Spatial Coupling of a Lattice Boltzmann uid model with a Finite Dierence Navier-Stokes solver

Jonas Latt

Bastien Chopard

PaulA buquerque

M arch 2, 2022

A bstract

In multiscale, multi-physics applications, there is an increasing need for coupling numerical solvers that are each applied to a di erent part of the problem. Here we consider the case of coupling a Lattice Boltzm ann uid model and a Finite Di erence N avier-Stokes solver. The coupling is implemented so that the entire computational dom ain can be divided in two regions, with the FD solver running on one of them and the LB one on the other.

We show how the various physical quantities of the two approaches should be related to ensure a smooth transition at the interface between the regions. We demonstrate the feasibility of the method on the Poiseuille ow, where the LB and FD schemes are used on adjacent sub-domains.

The same idea can be also developed to couple LB models with Finite Volumes, or Finite Elements calculations.

The motivation for developing such a type of coupling is that, depending on the geometry of the ow, one technique can be more e cient, less memory consuming, or physically more appropriate than the other in some regions (e.g. near the boundaries), whereas the converse is true for other parts of the same system. We can also in agine that a given system solved, say by FD, can be augmented in some spatial regions with a new physical process that is better treated by a LB model. Our approach allows us to only modify the concerned region without altering the rest of the computation.

1 Introduction

When it comes to the numerical analysis of uid ows, one has the choice between many dierent models. On one hand there are solvers based on the discretization of the Navier-Stokes equations, for example by a numerical scheme of nite dierences, nite elements or nite volumes. On the other hand, a new category of solvers have emerged over the past decades that are based on kinetic theories. They describe the uid dynamics at a molecular level and can be seen as discretization schemes for the Boltzm ann equation.

In this paper we consider the possibility of solving separate spatial regions of a simulations with a di erent solver. In particular, we are interested in coupling a nite di erence (FD) solver of the two-dimensional N avier-Stokes equations with a lattice Boltzm ann (LB) method, i.e. a solver for the Boltzm ann equation. The motivation is that depending on the nature of the region, optimal e ciency may be reached with a di erent solver. The same reasoning applies to the implementation of boundary conditions that are more or less naturally form ulated in a given num erical scheme.

As an example, consider the computation of the drag force experienced by a rigid body placed in a uniform stream. During the num erical treatment of this problem, two kinds of boundary conditions need to be implemented, one for the boundaries of the body and one for the boundaries of the computational domain. In the rst case, the emphasis is put on a correct representation of physical properties of the body. This part of the physics. Furthermore, the LB model gives a direct access to physical quantities such as the drag force. On the other hand, the boundaries of the computational domain are required to simulate a space that extends in ntely in all directions. A lot of computational space can be saved if those boundaries in plement an appropriate velocity eld ([1]). Indeed, the velocity eld can be shown to be independent of the geometry of the body at a large enough distance. It depends only on the drag force and can be computed analytically. The implementation of this analytical solution on the boundaries nds a very natural form ulation in the FD scheme, which is based on macroscopic variables.

C om puter Science D epartm ent, U niversity of G eneva, 1211 G eneva 4, Sw itzerland

In order to couple a LB with a FD m odel, it is crucial to understand how the LB set of variables is related to the FD set and vice versa. Our method follows the same arguments as the ones developed in [2], where the coupling between a LB and a FD solver for the heat equation is presented. The connection between the two models is achieved through a rst-order expansion of the LB variables around a local equilibrium term. One nds that the zeroth-order term s of the expansion are related to the macroscopic quantities (i.e. the FD variables), whereas the rst-order term s depend on gradients of those quantities.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a brief overview of the chosen LB and FD models. Conceptual di erences between the models are pointed out in view of the formulation of the coupling algorithm which is developed in section 3. This rather technical section contains the rst order expansion of the LB variables and a guideline to the LB/FD coupling. The algorithm is validated in section 4 on a Poiseuille ow and is found to be of second order in the velocities. Section 5 draws a conclusion and presents some

plans for future work .

2 The num erical m odels

The FD model used in our study implements a nite di erence scheme on a staggered grid. It is explicit in the velocities and implicit in the pressure. The chosen LB model implements the LBGK formulation, in which the dynamics are expressed in form of a relaxation towards a local equilibrium term.

