

# **FUN3D v12.4 Training**

## **Session 14: Adjoint-Based Design for Unsteady Flows**

Eric Nielsen



# Learning Goals

- The challenges of unsteady adjoint-based design
- Additional inputs for unsteady design
- Example problem: Maximize L/D for a pitching wing
- Application examples

What we will *not* cover

- Extensive details on setting up the most general problems



# The Challenges of Unsteady Adjoint-Based Design

## *Sheer Expense*

- The adjoint approach still provides all of the sensitivities at the same cost as analysis, and the 20x estimate still applies for the expense of an optimization
- But every simulation is now an unsteady problem
- Where the steady adjoint solver linearized about a single solution (the steady-state), the unsteady adjoint solver must essentially do this at every physical time step



# The Challenges of Unsteady Adjoint-Based Design

## *Big Data*

- Since the adjoint must be integrated backwards in time, this implies that we have the forward solution available at every time plane
  - Brute force it: Store the entire forward solution
  - Recompute it: Store the forward solution periodically and recompute intermediate time steps as needed
  - Approximate it: Store the forward solution periodically and interpolate intermediate time planes somehow



# The Challenges of Unsteady Adjoint-Based Design

## *Big Data*

***In FUN3D, we store all of the forward data to disk***


- The amount of data adds up fast – consider an example:
  - 50,000,000 grid points and 10,000 physical time steps
  - Using a 1-equation turbulence model (6 unknowns per grid point)
  - Dynamic grids (3 additional unknowns per grid point)
    - $50,000,000 \times 10,000 \times (6+3) \times 8 \text{ bytes} = 36 \text{ Terabytes}$
- So far, this amount of data has not been prohibitively large for our resources, but it is a lot (and we need to go bigger)
  - Will need to tackle this in the long-term
- So far, the challenge has been efficiently getting the data to/from the disk at every single time step



# The Challenges of Unsteady Adjoint-Based Design

## *Big Data*

- Conventional approaches used to write restart files are prohibitively expensive
- System should have a parallel file system
- FUN3D uses parallel, asynchronous, unformatted direct access read/writes from every rank
  - Flow solver is writing the previous time plane while the current time step is computing
  - Adjoint solver is pre-fetching earlier time planes while the current time step is computing
- This strategy performs well for the problems we have run, but is not infinitely scalable



# The Challenges of Unsteady Adjoint-Based Design

## *Other Factors*

- If dynamic grids are involved, all of the unsteady metrics and mesh motion/deformations must be differentiated at each time step
- If overset dynamic grids are involved, the relationship between the component grids must also be differentiated at each time step – both motion and interpolants
- If another disciplinary model impacts the CFD model, then that other discipline must also be differentiated, as well as the coupling procedure between the two
- Finally, if the flowfield is chaotic, traditional discrete sensitivity analysis may not produce the sensitivities you desire
  - Critical for LES; have seen evidence of the problem even for URANS
  - Very new research topic in the sensitivity analysis community



# Additional Inputs For Unsteady Design

## *Design Variables*

- All design variables available for steady flows are also available for unsteady flows
- Design variables for a body may now also include FUN3D's rigid motion parameters
- Also have infrastructure for other variables such as boundary condition parameters (e.g., blowing/suction rates), pilot inputs (collective, cyclics) for rotor trimming, etc





# Additional Inputs For Unsteady Design

## *Custom Kinematics*

- Design of custom kinematics: users may provide their own routine with a time-dependent  $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{D})$  matrix governing an individual body's motion
  - Written in complex-variable form, FUN3D will determine its Jacobians automatically

```
!===== USER_SUPPLIED_T =====80
!
! Provides route for user to supply a custom T matrix as a function of time
! and design variables. Complex-valued variables enable automated jacobian
! evaluation.
!
!=====80
subroutine user_supplied_t(ndv,current_time,dvs,t,xcg,ycg,zcg)

    use kinddefs, only : dp

    integer, intent(in) :: ndv

    complex(dp), intent(in) :: current_time
    complex(dp), intent(out) :: xcg, ycg, zcg

    complex(dp), dimension(ndv), intent(in) :: dvs
    complex(dp), dimension(4,4), intent(out) :: t

    continue

end subroutine user_supplied_t
```



