

Turbulent shear layers in confining channels

GP Benham,¹ AA Castrejon-Pita,² IJ Hewitt,¹ CP Please,¹ RW Style,³ and P Bird⁴

¹Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Andrew Wiles Building,

Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG United Kingdom

²Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3PS, United Kingdom

³Department of Materials, ETH Zürich, Zürich 8093, Switzerland

⁴VerdErg Renewable Energy Limited, 6 Old London Rd,

Kingston upon Thames KT2 6QF, United Kingdom

(Dated: September 5, 2022)

We present a simple model for the development of shear layers between parallel flows in confining channels. Such flows are important across a wide range of topics from diffusers, nozzles and ducts to urban air flow and geophysical fluid dynamics. The model shows good agreement with both particle-image-velocimetry experiments and computational turbulence modelling (at a fraction of the computation time). It can be used for both modelling, and design purposes. We demonstrate the latter by showing how the model can be used to investigate optimal pressure recovery in diffusers with non-uniform inflow.

Shear layers, where two parallel flows undergo turbulent mixing, are very common. For unbounded flows, the shear layer is one of a select few problems in turbulence which have a simple analytical model – derived from the turbulent boundary layer equations and Prandtl mixing length theory [1, 2]. However, this model is often not practicable in many situations where the flows are confined in a (not necessarily straight) channel. Examples of such flows include blockages and cavities in pipes [3–5], building ventilation [6], air flow in urban environments [7–9], environmental flows [10–15], biological flows [16, 17], geophysical flows [18] engine and aerodynamic design [19–21], and mixing flows in diffusers [22], nozzles [23] and pumps [24]. In such cases, it is important to account for the confining effect of the channel walls. While there are a limited number of experimental [5, 6, 8, 9, 25–31] and numerical [7, 32] studies, there is little theoretical understanding.

Here we show that a simple model, comprising two plug flow regions separated by a linear shear layer, can be used to model confined shear layers and gives surprisingly good agreement with both experiments and detailed Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD). The simplicity of this model means it both gives good physical intuition into the flow, and is computationally very cheap. Thus it can be used to quickly find optimal parameters in engineering design problems [24]. It also avoids the need for high levels of expertise that are typically required with CFD when choosing turbulence models and selecting boundary conditions [1, 33].

The flow geometry we consider is shown in Figure 1. We consider two-dimensional turbulent flow in a long, thin channel where the rate of change of the channel width remains small. We assume that flow is symmetric about the channel centreline and therefore consider only half of the channel. To model this, we generalize the classical model for a shear layer between unconfined flows [1, 2], where a flow with velocity U_1 in the x direction meets




FIG. 1. Schematic diagram of the symmetric velocity profile in half of the channel. The flow can be divided up into three regions: Two plug flow regions of different speeds and a turbulent shear layer between them.

a second, parallel flow with velocity $U_2 < U_1$. A shear layer then forms at the point they meet and grows with a width $\delta(x)$. To good approximation, the average velocity in the shear layer increases linearly from U_2 to U_1 across its width [2]. Furthermore from the turbulent boundary layer equations and Prandtl’s mixing length theory, it can be shown [1, 2] that

$$\frac{d\delta}{dx} = 2S \frac{U_1 - U_2}{U_1 + U_2}. \quad (1)$$

The spreading parameter $S = 0.06 - 0.11$ is a non-dimensional number which has been determined by numerous experiments [33].

When the flow is confined, the shear layer may reach the channel walls, so that its width can no longer evolve according to (1). To accommodate such situations we

reinterpret Equation (1) as describing how the shear in the layer behaves rather than how the width develops. To do this we introduce the gradient of the velocity profile, or shear rate, $\epsilon_y = (U_1 - U_2)/\delta$. Using this new variable Equation (1) is rewritten as

$$\frac{U_1 + U_2}{2} \frac{d\epsilon_y}{dx} = -S\epsilon_y^2, \quad (2)$$

and we assume that this evolution of the shear rate continues even when the shear layer is adjacent to the wall. A useful interpretation of this equation is that, moving along the channel at the average velocity in the shear layer $(U_1 + U_2)/2$, the shear rate decays at a rate proportional to the square of itself. There are several different ways of modelling how the shear rate evolves when the flow is confined to a channel. We find that Equation (2) agrees well with experiments and CFD, and has the advantage that it imposes that the shear rate is strictly decreasing, which is physically realistic.