In the following, we will restrict the discussion to an overview and a couple of technical aspects of those two models. The interested reader will nd more details on the LB model in the references [3], [4] and [5]. The FD model is explained in many details in the reference [6]. This book o ers among others a reference to a complete implementation of the FD code in the C language.

2.1 Spatial discretization

W e consider a two-dim ensional, rectangular region

$$= [0;1] [0;h] 2 R^{2}$$

on which we introduce a grid. This grid is divided into $i_{m ax}$ cells of equal size in the x-direction and $j_{m ax}$ cells in the y-direction, resulting in grid lines spaced at a distance

$$x = l = j_{max}$$
 and $y = h = j_{max}$

The FD model is based on three quantities that are de ned on each cell: the pressure (p), the xcomponent (u) and the y-component (v) of the velocity. They are how ever placed on a staggered grid. A given index (i; j) of the cell is assigned to the pressure at the cell center, to the x-component of the velocity at the right edge and the y-component at the upper edge (cf. Figure 1). The reason for this staggered arrangement is that it prevents possible pressure oscillations which could occur had all three variables u, v and p be evaluated at the same grid points.

The LB model uses nine variables $f_k; k = 0$ 8 which are all evaluated at the same location of a cell. We xed our choice on the upper right corner. This is to ensure that the LB and the FD model have a compatible interpretation of the location of the dom ain boundary . Indeed, this boundary is de ned on a cell edge in the FD model. Considering that most im plem entations of LB boundary conditions set the dom ain boundary on top of a LB node, this leads us to placing the LB node on the intersection of two cell edges.

The situation is depicted on Figure 2 for a system of extent $i_{max} = j_{max} = 3$. It shows also that as a result of the staggered arrangement, not all extrem algrid points of the FD set of variables come to lie on the dom ain boundary. For this reason, an extra boundary strip of grid cells is introduced, so that the boundary conditions may be found by linear interpolations between the nearest grid points on either side.

2.2 The FD model

The FD model is based on a discretization of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

$$Q_t u + u \tilde{r} u = \tilde{r} p + u + \tilde{r}; \qquad (1)$$

Figure 1: Choice of indices for FD and LB variables on a chosen grid cell (i; j).



Figure 2: C om putational grid representing a dom ain of size $(i_{m ax} x)$ $(j_{ax} y) w \pm m_{m ax} = j_{m ax} = 3$. The left hand side depicts the staggered arrangement of the variables over the grid when the dom ain is resolved by a FD scheme. In the case of a LB solver, all variables are located on cell edges, as shown on the right hand side. The location of the boundary strip is indicated by a dashed line.



and the continuity equation

(2)

The computation of the successive iterations $u^{(t)}; v^{(t)}; p^{(t)}$) $u^{(t+1)}; v^{(t+1)}; p^{(t+1)}$ contains two distinct steps:

- 1. Resolution of the poisson equation to obtain the new pressure eld. This computation utilizes the values of the pressure and the velocity at the time t: u^(t); v^(t); p^(t)) p^(t+1). In presence of D irichlet boundary conditions, this procedure has a unique solution (except for an integration constant). In particular, there is no need for knowing the value of the pressure on the boundary.
- 2. Computation of the new velocity eld according to a nite di erence scheme. It uses the pressure eld at step t+1: $u^{(t)};v^{(t)};p^{(t+1)}$) $u^{(t+1)};v^{(t+1)}$.

2.3 The LB model

The LB model can be interpreted as a discretization of the Boltzm ann transport equation on the chosen lattice. The possible velocities for the pseudo-particles are the vectors \mathbf{v}_k . They are chosen so as to match the lattice directions: if \mathbf{r} is a lattice site, $\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{v}_k$ t is also a lattice site. In the present case, we use a so-called D 2Q 9 lattice with nine possible velocities: a zero velocity to describe the population of rest particles, four velocities for the horizontal and vertical directions, and four velocities for the diagonal directions. We restrict our considerations to a lattice with equal spacing in the x and y directions, i.e. $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} = : \mathbf{r}$. The LB model can also be implemented on di erent kins of lattices, but it needs to satisfy a couple of isotropy requirements. For example, the second- and third-order tensors of the D 2Q 9 lattice are

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ m_k v_k & v_k & v_k \end{pmatrix} = 0;$$
(4)

where is the K ronecker symbol, and b is a constant that is characteristic for the lattice.

