Modeling wave-structure interactions by an immersed boundary method in a σ -coordinate model

Gangfeng Ma¹, Arash A. Farahani¹, James T. Kirby² and Fengyan Shi²

¹ *Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Old Dominion University,
Norfolk, VA, USA*

² *Center for Applied Coastal Research, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA*
Corresponding author: Tel: 1-757-683-4732; Email address: gma@odu.edu

Abstract

This paper studies wave-structure interactions using an immersed boundary (IB) method in a σ coordinate non-hydrostatic wave model. In contrast to a fixed grid, the σ grid follows the movement of the free surface, which may introduce numerical errors when applying the IB method. When the grid cells located inside the structure at the previous time step move into the flow domain at the current time step, a reconstruction of velocities at the cell center is conducted to accurately estimate the fluxes at the cell faces by enforcing the no-slip boundary condition at the structure boundaries. The model is validated against experimental data in three different problems, including solitary wave interactions with rectangular obstacles, periodic wave interaction with a submerged bar and non-breaking solitary wave interactions with multiple cylinders. These test cases deal with bottom-mounted, floating as well as emergent structures with different shapes. The agreements between simulations and measurements are generally good in terms of free surface ele-

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

June 29, 2016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

vation, flow velocity, dynamic pressure and wave runup. It is shown that the IB method is a promising tool to simulate wave processes around structures and to predict wave/surge loads on near-coast structures.

Keywords: non-hydrostatic modeling, NHWAVE, immersed boundary method, wave-structure interactions

1. Introduction

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Wave-structure interaction has become an increasingly important problem due to the need of accurately predicting wave/surge loads on near-coast structures, which requires the understanding of flow characteristics as well as wave processes such as wave scattering and reflection around the structures. The boundary integral method (BIM) based on a potential flow theory (Skourup et al., 1992; Grilli et al., 1994; Koo and Kim, 2007) fail to reproduce the vortices and turbulent flow structures, thus are not capable of accurately predicting the pressure distributions and wave forces on structures, especially with complex and irregular shapes. Recent trends are towards using a computational fluid dynamics (CFD) model for this problem, for example, Hieu and Tanimoto (2006); Shen and Chan (2008), Mo and Liu (2009); Finnegan and Goggins (2012); Westphalen et al. (2012); Liu et al., (2013); Ha et al. (2014). These studies used either a Navier-Stokes solver with a Volume-of-Fluid (VOF) method or a Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH) method with the aid of proper turbulence closure to simulate turbulent flow characteristics around the structures, which have been proved to be rather successful.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 The major issue of a CFD model is its expensive computational cost, which
11 limits the usage of this type of model in a large-scale domain.
12

13
14 An alternative to the CFD model for wave-structure interaction is the
15 non-hydrostatic wave model (Lin et al., 2002; Zijlema and Stelling, 2008; Ma
16 et al., 2012), which has shown great potential for resolving wave dynamics,
17 including wave breaking (Ma et al., 2012; Smit et al., 2013; Zijlema and
18 Stelling, 2008; Derakhti et al., 2016b,c), nonlinear wave dynamics (Smit et
19 al., 2014) as well as infragravity wave motions (Ma et al., 2014; Rijnsdorp et
20 al., 2014). Compared to the CFD models, the non-hydrostatic wave models
21 assume that the free surface is a single value function of horizontal coordi-
22 nates, which dramatically simplifies the Navier-Stokes equations, resulting in
23 an explicit equation for free surface elevation. This simplification would lead
24 to much more efficient computation of free surface elevation as well as water
25 depth. Most of the existing non-hydrostatic wave models are formulated in
26 surface- and terrain-following σ coordinate (Lin et al., 2002; Yun and Wu,
27 2004; Zijlema and Stelling, 2008; Ma et al., 2012), which essentially maps the
28 vertical water column in the physical domain to a transformed space. With
29 this coordinate transformation, a limitation on the computational domain
30 has been imposed that neither water depth h nor free surface η can have
31 discontinuity in order to avoid the local singularity (Lin, 2006). This limi-
32 tation prohibits the application of the model to the problems with floating
33 and emergent structures as well as bottom-mounted structures with vertical
34 faces. To overcome this restriction, Lin (2006) proposed a 3D multiple-layer σ
35
36
37
38
39
40

coordinate model to simulate surface wave interactions with various types of structures including floating and emergent structures. His model performed well in the cases with a structure of simple geometry, i.e. rectangular block. However, this extension of the σ coordinate model leads to a great deal of complexity in the resulting governing equations. In addition, it fails to deal with structures of irregular shapes and complex geometry. Its performance on wave interactions with multiple structures was not proved either.

