

A new formulation of the distributed Lagrange multiplier/fictitious domain method for particulate flows

N.A. Patankar¹

P. Singh

Department of Mechanical Engineering, NJIT, University Heights, Newark, NJ 07102

D.D. Joseph

¹ Department of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455

R. Glowinski and T.-W. Pan

Department of Mathematics, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204

Abstract

A Lagrange-multiplier-based fictitious-domain method (DLM) for the direct numerical simulation of rigid particulate flows in a Newtonian fluid was presented by Glowinski, Pan, Hesla and Joseph (1999). An important feature of this finite element based method is that the flow in the particle domain is constrained to be a rigid body motion by using a well-chosen field of Lagrange multipliers. The constraint of rigid body motion is represented by $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{U} + \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{r}$; \mathbf{u} being the velocity of the fluid at a point in the particle domain; \mathbf{U} and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ are the translational and angular velocities of the particle, respectively; and \mathbf{r} is the position vector of the point with respect to the center of mass of the particle. The fluid-particle motion is treated implicitly using a combined weak formulation in which the mutual forces cancel. This formulation together with the above equation of constraint gives an algorithm that requires extra conditions on the space of the distributed Lagrange multipliers when the density of the fluid and the particles match.

In view of the above issue a new formulation of the Lagrange-multiplier-based fictitious-domain method for particulate flow is presented in this paper. In this approach the deformation rate tensor within the particle domain is constrained to be zero at points in the fluid occupied by rigid solids. This formulation shows that the state of stress inside a rigid body depends on the velocity field similar to pressure in an incompressible fluid. The new formulation is implemented by modifying the DLM code for two dimensional

particulate flows developed by Singh, Joseph, Hesla, Glowinski and Pan (1999). The code is verified by comparing results with other simulations and experiments.

1 Introduction

Direct numerical simulation of the motion of rigid bodies in a fluid can be applied in numerous settings; e.g. sedimenting and fluidized suspensions, lubricated transport, hydraulic fracturing of reservoirs, slurries etc. The capability of simulating the motion of large number of particles in a fluid is important for predicting the effective properties of the particulate mixture in such applications.

Hu, Joseph and Crochet (1992), Hu (1996) and Johnson and Tezduyar (1996, 1997) developed finite element methods based on unstructured grids to simulate the motion of large numbers of rigid particles in two and three dimensions in a Newtonian fluid. Hu (1996) treats the fluid particle motion implicitly by using a combined weak formulation of Hesla (1991). The method of Hu *et al.* (1992) for a Newtonian suspending fluid was first extended for static simulation of particles in a viscoelastic fluid by Huang and Feng (1995). The same scheme was later extended by them to enable dynamic simulation of particles, the first results of which were presented by Feng, Huang and Joseph (1996). Hu further improved their scheme. Recent results of dynamic simulation of particles in a viscoelastic fluid can be found in the papers by Huang, Feng, Hu and Joseph (1997) and Huang, Hu and Joseph (1998). Their numerical scheme has been described in detail by Patankar (1997) and the simulation results for about 100 particles in two dimensions in an Oldroyd B fluid were also reported there.

Glowinski, Pan, Hesla and Joseph (1999) and Glowinski, Pan, Hesla, Joseph and P eriaux (1998) presented a Lagrange-multiplier-based fictitious-domain method (DLM) for the direct numerical simulation of the motion of large numbers of rigid particles in a Newtonian fluid. Their finite element formulation permits the use of a fixed structured grid. This eliminates the need for remeshing the domain which is necessary in the unstructured grid based methods. Structured grids also allow the use of fast and efficient solvers. A recent three-dimensional calculation of the fluidization of 1204 spheres by Pan

can be found at the web site http://www.aem.umn.edu/Solid-Liquid_Flows. Singh, Joseph, Hesla, Glowinski and Pan (1999) extended this method to simulate the motion of rigid particles in an Oldroyd B fluid.