The system is described by 9 corresponding density distribution functions $f_k(r;t); k = 0:::8$, representing the distribution of particles entering site r at time t and m oving in direction v_k . Physical quantities such as the local particle density and velocity are de ned from m om ents of these distributions:

$$= \underset{k=0}{\overset{X^{8}}{m}} \underset{k=0}{\overset{K}{m}} \underset{k=0}{\overset{K^{8}}{m}} \underset{k=0}{\overset{K^{8}}{m}} \underset{k=0}{\overset{K^{8}}{m}} \underset{k=0}{\overset{K^{8}}{m}} \underset{k=0}{\overset{K^{8}}{m}}$$
(5)

The m $_k$ are the lattice weights: those constant values compensate for the di erent lengths of diagonal and non-diagonal directions.

Although this uid model is compressible (the density is space and time dependent), it can be shown to solve the incompressible N avier-Stokes equations in the small M ach number regime. The uid pressure is related to the uid density by the ideal gas state equation $p = c_s^2$, where c_s^2 is the speed of sound. Therefore, in the LB model, there is no need to solve the Poisson equation for the pressure. It is all built-in in the equation of motion for the f_k . However, there exists not always a straightforward way of treating the pressure on the boundaries, and an appropriate boundary condition has to be found.

In the BGK approximation, the particle collision is obtained by a relaxation with coecient ! to a truncated M axwell-Boltzm ann equilibrium distribution function $f^{(eq)}$, which depends only on the local uid density and velocity:

$$f_{k}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{v}_{i} t; t + t) \quad f_{k}(\mathbf{r}; t) = ! \quad f_{k}(\mathbf{r}; t) \quad f_{k}^{(eq)}(\mathbf{r}; t) + \frac{b \ t}{v^{2}}F \quad \mathbf{y},$$
 (6)

where

$$f_{k}^{(eq)}(\mathbf{r};t) = a + \frac{b}{a}v_{i}u + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{b}{a}v_{i}u + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{b}{a}u^{2}$$
 (7)

!

In these form ulae and in the further developm ents, a repeated greek index inside a multiplicative term in plies a sum on this index. The term a, like b, is a lattice constant.

Figure 3: Subdivision of the computational domain into a FD subdom ain ($_1$) and a LB subdom ain ($_2$). O ne lattice cell on the interface between $_1$ and $_2$, at the position $i = i_{int}$, is computed by both m ethods. The boundary nodes of the subdom ains are represented by white symbols. They must be implemented by m eans of a coupling term between the two m ethods.



O ne particularity of this model is that it satis as the mass and momentum conservation at the molecular level:

$$\underset{k}{\overset{X}{m_k v_k}} (f_k (x + v_i t; t + t) f_k (x; t)) = tF :$$
(9)

3 The coupling algorithm

3.1 The FD-LB interface

In this section, we cut into two subdom ains $_1$ and $_2$ such that $= _1 ~_2$. We apply in $_1$ the FD m ethod and in $_2$ the LB m ethod respectively. For facility, we assume that the subdom ains are rectangular, $_1$ occupying the left hand side and $_2$ the right hand side of the dom ain. This procedure can how ever be extended with few changes to a general boundary.

The way boundary conditions are in plan ented in the FD and the LB scheme has already been touched upon in section 1. In particular, Figure 2 describes the position of the extrem algrid points (drawn as white circles and squares) to which a boundary value must be furnished. On the coupling interface between $_1$ and $_2$, those boundary values are taken from the boundaries of the opposite domain. As a consequence of the staggered arrangement of the LB values with respect to the FD values, there is a need for an overlap between $_1$ and $_2$. There are several ways the coupling can be implemented. We chose a method in which the overlap extends on roughly one lattice site. The position of this site is indexed by $i = i_{int}$ (see Figure 3).

As a conclusion, the FD dom ain requires the know ledge of the values for $u_{i;j}$ for $i = i_{int}$ and j = 1 maximizes m_{axj} , and the values for $v_{i;j}$ for $i = i_{int} + 1$ and j = 0 maximizes m_{axj} . Those values are easily obtained from the LB eld that o ers a natural access to the macroscopic variables (5).