In this paper, we propose to use an immersed boundary (IB) method (Fadlun et al., 2000) to simulate wave-structure interactions in a σ coordinate non-hydrostatic model NHWAVE. Using this method, the solid structures are treated as virtual bodies and replaced by IB forces at their boundaries. The water depth and free surface at the locations of the structures are defined as the same as those without the structures so that their continuousness is not affected by the presence of structures of any types. The IB method was originally developed by Peskin (1982) to simulate cardiac mechanics and associated blood flow. Since then, numerous modifications and refinements have been proposed, and wide applications on fluid-structure interactions have been carried out (Mittal and Iaccarino, 2005). Recently, the IB method has also been introduced in VOF models to study wave-structure interactions (Shen and Chan, 2008; Shen et al., 2009; Ha et al., 2013). However, to our knowledge, no studies have ever been conducted to show the performance of IB method in a σ coordinate wave model. Under the σ coordinate, all the interior grid points are not fixed. They fluctuate up and down with the

moving free surface in the physical domain. While the boundaries of the rigid structures are fixed in space and time. As a result, the grid points around the structures may move into the fluid domain at one time and inside the structures at another time (Lin, 2006), which brings great challenges to implement the IB method using the direct forcing approach because the interpolation of the velocities may introduce large numerical errors.

The paper is organized as follows. The IB method and NHWAVE model formulations are introduced in section 2. Numerical simulations including solitary wave interactions with rectangular obstacles, periodic wave interactions with a submerged bar and non-breaking solitary wave interactions with multiple cylinders are presented in section 3. Finally, the conclusions are given in section 4.

2. Formulations

NHWAVE (Ma et al., 2012, Derakhti et al., 2016a) is a three-dimensional non-hydrostatic wave model that is capable of predicting instantaneous free surface and 3D flow fields. It is based on the assumption that the free surface is a single value function of horizontal coordinates. Fluid phenomena involving overturning of the free surface, such as plunging breaking waves, are not considered in this study. The governing equations of NHWAVE are the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in well-balanced conservative form, formulated in time-dependent surface and terrain-following σ coordi-

nate, which is defined as

$$t = t^* \quad x = x^* \quad y = y^* \quad \sigma = \frac{z^* + h}{D} \quad (1)$$

where the total water depth $D(x, y, t) = h(x, y) + \eta(x, y, t)$.

With σ coordinate transformation, the well-balanced mass and momentum equations are given by

$$\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Du}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial Dv}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial \sigma} = 0 \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial \sigma} = \mathbf{S}_h + \mathbf{S}_p + \mathbf{S}_\tau \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{U} = (Du, Dv, Dw)^T$ and ω is the vertical velocity in the σ coordinate image domain. The fluxes are

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} Duu + \frac{1}{2}g\eta^2 + gh\eta \\ Duv \\ Duw \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{G} = \begin{pmatrix} Duv \\ Dvv + \frac{1}{2}g\eta^2 + gh\eta \\ Dvw \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{H} = \begin{pmatrix} u\omega \\ v\omega \\ w\omega \end{pmatrix}$$

The first three source terms on the right hand side of equation (3) account for the contributions from hydrostatic pressure, non-hydrostatic pressure and

94 turbulent diffusion, given by

$$\mathbf{S}_h = \begin{pmatrix} g\eta \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \\ g\eta \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{S}_p = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{D}{\rho} \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial \sigma} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x^*} \right) \\ -\frac{D}{\rho} \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial p}{\partial \sigma} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial y^*} \right) \\ -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \sigma} \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{S}_\tau = \begin{pmatrix} DS_{\tau_x} \\ DS_{\tau_y} \\ DS_{\tau_z} \end{pmatrix}$$

95 where $DS_{\tau_x}, DS_{\tau_y}, DS_{\tau_z}$ are diffusion terms. Written in a conservative form,
 96 the diffusion terms are given by (Derakhti et al., 2016a)

$$DS_{\tau_i} = \frac{\partial 2(\nu + \nu_t)E_{ij}}{\partial x_j} \lambda_j + \frac{\partial 2\sigma_{x_j^*}(\nu + \nu_t)E_{ij}}{\partial \sigma} \quad (4)$$

97 where $\lambda_j = 1 - \delta_{3j}, (j = 1, 2, 3)$, ν is kinematic viscosity, ν_t is turbulent
 98 viscosity, $\sigma_{x_j^*} = \partial \sigma / \partial x_j^*$, and

$$E_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\partial U_i}{\partial x_j} \lambda_j + \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} \lambda_i + \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \left(\sigma_{x_j^*} U_i + \sigma_{x_i^*} U_j \right) \right\} \quad (5)$$

99 In order to simulate the turbulence flow around the structures, a simple
 100 Smagorinsky subgrid model is employed to calculate eddy viscosity in this
 101 paper. Because turbulence in the wave boundary layer is not the concern of
 102 the current study, this model is sufficient to capture very large eddies around
 103 structures. The turbulent viscosity is calculated by

$$\nu_t = (C_s \Delta)^2 \sqrt{S_{ij} S_{ij}} \quad (6)$$

104 where C_s is the Smagorinsky coefficient, which is taken as 0.1, Δ is the filter

width, which is calculated as $\Delta = (\Delta x \Delta y \Delta \sigma D)^{1/3}$, and $S_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j^*} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i^*})$ is the stress tensor. Instead of modeling every detail in the near-wall region, a wall function proposed by Cabot and Moin (2000) is adopted to approximate the eddy viscosity at the first cell adjacent to the wall:

$$\frac{\nu_t}{\nu} = \kappa y_w^+ (1 - e^{-y_w^+/A})^2 \quad (7)$$

where $y_w^+ = y_w u_\tau / \nu$ is the distance to the wall in wall units, $\kappa = 0.41$ and $A = 19$ (Cabot and Moin, 2000).

