Abstract

The present work performs comparisons between the Yee, Warming and Harten and the Hughson and Beran algorithms in the solution of inviscid and laminar and turbulent viscous flows in three-dimensions. The Euler and the Navier-Stokes equations, on a finite volume context and using a structured spatial discretization, are solved. The algorithms are flux difference splitting type and a dimensional splitting method is used to perform time integration. The physical problem of the supersonic flow along a ramp is studied. Turbulence is taking into account considering two turbulence models, namely: the Cebeci and Smith and the Baldwin and Lomax algebraic ones. The results have demonstrated that the Hughson and Beran scheme yields more severe pressure fields, while the Yee, Warming and Harten scheme presents more accurate results.

1 Introduction

Conventional non-upwind algorithms have been used extensively to solve a wide variety of problems (Kutler [1] and Steger [2]). Conventional algorithms are somewhat unreliable in the sense that for every different problem (and sometimes, every different case in the same class of problems) artificial dissipation terms must be specially tuned and judicially chosen for convergence.

Upwind schemes are in general more robust but are also more involved in their derivation and application. Some upwind schemes that have been applied to the Euler equations are: Yee, Warming and Harten [3], and Hughson and Beran [4]. Some comments about these methods are reported below:

Yee, Warming and Harten [3] implemented a high resolution second order explicit method based on Harten’s ideas. The method had the following properties: (a) the scheme was developed in conservation form to ensure that the limit was a weak solution; (b) the scheme satisfied a proper entropy inequality to ensure that the limit solution would have only physically relevant discontinuities. The method was applied to the solution of a quasi-one-dimensional nozzle problem and to the two-dimensional shock reflection problem, yielding good results.

Hughson and Beran [4] proposed an explicit, second order accurate in space, TVD (Total Variation Diminishing) scheme to solve the Euler equations in axis-symmetrical form, applied to the studies of the supersonic flow around a sphere and the hypersonic flow around a blunt body. The scheme was based on the modified flux function approximation of Harten [5] and its extension from the two-dimensional space to the axis-symmetrical treatment was developed. Results were of good quality.

There is a practical necessity in the aeronautical industry and in other fields of the capability of calculating separated turbulent compressible flows. With the available numerical methods, researches seem able to analyze several separated flows, three-
dimensional in general, if an appropriated turbulence model is employed. Simple methods, as the algebraic turbulence models of Cebeci and Smith [6] and of Baldwin and Lomax [7], supply satisfactory results with low computational cost.

The present work performs comparisons between the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] and the Hughson and Beran [4] algorithms in the solution of inviscid and laminar and turbulent viscous flows in three-dimensions. The Euler and the Navier-Stokes equations, on a finite volume context and using a structured spatial discretization, are solved. The algorithms to perform numerical experiments are of TVD flux difference splitting type, second order accurate. A dimensional splitting method, first order accurate, is used to time integration. The physical problem of the supersonic flow along a ramp is studied. Turbulence is taking into account considering two turbulence models, namely: the Cebeci and Smith [6] and the Baldwin and Lomax [7] algebraic ones. The results have demonstrated that the Hughson and Beran [4] yields more severe pressure fields, while the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] scheme presents more accurate results.

2 Navier-Stokes Equations

As the Euler equations can be obtained from the Navier-Stokes ones by disregarding the viscous vectors, only the formulation to the later will be presented. The Navier-Stokes equations in integral conservative form, employing a finite volume formulation and using a structured spatial discretization, to three-dimensional simulations, can be written as:

\[
\frac{\partial \vec{Q}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \vec{F} = 0 ,
\]

where \( V \) is the cell volume, which corresponds to an hexahedron in the three-dimensional space; \( \vec{Q} \) is the vector of conserved variables; and

\[
\vec{F} = (E_x - E_v) \hat{i} + (F_x - F_v) \hat{j} + (G_x - G_v) \hat{k}
\]

represents the complete flux vector in Cartesian coordinates, with the subscript “e” related to the Euler contributions and “v” is related to the viscous contributions. These vectors are described below:

\[
Q = \begin{pmatrix}
\rho \\
\rho u \\
\rho v \\
\rho w \\
e
\end{pmatrix},
E_x = \begin{pmatrix}
\rho u^2 + p \\
\rho u v \\
\rho w v \\
\rho w^2 + p \\
(e + p)u
\end{pmatrix},
F_x = \begin{pmatrix}
\rho u^2 + p \\
\rho u v \\
\rho v^2 + p \\
\rho w^2 + p \\
(e + p)v
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
G_x = \begin{pmatrix}
\rho w \\
\rho u w \\
\rho v w \\
\rho w^2 + p \\
(e + p)w
\end{pmatrix},
E_y = \frac{1}{Re} \begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
\tau_{xx} \\
\tau_{xy} \\
\tau_{xz} \\
\tau_{xu} + \tau_{yu} + \tau_{xw} - q_x
\end{pmatrix},
F_y = \frac{1}{Re} \begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
\tau_{xx} \\
\tau_{xy} \\
\tau_{xz} \\
\tau_{y} + \tau_{yu} + \tau_{yw} - q_y
\end{pmatrix},
G_y = \frac{1}{Re} \begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
\tau_{xx} \\
\tau_{xy} \\
\tau_{xz} \\
\tau_{z} + \tau_{zu} + \tau_{zw} - q_z
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

In these equations, the components of the viscous stress tensor are defined as:

\[
\tau_{xx} = 2(\mu_m + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} - 2 \lambda (\mu_m + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} ;
\]

\[
\tau_{xy} = \mu_m + \mu_f \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} ;
\tau_{xz} = \mu_m + \mu_f \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} ;
\]

\[
\tau_{yx} = 2(\mu_m + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} - 2 \lambda (\mu_m + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} ;
\tau_{yz} = (\mu_m + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} ;
\]

\[
\tau_{xz} = 2(\mu_m + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} - 2 \lambda (\mu_m + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} .
\]

The components of the conductive heat flux vector are defined as follows:

\[
q_x = -\gamma (\mu_m + \mu_f + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} ;
q_y = -\gamma (\mu_m + \mu_f + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} ;
\]

\[
q_z = -\gamma (\mu_m + \mu_f + \mu_f) \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \xi} .
\]

The quantities that appear above are described as follows: \( \rho \) is the fluid density, \( u, v \) and \( w \) are the Cartesian components of the flow velocity vector in the \( x, y \) and \( z \) directions, respectively; \( e \) is the total energy; \( p \) is the fluid static pressure; \( e_f \) is the fluid internal energy; the \( \tau \)’s represent the components of the viscous stress tensor; \( \Pr \)
is the laminar Prandtl number (=0.72); Prd\(_f\) is the turbulent Prandtl number (=0.9); the \(q\)'s represent the components of the conductive heat flux; \(\mu_M\) is the fluid molecular viscosity; \(\mu_T\) is the fluid turbulent viscosity; \(\gamma\) is the ratio of specific heats at constant pressure and volume, respectively (=1.4); and Re is the Reynolds number of the simulation. The molecular viscosity is estimated by the Sutherland law.

The Navier-Stokes equations were nondimensionalized in relation to freestream properties. To allow the solution of the matrix system of five equations to five unknowns defined by Eq. (1), it is used the state equation:

\[
p = (\gamma - 1) \left[ e - 0.5 \rho (u^2 + v^2 + w^2) \right]
\]

(13)

where \(S_{x,\text{int}} = n_x S\), \(S_{y,\text{int}} = n_y S\), \(S_{z,\text{int}} = n_z S\) are the Cartesian components of the flux area and \(S\) is the flux area, calculated as described in Maciel [8-10], as also the cell volumes.

The properties calculated at the flux interface are obtained either by arithmetical average or by Roe [11] average. In this work, Roe [11] average was used. The speed of sound at the flux interface is given by:

\[
a_{\text{int}} = \sqrt{(\gamma - 1) \left[ H_{\text{int}} - 0.5(u_{\text{int}}^2 + v_{\text{int}}^2 + w_{\text{int}}^2) \right]},
\]

(16)

where \(H_{\text{int}}, u_{\text{int}}, v_{\text{int}}\) and \(w_{\text{int}}\) are calculated at the flux interface. The eigenvalues of the Euler equations, in the \(\xi\) direction, are given by:

\[
\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = U_{\text{cont}} - a_{\text{int}} h_n, \quad \lambda_2 = U_{\text{cont}} + a_{\text{int}} h_n.
\]

(17)

(18)

The jumps of the conserved variables, necessary to the construction of the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] dissipation function, are given, for example, by:

\[
\Delta \rho = V_{\text{int}} (\rho_R - \rho_L) \quad \Delta (\rho u) = V_{\text{int}} (\rho u_R - (\rho u)_L).
\]

(19)