The LB domain on the other hand requires the knowledge of the 9 values $f_{k;i;j}$ at $i = i_{int}$ 1 and j = 0 maxis. Those values are more dicult to get at. Clearly, the LB values, o ering a description of the uid at a molecular level, contain more information than the FD values. In the next section, we present a rst-order expansion of the f^(k). It will show that they depend both of the values of the macroscopic variables and their gradients. Furthermore, the results of the rst-order expansion will serve as a dictionary to convert from FD values to LB values.

3.2 First-order expansion of the LB equation

The rst-order expansion of the LB dynam ics is based on three approximations:

1. The stream ing operator in equation (6) is replaced by a rst-order time and space series:

$$f_{k}(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{v}_{i} t; t + t) \quad f_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}; t) \quad t \boldsymbol{\ell}_{t} f_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}; t) + t (\boldsymbol{v}_{i} \boldsymbol{\ell}) f_{k}(\boldsymbol{x}; t)$$
(10)

2. The values f_k are split up into an equilibrium an non-equilibrium part. The spatial and temporal derivatives of the non-equilibrium part are neglected:

$$f_k \coloneqq f_k^{(eq)} + f_k^{(neq)} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_t f_k^{(neq)} \quad 0, \quad \ell \quad f_k^{(neq)} \quad 0:$$
(11)

3. All second order velocity terms are neglected in the equilibrium distribution:

$$f_{k}^{(eq)} \quad a \quad + \quad b \quad \frac{v_{k} \quad u}{v^{2}} \tag{12}$$

These approximations are consistent with the point of view taken by a rst order C hapman-Enskog expansion (see for example [4]). In the following, we simplify the notation and replace the approximation sign () by a straight equality sign.

W e start by expressing the conservation form ulae (8) and (9) at the rst order. From (8) we obtain

$$X = m_{k} (\theta_{t} f_{k} + v_{k} \theta_{k}) = 0) = \frac{\theta}{\theta t} + div(u) = 0;$$
(13)

We consider the case of an incompressible uid, thus

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} = \operatorname{div}(\vartheta) = 0; \tag{14}$$

M om entum conservation (9) gives

X

$$m_{k} (t @_{t} v_{k} f_{k} + r v_{k} v_{k} f_{k}) = 0) @_{t} (u) + @ = 0:$$
(15)

This relation expresses the same physical content as the N avier-Stokes equations (1). We have introduced the stress tensor, de ned as $= \int_{k} m_{k} v_{k} v_{k} f_{k}$. A second order analysis of the stress tensor enables to verify the equivalence between (1) and (15), but this point is out of the scope of the present developm ent.

W ith those relations, we are ready to consider the expansion of the LB dynam ics (6). Using (10), we nd

$$! f_{k}^{(neq)} + \frac{b}{v^{2}} \vec{F} \quad \mathbf{F} = t \theta_{t} f_{k} + r(q_{k} \theta) f_{k} \stackrel{(11)}{=} t \theta_{t} f_{k}^{(eq)} + r(q_{i} \theta) f_{k}^{(eq)} :$$
(16)

The time-derivative of the equilibrium term is further expanded:

$$\varrho_{t}f_{k}^{(eq)} = \varrho f_{k}^{(eq)}\varrho_{t} + \varrho_{u} f_{k}^{(eq)}\varrho_{t}(u) \stackrel{(14;15)}{=} \frac{bv_{k}}{v^{2}} (\varrho + tF):$$
(17)

From the isotropy relations (3,4), we know that

$$\varrho = \frac{a}{b} v^2 \varrho :$$
(18)

Thus,

$$\varrho_{t}f_{k}^{(eq)} = \frac{bv_{k}}{v^{2}} (\varrho + tF) = av_{k} \varrho + \frac{bv_{k}}{v^{2}} tF :$$
(19)

Plugging into (16) gives

$$f_{k}^{(neq)} = \frac{t}{!} av_{k} \theta v_{k} \theta a + b \frac{v_{k} u}{v^{2}}$$
$$= t \frac{b}{!} \frac{v_{k} v_{k}}{v^{2}} \theta (u)$$
(20)

This equation is the nallead in the chain to convert from the macroscopic variables to the set of LB variables. In order to summarize our notings, we remember that the f_k are split up into an equilibrium and non-equilibrium part: $f_k = f_k^{(eq)} + f_k^{(neq)}$, where $f_k^{(eq)} = f_k^{(eq)}$ (; u) is obtained from equation (7), and $f_k^{(neq)} = f_k^{(neq)}$ (; 0 u) is approximated with the help of equation (20).