To solve the water depth D , we integrate the continuity equation (2) from $\sigma = 0$ to 1. By using the boundary conditions at the bottom and surface for ω , we may obtain the equation for free surface movement.

$$\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (D \int_0^1 u d\sigma) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (D \int_0^1 v d\sigma) = 0 \quad (8)$$

2.1. Numerical schemes

The well-balanced continuity and momentum equations (2) and (3) are discretized by a combined finite-volume and finite-difference approach with a second-order Godunov-type scheme. Following the numerical framework of NHWAVE (Ma et al., 2012), the velocities are defined at the cell centers, while the pressure is defined at the vertically-facing cell faces in order to accurately prescribe zero pressure condition at the free surface. The two-stage second-order nonlinear Strong Stability-Preserving (SSP) Runge-Kutta scheme (Gottlieb et al., 2001) is adopted for time stepping in order to obtain

second-order temporal accuracy. At the first stage, an intermediate quantity $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}$ is evaluated using a typical first-order, two-step projection method given by

$$\frac{\mathbf{U}^* - \mathbf{U}^n}{\Delta t} = - \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial \sigma} \right)^n + \mathbf{S}_h^n \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{U}^{(1)} - \mathbf{U}^*}{\Delta t} = \mathbf{S}_p^{(1)} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbf{U}^n$ represents $\mathbf{U}$ value at time level n , $\mathbf{U}^*$ is the intermediate value in the two-step projection method, and $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}$ is the final first stage estimate.

At the second stage, the velocity field is updated to a second intermediate level using the same projection method, after which the Runge-Kutta algorithm is used to obtain a final value of the solution at the $n + 1$ time level.

$$\frac{\mathbf{U}^* - \mathbf{U}^{(1)}}{\Delta t} = - \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial \sigma} \right)^{(1)} + \mathbf{S}_h^{(1)} \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{U}^{(2)} - \mathbf{U}^*}{\Delta t} = \mathbf{S}_p^{(2)} \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{U}^{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{U}^n + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{U}^{(2)} \quad (13)$$

NHWAVE employs a shock-capturing HLL approximate Riemann solver (Harten et al., 1983) to solve momentum equations (i.e. eqs. (9) and (11)). In this scheme, the values of the conservative variables within a cell are calculated using a second-order piecewise linear reconstruction method based on the cell center data. Thus, the left and right values of $\mathbf{U}$ at the cell face

(14) $(i + \frac{1}{2})$ can be reconstructed by

$$\mathbf{U}_{i+1/2}^L = \mathbf{U}_i + \frac{1}{2}\Delta x_i \Delta \mathbf{U}_i, \quad \mathbf{U}_{i+1/2}^R = \mathbf{U}_{i+1} - \frac{1}{2}\Delta x_{i+1} \Delta \mathbf{U}_{i+1} \quad (14)$$

where $\Delta \mathbf{U}_i$ is the gradient of $\mathbf{U}$ at cell i , which is estimated by

$$\Delta \mathbf{U}_i = avg \left(\frac{\mathbf{U}_{i+1} - \mathbf{U}_i}{x_{i+1} - x_i}, \frac{\mathbf{U}_i - \mathbf{U}_{i-1}}{x_i - x_{i-1}} \right) \quad (15)$$

in which *avg* is a van Leer limiter, which is used to avoid spurious oscillations in the reconstruction data. The flux $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^L, \mathbf{U}^R)$ is estimated by solving a local Riemann problem at each horizontal facing cell face.

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^L, \mathbf{U}^R) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^L) & \text{if } s_L \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{F}^*(\mathbf{U}^L, \mathbf{U}^R) & \text{if } s_L < 0 < s_R \\ \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^R) & \text{if } s_R \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}^*(\mathbf{U}^L, \mathbf{U}^R) = \frac{s_R \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^L) - s_L \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{U}^R) + s_L s_R (\mathbf{U}^R - \mathbf{U}^L)}{s_R - s_L} \quad (17)$$

with wave speeds s_L and s_R defined by

$$s_L = \min(u_L - c_L, u_s - c_s) \quad (18)$$

$$s_R = \max(u_R + c_R, u_s + c_s) \quad (19)$$

where $c_L = \sqrt{gD_L}$, $c_R = \sqrt{gD_R}$, u_s and c_s are estimated by

$$u_s = \frac{1}{2}(u_L + u_R) + c_L - c_R \quad (20)$$

$$c_s = \frac{c_L + c_R}{2} + \frac{u_L - u_R}{4} \quad (21)$$

In the projection step (i.e. eqs. (10) and (12)), a Poisson equation can be derived by applying the continuity equation (Ma et al., 2012). The Poisson equation can be discretized by finite difference method, resulting in a linear equation system with a coefficient matrix of 15 diagonal lines. The linear system is solved using the high performance preconditioner HYPRE software library.