For the case of a confined flow we combine this description of the shear layer with conservation equations to describe the plug-like flows on either side, whose speeds U_1 and U_2 now vary with x . We consider the case of symmetric flow in a half channel $0 < y < h(x)$, as shown schematically in Figure 1. Coflowing inner and outer streams mix inside the channel. The velocity profile is approximated as

$$u = \begin{cases} U_2 & : 0 < y < h_2, \\ U_2 + \epsilon_y (y - h_2) & : h_2 < y < h - h_1, \\ U_1 & : h - h_1 < y < h, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $h_1(x)$ and $h_2(x)$ vary with distance along the channel. The width of the shear layer is $\delta = h - h_1 - h_2$. Additionally, assuming that the channel is much longer than it is wide, from boundary layer theory [1], the pressure is approximately uniform across the channel width and $p = p(x)$. By invoking conservation of mass and momentum, we can now predict how U_1, U_2, h_1, h_2 and p evolve. Averaged across the channel, the mass and momentum equations are

$$\int_0^h \rho u dy = Q, \quad \frac{d}{dx} \left(\int_0^h \rho u^2 dy \right) + h \frac{dp}{dx} = \tau_w, \quad (4)$$

where ρ is the density and Q is the constant mass flux per unit depth. τ_w is the wall stress, which can be modelled with a variety of theoretical/empirical expressions, such as the Darcy-Weisbach equation $\tau_w = -\frac{1}{8}f\rho U_1^2$, where f is the empirical Darcy friction factor [34, 35]. We assume that the main contributions to energy dissipation come from the wall drag and turbulent fluctuations in the shear layer. We ignore the energy dissipation in the unmixed plug flow regions since it is small by comparison [1]. Thus, in the plug regions we assume Bernoulli's




FIG. 2. Experimental setup, showing the configuration for the widening rectangular channel. A recirculating pump provides a constant flow rate.

equation holds [36]

$$p + \frac{1}{2}\rho U_i^2 = \frac{1}{2}\rho U_i(0)^2 \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (5)$$

where we take $p(0) = 0$ as the reference pressure. Now, for a given channel shape $h(x)$, and inlet conditions $U_1(0), U_2(0), h_1(0)$ and $h_2(0)$, we can solve a system of differential algebraic equations (2)-(5) to find $u(x, y)$ and $p(x)$.

We validate our model by comparison with Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) experiments and CFD modelling. In the experiments, water flows through an acrylic channel of rectangular cross-section at constant flow rate (see Figure 2). At the channel inlet, three inflows merge to generate shear layers: two symmetric, fast, outer flows, and a slow (partially-blocked) inner flow along the channel centre. We use two different configurations. In the first, the walls of the channel are straight so that there is no flow dilation. In the second, the walls of the channel widen at an angle of 5° . The channel dimensions are $25 \text{ cm} \times 7.5 \text{ cm} \times 2 \text{ cm}$. If we take a typical length scale as the smallest of these dimensions (channel depth), and a typical velocity scale as the average speed of the fast outer flow measured by PIV (50 cm/s), then the Reynolds number is $Re \approx 10^4$. At the inlet the flow is observed to be fully turbulent, indicated by significant turbulent fluctuations (see Figure 3) and a turbulent intensity of $I = \sqrt{2/3k}/(u^2 + v^2) \approx 10\%$ [1].

We perform PIV by adding a dilute suspension of neutrally-buoyant, pliolite, tracer particles to the flow [37, 38], and shining a pulsed *Nd:YAG* laser sheet through the channel side wall at its halfway height. A synchronized high-speed camera takes images at 1 ms




FIG. 3. Comparison of PIV, CFD and simplified model for straight channel (a, b, c, g), and widening channel (d, e, f, g), where flow is from left to right. (a, d) Streamlines overlaid on colour plot of time-averaged velocity magnitude. (b, e) Colour plot of time-averaged turbulent kinetic energy k . (c, f) Velocity profiles taken at five cross sections in channel. Solid black, dashed red and dot-dashed blue lines represent simplified model, PIV and k - ϵ turbulence model results, respectively. (g) Streamwise pressure profiles. Colour scheme is same as above, with red data points representing experimental data and error margins correspond to one standard deviation.

intervals controlled with the *TSI Insight 4G* computer package [39]. *Matlab*'s package *PIVlab* [40, 41] then allows us to extract time-averaged properties of the flow such as the streamwise and transverse velocities (u, v) (see video in Supplemental Materials [42]) and the turbulent kinetic energy k [1, 33]. Simultaneously we measure time-averaged pressures along the channel using regularly-spaced, open-tube-manometer pressure tapings.