For some values of the index k, the relation (20) can be further simplied by imposing the continuity equation (2). Table 1 explicits the value of $f_k^{(neq)}$ for every k.

Table 1: Dictionary for the conversion from macroscopic variables to the non-equilibrium LB term.

$t_k = != (tb) f_k^{(neq)}$					
k	t _k	k	ъ,	k	t _k
0	0	3	@ _x u _x	6	0 _x u _y 0 _y u _x
1	0 _x u _x	4	0 _y u _y	7	$(a_x u_y + a_y u_x)$
2	0 _y u _y	5	$\theta_x u_y + \theta_y u_x$	8	0 _x u _y 0 _y u _x

3.3 Coupling the FD values

Coupling the boundaries of the FD eld to the LB eld is a simple exercise. We have seen in section 2.2 that the values of the pressure need not be coupled. The two components of the velocity eld are computed in a straightforward manner from relations (5). Because the FD and the LB variables are not de ned at the same point of a lattice cell, we need to adjust the values by a linear interpolation. This leads to the following relations:

$$u_{i_{int},j}^{FD} = 1=2 \ u_{i_{int},j}^{LB} + u_{i_{int},j-1}^{LB}$$
(21)

$$v_{i_{int}+1;j}^{FD} = 1=2 v_{i_{int}+1;j}^{FD} + v_{i_{int};j}^{FD}$$
 (22)

3.4 Coupling the LB values

For the computation of the equilibrium term $s f_k^{(eq)}$, we need to obtain the macroscopic variables u, v and p from the FD eld. This is done by linear interpolation:

$$u_{i_{int}}^{LB} = 1 = 2 (u_{i_{int}}^{FD} + u_{i_{int}}^{FD})$$
(23)

$$\mathbf{v}_{i_{int}}^{LB} = 1 = 2 \left(\mathbf{v}_{i_{int}}^{FD} + \mathbf{v}_{i_{int}}^{FD} \right)$$
(24)

$$p_{i_{int} 1;j}^{LB} = 1 = 4 (p_{i_{int};j+1}^{FD} + p_{i_{int} 1;j+1}^{FD} + p_{i_{int} 1;j+1}^{FD} + p_{i_{int} 1;j}^{FD} + p_{i_{int};j+1}^{FD})$$
(25)

A certain di culty consists in relating the pressure eld from the FD simulation to the density eld of the LB simulation. Indeed, both elds contain a constant additive term which is a priori unknown. Expressing this term through an o set p_{ofs} of the pressure eld, one has the following situation:

$$\frac{C_{\rm s}^2 ({\rm LB})}{({\rm LB})} = p^{({\rm FD})} p_{\rm ofs}$$
(26)

We chose to x this constant by averaging the FD pressure and the LB density on the interface between $_1$ and $_2$ Z Z

$$= 1=h \qquad \text{and} \quad \overline{p} = 1=h \qquad \text{drp}$$

$$e_1 e_2 \qquad e_1 e_2 e_2 e_2 \qquad e_1 e_2 e_2 \qquad e_1 e_2 e_2 \qquad e_1 e_2 e_2 \qquad e_1 e_2 e_$$

and claim ing that the density average is constant on the interface: - = 0. This leads to

$$= _{0} \frac{p \overline{p}}{c_{s}^{2}} + 1 : \qquad (28)$$

It is not clear if this way of doing is optimal. A nother solution m ight consist in solving locally the Poiseuille equation on the boundary of the LB eld. This would enable to compute the values for from LB variables only.

The non-equilibrium terms $f_k^{(neq)}$ are based on the gradients of the velocities. Figure 3 shows that two of those gradients can be approximated by a centered di erence of half the mesh width:

$$\varrho_{y} u_{i_{int} 1;j}^{LB} = 1 = r (u_{i_{int} 1;j+1}^{FD} u_{i_{int} 1;j}^{FD})$$
(29)

$$\theta_{x} v_{i_{jnt} 1;j}^{LB} = 1 = r(v_{i_{jnt},j}^{FD} v_{i_{jnt},j}^{FD})$$
(30)

O ne gradient needs to be calculated as a centered di erence of mesh width, based on interpolated values of the velocity:

$$\varrho_{y} v_{i_{int} 1;j}^{LB} = \frac{1}{4 x} (v_{i_{int};j+1}^{FD} + v_{i_{int} 1;j+1}^{FD} (v_{i_{int};j-1}^{FD} + v_{i_{int} 1;j-1}^{FD})):$$
(31)

