$ as they do not lead to sweep and ejection type events taking place at the boundary plane.

Figure 14 and Figure 15 map how changes in turbulence and drag occur for the cases in table 2 with respect to their transpiration conditions. It is apparent that going from a spanwise-only ($L_{<::>}MZ_{<::>}$) to both streamwise-spanwise ($L_{<::>}M<::>$) and then to a streamwise-only ($L_{<::>}MX_{<::>}$) transpiration condition is a movement away from greater levels of turbulence and drag, consistent with what was shown in figure 12 for the level of transpiration activity taking place at the boundary plane. This is more readily
observable in figure 14(b) and figure 15(b), where data points sharing the same color have similar value transpiration coefficients and differ only in transpiration component (having either $m_x l_x^+$, $m_z l_z^+$ or both). The different combinations of the TRM also demonstrate a divergent trend relative to each-other; such that for higher transpiration coefficients the disparity between them becomes greater.

6. Concluding remarks

This work has investigated the Transpiration-Resistance Model (TRM) (Lacis et al. 2020), a set of boundary conditions proposed as effective representations of surface micro-textures, in turbulent channel flows. The applicability of the TRM in reproducing the effects of rough surfaces on turbulent flows is also studied. The TRM reproduces the near-wall turbulence modifications seen for transitionally rough flows and results in similar levels of drag change. The applicability of the TRM in serving as a surrogate for such surfaces encompasses both the regime of smooth-wall like turbulence displacement (Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral 2020; Ibrahim et al. 2021) and that of the unstable regime where an instability akin to the Kelvin-Helmholtz type is observed. However, the extent of the applicability in the latter regime is still to be determined.

As recently reviewed by Chung et al. (2021), significant effort has been directed towards obtaining predictive models for drag change over rough surfaces. Such models aim to eschew having flow variables as inputs and only be reliant on surface topography measures. Empirically derived models of such kind are typically limited in their validity to a narrow range of rough surfaces. Other approaches have been to utilize machine-learning at obtaining predictive algorithms which are more robust and versatile than empirical models (Aghaei Jouybari et al. 2021). All of such efforts generally express the rough surface with an equivalent sand-grain height, $k_s^+$, based on the experiments of Nikuradse (1933). This subsequently allows for usage of Moody-type diagrams in predicting drag based on a single representative value. This approach is suitable for fully rough flows where the drag change becomes independent of viscosity, but becomes difficult to leverage for transitionally rough flows where viscous effects remain significant. A compromise can be to perhaps leverage effective models such as the TRM and characterize transitionally rough flows in terms of flow “lengths” such as slip and transpiration. These length parameters may then be used to obtain scaling relations for transitionally rough drag.

Potential also exists in using the TRM to reproduce the effect of porous mediums on the overlying turbulent flow. Many of the flow features observed over rough surfaces are similarly observed over porous structures, such as the linear regime of drag change due to turbulence displacement and the existence of an unstable regime marked by KH instability (Gómez-de-Segura & García-Mayoral 2019). The more extensive formulation of the TRM proposed by Lacis et al. (2020) for permeable substrates may be used for such purposes.
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Appendix A. Derivation of (1.4)

Following the procedure of Abderrahaman-Elena et al. (2019), the relation $\Delta U^+ = l_U^+ - l_{uv}^+$ can be obtained using the time and space averaged mean momentum equation integrated along the wall-normal direction, also known as the total stress equation,

$$\frac{-u'v'}{\tau} + \frac{dU^+}{dy^+} = \frac{\delta^+ - y^+}{\delta^+}.$$

(A 1)

Here, $dU^+/dy^+$ is the viscous stress and the term on the right-hand side is the total stress with $\delta^+$ being the channel half-height in inner units or $Re_\tau$. For the situation involving virtual origins, the wall-normal reference position is $y' = y^+ + l_{uv}^+$ and the half-height becomes $\delta' = \delta^+ + l_{uv}^+$. (A 1) can be integrated between any two wall-normal positions to give the differences in mean velocity and Reynolds shear stress between them. Taking the two positions as the locations of the domain boundary, $y' = l_{uv}^+$, and a height within the logarithmic layer, $H^+$, gives,

$$\int_{l_{uv}^+}^{H^+} -u'v' dy^+ + U^+(H^+) - U^+(l_{uv}^+) = H^+ - l_{uv}^+ - \frac{H^+ - l_{uv}^+}{2\delta^+}.$$  