2.2. Immersed boundary method

In the immersed boundary (IB) method, the structures are treated as virtual bodies and replaced by IB forces applied on their boundaries (Figure 1). To implement the IB method, an additional IB force is added to the projection step of the solver (Ha et al., 2014), i.e. equations (6) and (8).

$$\frac{\mathbf{U}^{(k)} - \mathbf{U}^*}{\Delta t} = \mathbf{S}_p^{(k)} + \mathbf{f}_{IBF}^{(k)} \quad (22)$$

where $k = 1, 2$ at the first and second stages, respectively. The IB force $\mathbf{f}_{IBF}$ is defined as a Dirac delta function, which has non-zero values only at the structure boundaries. An IB velocity $\hat{\mathbf{U}}$ is employed to enforce a no-slip boundary condition at the structure boundaries. Thus the IB forcing is given

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 by
11
12
13

$$\mathbf{f}_{IBF}^{(k)} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{U}}^{(k)} - \mathbf{U}^*}{\Delta t} - \mathbf{S}_p^{(k)} \quad (23)$$

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

161 The IB force is applied at the cell center in the fluid domain nearest the
162 solid surface. To find the IB velocity at the cell center, an interpolation is
163 usually required. In this study, the linear interpolation approach proposed
164 by Fadlun et al. (2000) is employed. The details of the interpolation scheme
165 can also be referred to Ha et al. (2014). As shown in Figure 1, the IB veloc-
166 ities at the center of the cells nearest the structure are obtained by linearly
167 interpolating the velocities at the structure boundary and the neighboring
168 cell.

169 In Figure 1, we see that the computational grids in the σ coordinate
170 follow the movement of the free surface. The cell center, where the velocities
171 are defined, could be located inside the structure at one time and move into
172 the flow domain at another time. This always happens in the cases with
173 submerged and floating structures. If the cell center is within the structure,
174 its velocities are assumed to be the same as the velocities of the structure.
175 When the cells located inside the structure at the previous time step move
176 into the flow domain at the current time step, reconstruction of the velocities
177 at the previous time step is needed to accurately estimate the fluxes at the cell
178 faces by enforcing the no-slip boundary condition at the structure boundaries.

3. Numerical simulations

3.1. Solitary wave propagation through rectangular obstacles

The model is firstly applied to study solitary wave propagation through a bottom-mounted rectangular obstacle. Both laboratory measurement (Zhuang and Lee, 1996) and numerical simulation (Lin, 2006) showed that a strong vortex structure is formed behind the obstacle during the passage of the solitary wave and it persists for a very long time. It is extremely important to capture this vortex structure in order to predict the wave forces on the obstacle.

The model setup is shown in Figure 2(a). The computational domain is 5 m long, discretized by 2000 grid cells with a uniform grid size of 2.5 mm. 40 vertical layers are employed in order to well capture the vortical structure behind the obstacle. The water depth is constant with $h = 0.228$ m. The incident solitary wave has a wave height of 0.069 m. The rectangular obstacle has a height of $h/2 = 0.114$ m and a length of $L = 0.381$ m. At the boundaries of the obstacle, the IB forcing is applied. The temporal variations of horizontal as well as vertical velocities are measured at two points behind the obstacle. Point 1 is located at 0.040 m above the bottom and 0.034 m downstream from the obstacle, and point 2 is at 0.017 m above point 1. To accurately simulate the evolution of the vortical structure, proper turbulence model must be included. In this study, a Smagorinsky Sub-Grid Scale turbulence model is employed.

Figure 2(b)-(d) show the simulated flow fields during the passage of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

202 solitary wave near the obstacle. We can clearly see the development and
203 growth of the vortical structure behind the obstacle. The vortex is developed
204 when the wave crest reaches the rear boundary of the obstacle. As the solitary
205 wave passes by, the vortex grows in both size and strength. The core of the
206 vortex tends to move downward in the direction of wave propagation and rise
207 upward towards the free surface. The IB method implemented in NHWAVE
208 can well capture the effects of the obstacle on the flow fields under the solitary
209 wave.

210 Figure 3 presents the model-data comparisons of time series of horizontal
211 and vertical velocities at two measurement points. It can be seen that simu-
212 lations agree very well with the measurements at both points. The vortical
213 structure initiates at around $t\sqrt{g/h} = 12.0$, accompanied by the increase
214 of both horizontal and vertical velocities in magnitude. The horizontal ve-
215 locities are negative, indicating the development of reverse flow behind the
216 obstacle, which is accurately captured by the present model. Figure 3 also
217 includes the simulated velocities with doubled grid cells. Clearly, the results
218 with coarse and fine grids have minor difference, indicating that the current
219 grid is sufficiently fine to capture the flow field around the obstacle.