The \(\alpha\) vectors at the \((i+\frac{1}{2}, j, k)\) interface are calculated by the following manner:

\[
\{\alpha_{i+1/2, j, k}\} = \left[ R^{-1} \right]_{i+1/2, j, k} \{\Delta_{i+1/2, j, k}\} \quad \Box,
\]

(20)

with:

\[
\{\Delta_{i+1/2, j, k}\} = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \rho \quad \Delta (\rho u) \quad \Delta (\rho v) \quad \Delta (\rho w) \quad \Delta \xi \end{bmatrix}^T.
\]

(21)

\[
q^2 = u_{\text{int}}^2 + v_{\text{int}}^2 + w_{\text{int}}^2, \quad \phi = u_{\text{int}} h_x' + v_{\text{int}} h_y' + w_{\text{int}} h_z'; \quad h_x' = h_x / h_n, \quad h_y' = h_y / h_n \quad \text{and} \quad h_z' = h_z / h_n.
\]

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)
The Yee, Warming and Harten [3] dissipation function uses the right-eigenvector matrix of the normal to the flux face Jacobian matrix in generalized coordinates:

\[
[R] = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Two options to the \( \psi \) entropy function, responsible to guarantee that only relevant physical solutions are to be considered, are implemented aiming an entropy satisfying algorithm:

\[
\psi_i = \Delta t_{i,j,k} \lambda_i = \frac{Z_i}{2} + 0.25; \quad \psi_i = \frac{Z_i}{2} + 0.25 \quad \text{or}
\]

\[
\psi_i = \begin{cases} 
|Z_i|, & \text{if } |Z_i| \geq \delta_f \\
0.5(|Z_i| + \delta_f^2) / \delta_f, & \text{if } |Z_i| < \delta_f
\end{cases}
\]

where “I” varies from 1 to 5 (three-dimensional space) and \( \delta_f \) assuming values between 0.1 and 0.5, being 0.2 the value recommended by Yee, Warming and Harten [3]. In the present studies, Eq. (28) was used to perform the inviscid numerical experiments and Eq. (27) was used to perform the viscous numerical experiments.

The \( \tilde{g} \) function at the \((i+\frac{1}{2},j,k)\) interface is defined by:

\[
\tilde{g}_i = 0.5(\psi_i - Z_i^2) \alpha', \quad \text{with } \alpha' \quad \text{being the } \ell \text{th component of the alpha vector (Eq. 20).}
\]

The \( g \) numerical flux function, which is a limited function to avoid the formation of new extrema in the solution and is responsible to the second order accuracy of the scheme, is determined by:

\[
g_{i+1/2,j,k} = \text{sgn}\alpha' \times \text{MAX}(0, \text{MIN}|\tilde{g}_i g_{i+1/2,j,k} \times \text{sgn}|), \quad \text{(30)}
\]

where \( \text{sgn}_i \) is equal to 1.0 if \( \tilde{g}_i \geq 0.0 \) and -1.0 otherwise.

The 0 term, responsible to the artificial compression, which enhances the resolution of the scheme at discontinuities, is defined in Maciel [10]. The \( \beta \) parameter at the \((i+\frac{1}{2},j,k)\) interface, which introduces the artificial compression term in the algorithm, is given by the following expression:

\[
\beta_i = 1.0 + \omega_i \text{MAX}(\theta_i^{1,j,k}, \theta_i^{1+1,j,k}), \quad \text{(31)}
\]

in which \( \omega_i \) assumes the following values: \( \omega_i = 0.25 \) (non-linear field), \( \omega_i = \omega_j = \omega_k = 1.0 \) (linear field) and \( \omega_i = 0.25 \) (non-linear field). The numerical characteristic speed, \( \varphi_i \), at the \((i+\frac{1}{2},j,k)\) interface, which is responsible to transport the numerical information associated to the \( g \) numerical flux function, is defined by:

\[
\varphi_i = \begin{cases} 
\left( g_i - g_{i+1/2,j,k} \right) / \alpha', & \text{if } \alpha' \neq 0.0 \\
0.0, & \text{if } \alpha' = 0.0
\end{cases}
\]

The entropy function is redefined considering \( \varphi_i \) and \( \beta_i \): \( \varphi_i = \varphi_i + \beta_i \varphi_i \), and \( \psi_i \) is recalculated according to Eq. (27) or to Eq. (28). The Yee, Warming and Harten [3] dissipation function is specified by the following product:

\[
D_{i+1/2,j,k} = \left( R_{i+1/2,j,k} \right) \left( g_{i+1/2,j,k} + g_{i+1/2,j,k} \right) - \psi_i \left( \varphi_i \right)_{i+1/2,j,k}, \quad \text{(33)}
\]