The experimental results are shown in Figure 3 for nominally the same inflow velocities in both straight and widening channels. Figures 3(a,d) show streamlines (black curves) superposed on colormaps showing the local, time-averaged flow speed $\sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$. These clearly show the flow mixing and, in the second case, the overall flow deceleration in the widening channel. In the straight channel case, mixing together occurs over whole the channel length, with the faster streams slowing down and the slower stream speeding up, as can be seen by a expansion/contraction of streamlines in the outer/inner flow. In the case of the widening channel, the expansion causes the flows to slow down at different rates, accentuating the non-uniform flow profile. This can be seen by how at $x = 25$ cm the slower central stream almost stops entirely.

The location of the shear layer is more clearly shown by the plots of turbulent kinetic energy in Figures 3(b,e) where we see the expanding mixing layer, as well as some evidence of wall friction at the channel's side walls. Importantly, Figure 3(e) highlights how the classical picture of a free shear layer that grows in thickness at a constant rate breaks down in a confined geometry. Finally, Figures 3(c,f) show velocity profiles (red curves) across the channel at evenly spaced positions (dash-dotted lines).

CFD modelling is performed with a steady k - ϵ turbulence model [43] on the same three-dimensional geometry as the experiment using the open-source software package *openFoam* [44]. Inlet conditions were modeled slightly further upstream at $x = -10$ cm, corresponding to the three inflows in the experiment (see Figure 2), with plug flow profiles for each of the three inflows such that the mass flux is consistent with PIV measurements. Inlet conditions for the turbulence variables k and ϵ are given by the free-stream boundary conditions, as is common in the literature [1, 45], $k = I^2 \times 3/2 (u^2 + v^2)$ and $\epsilon = 0.09k^{3/2}/\ell$, with turbulence intensity $I = 10\%$ and mixing length $\ell = 1$ cm (same order of magnitude of the width of each of the inlet flows).

For comparison with the simple mathematical model, we used the PIV-measured speeds of the streams at the inlet $x = 0$ as initial conditions for U_1 and U_2 . We also modify the Darcy-Weisbach equation to account for wall drag on the lid and base of the channel (as well as the side walls)

$$\tau_w = -\frac{1}{8}f\rho \left(U_1^2 + \frac{2}{d} \int_0^h u^2 dy \right), \quad (6)$$

where d is the depth of the channel in the third dimension. In the Supplemental Materials [42], we show how Equations (4) and (6) can be derived from the turbulent boundary layer equations. The Darcy friction factor comes from the empirical Blasius relationship [46] for flow in smooth pipes $f = 0.316/Re^{1/4}$, giving a value of $f = 0.03$. The spreading parameter $S = 0.06 - 0.11$ has been determined by numerous experiments [33] and we find that $S = 0.11$ fits best with our data. The simple model, experiments and CFD show very good agreement. For example, the streamwise velocities u are compared in Figures 3(c, f). Figure 3(g) also shows a comparison of the pressure change (relative to the inlet pressure) along the channel centreline. Dominant features of the flow profile and pressure variation are captured accurately by the simple model. However, near the wall the simple model is less accurate due to the fact that it does not explicitly resolve the development of boundary layers.

Two other geometries are investigated using the simple model and CFD in the Supplemental Materials [42] for a variety of Reynolds numbers and inlet velocity ratios $U_2(0)/U_1(0)$. Again, there is good agreement between the results of the simple model and CFD, indicating that the simple model presented here is robust and has strong capabilities in predicting the dominant features of the flow and pressure. It can therefore serve as a useful, low-computational-cost tool in modelling and optimizing processes that involve confined shear layers, such as diffusers and nozzles.

As an example, we use the model to study the optimal design of a two-dimensional diffuser with a non-uniform inlet flow profile. We restrict our attention to a particular class of shapes that are characterised by three linear sections: a straight section for $0 \leq x \leq x_1$, followed by a widening section of constant opening angle for $x_1 < x \leq x_2$, followed by another straight section for $x_2 < x \leq L$, where L is the total length of the profile (see Figure 4). This class of diffuser shapes is both realistic and has the advantage that it can be defined by a very small number of parameters. We measure diffuser performance by its mass-averaged pressure recovery coefficient – a measure of the pressure gained in the diffuser, relative to the kinetic energy flux at the inlet [47],

$$C_p = \frac{\int_0^h up dy|_{x=L} - \int_0^h up dy|_{x=0}}{\int_0^h \frac{1}{2} \rho u^3 dy|_{x=0}}. \quad (7)$$

Note that $C_p \in [-\infty, 1]$, with $C_p = 1$ when all the dynamic pressure of the inlet flow is converted into static pressure. For a fixed finite area ratio $h(L)/h(0)$ and inlet flow profile, there is a maximum possible pressure recovery which is less than 1 [48]. For uniform inviscid flow this ideal limit is $C_{p_i} = 1 - (h(0)/h(L))^2$ and for non-uniform flow, it is not known what the limit is [48].