220 To evaluate the model skill on simulating waves interacting with a floating
221 object, a new simulation is conducted (Figure 4). The computational domain
222 is 50 m long, discretized by 1000 grid cells with a uniform grid size of 0.05
223 m. 40 vertical layers are again used in the vertical direction to capture the
224 complicated flow field around the floating object. The water depth is 1.0 m.

225 The incident solitary wave has a wave height of 0.1 m. The floating object has
 226 a rectangular shape with 5 m long and 0.4 m high, located at $(x, y) = (20.0,$
 227 $0.4)$ m. Due to the lack of experimental data, this problem is also simulated
 228 by a validated Navier-Stokes solver TRUCHAS (Ma et al., 2011; Derakati
 229 and Kirby, 2014), which uses a Volume-of-Fluid (VOF) approach to capture
 230 the solid-fluid as well as water-air interfaces. The results at three gauges
 231 from both models are compared in Figure 4. Clearly, the discrepancies are
 232 negligible, indicating that the current model is able to accurately simulate
 233 waves interacting with a floating body.

234 The model's capability of simulating 3D interactions between solitary
 235 waves and a block is demonstrated through reproducing the laboratory ex-
 236 periments of Lara et al. (2012). The experiment was performed in the
 237 University of Cantabria wave flume, which is 20.62 m long, 0.58 m wide and
 238 0.8 m high. The impervious rectangular block has dimensions of 30 cm in
 239 the cross-flume direction and 24 cm in the along-flume direction as shown in
 240 Figure 5. Its closest face to the wavemaker was located 10.84 m away from
 241 the wavemaker mean position. The case with the highest wave height (14
 242 cm) is selected for numerical simulation. The still water depth is 0.45 m. A
 243 series of 15 s is simulated, which includes the first impact of the wave with
 244 the structure and the first reflection that reaches the obstacle again. The
 245 computational is discretized by a uniform grid with $\Delta x = 0.02$ m and $\Delta y =$
 246 0.01 m. 20 vertical layers are employed in order to better capture the vortices
 247 generated around the obstacle. The simulation takes about 15 hours, which

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
248 is much faster than that of a VOF simulation using OpenFOAM (Higuera et
10
11 al., 2013).
12

13
14 250 Figure 6 and 7 compare the simulated and measured free surface eleva-
15
16 251 tions at 12 wave gauges. Generally, the agreements are excellent, except that
17
18 252 small discrepancies can be found at gauge 5 and 6, where the results may be
19
20 253 affected by the big eddies around the obstacle generated during the passage
21
22 254 of the solitary wave. The leading wave as well as the reflected wave from the
23
24 255 end wall are both well captured by the model.
25

26 27 256 *3.2. Periodic wave over a submerged bar* 28

29
30 257 In this section, the model is used to examine the interactions between
31
32 258 dispersive waves and a submerged obstacle, which has two slopes that cut
33
34 259 through the computational cells. The experimental data collected by Beji
35
36 260 and Battjes (1993) are employed to validate the model. The model setup is
37
38 261 shown in Figure 8. The water depth is 0.4 m over the whole domain. The
39
40 262 incident periodic waves have a period of 2.02 s and a wave height of 2.0 cm.
41
42 263 The submerged bar is simulated using the IB method. It has a height of
43
44 264 0.3 m. The offshore slope of the bar is 1/20 and the onshore slope is 1/10.
45
46 265 The computational domain is discretized by 1750 grid cells with a uniform
47
48 266 grid size of 0.02 m. 40 vertical layers are employed to capture the flow field
49
50 267 around the bar.
51

52
53 268 Figure 9 shows the model-data comparisons of free surface elevations at
54
55 269 six measurement gauges. Wave shoaling at station a and propagation over
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the bar at station b are well simulated by the model. The bound higher harmonics generated by the nonlinear shoaling wave on the upward slope of the bar become free on the downward slope, resulting in irregular wave pattern at station c-f. The model generally predicts free surface evolution at these stations well, indicating that dispersion of the higher frequency components is well simulated. It is proved that interactions between dispersive waves and submerged obstacle are well captured by the current model.

3.3. *Non-breaking solitary wave interacting with a group of slender vertical cylinders*

In this section, we will examine the capability of the current model on simulating wave interactions with multiple objects. The experimental data collected by Mo and Liu (2009) are used to check the accuracy of the model. The experiments were conducted in the Tsunami Wave Basin at the O.H. Hinsdale Wave Research Laboratory at Oregon State University and examined the interactions between non-breaking solitary waves and a group of three vertical cylinders. The wave basin has an effective length of 48.8 m, a width of 26.5 m and a depth of 2.1 m. Three stainless steel circular cylinders with a diameter of $D = 1.219$ m were instrumented and installed in the basin. The time series of free surface elevations were collected at 10 wave gauges. The velocities were measured by 5 Acoustic Doppler Velocimetries (ADV). The details of the experimental setup is referred to Mo and Liu (2009).