(A 2)

Then $U^+(l_{uv}^+) = U_{slip}^+$ since $y'^+ = l_{uv}^+$ is where the mean flow slip exists. Under the assumption that both the mean flow and turbulence only become displaced, a similar integration is carried out for a regular smooth-wall flow between $y^+ = l_{uv}^+$, which is the height above the wall where the Reynolds shear-stress matches that of the displaced flow, and a height $H^+$ within the logarithmic layer giving:

$$\int_{l_{uv}^+}^{H^+} -u'v'_s dy^+ + U_{s}^+(H^+) - U_{s}^+(l_{uv}^+) = H^+ - l_{uv}^+ - \frac{H^+ - l_{uv}^+}{2\delta^+}.  

(A 3)

Subtracting (A 2) from (A 3), and assuming the friction Reynolds numbers to be equal or of negligible difference such that $\delta^+ = \delta'^+$, gives:

$$\Delta U^+ = U^+(H^+) - U_{s}^+(H^+),$$

$$= U_{slip}^+ - U_{s}^+(l_{uv}^+) - \int_{l_{uv}^+}^{H^+} [(-u'v'_s) - (-u'v'^+)] dy^+,  

(A 4)$$

If turbulence remains smooth-wall like $\tau_2 = 0$ and since $dU^+/dy^+ \approx 1$ in the near-wall viscous dominated region, the terms $U_{slip}^+$ and $U_{s}^+(l_{uv}^+)$ can be substituted with $l_U^+$ and $l_{uv}^+$ giving:

$$\Delta U^+ = \tau_1 = l_U^+ - l_{uv}^+,  

(A 5)$$

If there are contributions to $\Delta U^+$ aside from the virtual origin effect, (A 5) will not be valid as $\tau_2 \neq 0$. Note also that should differences in Reynolds number become significant, there will be additional contributions to $\tau_2$ due to a greater proportion of Reynolds shear stress in the total stress distribution. Nevertheless, the virtual origin framework serves as a useful means in analysing the drag change of wall-bounded turbulent flows and distinguishing the regime of smooth-wall like turbulence modulation from the non-smooth regime.
Appendix B. Solver validation and grid convergence

Figure 16 compares the one-point low-order statistics of the solver used in this work against those of Lee & Moser (2015) which were obtained using a spectral method solver. There is a Reynolds number discrepancy between the two data-sets ($Re_τ = 180$ vs $Re_τ = 182$) resulting in the zero-crossing point of the Reynolds shear-stress profiles to be slightly offset from one-another. There is a slight difference between the two mean velocity profiles in the logarithmic region, partially due to the low Reynolds number affect arising from the difference in $Re_τ$, but mainly due to the spectral data being of a higher fidelity. The r.m.s. profiles of Lee & Moser (2015) also exhibit a higher near-wall peak than that of the current work. These discrepancies are due to the lower effective resolution of second-order finite-difference schemes relative to spectral methods at similar grid resolutions as explained by Lee & Moser (2015). Nevertheless, quantitative agreement is still very good between the two data-sets; with the absolute maximum difference between the mean velocity, r.m.s. velocity fluctuations and Reynolds shear-stress not exceeding 1%, 2% and 1.2% respectively.

Figure 17 compares two of the TRM simulations, L2M2 and L2MZ5, with higher resolution counterparts to assess solution grid independence. The mean velocity profiles for both cases do not exceed a 0.6% difference in absolute maximum. For the r.m.s. velocity fluctuations; L2M2 and L2MZ5 have differences of approximately 0.2% and 0.5% respectively for both $u_{rms}$ and $v_{rms}$ in absolute maximum, while the difference in $w_{rms}$
for both L2M2 and L2MZ5 is approximately 1%. The Reynolds shear-stress for L2M2 has an absolute maximum difference of approximately 0.3%, while for L2MZ5 it is 1.4%. The results demonstrate satisfactory grid independence, with any additional accuracy obtainable by using a higher resolution grid not justifying the increased simulation cost.
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