For the purpose of this optimisation, we consider a diffuser which is 30 half-widths long $L/h(0) = 30$ and has




FIG. 4. Optimum design of a diffuser with a non-uniform inlet flow profile. The diffuser, composed of two straight sections and widening section, is 30 half-widths long $L/h(0) = 30$, and has area ratio $h(L)/h(0) = 1.5$. The two parameters x_1 and x_2 define the split between straight and widening sections. Pressure recovery coefficient is given by Equation (7) and has maximum value of $C_p = 0.466$ at $x_1/h(0) = 6$ and $x_2/h(0) = 12$. Optimum shape, together with velocity profiles from simplified model and CFD at evenly spaced locations, shown as an insert.

area ratio $h(L)/h(0) = 1.5$. The inlet profile is taken to be a discontinuous step function as in Figure 1 with $U_2(0)/U_1(0) = 0.5$ and $h_2(0) = h_1(0)$. In Figure 4 we show a contour plot of C_p over all possible diffuser shapes of this kind. We restrict the parameter space such that the opening angle of the widening section is less than 7° . This is because separation starts to occur for angles larger than around this value [48] and the simple model is incapable of accounting for separation effects. There is an optimum at $x_1/h(0) = 6$ and $x_2/h(0) = 12$, giving an optimal pressure recovery of $C_p = 0.466$. Note that this is 84% of the ideal inviscid value $C_{p_i} = 0.556$. The optimal shape, together with velocity profiles at evenly spaced positions (from both simplified model and CFD), are shown as an insert in Figure 4. The optimum is striking a balance between not widening too soon, which would exacerbate the non-uniform flow, and not staying narrow for too long, which would increase wall friction losses.

To conclude, we have developed a simple model of mixing in confined geometries that shows good agreement with PIV experiments and CFD. The model's simplicity makes it ideal for simulation and design purposes for a range of problems from diffuser design to urban and geophysical flows. In particular, given its low computational cost, it can be used to perform shape optimisation to

maximise pressure recovery for a given inlet flow profile. Although here we have focused on two-dimensional flows, the model can be easily modified to address axisymmetric and non-symmetric flows.

This publication is based on work supported by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Industrially Focused Mathematical Modelling (EP/L015803/1) in collaboration with VerdErg Renewable Energy Limited and inspired by their novel Venturi-Enhanced Turbine Technology for low-head hydropower. Experimental work was supported by the John Fell Fund (Oxford University Press).