The model setup is shown in Figure 10. To reduce the computational cost,

the domain is chosen to be 30 m long and 7 m wide, which covers only a half of the wave basin because of the symmetric arrangement of the locations for cylinders. The width of the domain is designed to be greater than $5D$ to ensure that wave reflection from the lateral walls does not contaminate the results in the region of interest within the simulation time. The water depth is 0.75 m. The incident solitary wave has a wave height of $H = 0.3$ m. A 6 m wide sponge layer is placed at the end of the domain to absorb the wave energy. The placement of the wave gauges and ADVs are shown in Figure 7. The domain is discretized by 600×140 grid cells with the grid size of $\Delta x = 0.05$ m and $\Delta y = 0.05$ m. 10 vertical layers are employed to capture the vertical structure of velocity field. A simple Smagorinsky Sub-Grid Scale model is used to simulate turbulent flow.

Figure 11 demonstrates the interactions between the solitary wave and three vertical cylinders. The wave reaches at the cylinders nearest the wave-maker around $t/\sqrt{h/g} = 25.32$. The water level is the highest in the front of the cylinders due to the wave runup. After the wave passes by the first row of the cylinders at $t/\sqrt{h/g} = 28.93$, the highest water level is found behind the cylinders due to wave focusing and wave runup at the farthest cylinder. At $t/\sqrt{h/g} = 32.55$, the wave has completely propagated through the cylinder group. The water level behind the farthest cylinder is high purely due to focusing of the diffracted waves.

The comparisons of simulated and measured free surface elevations at wave gauges are presented in Figure 12, in which the free surface elevations

are normalized by the incident wave height H . Excellent agreements are observed at most wave gauges. Small discrepancy is found at gauge 5, which is located at the rear end of the first two cylinders. More importantly, the secondary waves generated by scattering from the cylinders are well captured by the current model. These comparisons are even better than those of a VOF simulation by Mo and Liu (2009), in which noticeable differences appeared for the secondary scattered waves.

The comparisons of simulated and measured flow velocities at 5 ADVs are displayed in Figure 13. At ADV1, which is located between the first two cylinders nearest to the wavemaker, the comparisons of three components of velocity are all excellent. At ADV2 and ADV3, where the flow separation takes place, noticeable differences in the horizontal velocities are observed. Specifically, the streamwise velocity u is slightly over predicted at ADV2 while it is underestimated at ADV3. The prediction of the flow field within the cylinder group probably requires a more sophisticated turbulence model. At ADV4 and ADV5, the simulations generally agree well with the measurements.

The predicted wave runoff in the front of the farthest cylinder is examined in Figure 14. Excellent agreement between simulation and measurement is obtained, indicating that the current model can well predict the wave processes around the cylinders. The maximum wave runoff is about 1.5 times larger than the incident wave height. The simulated and measured dynamic pressures at 0.1 m above the bed in the front of the farthest cylinder are

also compared in Figure 14. The dynamic pressure is normalized by $\rho g H$, where H is the incident wave height. The peak dynamic pressure during wave runup on the cylinder is accurately predicted the model. However, the dynamics pressure is slightly underestimated during wave run-down. The model generally predicts well the wave runup and run-down processes on the cylinder.

4. Conclusions

This paper implemented an immersed boundary (IB) method in a σ coordinate non-hydrostatic model NHWAVE to simulate wave-structure interactions. In contrast to a fixed grid, the σ grid follows the movement of the free surface. The grid cell center, where the velocities are defined, is located inside the structure at one time and can move into the flow domain at another time. When this situation takes place, a reconstruction of the flow velocities at the previous time step is needed in order to accurately estimate the fluxes at the cell faces. The IB-NHWAVE model was utilized to study solitary wave interactions with rectangular obstacles, periodic wave interactions with a submerged bar and non-breaking solitary wave interactions with multiply cylinders. The simulations agreed well with the measurements in terms of free surface elevation, velocity, dynamic pressure as well as wave runup. The structures in these test cases have different shapes and their boundaries may cut through the grid cells. It has been shown that the IB-NHWAVE is a promising tool to predict wave/surge loads on near-coast structures.

Acknowledgments

The first author acknowledges the supports from National Science Foundation (OCE-1334641 and CMMI-1537100) to further develop NHWAVE model.