There are not enough grid points at hand for computing the fourth gradient at the same level of precision. We are luckily saved by the continuity equation (2) which delivers the requested value:

$$\mathfrak{G}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{u}_{i_{\text{int}}}^{\text{LB}} = \mathfrak{G}_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{v}_{i_{\text{int}}}^{\text{LB}}$$
(32)

Now that all missing variables have been computed, we take a step back and discuss the overall algorithm of a LB iteration step. For the purpose of this discussion, the dynam ics (6) are split into two steps. The rst, the collision step, handles the computation of the equilibrium distribution and m aps the \incom ing particle stream " $f_k^{(in)}$ onto the \outgoing particle stream " $f_k^{(out)}$. It is followed by a stream ing step that transports the particles by a value of t in time and w_k t in space. The details of an iteration step are as follows:

- 1. On bulk nodes, (t) and u (t) are computed from the incoming particle densities $f_k^{(in)}$ (t). On boundary nodes, all the values (t), u (t) and $f_k^{(in)}$ (t) are obtained from the variables of the FD eld at time t.
- 2. All nodes, bulk and boundaries, perform the collision step: $f_k^{(out)}(\mathbf{r};t) = (1 + f_k^{(in)}(\mathbf{r};t) + f_k^{(eq)}(\mathbf{r};t)$.
- 3. The bulk nodes perform the streaming step: $f_k^{(in)}(r + v_k t; t + t) = f_k^{(out)}(r; t)$, for all r such that $r + v_k$ t lies on a bulk node.

A lternatively, it is possible to extend the stream ing step to boundary nodes for those values of $f_k^{(in)}$ that are incoming from the bulk of the LB simulation. They are kept unchanged, unlike the remaining set of $f_k^{(in)}$ and the macroscopic variables and a that are provided by the FD eld. In our simulations, this procedure seem ed to produce results equivalent to those of the proposed algorithm.

4 Validation on a Poiseuille ow

W e propose a validation of our coupling algorithm on the simulation of a Poiseuille ow. This is a stationary ow in a channel of in nite length with no-slip boundaries. The boundaries extend horizontally at a height y = 0 and y = L. The uid velocity is strictly horizontal and does not depend on the x position: v = 0; @_xu = 0. The analytical solution of the Navier-Stokes equations (1) for this problem is known and predicts a parabolic velocity pro le:

$$u(y) = \frac{1}{2}C(Ly y^2)$$
: (33)

The constant C can be related to the body force (C = f_x) or to the pressure gradient (C = $\ell_x p$), depending on how the uid is driven.

In our example, the uid is driven by a body force. The left and the right borders implement periodic boundary conditions in order to simulate a channel of in nite length. Special care must be taken on specifying this boundary in the FD model. Indeed, during the simulation it tends to build up a pressure gradient that must be eliminated by imposing a constant value of the pressure on the left and right boundary.

The simulation is performed on a grid of size $i_{m ax} = 3$ and $j_{m ax} = 50$. The physical channel widht is set to L = 1 and the body force has the value $F_x = 0.01$. The num eric values u_{sim} are compared to the analytic solution u_{ana} from equation (33) by means of the overall error (the indices of the formula refer to the LB convention introduced on Figure 1):

$$= \frac{q \frac{p_{j=0}}{p_{j=0}} (u_{sin} (;j)) \frac{1}{kha} (;j)}{q \frac{p_{j=0}}{p_{j=0}} u_{ana} (;j)}$$
(34)

We have run three simulations that can be compared among each other. The rst simulation implements a pure LB model with bounce-back boundaries, the second simulation a pure FD model, and the third simulation is a FD {LB hybrid. In the rst case, the no-slip property of the walls is implemented by a boundary condition known under the name of bounce-back (see e.g. [4]). In the third case, the top and bottom strips of size $j_{max}^0 = 3$ are computed by the FD model and the bulk domain by the LB model (see Figure 4).

A remarkable result of the simulations is that the FD-only model reaches the analytical solution at the machine level of precision (10¹⁵). A lthough there exist LB boundary conditions which obtain the same result ([7]), their implementation is less natural and straightforward than the one of the FD model. We

Figure 4: The computational grid for the simulation of a Poiseuille ow is partitioned into three subdom ains $_1$, $_2$ and $_3$. The FD scheme is used on the boundary domains $_1$ and $_3$, and the LB scheme on the bulk domain $_2$.