The convective numerical flux vector to the \((i+\frac{1}{2},j,k)\) interface is described by:

\[
F_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} = \left( E_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} + F_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} h_{i} + G_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} h_{i} \right) V_{i+1/2,j,k} + 0.5D_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)}
\]

with:

\[
F_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} = \left( E_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} h_{i} + F_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} h_{i} + G_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)} h_{i} \right) V_{i+1/2,j,k} + 0.5D_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(1)}
\]
\[ E_{int}^{(i)} = 0.5\left(E_k^{(i)} + E_L^{(i)}\right), \quad F_{int}^{(i)} = 0.5\left(F_k^{(i)} + F_L^{(i)}\right) \]
and \[ G_{int}^{(i)} = 0.5\left(G_k^{(i)} + G_L^{(i)}\right). \quad (35) \]

The explicit version of this scheme employs a dimensional splitting method, first order accurate, which divides the temporal integration in three steps, each one associated with a different spatial direction. Details can be found in Maciel [9-10]. The treatment of the viscous gradients present in the Navier-Stokes equations is described in detail in Maciel [8-10].

4 Hughson and Beran [4] Algorithm

The Hughson and Beran [4] algorithm, second order accurate in space, follows Eqs. (14) to (26). The next step consists in determining the \( g \) numerical flux function. This function has different definitions to non-linear fields \((l = 1 \text{ and } 5)\) and linear fields \((l = 2 \text{ to } 4)\). Details of the definition of this function are found in Maciel [10]. Once the \( g \) function is determined, Eqs. (27), \( v_l \) term, and (28) are employed and the \( \sigma_l \) term at the \((i+\frac{1}{2},j,k)\) interface is defined:

\[ \sigma_l = 0.5\left(\psi_l - Z_l^2\right). \quad (36) \]

The \( \varphi_l \) numerical characteristic speed at the \((i+\frac{1}{2},j,k)\) interface is defined by:

\[ \varphi_l = \begin{cases} 
\sigma_l \left(g_{i+1/2,j,k}^l - g_{i,j,k}^l\right)/\alpha_l', & \text{if } \alpha_l' \neq 0 \\
0, & \text{if } \alpha_l' = 0
\end{cases} . \quad (37) \]

The entropy function is redefined considering the \( \varphi_l \) term: \( Z_l = v_l + \varphi_l \) and \( \psi_l \) is recalculated according to Eq. (28). The Hughson and Beran [4] dissipation function is constructed by the following product:

\[ D_{HBB}^{(i+1/2,j,k)} = \left[R_{i+1/2,j,k}^{(i)}\left||\partial g_{i,j,k} + g_{i+1,j,k}\right|\psi_l\sigma_l|\right]^{(i+1/2,j,k)} . \quad (38) \]

The convective numerical flux vector of the Hughson and Beran [4] scheme is defined by:

\[ F_{int}^{(i+1/2,j,k)} = \begin{cases} 
E_{int}^{(i)}h_k + F_{int}^{(i)}h_j + G_{int}^{(i)}h_iV_{int} + 0.5D_{HBB}^{(i)}, & \text{with } E_{int}^{(i),} \ F_{int}^{(i),} \text{ and } G_{int}^{(i),} \text{ determined by Eq. } (35).
\end{cases} \]

5 Turbulence Models

5.1 Model of Cebeci and Smith [6]

The problem of the turbulent simulation is in the calculation of the Reynolds stress. Expressions involving velocity fluctuations, originating from the average process, represent six new unknowns. However, the number of equations keeps the same and the system is not closed. The modeling function is to develop approximations to these correlations. To the calculation of the turbulent viscosity according to the Cebeci and Smith [6] model, the boundary layer is divided in internal and external.

Initially, the \((v_w)\) kinematic viscosity at wall and the \((\tau_{xy,w})\) shear stress at wall are calculated. After that, the \((\delta)\) boundary layer thickness, the \((\delta_{LM})\) linear momentum thickness and the \((V_{BL})\) boundary layer tangential velocity are calculated. So, the \((N)\) normal distance from the wall to the studied cell is calculated. The \(N^+\) term is obtained from:

\[ N^+ = \sqrt{Re}\sqrt{\tau_{xy,w}/\rho_{w}/N/v_w} , \quad (40) \]

where \(\rho_{w}\) is the wall density. The van Driest damping factor is calculated by:

\[ D = I - e^{(-N^+/26)/[\mu_w/v_{w}]} A^+ , \quad (41) \]