References

- Beji S. and Battjes J.A., 1993, Experimental investigation of wave propagation over a bar, *Coastal Eng.*, 19, 151162
- Cabot W. and Moin P., 2000, Approximate wall boundary conditions in the large-eddy simulation of high Reynolds number flow, *Flow Turb. Combust.*, 63, 269-291
- Derakhti M. and Kirby J. T., 2014, Bubble entrainment and liquid-bubble interaction under unsteady breaking waves, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 761, 464-506
- Derakhti M., Kirby J. T., Shi F. and Ma G., 2016a, NHWAVE: Governing equations, exact boundary conditions and turbulence modeling, *Ocean Modelling*, under review
- Derakhti M., Kirby J. T., Shi F. and Ma G., 2016b, Wave breaking in the surf zone and deep water in a non-hydrostatic RANS model. Part 1: Organized wave motions, *Ocean Modelling*, under review
- Derakhti M., Kirby J. T., Shi F. and Ma G., 2016c, Wave breaking in the surf zone and deep water in a non-hydrostatic RANS model. Part 2: Breaking-induced velocity and turbulence, *Ocean Modelling*, under review
- Fadlun E.A., Verzicco R., Orlandi P. and Mohd-Yusof J., 2000, Combined

384 immersed-boundary finite-difference methods for three-dimensional com-
 385 plex flow simulations, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 161, 35-60

386 Finnegan W. and Goggins J., 2012, Numerical simulation of linear water
 387 waves and wave-structure interaction, *Ocean Engineering*, 43, 23-31

388 Gottlieb S., Shu C.-W. and Tadmor E., 2001, Strong stability-preserving
 389 high-order time discretization methods, *SIAM Review*, 43, 89-112

390 Grilli S.T., Losada M.A. and martin F., 1994, Characteristics of solitary
 391 wave breaking induced by breakwaters, *Journal of Waterway, Port,
 392 Coastal and Ocean Engineering*, 120, 74-92

393 Ha T., Shim J., Lin P. and Cho Y., 2014, Three-dimensional numerical
 394 simulation of solitary wave run-up using the IB method, *Coastal Engi-
 395 neering*, 84, 38-55

396 Hieu P.D. and Tanimoto K., 2006, Verification of a VOF-based two-phase
 397 flow model for wave breaking and wave-structure interactions, *Ocean
 398 Engineering*, 33, 1565-1588

399 Higuera P., Lara J.L. and Losada I.J., 2013, Simulating coastal engineering
 400 processes with OpenFOAM, *Coastal Engineering*, 71, 119-134

401 Koo W.C. and Kim M.H., 2007, Fully nonlinear wave-body interactions
 402 with surface-piercing bodies, *Ocean Engineering*, 34, 1000-1012

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 403 Lara J.L., del Jesus M. and Losada I.J., 2012, Three-dimensional inter-
11 404 action of waves and porous coastal structures, Part II: Experimental
12
13 405 validation, *Coastal Engineering*, 64, 26-46
14
15
16 406 Lin P. and Li C.W., 2002, A σ -coordinate three-dimensional numerical
17
18 407 model for surface wave propagation, *International Journal of Numeri-*
19
20 408 *cal Methods in Fluids*, 38, 1045-1068
21
22
23 409 Lin P., 2006, A multiple-layer σ -coordinate model for simulation of wave-
24
25 410 structure interaction, *Computers & Fluids*, 35, 147-167
26
27
28 411 Liu X., Xu H., Shao S. and Lin P., 2013, An improved incompressible SPH
29
30 412 model for simulation of wave-structure interaction, *Computers & Flu-*
31
32 413 *ids*, 71, 113-123
33
34
35 414 Ma G., Shi F. and Kirby J. T., 2011, A polydisperse two-fluid model for surf
36
37 415 zone bubble simulation, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116, C05010,
38
39 416 doi:10.1029/2010JC006667
40
41
42 417 Ma G., Shi F. and Kirby J.T., 2012, Shock-capturing non-hydrostatic model
43
44 418 for fully dispersive surface wave processes, *Ocean Modelling*, 43-44, 22-
45
46 419 35
47
48
49 420 Ma G., Su S.-F., Liu S. and Chu J.-C., 2014, Numerical simulation of infra
50
51 421 gravity waves in fringing reefs using a shock-capturing non-hydrostatic
52
53 422 model, *Ocean Engineering*, 85, 54-64
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 423 Mittal R. and Iaccarino G., 2005, Immersed boundary methods, *Annu. Rev.*
424 *Fluid Mech.*, 37, 239-261
- 425 Mo W. and Liu P. L.-F., 2009, Three dimensional numerical simulations for
426 non-breaking solitary wave interacting with a group of slender vertical
427 cylinders, *Inter J. Nav. Archie. Oc. Engine.*, 1, 20-28
- 428 Peskin C.S., 1982, The fluid dynamics of heart valves: experimental, the-
429 oretical and computational methods, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 14,
430 235-259
- 431 Rijnsdorp D.P., Smit P.B. and Zijlema M., 2014, Non-hydrostatic modelling
432 of infragravity waves under laboratory conditions, *Coastal Engineering*,
433 85, 30-42
- 434 Skourup J., Sterndorff M.J. and Hansen E.A., 1992, Numerical modeling
435 of wave-structure interaction by a three-dimensional non-linear bound-
436 ary element method: A step towards the numerical wave tank, *Ocean*
437 *Engng.*, 19, 437-460
- 438 Shen L. and Chan E.-S., 2008, Numerical simulation of fluid-structure in-
439 teraction using a combined volume of fluid and immersed boundary
440 method, *Ocean Engineering*, 35, 939-952
- 441 Shen L., Chan E.-S. and Lin P., 2009, Calculation of hydrodynamic forces
442 acting on a submerged moving object using immersed boundary method,
443 *Computer & Fluids*, 38, 691-702