In the DLM method the flow in the particle domain is constrained to be a rigid body motion using a field of Lagrange multipliers. The constraint of rigid body motion is represented by

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{U} + \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{r} , \quad (1)$$

\mathbf{u} being the velocity of the fluid at a point in the particle domain; \mathbf{U} and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ are the translational and angular velocities of the particle, respectively; and \mathbf{r} is the position vector of the point with respect to the center of mass of the particle. The fluid-particle motion is treated implicitly using a combined weak formulation of Hesla (1991) in which the mutual forces cancel. This formulation and the above equation of constraint were the key features of the DLM method of Glowinski, Pan, Hesla and Joseph (1999). They stated that the resulting algorithm as presented by them could not be used directly if the particles were neutrally buoyant however it could be made to work by adding extra conditions to the space of the distributed Lagrange multipliers. Extension of this formulation to three dimensions with irregularly shaped bodies requires that another term [$\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{I}_p \boldsymbol{\omega}$ where \mathbf{I}_p is the moment of inertia tensor] must be added to the angular momentum equation for particles in the coupled particle-fluid system of equation.

In this paper we address the above issues by presenting a new DLM formulation for particulate flow. It was recognized by Hesla (1997) that, in the DLM method of Glowinski *et al.* (1999), the translational and angular velocities of the particles appear as “extra unknowns”, in some sense, in addition to the velocity field \mathbf{u} inside the particles, even though they are completely determined in terms of \mathbf{u} . Hence he suggested that \mathbf{U} and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ be eliminated as independent unknowns at the outset by replacing them by the respective classical mechanical integral expressions in terms of \mathbf{u} . This suggestion if implemented gives rise to an algorithm that can be used in the density matched case without extra conditions on the space of the distributed Lagrange multipliers. In this

paper we present an approach in which the deformation rate tensor within the particle domain is constrained to be zero in order to impose the rigid body motion. This eliminates \mathbf{U} and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ as variables from the coupled system of equations and at the same time is much easier to implement, numerically, compared to the suggestion of Hesla (1997). The resulting algorithm in our approach requires no extra conditions for the density matched case. Physical interpretation of the formulation will be explained in the next section. We will then present some details of the numerical implementation of the new formulation. We implemented this formulation by modifying the DLM code for two dimensional particulate flows developed by Singh, Joseph, Hesla, Glowinski and Pan (1999). Lastly we will verify the code through some known test cases.

2 Mathematical formulation

2.1 Strong form

Let Ω be the computational domain which includes both the fluid and the particle domain. Let $P(t)$ be the particle domain. Let the fluid boundary not shared with the particle be denoted by Γ . For simplicity we will assume that a Dirichlet boundary condition is imposed on Γ and that there is only one particle in the computational domain. We note that the formulation can be easily generalized beyond these assumptions. The body force will also be assumed to be constant so that there is no net torque acting on the particles. The governing equations for fluid motion are given by:

$$\rho_f \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} \right) = \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \rho_f \mathbf{g} \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}, \quad (2)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_\Gamma(t) \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_i \quad \text{on } \partial P(t), \quad (5a)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{t} \quad \text{on } \partial P(t), \quad (5b)$$

$$\mathbf{u}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}) \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \overline{P(0)} , \quad (6)$$

where ρ_f is the fluid density, \mathbf{u} is the fluid velocity, \mathbf{g} is the acceleration due to gravity, \mathbf{n} is the outward normal on the particle surface, \mathbf{u}_i is the velocity at fluid-particle interface $\partial P(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the stress tensor. The initial velocity \mathbf{u}_0 should satisfy (3). The boundary velocity in (4) should satisfy the compatibility condition due to (3). For an incompressible fluid the divergence-free constraint (3) gives rise to pressure in the fluid. The stress tensor is then given by:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = -p\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\tau} , \quad (7)$$

where \mathbf{I} is the identity tensor, p is the pressure and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ is the extra stress tensor. For a Newtonian fluid $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ represents the viscous stress whereas for a viscoelastic fluid it represents the viscous and the elastic stress in the fluid. Extra stress depends on the deformation rate of the fluid at a given location. In a viscoelastic fluid it also depends on the history of deformation.