with \(A^+ = 26\) and \(\mu_w\) is the wall molecular viscosity. After that, the \((dVt/dN)\) normal to the wall gradient of the tangential velocity is calculated and the internal turbulent viscosity is given by:
\[ \mu_T = \text{Re} \rho (\kappa ND)^2 \frac{dVt}{dN}, \quad (42) \]

where \( \kappa \) is the von Kármán constant, which has the value 0.4. The intermittent function of Klebanoff is defined in Maciel [9-10]. With it, the external turbulent viscosity is calculated by:

\[ \mu_{Te} = \text{Re}(0.0168)\rho Vt_{BL} \delta_{LMBL} g_{Kleb}. \quad (43) \]

Finally, the turbulent viscosity is chosen from:

\[ \mu_T = \text{MIN}(\mu_T, \mu_{Te}). \]

5.2 Model of Baldwin and Lomax [7]

To the calculation of the turbulent viscosity according to the Baldwin and Lomax [7] model, the boundary layer is again divided in internal and external. In the internal layer,

\[ \mu_{Ti} = \rho l_{mix} \| \omega \| \text{ and } l_{mix} = \kappa N \left( I - e^{-N'/A_0} \right). \quad (44) \]

In the external layer,

\[ \mu_{Te} = \rho \alpha C_{cp} F_{wake} F_{Kleb} (N; N_{max} / C_{Kleb}), \quad (45) \]

with \( F_{wake} \) and \( F_{max} \) defined in Maciel [9-10].

The constant values are: \( \kappa = 0.4 \), \( \alpha = 0.0168 \), \( A_0^* = 26 \), \( C_{cp} = 1.6 \), \( C_{Kleb} = 0.3 \) and \( C_{wake} = 1 \). \( F_{Kleb} \) is the intermittent function of Klebanoff defined by the Baldwin and Lomax [7] model in Maciel [9-10], \( \| \omega \| \) is the magnitude of the vorticity vector and \( U_{diff} \) is the maximum velocity value in the boundary layer case. To free shear layers,

\[ U_{diff} = \left( \sqrt{u^2 + v^2 + w^2} \right)_{\text{max}} - \left( \sqrt{u^2 + v^2 + w^2} \right)_{N=N_{max}} \quad (46) \]

6 Initial and Boundary Conditions

Values of freestream flow are adopted as initial condition, in the whole calculation domain, to the ramp physical problem (Jameson and Mavriplis [12], and Maciel [8-10, 13-14]).

The boundary conditions are basically of three types: solid wall, entrance and exit. These conditions are implemented in special cells named ghost cells and details of these implementations are found in Maciel [8-10, 13-14].

7 Results

Tests were performed in a microcomputer with processor AMD ATHLON XP 2600+, 1.91GHz, and 512 Mbytes of RAM memory. A reduction of four orders of magnitude in the value of the maximum residue in the field, considering all conservation equations, was adopted as convergence criterion. The configuration upstream and the configuration longitudinal plane angles were set equal to 0.0°. The ramp problem is a supersonic flow hitting a ramp with 20° of inclination. It originates a shock wave and an expansion fan. The ramp configuration is described in Fig. 1, in the xy plane. Its spanwise length is 0.25m.

A freestream Mach number of 5.0 (high supersonic flow) was adopted as initial condition to the inviscid and viscous laminar and turbulent simulations.

7.1 Inviscid Solutions

The mesh employed to the inviscid simulations has 61 points in the \( \xi \) direction, 60 points in the \( \eta \) direction and 10 points in the \( \zeta \) direction. In finite volumes, this mesh is
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composed of 31,860 hexahedra and 36,600 nodes. Figure 1 and 2 shows the pressure contours obtained by the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] and the Hughson and Beran [4] schemes, respectively.

Good symmetry and homogeneity properties are observed in both solutions. The pressure field generated by the Hughson and Beran [4] scheme is more severe than that generated by the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] scheme, characterizing the former as more critical, more conservative than the later.

Figure 4 presents the wall pressure distributions obtained by both schemes at \( k = K\text{MAX}/2 \) (the middle of the ramp), where KMAX is the maximum number of points in the \( z \) direction (10 in this case). They are compared with the oblique shock wave and the Prandtl-Meyer expansion wave theories. Both solutions present a pressure oscillation at the ramp, which damages the quality of the solution. The width of the pressure plateau is not well captured by both schemes. Even the pressure after the expansion fan is bad captured by the schemes, presenting an under-shoot in this region.