- 444 Smit P., Zijlema M. and Stelling G.S., 2013, Depth-induced wave breaking
445 in a non-hydrostatic, near-shore wave model, *Coastal Engineering*, 76,
446 1-16
- 447 Smit P., Janssen T., Holthuijsen L. and Smith J., 2014, Non-hydrostatic
448 modeling of surf zone wave dynamics, *Coastal Engineering*, 83, 36-48
- 449 Westphalen J., Greaves D.M., Williams C.J.K., Hunt-Raby A.C. and Zang
450 J., 2012, Focused waves and wave-structure interaction in a numerical
451 wave tank, *Ocean Engineering*, 45, 9-21
- 452 Yuan H. and Wu C.H., 2004, A two-dimensional vertical non-hydrostatic
453 σ model with an implicit method for free-surface flows, *International*
454 *Journal For Numerical Methods In Fluids*, 44, 811-835
- 455 Zhuang F. and Lee J.J., 1996, A viscous rotational model for wave overtop-
456 ping over marine structure, *Proc. 25th Int. Conf. Coast. Eng.*, ASCE,
457 2178-2191
- 458 Zijlema M. and Stelling G.S., 2008, Efficient computation of surf zone waves
459 using the nonlinear shallow water equations with non-hydrostatic pres-
460 sure, *Coastal Engineering*, 55, 780-790

Figure 1: Illustration of IB method and linear interpolations of IB velocities in a σ -coordinate model. The σ grid temporally varies with the movement of the free surface. The dashed ellipse indicates the boundary of the structure, where the IB forces are applied.

Figure 2: (a) Model setup of a solitary wave past a submerged obstacle and the simulated vortical structures behind the obstacle at (b) $t\sqrt{g/h} = 12.64$; (c) $t\sqrt{g/h} = 13.95$ and (d) $t\sqrt{g/h} = 15.27$. The two circles behind the obstacle indicate the locations of measurement points 1 (lower) and 2 (upper).

Figure 3: Model-data comparisons of the time series of horizontal and vertical velocities at two points behind the obstacle. Upper two panels show the results at point 1 and lower two panels show the results at point 2. Circles: experimental data; Solid lines: simulation results with 2000×40 grid cells; Dashed lines: simulation results with 4000×40 grid cells.

Figure 4: Model setup of a solitary wave propagation through a floating object and the comparisons of simulated surface elevations at (a) gauge 1, (b) gauge 2 and (c) gauge 3 using the present model (solid lines) and a VOF model (dashed lines).

Figure 5: Computational domain for 3D interactions between a solitary wave and a block and the locations of the wave gauges. Solid lines: simulations; dashed lines: measurements

Figure 6: Comparisons of simulated and measured free surface elevations at the first six wave gauges. Solid lines: simulations; dashed lines: measurements

Figure 7: Comparisons of simulated and measured free surface elevations at the last six wave gauges.

Figure 8: Model setup for the periodic waves interacting with a submerged bar. The locations of six wave gauges are located at (a) $x = 10.5$ m; (b) $x = 12.5$ m; (c) $x = 13.5$ m; (d) $x = 14.5$ m; (e) $x = 15.7$ m and (f) $x = 17.3$ m. A 10 m wide sponge layer is placed at the right end of the domain to absorb wave energy.

Figure 9: Comparisons of free surface elevations between simulations (solid lines) and measurements (circles) at (a) $x = 10.5$ m; (b) $x = 12.5$ m; (c) $x = 13.5$ m; (d) $x = 14.5$ m; (e) $x = 15.7$ m and (f) $x = 17.3$ m.

Figure 10: Model setup for a solitary wave interacting with three slender vertical cylinders. The computational domain covers the region with $y > 0$. Three cylinders are located at $(x, y) = (21.085, 0.0)$, $(18.6595, 1.219)$ and $(18.6595, -1.219)$ m, respectively. The diameter of the cylinder is $D = 1.219$ m. The dots indicate the locations of 10 wave gauges deployed to measure the free surface elevations. The triangles indicate the locations of ADV measurements. A 6 m wide sponge layer is placed at the right end of the domain to absorb wave energy.

Figure 11: Solitary wave interacting with three slender vertical cylinders at (a) $t/\sqrt{h/g} = 25.32$; (b) $t/\sqrt{h/g} = 28.93$ and (c) $t/\sqrt{h/g} = 32.55$.

Figure 12: Model-data comparisons of temporal variations of free surface elevations at wave gauges. Circles: experimental data; solid lines: simulations.

Figure 13: Model-data comparisons of temporal variations of velocities at 5 ADV gauges. Circles: experimental data; solid lines: simulations.

Figure 14: Model-data comparisons of wave runup and dynamic pressure in the front of the cylinder. Dashed lines: measurements; solid lines: simulations.