Particle motions can be represented in terms of translational and angular velocities using Newton's second law. In the present formulation we treat the particle as a fluid subjected to an additional rigidity constraint. The governing equations for particle motion are then given by:

$$\rho_s \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} \right) = \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \rho_s \mathbf{g} \text{ in } P(t) , \quad (8)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \text{ in } P(t) , \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}] = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T) = \mathbf{0} \text{ in } P(t) , \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_i \text{ on } \partial P(t) , \quad (11a)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{t} \text{ on } \partial P(t) , \quad (11b)$$

$$\mathbf{u}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{u}_0(\mathbf{x}) \text{ in } P(0) , \quad (12)$$

where ρ_s is the particle density. Rigidity constraint (10) has been used before by Joseph and Lundgren (1990) to derive the ensemble averaged two-fluid equations for flowing composites of solid particles in a liquid. The initial velocity \mathbf{u}_0 should satisfy (10). The rigidity constraint (10) ensures that the velocity field is divergence-free. Hence (9) is a redundant equation. We nevertheless choose to keep this constraint since it will be required in the DLM formulation to be presented later. As noted earlier, (9) gives rise to a pressure field in the particle domain. Similarly the rigidity constraint (which is a tensor constraint) gives rise to a stress field \mathbf{L} . \mathbf{L} is a symmetric second-order tensor. Variational analysis of the above equations shows that the pressure and \mathbf{L} are nothing but distributed Lagrange multipliers due to the divergence-free and rigidity constraints respectively. This will become evident in the weak form to be presented in the next section. \mathbf{L} is an additional stress field required inside the particle domain to maintain the rigid-body motion. A similar interpretation of the Lagrange multiplier in terms of additional body force per unit volume was given by Glowinski *et al.* (1999). Stress inside the particle is then given by:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = -p\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{L} + \boldsymbol{\tau} . \quad (13)$$

$\boldsymbol{\tau}$ can be considered to be zero inside the particle domain since the deformation inside a rigid particle is always zero. The pressure term will not arise if (9) is not used.

On using (10) to apply the rigidity constraint we obtain a Lagrange multiplier \mathbf{L} with six scalar variables in the three-dimensional case. This is because (10) represents six scalar constraint equations at a point. A reformulation of (10) can reduce the number of Lagrange multiplier variables to three. To this end we note that rigidity constraint can also be implemented by imposing:

$$\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}]) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{in } P(t) , \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}] \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \partial P(t) , \quad (15)$$

where (14) and (15) represent three scalar constraint equations at a point. As a result \mathbf{L} is no longer the Lagrange multiplier itself. It remains the stress field inside the particle due to the rigidity constraint. It can be represented in terms of a Lagrange multiplier λ by an expression to be derived in the next section. The expression is

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D}[\lambda] , \quad (16)$$

where λ is a vector with three scalar components in a three-dimensional case.

The idea of computing the motion inside the particle as a (rigid) velocity field \mathbf{u} produced by a certain (symmetric) stress tensor field σ was proposed by Hesla (1995). In Hesla's method, the entire stress tensor σ inside the particle is postulated as $\mathbf{D}[\phi]$, where ϕ is an unknown vector field satisfying the inhomogeneous equation (23), to be presented later, with λ replaced by ϕ . A finite-element code implementing Hesla's method is currently under development. We note that in the present approach the form for stress inside a rigid solid given by (16) is an outcome of the rigidity constraint (14)-(15) and is not postulated as in the approach of Hesla (1995). This derivation will be presented next.

2.2 Weak form

In the following derivation we will consider the two-dimensional case. To obtain the weak form of the governing equations of the fluid we use the traction boundary condition on the fluid-particle interface. We define the solution space for velocity in the fluid domain as

$$V_{ur}(t) = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)})^2, \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_r(t) \text{ on } \Gamma \right\}$$

and the variation space for the velocity as

$$V_0(t) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)})^2, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \Gamma \right\} .$$

The solution space for the pressure is

$$L_0^2(\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}) = \left\{ q \in L^2(\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}) \mid \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}} q \, d\mathbf{x} = 0 \right\}.$$

The weak formulation for the fluid phase is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}} \rho_f \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{g} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\partial P(t)} (\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & + \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}} q (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V_0 \text{ and } q \in L^2(\Omega \setminus \overline{P(t)}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

To obtain the weak form of the particle equations we use the traction boundary condition as before. As a first step we impose the rigidity constraint in the solution and variation space for velocity in the particle domain. It is given by

$$V_p(t) = \left\{ \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \in H^1(P(t))^2, \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] = \mathbf{0} \text{ in } P(t) \right\}.$$

For $\mathbf{u} \in V_p(t)$ and $p \in L_0^2(P(t))$ the weak formulation for the particle phase becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{P(t)} \rho_s \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{g} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{P(t)} p (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\partial P(t)} (\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} \\ & + \int_{P(t)} q (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in V_p \text{ and } q \in L^2(P(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