# Additional Inputs For Unsteady Design

## *Objective/Constraint Functions*

- The unsteady implementation supports two forms of objective/constraint functions
- The first is based on an integral of the functional form  $f$  introduced for steady flows:

$$f_i = \sum_{n=N_i^1}^{N_i^2} f_i^n \Delta t$$

- The second form is similar, but is based on time-averaged quantities:

$$f_i = \left[ \left( \frac{1}{(N_i^2 - N_i^1 + 1)} \sum_{n=N_i^1}^{N_i^2} C_i^n \right) - C_i^* \right]^{p_i}$$



# Additional Inputs For Unsteady Design



## *Objective/Constraint Functions*

- The sign of the cost function/constraint input toggles between the two unsteady function forms
  - Positive sign indicates form #1, negative sign indicates form #2
- In addition to the inputs required for steady simulations, the user must now also provide the time interval over which to accumulate the cost function

```
#####
##### Function Information #####
#####
Number of composite functions for design problem statement
1
#####
Cost function (1) or constraint (2)
1
If constraint, lower and upper bounds
0.0 0.0
Number of components for function 1
1
Physical timestep interval where function is defined
1 1
Composite function weight, target, and power
1.0 0.0 1.0
Components of function 1: boundary id (0=all)/name/value/weight/target/power
0 clcd 0.0000000000000000 1.000 20.00000 2.000
```



# Maximize Time-Averaged L/D for a Pitching Wing



- FUN3D's design driver and the optimization packages themselves don't distinguish between steady and unsteady CFD problems – they just see  $f$  and  $\nabla f$
- The problem setup is very similar to steady design cases; will only highlight the differences here

# Maximize Time-Averaged L/D for a Pitching Wing

```
command_line.options
```

```
2
2 flow
  '--moving_grid'
  '--timedep_adj_frozen'
2 adjoint
  '--moving_grid'
  '--timedep_adj_frozen'
```

- Tell the solvers that it is a moving grid case
- Also specify that we want to do a time-dependent adjoint
  - This kicks in the I/O mechanisms, among other things



# Maximize Time-Averaged L/D for a Pitching Wing

## moving\_body.input

```
&body_definitions
  n_moving_bodies = 1,          ! number of bodies in motion
  body_name(1) = 'domain',      ! name must be in quotes
  parent_name(1) = '',          ! '' means motion relative to inertial ref frame
  n_defining_bndry(1) = -1,      ! shortcut to specify all solid surfaces
  defining_bndry(1,1) = 1,       ! index 1: boundary number 2: body number; use any number for shortcut
  motion_driver(1) = 'forced',   ! 'forced', '6dof', 'file', 'aeroelastic'
  mesh_movement(1) = 'rigid',    ! 'rigid', 'deform'
  x_mc(1) = 0.25,                ! x-coordinate of moment_center
  y_mc(1) = 0.0,                 ! y-coordinate of moment_center
  z_mc(1) = 0.0,                 ! z-coordinate of moment_center
  move_mc(1) = 1                 ! move mom. cntr with body/grid: 0=no, 1=yes
/
&forced_motion
  rotate(1) = 2,                 ! rotation type: 1=constant rate 2=sinusoidal
  rotation_freq(1) = 0.009000,   ! reduced rotation frequency
  rotation_amplitude(1) = 5.00,   ! max rotational displacement
  rotation_origin_x(1) = 0.25,    ! x-coordinate of rotation origin
  rotation_origin_y(1) = 0.0,     ! y-coordinate of rotation origin
  rotation_origin_z(1) = 0.0,     ! z-coordinate of rotation origin
  rotation_vector_x(1) = 0.0,     ! unit vector x-component along rotation axis
  rotation_vector_y(1) = 1.0,     ! unit vector y-component along rotation axis
  rotation_vector_z(1) = 0.0,     ! unit vector z-component along rotation axis
/
```