Figure 5: Simulation of a body-force driven Poiseuille ow with (1) a LB model, (2) a FD model and (3) a FD-LB hybrid (see Figure 4). The curves show the time-evolution of the error, compared to the analytical solution of the Poiseuille ow.



further remark that the LB model has a faster convergence (in terms of iteration steps) than the FD model. The stationary velocity eld of the LB simulation is dock distinct from the analytical prediction, due to the limited precision of the boundary condition that is known to be of rst order. The hybrid simulation shows the expected convergence speed of the LB model and an error due to the limited precision of the coupling. However, the error is two orders of magnitude sm aller than the one due to the bounce-back boundaries of the LB-only simulation. The results of the simulations are shown on Figure 5.

The order of precision of the coupling can be estimated by varying the grid resolution (j_{max}) while keeping the physical quantities (L, F_x) constant. Figure 6 plots the error of the stationary velocity eld as a function of the grid resolution. It appears clearly that the coupling acts like a second-order boundary condition for the velocity eld. No conclusion can be taken concerning the coupling of the pressure eld, because the latter is constant in a Poiseuille ow.

5 Conclusion

In this work, a LB scheme for 2-D incompressible uid ows is spatially coupled to a FD scheme on a computational domain partitioned in two regions. We present a way to relate the LB distribution functions f_k with the classical physical quantities and their derivatives. Two particular FD and LB schemes are introduced, and a complete coupling algorithm between the two is proposed. At the interface, the LB and FD are connected so as to preserve continuity of the physical quantities. The connection between the f_k

Figure 6: Error of a FD-LB hybrid Poiseuille ow simulation as a function of the grid resolution. A log-log plot shows the coupling of the velocity eld to be of second order.



variables and the standard macroscopic physical quantities is obtained through the analysis of a rst-order truncated series around the local equilibrium. The equilibrium part of f_k is related to the macroscopic quantities and the non-equilibrium part to the gradients thereof. Our coupling methodology is indeed an approximation since we neglect higher-order derivatives in the nonequilibrium distributions. A validation was performed by simulating a Poiseuille ow with FD boundary strips and LB bulk and comparing it with an analytic solution. The simulation shows that in this case, the coupling of the velocity eld is of second order in the grid resolution.

We consider the work on the LB-FD coupling to be interesting by its own means, as it expresses the conceptual di erences between the approaches of those models. In particular, it might be inspiring in formulating new kinds of boundary conditions for either model. In this sense, the FD model can take prot of the physical point of view taken in the LB approach, whereas LB boundary condition can be inspired by the strict m athem atical formulations of the FD boundaries.

The value of our hybrid model in practice needs still to be shown, but we are condent that it will prove itself useful in a large class of scientic and engineering problems. We plan to provide rst sample applications by implementing drag force experiments with LB obstacles and FD domain boundaries.

R eferences

- [1] Peter W ittwer, Sebastian Bonisch, and Vincent Heuveline. A daptive boundary conditions for exterior ow problem s, 2003. Preprint: http://pcc2341f.unige.ch/publications/paper029/paper029.pdf.
- [2] Paul A Louquerque, Davide A lem ani, Bastien Chopard, and Pierre Leone. Coupling a lattice boltzm ann and a nite di erence scheme. In ICCS 2004. Krakow, Poland, 2004.
- [3] Sauro Succi. The Lattice Boltzm ann Equation, For Fluid Dynamics and Beyond. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- [4] B.Chopard and M.Droz.Cellular Autom ata M odeling of Physical System s.Cam bridge University Press, 1998.
- [5] Dieter A.Wolf-Gladrow.Lattice-GasCellular Autom ata and Lattice Boltzmann Models: an Introduction. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1725. Springer, Berlin, 2000.
- [6] M ichaelG riebel, Thom as D ornseifer, and T ilm an N eunho er. N um erical S im ulation in F luid D ynam ics. A Practical Introduction. Siam, P hiladelphia, 1998.
- [7] Takaji Inamuro, Masato Yoshino, and Fum in anu Ogino. A non-slip boundary condition for lattice Boltzmann simulations. Phys. Fluids, 7 (12) 2928 (2930, 1995.