As in the approach of Glowinski *et al.* (1999) we relax the constraint in the velocity space $V_p(t)$ by enforcing it in a weak sense as a side constraint. The weak form of the constraint equation can be taken to be the weak form of equations (14)-(15). It is given by

$$\int_{P(t)} \mathbf{D}[\mu] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}] d\mathbf{x} = 0, \quad \forall \mu \in H^1(P(t))^2, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(P(t))^2$. Using (19) requires the addition of an appropriate distributed Lagrange multiplier λ in (18). The modified weak formulation for the particle phase becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{P(t)} \rho_s \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{g} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{P(t)} p (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{P(t)} \mathbf{D}[\lambda] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathcal{P}(t)} (\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{x} \\ & + \int_{P(t)} q (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{P(t)} \mathbf{D}[\mu] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}] d\mathbf{x} = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in H^1(P(t))^2, \mu \in H^1(P(t))^2 \text{ and } q \in L^2(P(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in H^1(P(t))^2$, $\lambda \in H^1(P(t))^2$ and $p \in L_0^2(P(t))$. It can be verified that the strong form of (20) is represented by (8)-(10) and (13)-(16). As stated before, (16) is obtained due the imposition of rigidity constraint (19). Physically one may perceive the stress \mathbf{L} in a rigid body to be similar to pressure in an incompressible fluid. In the DLM formulation of Glowinski *et al.* (1999) various forms of constraint equations were suggested. For the present formulation we see that (19) is the most suitable form of the constraint equation.

Adding (17) and (20), using the interface condition (5) and (11) and noting that the extra stress τ (modeled as a function of the deformation rate or the deformation history) is zero inside a rigid body we get the following combined weak form of the problem:

For $t > 0$, find $\mathbf{u} \in W_{\text{ur}}$, $p \in L_0^2(\Omega)$, $\lambda \in H^1(P(t))^2$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \rho_f \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{g} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega} p (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} q (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] d\mathbf{x} \\ & + \int_{P(t)} (\rho_s - \rho_f) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{g} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{P(t)} \mathbf{D}[\lambda] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] d\mathbf{x} + \int_{P(t)} \mathbf{D}[\mu] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}] d\mathbf{x} = 0, \\ & \forall \mathbf{v} \in W_0, \mu \in H^1(P(t))^2 \text{ and } q \in L^2(\Omega), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_{u_\Gamma}(t) &= \left\{ \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^2, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_\Gamma(t) \text{ on } \Gamma \right\}, \\ W_0(t) &= \left\{ \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \in H^1(\Omega)^2, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \Gamma \right\}, \\ L_0^2(\Omega) &= \left\{ q \in L^2(\Omega) \mid \int_\Omega q d\mathbf{x} = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The initial conditions are given by (6) and (12). The fluid-particle interface condition is internal to the combined system. Hence there are no explicit interface force or velocity terms in (21). We note that the particle translational and angular velocities are not present in the combined form (21) unlike the original DLM formulation of Glowinski *et al.* (1999). This is especially convenient in a three-dimensional case with irregularly shaped bodies for which there is added complexity due to the nonlinear nature of the angular momentum equations. The above formulation is due to the first author.

2.3 An alternate strong form

The third author has proposed that one can rewrite the strong form presented in section 2.1 for given velocity and position of the particles. We can extract the following problems for \mathbf{u} and λ on $\Omega \setminus \overline{\mathcal{P}(t)}$ and $\mathcal{P}(t)$, given $\mathbf{U}(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}(t)$ and the translational and angular positions of the particles:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_f \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u} \right) &= -\nabla p + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} + \rho_f \mathbf{g} \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\mathcal{P}(t)}, \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\mathcal{P}(t)}, \\ \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{u}_\Gamma(t) \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \\ \mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{U} + \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{r} \quad \text{on } \partial \mathcal{P}(t) \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{D}(\lambda)] &= \rho_s \left(\frac{d\mathbf{U}}{dt} + \frac{d\boldsymbol{\omega}}{dt} \times \mathbf{r} + \boldsymbol{\omega} \times (\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{r}) - \mathbf{g} \right) \text{ in } \mathcal{P}(t), \\ \mathbf{n} \cdot [\mathbf{D}(\lambda)]_s &= \mathbf{n} \cdot [-p\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\tau}]_f \text{ on } \partial\mathcal{P}(t),\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