7.2 Viscous Solutions

The mesh used in the viscous simulations has 37,260 hexahedra and 42,700 nodes. This mesh is equivalent, in finite differences, of being composed of 61 points in the \( \xi \) direction, 70 points in the \( \eta \) direction and 10 points in the \( \zeta \) direction. An exponential stretching of 10% in the \( \eta \) direction was employed. The Reynolds number was estimated in \( 4 \times 10^5 \), to a flight altitude of 20,000m and \( l = 0.0437 \text{m} \), based on Fox and McDonald [15].

7.2.1 Laminar Results

Figure 5. Pressure contours (YWH-L).
The laminar results presents the pressure contours obtained by the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] and the Hughson and Beran [4] algorithms described in Figs. 5 and 6. As can be observed, good symmetry characteristics and homogeneity properties are observed. The shock wave is well captured in both solutions and the Hughson and Beran [4] scheme again yields the most severe pressure field, characterizing it as the most conservative scheme.

Figure 6. Pressure contours (HB-L).

7.2.2 Cebeci and Smith [6] Results
Figures 7 and 8 exhibit the pressure contours obtained by the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] and by the Hughson and Beran [4], respectively, using the Cebeci and Smith [6] turbulence model. As can be noted the Hughson and Beran [4] scheme is again the most conservative, presenting the most severe pressure field.

Figure 7. Pressure contours (YWH-CS).

7.2.3 Baldwin and Lomax [7] Results
Figures 9 and 10 show the pressure contours obtained by the Yee, Warming and Harten [3]

7.2.4 Pressure Distributions and Shock Angle of the Oblique Shock Wave

Figure 11 exhibits the wall pressure distributions obtained by the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] algorithm in the laminar and turbulent cases. They are compared with the inviscid solution, the expected result due to boundary layer theory. The pressure distribution generated as using the Cebeci and Smith [6] model was the most severe.

Figure 11. Wall pressure distributions (YWH).

Figure 12 shows the wall pressure distributions obtained by the Hughson and Beran [4] algorithm in the laminar and turbulent cases. The pressure distribution generated as using the Baldwin and Lomax [7] model was the most severe. As conclusion, the pressure distributions generated by the Hughson and Beran [4] scheme are more severe.

One way to quantitatively verify if the solutions generated by each scheme are satisfactory consists in determining the shock angle of the oblique shock wave, \( \beta \), measured in relation to the initial direction of the flow field. Anderson [16] (pages 352 and 353) presents a diagram with values of the shock angle, \( \beta \), to oblique shock waves. The value of this angle is determined as function of the freestream Mach number and of the deflection angle of the flow after the shock wave, \( \phi \). To the ramp problem, \( \phi = 20^\circ \) (ramp inclination angle) and the freestream Mach number is 5.0, resulting from this diagram a value to \( \beta \) equals to 30.0\(^\circ\). Using a transfer in Figures 2, 3, 5 to 10, considering the xy plane, it is possible to obtain the values of \( \beta \) to each scheme, as well the respective errors, shown in Tab. 1, to each case. As can be observed, the best scheme was the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] one, using the Cebeci and Smith [6] model, with a percentage error of 0.33%. Moreover, the minimum errors were due to the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] scheme.

Table 1. Values of the shock angle and errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>Error (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inviscid</td>
<td>Yee, Warming</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Harten</td>
<td>Vis./Lam.</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vis./CS</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vis./BL</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscid</td>
<td>Hughson and</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beran [4]</td>
<td>Visc./Lam.</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visc./CS</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visc./BL</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Conclusions

The present work performs comparisons between the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] and the Hughson and Beran [4] algorithms in the solution of inviscid and laminar and turbulent viscous flows in three-dimensions. The Euler
and the Navier-Stokes equations, on a finite volume context and using a structured spatial discretization, are solved. The algorithms to perform numerical experiments are of TVD flux difference splitting type, second order accurate in space. A dimensional splitting method, first order accurate, is used to time integration. The physical problem of the supersonic flow along a ramp is studied. Turbulence is taking into account considering two turbulence models, namely: the Cebeci and Smith [6] and the Baldwin and Lomax [7] algebraic ones.

The results have demonstrated that the Hughson and Beran [4] scheme yields more severe pressure fields in all cases, characterizing this scheme as more conservative and indicated to the project phase of aerospace vehicle development. On the other hand, the Yee, Warming and Harten [3] scheme, in all cases, was the most accurate, being recommended to a more advanced project phase, where more accurate results are important to estimate the levels of security of the systems.
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