-
- [1] H. Schlichting, K. Gersten, E. Krause, H. Oertel, and K. Mayes, *Boundary-layer theory*, Vol. 7 (Springer, 1960).
 - [2] J. Jiménez, Notes for the Polytechnique course on turbulence (2004).
 - [3] M. Griffith, M. Thompson, T. Leweke, K. Hourigan, and W. Anderson, *J. Fluid Mech.* **582**, 319 (2007).
 - [4] P. R. Bailey, A. Abbá, and D. Tordella, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 013013 (2013).
 - [5] S. Suresha, R. Sujith, B. Emerson, and T. Lieuwen, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 042206 (2016).
 - [6] H. Burridge and G. Hunt, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **2**, 023501 (2017).
 - [7] A. Sau, R. R. Hwang, T. W. Sheu, and W. Yang, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 056303 (2003).
 - [8] M. M. Alam and J. P. Meyer, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 056304 (2011).
 - [9] Y. Nakamura and S. Ozono, *J. Fluid Mech.* **178**, 477 (1987).
 - [10] A. King, R. Tinoco, and E. Cowen, *J. Fluid Mech.* **701**, 1 (2012).
 - [11] B. Michelsen, S. Strobl, E. J. Parteli, and T. Pöschel, *Nature Scientific Reports* **5** (2015).
 - [12] J. G. Venditti, C. D. Rennie, J. Bomhof, R. W. Bradley, M. Little, and M. Church, *Nature* **513**, 534 (2014).
 - [13] A. Araújo, E. Parteli, T. Pöschel, J. Andrade Jr, and H. Herrmann, *Nature Scientific Reports* **3** (2013).
 - [14] I. A. Lima, A. D. Araújo, E. J. Parteli, J. S. Andrade Jr, and H. J. Herrmann, *Nature Scientific Reports* **7** (2017).
 - [15] W. Anderson and M. Chamecki, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 013005 (2014).
 - [16] S. L. Sanderson, E. Roberts, J. Lineburg, and H. Brooks, *Nature Communications* **7** (2016).
 - [17] P. F. Davies, *Nature Clinical Practice Cardiovascular Medicine* **6**, 16 (2009).
 - [18] B. Podvin and A. Sergent, *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 013112 (2017).
 - [19] S. Simone, F. Montomoli, F. Martelli, K. S. Chana, I. Qureshi, and T. Povey, *Journal of Turbomachinery* **134**, 011012 (2012).
 - [20] L. Chamorro, C. Hill, S. Morton, C. Ellis, R. Arndt, and F. Sotiropoulos, *J. Fluid Mech.* **716**, 658 (2013).
 - [21] S. Kang, X. Yang, and F. Sotiropoulos, *J. Fluid Mech.* **744**, 376 (2014).
 - [22] K. P. Lo, C. J. Elkins, and J. K. Eaton, *Experiments in Fluids* **53**, 1317 (2012).
 - [23] J. Zhang, T. L. Jackson, J. Buckmaster, and F. Najjar, *Journal of Propulsion and Power* **27**, 642 (2011).
 - [24] A. Shah, I. R. Chughtai, and M. H. Inayat, *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer* **58**, 62 (2013).
 - [25] I. Castro and A. Haque, *J. Fluid Mech.* **179**, 439 (1987).
 - [26] P. Bradshaw and F. Wong, *J. Fluid Mech.* **52**, 113 (1972).
 - [27] I. Castrot and A. Haques, *J. Fluid Mech.* **192**, 577 (1988).
 - [28] D. Schatzman and F. Thomas, *J. Fluid Mech.* **815**, 592 (2017).
 - [29] D. Burton and H. Babinsky, *J. Fluid Mech.* **707**, 287 (2012).
 - [30] A. Hooshanginejad and S. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **2**, 031601 (2017).
 - [31] D. Lander, C. Letchford, M. Amitay, and G. Kopp, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **1**, 044406 (2016).
 - [32] G. Lavalle, J.-P. Vila, M. Lucquiaud, and P. Valluri, *Phys. Rev. Fluids* **2**, 014001 (2017).
 - [33] S. B. Pope, *Turbulent flows* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
 - [34] R. W. Johnson, *Handbook of fluid dynamics* (CRC Press, 2016).
 - [35] H. Ockendon, J. Ockendon, and S. Falle, *J. Fluid Mech.* **445**, 187 (2001).
 - [36] G. K. Batchelor, *An introduction to fluid dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
 - [37] J. Sveen and S. Dalziel, *Measurement Science and Technology* **16**, 1954 (2005).
 - [38] S. B. Dalziel, M. Carr, J. K. Sveen, and P. A. Davies, *Measurement Science and Technology* **18**, 533 (2007).
 - [39] TSI Incorporated, *500 Cardigan Road, Shoreview, MN 55126*.
 - [40] M. U. Guide, Inc., Natick, MA **5**, 333 (1998).
 - [41] W. Thielicke and E. Stamhuis, *Journal of Open Research Software* **2** (2014).
 - [42] See Supplemental Material at [URL] which includes a model derivation, extra geometries and a supporting movie.
 - [43] B. E. Launder and D. B. Spalding, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **3**, 269 (1974).
 - [44] H. G. Weller, G. Tabor, H. Jasak, and C. Fureby, *Computers in Physics* **12**, 620 (1998).
 - [45] CFD Online; 2016. [Online] (<http://www.cfd-online.com>).
 - [46] B. McKeon, M. Zagarola, and A. Smits, *J. Fluid Mech.* **538**, 429 (2005).
 - [47] V. Filipenco, S. Deniz, J. Johnston, E. Greitzer, and N. Cumpsty, *ASME J. Turbomach* **122**, 1 (1998).
 - [48] R. D. Blevins, New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1984, 568 p. **1** (1984).