where we have not defined pressure in the particle domain since it is redundant in the presence of stress due to λ , and $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ in the particle domain is taken to be zero. Thus the stress in the particle is only due to the Lagrange multiplier λ . We have used (1) in order to derive (23) from (8). In the second equation in (23), the left hand side is evaluated in the particle domain and the right hand side is evaluated in the fluid domain. Initial conditions are the same as given before. These are solvable Dirichlet and Neumann problems which are decoupled for any specified motion of the particles. The strong form in (22)-(23) can form a basis for a new computational scheme. In such a scheme the fluid domain can be extended to include the particle domain. Equation (23) then ensures that the region occupied by the particles move rigidly. Hesla's (1995) scheme, mentioned earlier, is based on essentially the same set of strong equations. In the present work the above strong form is not considered in the numerical implementation.

3 Numerical scheme

The new formulation is implemented by modifying the DLM code for two-dimensional particulate flows developed by Singh, Joseph, Hesla, Glowinski and Pan (1999). Their code can simulate rigid particulate flows in Newtonian as well as viscoelastic fluids. To highlight the modification of their code we will consider the suspending fluid to be Newtonian. The particles are assumed to be circular so that the angular motion of the particles need not be considered. Singh *et al.* (1999) use the Marchuk-Yanenko operator splitting scheme for time discretization. The modified algorithm based on this scheme is:

- (1) Calculate particle velocity: Given \mathbf{u}^n and $P(t^n)$, find the translational velocity, \mathbf{U}^n , of the particle:

$$\mathbf{U}^n = \frac{1}{M} \int_{P(t^n)} \rho_s \mathbf{u}^n d\mathbf{x} , \quad (24a)$$

where M is the mass of the particle. For a non-circular particle it is necessary to update the angular position of the particle. Angular velocity, ω^n , of the particle is then calculated by

$$I_p \omega^n = \int_{P(t^n)} \mathbf{r} \times \rho_s \mathbf{u}^n d\mathbf{x} , \quad (24b)$$

where I_p is the moment of inertia of the particle.

- (2) Explicit update of particle position: Compute \mathbf{X}^{n+1} by the following procedure:

Set $\mathbf{X}^{n+1,0} = \mathbf{X}^n$.

do $k=1, K$

$$\mathbf{X}^{*n+1,k} = \mathbf{X}^{n+1,k-1} + \left(\frac{\mathbf{U}^n + \mathbf{U}^{n-1}}{2} \right) \left(\frac{\Delta t}{K} \right) \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^{n+1,k} = \mathbf{X}^{*n+1,k} + M^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}^{n+1,k-1}) + \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}^{*n+1,k})}{2} \right) \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2K^2} \quad (26)$$

enddo

Set $\mathbf{X}^{n+1} = \mathbf{X}^{n+1,K}$, this also gives $P(t^{n+1})$.

$$\text{Set } \mathbf{A}_c^{n+1} = \frac{2}{(\Delta t)^2} \left(\mathbf{X}^{n+1} - \mathbf{X}^n - \left(\frac{\mathbf{U}^n + \mathbf{U}^{n-1}}{2} \right) \Delta t \right) , \quad (27)$$

where \mathbf{F} denotes the collision force acting on the particles to prevent them from penetrating each other or the walls of the domain. Modeling of this force in the

present scheme is the same as that of Glowinski *et al.* (1999). More details can be found therein. \mathbf{A}_c is the acceleration of the particle due to collision. This term provides an additional body force acting on the particle and is included in the combined momentum equation to be solved in the subsequent steps. This explicit update scheme is similar although not identical to that used by Hu (1996) in the present version of his code. In his scheme the calculation of \mathbf{F} is done differently. Glowinski *et al.* (1999) and Singh *et al.* (1999) did not use explicit update scheme.