- Body names must match those specified in rubber.data



# Maximize Time-Averaged L/D for a Pitching Wing

## rubber.data

```
#####
##### Design Variable Information #####
#####
Global design variables (Mach number / angle of attack)
Index Active      Value      Lower Bound      Upper Bound
Mach    0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+01
AOA     0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+01
Number of bodies
1
Rigid motion design variables for 'domain'
Var Active      Value      Lower Bound      Upper Bound
RotRate  0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
RotFreq  0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
.
.
TrnVecy  0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
TrnVecz  0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
Parameterization Scheme (Massoud=1 Bandadds=2 Sculptor=4)
1
Number of shape variables for 'domain'
166
Index Active      Value      Lower Bound      Upper Bound
1      0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
2      0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
.
.
164    0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
165    0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
166    0    0.000000000000000E+00  0.000000000000000E+00  0.500000000000000E+01
```

- Body names must match those specified in moving\_body.data



# Maximize Time-Averaged L/D for a Pitching Wing

rubber.data

```
#####
##### Function Information #####
#####
Number of composite functions for design problem statement
    1
#####
Cost function (1) or constraint (2)
    -1
If constraint, lower and upper bounds
    0.0 0.0
Number of components for function    1
    1
Physical timestep interval where function is defined
    51    100
Composite function weight, target, and power
    1.0 0.0 1.0
Components of function    1: boundary id (0=all)/name/value/weight/target/power
    0 clcd                0.0000000000000000    1.000    20.00000    2.000
```

- Negative sign on function/constraint selection indicates time-averaging form is to be used
- Time step interval for function is also specified




$$f = \left[ \left( \frac{1}{50} \sum_{n=51}^{100} (L/D)^n \right) - 20 \right]^2$$






# Maximize Time-Averaged L/D for a Pitching Wing

- The optimization is executed just as in the steady flow case
- Here, the time-averaged value of L/D has been raised from its nominal baseline value of 0 to an optimized value of 6.8



# Unsteady Design Applications

- This capability is very advanced and can require extensive problem setup for more general, complex applications
- Willing to work closely with someone interested in using it, but fire-hosing you with the intimate details at this point is probably not productive
- Instead, consider some of these prior applications to perhaps spur some ideas on future uses...



**Adjoint Propagating Upstream  
of Wind Turbine**






**Design of Tilt Rotor  
During Pitch-Up**



# F-15 Configuration

Modify Shape to Maximize L/D Subject to Prescribed Oscillations




# Active Flow Control Study



- Objective: Maximize lift using all available parameters
- Design variables include
  - External wing shape
  - Jet blowing parameters
  - Jet incidence and location
  - Relative location of slat/main/flap
- Scaling study also performed for very frequent massively parallel I/O
- Designs performed using 2,048 cores for ~5 days per run
- Mean value of lift increased by 27%




Jet Incidence



Shape Deformation







Jet Sliding




Relative Translation  
And Rotation



# Active Flow Control Study





# Flapping Wing Shape & Kinematics




Baseline

Optimal



# UH-60 Black Hawk

## Maximize Lift Subject to Trimming Constraints



View of Blade Articulation from  
Blade Reference Frame

$$\theta = \theta_c + \theta_{1c} \cos \psi + \theta_{1s} \sin \psi$$





Blade pitch      Collective      Lateral cyclic      Longitudinal cyclic

- Design variables include blade shape and collective/cyclics
- Three unsteady adjoints computed simultaneously (lift, long/lat moments)



# UH-60 Black Hawk

## Maximize Lift Subject to Trimming Constraints



- Adjoint shows sensitivity of objective function to local disturbances in space and time
- May also be used to perform rigorous error estimation and mesh adaptation
  - Traditional feature-based techniques do not identify such regions






# List of Key Input/Output Files

## Input

- Same as for steady flows, plus
- `moving_body.input`

## Output

- Same as for steady flows



# What We Learned

- Challenges involved with adjoint-based unsteady design
- Additional inputs required for unsteady design
- Simple design example for pitching wing
- Previous applications

***Many aspects of this capability are “researchy” and applications of it would benefit from close collaboration***