- (3) Fractional step 1: Find $\mathbf{u}^{n+1/3} \in W_{\text{ur}}(t^{n+1})$ and $p^{n+1/3} \in L_0^2(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \rho_f \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}^{n+1/3} - \mathbf{u}^n}{\Delta t} - \mathbf{g} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega} p^{n+1/3} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} q (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^{n+1/3}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ + \alpha \int_{\Omega} 2\eta \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}^{n+1/3}] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in W_0 \text{ and } q \in L^2(\Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

- (4) Fractional step 2: Find $\mathbf{u}^{n+2/3} \in W_{\text{ur}}(t^{n+1})$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \rho_f \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}^{n+2/3} - \mathbf{u}^{n+1/3}}{\Delta t} + (\mathbf{u}^{n+2/3} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^{n+2/3} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \beta \int_{\Omega} 2\eta \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}^{n+2/3}] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \\ \forall \mathbf{v} \in W_0. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

- (5) Fractional step 3: Find $\mathbf{u}^{n+1} \in W_{\text{ur}}(t^{n+1})$ and $\lambda^{n+1} \in H^1(\mathbf{P}(t^{n+1}))^2$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \rho_f \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}^{n+2/3}}{\Delta t} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \gamma \int_{\Omega} 2\eta \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}^{n+1}] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\mathbf{P}(t^{n+1})} \rho_s \mathbf{A}_c^{n+1} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\mathbf{P}(t^{n+1})} \mathbf{D}[\lambda^{n+1}] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{v}] \, d\mathbf{x} \\ + \int_{\mathbf{P}(t^{n+1})} \mathbf{D}[\mu] : \mathbf{D}[\mathbf{u}^{n+1}] \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\mathbf{P}(t^{n+1})} (\rho_s - \rho_f) \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}^{n+1} - \mathbf{u}^n}{\Delta t} + (\mathbf{u}^{n+2/3} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{u}^{n+2/3} - \mathbf{g} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\mathbf{x} = 0, \\ \forall \mathbf{v} \in W_0 \text{ and } \mu \in H^1(\mathbf{P}(t^{n+1}))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

τ is replaced by the Newtonian stress and is split into the three fractional steps such that $\alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1$. In our simulations we set $\alpha = \beta = 0.5$, $\gamma = 0$ and viscosity of the Newtonian fluid is constant. We use linear interpolation for projection between the fluid and particle meshes which is necessary in the last fractional step. The above is a first order time discretization scheme. In case of a viscoelastic suspending fluid the above algorithm can be extended as per the details provided by Singh *et al.* (1999). In the present work the viscoelastic fluid model has been implemented. The first fractional step is the classical Stokes-like problem and is solved using a conjugate gradient method. Note that it is essential to have a pressure variable in the particle domain to get the classical Stokes problem in this step. This explains why constraint (9) was retained in the particle equations although it was redundant in the presence of the rigidity constraint. Fractional step two defines a nonlinear problem for velocity which is solved by using a least squares conjugate gradient algorithm. For details of these methods see Bristeau, Glowinski and Periaux (1987). Fractional step three is solved by a Uzawa conjugate gradient algorithm similar to that used by Glowinski *et al.* (1999). Details of this will not be repeated here.

We see from (30) that the algorithm as presented can also be used when the fluid and particle densities match. The above system of equations has been solved by using the Galerkin finite element method. A structured triangular finite element mesh is used, where the pressure is defined on a “twice-coarser” mesh. Linear shape functions are used (see Glowinski *et al.* (1999) or Singh *et al.* (1999) for details). A separate mesh, on which the Lagrange multiplier is defined, is used within the particle domain. Glowinski *et al.* (1999) had mentioned that in their DLM formulation a particle mesh that is coarser than the velocity mesh was good for stability or enhancing the conditioning of the algebraic system. They reported that this followed from general results on the approximation of generalized saddle-point problems. Although it is likely that the present formulation is subject to similar conditions, a comparison of the stability behavior of the present formulation and the previous DLM formulation needs to be done. In this work we have chosen to use the same coarse mesh in the particle domain as that used by Singh *et al.* (1999). Use of a particle mesh of the same size as that of velocity can enhance the

accuracy of the solution inside and near the particle domain. We intend to study the stability of this formulation under such condition in future.

4 Results

We will validate the code by presenting results of sedimentation of two circular particles in a Newtonian fluid. We consider a channel 2 cm wide (x-direction) and 8 cm tall (y-direction). The fluid viscosity is 0.01 g/cm-s and the density is 1 g/cc. The particle density is 1.01 g/cc and their radius is 0.1 cm. Gravity acts in the negative y-direction. The simulation is started at $t=0$ s by dropping the two particles at the center of the channel at a height of 7.2 cm and 6.8 cm. We perform simulations at two different time step and for two different mesh sizes. This case is identical to the one presented by Singh *et al.* (1999).

It is known that two particles dropped close to each other in a Newtonian fluid will undergo drafting, kissing and tumbling (Fortes, Joseph and Lundgren, 1987). Numerical results in Figure 1 agree well with this observation. This simulation (Case A) has a velocity mesh size of 1/96 cm, pressure mesh size of 1/48 cm and the particle mesh size of 1/64 cm. The time step is 0.01 s. Results of another simulation (Case B) with a time step of 0.005 s are compared to those of Case A in Figure 2. It is seen that the two cases are in good agreement until kissing and tumbling begins. This is because tumbling is essentially a breakup of an unstable configuration of the particle positions (Fortes *et al.*, 1987). After tumbling is complete the particles continue to fall at locations away from the center of the channel at a constant speed. Figure 2(d) shows that this terminal speed is the same in both the cases presented. There is greater agreement between the results if smaller time steps are used in the comparison. In Figure 2 we wish to emphasize that the scheme gives good results even at comparatively larger time steps. We also note that the overall qualitative behavior in both the cases is identical. This is important to ensure the same macroscopic behavior of the fluid particle mixture when the motion of large number of particles is simulated.

Results of Case B are also compared with another simulation (Case C) with a time step equal to 0.005 s, velocity mesh size of 1/144 cm, pressure mesh size of 1/72 cm and particle mesh size of 1/96 cm. Figure 3 shows that these two cases are also in good agreement.

The above results are for the case of a Newtonian suspending fluid. The present code can also simulate the motion of particles in an Oldroyd B fluid. Particles falling in a viscoelastic fluid have a tendency to form chains (Joseph and Liu, 1993). This behavior was simulated by Huang, Hu and Joseph (1998) and by Patankar (1997). To verify that the present code reproduces this behavior we consider sedimentation of eleven particles in a channel 2 cm wide and 8 cm tall. The initial positions of the particles are shown in Figure 4(a). We consider an Oldroyd B fluid with a viscosity of 0.3 g/cm-s, density of 1 g/cc and relaxation time of 3 s. Density of the particles is 1.02 g/cc and their radius is 0.1 cm. The time step is 0.005 s and the mesh size is same as that in Case C presented above. The Reynolds number ($=\rho_f V d / \eta$, where V is the particle velocity and d is the particle diameter) for this case is 0.167 and the Deborah number ($=V \lambda_r / d$, where λ_r is the relaxation time of the fluid) is 3.75. This results in a viscoelastic Mach number ($=\sqrt{Re De}$, where Re is the Reynolds number and De is the Deborah number) equal to 0.79 and the elasticity number ($=De/Re$) equal to 22.4. It was shown by Huang *et al.* (1998) that particle in a viscoelastic fluid tend to chain when Mach number < 1 and elasticity number > 1 . Figure 4(b) shows the location of the particles at $t=20$ s. There is a tendency to form chains which is in agreement with the previous results.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have presented a new formulation of the Lagrange-multiplier-based fictitious-domain method for particulate flow. In this approach, rigid motion is enforced by requiring that the deformation rate tensor vanish at points occupied by rigid solids. This formulation leads to a field of Lagrange multipliers λ for rigid motion analogous to the way that pressure arises as a Lagrange multiplier for incompressibility. The new formulation is implemented by modifying the DLM code for two dimensional particulate

flows developed by Singh *et al.* (1999). The code gives results which agree with the original DLM approach when the densities do not match and with experiments.

The present algorithm requires no extra condition on the space of Lagrange multipliers when the fluid and particle densities match. In this approach the particle translational and angular velocities are not present in the combined equations of motion. This is especially convenient for extending the method to a three-dimensional case with irregularly shaped bodies where there is added complexity due to the nonlinear nature of the angular momentum equations.

Acknowledgment

We acknowledge the support from NSF under KDI/NCC grant NSF/CTS-9873236 and the University of Minnesota Supercomputing Institute. The authors are indebted to Todd Hesla, for his careful proofreading of the manuscript.

6 References

- Bristeau, M. O., Glowinski, R., and Périaux, J. 1987 Numerical methods for the Navier-Stokes equations. *Comp. Phys. Rep.* 6, 73-187.
- Feng, J., Huang, P. Y., and Joseph, D. D., 1996 Dynamic simulation of the sedimentation of solid particles in an Oldroyd B fluid. *J. Non-Newt. Fluid Mech.* 63, 63-88.
- Fortes, A., Joseph, D. D., and Lundgren, T. S. 1987 Nonlinear mechanics of fluidization of beds of spherical particles. *J. Fluid Mech.* 177, 467-483.
- Glowinski, R., Pan, T.-W., Hesla, T. I., and Joseph, D. D. 1999 A distributed Lagrange multiplier/fictitious domain method for particulate flows. To appear in *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*.
- Glowinski, R., Pan, T.-W., Hesla, T. I., Joseph, D. D., and Périaux, J. 1998 A fictitious domain method with distributed Lagrange multipliers for the numerical simulation of particulate flow. In J. Mandel, C. Farhat and X.-C. Cai (Ed.), *Domain decomposition methods 10*, pp. 121-137. Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society.

- Hesla, T. I. 1991 The dynamical simulation of two-dimensional fluid/particle systems. Unpublished notes.
- Hesla, T. I. 1995 Stress in a rigid body. Private communication.
- Hesla, T. I. 1997 Partial reformulation of the Lagrange multiplier/fictitious domain method for particulate flows. Unpublished notes.
- Hu, H. H. 1996 Direct simulation of flows of solid-liquid mixtures, *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, 22, 335-352.
- Hu, H. H., Joseph, D. D., and Crochet, M. J. 1992 Direct simulation of fluid particle motions. *Theor. Comp. Fluid Dyn.* 3, 285-306.
- Huang, P. Y., Feng, J., Hu, H. H., and Joseph, D. D. 1997 Direct simulation of the motion of solid particles in Couette and Poiseuille flows of viscoelastic fluids. *J. Fluid Mech.* 343, 73-94.
- Huang, P. Y., Hu, H. H., and Joseph, D. D. 1998 Direct simulation of the sedimentation of elliptic particles in Oldroyd B fluids. *J. Fluid Mech.* 362, 297-326.
- Huang, P. Y., and Feng, J. 1995 Wall effects on the flow of viscoelastic fluid around a circular cylinder. *J. Non-Newt. Fluid Mech.* 60, 179-198.
- Johnson, A., and Tezduyar, T. 1996 3d simulation of fluid-particle interactions with the number of particles reaching 100. Research report 96-037, Army High Performance Computing Research Center, University of Minnesota.
- Johnson, A., and Tezduyar, T. 1997 Fluid-particle simulations reaching 100 particles. Research report 97-010, Army High Performance Computing Research Center, University of Minnesota.
- Joseph, D. D., and Liu, Y. J. 1993 Orientation of long bodies falling in a viscoelastic liquid. *J. Rheol.* 37, 961-983.
- Joseph, D. D., and Lundgren, T. S. 1990 Ensemble averaged and mixture theory equations for incompressible fluid-particle suspensions. *Int. J. Multiphase Flow*, 16, 35-42.
- Patankar, N. A. 1997 Numerical simulation of particulate two-phase flow. Ph. D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Singh, P., Joseph, D. D., Hesla, T. I., Glowinski, R. and Pan, T.-W. 1999 Direct numerical simulations of viscoelastic particulate flows. Submitted to J. Non-Newt. Fluid Mech.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Numerical simulation of drafting, kissing and tumbling of particles sedimenting in a Newtonian fluid.

Figure 2. Time history of (a) x coordinate of particle centers, (b) y coordinate of particle centers, (c) x-component of translational velocity and (d) y-component of translational velocity for Case A (solid lines) and Case B (dashed lines).

Figure 3. Time history of (a) x coordinate of particle centers, (b) y coordinate of particle centers, (c) x-component of translational velocity and (d) y-component of translational velocity for Case B (dashed lines) and Case C (solid lines).

Figure 4. Locations of eleven particles sedimenting in an Oldroyd B fluid at (a) $t = 0$ s and (b) $t = 20$ s.




Figure 1. Numerical simulation of drafting, kissing and tumbling of sedimenting particles in a Newtonian fluid.

Figure 2.







Figure 3.









Figure 4.

$t=0s$



(a)

$t=20s$



(b)