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Abstract
Purpose – The purpose of this study is simulation of dynamic stall behavior around the Eppler 387 airfoil in the low Reynolds number flow with a direct-forcing immersed boundary (DFIB) numerical model.

Design/methodology/approach – A ray-casting method is used to define the airfoil geometry. The governing continuity and Navier–Stokes momentum equations and boundary conditions are solved using the DFIB method.

Findings – The purposed method is validated against numerical results from alternative schemes and experimental data on static and oscillating airfoil. A base flow regime and different vortices patterns are observed, in accordance with other previously published investigations. Also, the effects of the reduced frequency, the pitch oscillation amplitude and the Reynolds number are studied. The results show that the reduced frequency has a major effect on the flow field and the force coefficients of the airfoil. On the other hand, the Reynolds number of the flow has a little effect on the dynamic stall characteristics of the airfoil at least in the laminar range.

Practical implications – It is demonstrated that the DFIB model provides an accurate representation of dynamic stall phenomenon.

Originality/value – The results show that the dynamic stall behavior around the Eppler 387 is different than the general dynamic stall behavior understanding in the shedding phase.
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Introduction
Dynamic retreating blade stall problem is one of the well-known limiting factors of high-speed characteristics of a rotary wing aircraft. When an airfoil is pitching up, the flow separation and separation-vortex shedding is delayed, resulting in a higher maximum lift coefficient. When the airfoil reaches the end of its angle and starts to pitch down, the separation-vortex is generally rapidly shed from the airfoil, causing enormous drop in lift. The critical angle of attack for the stall is about 15°, but it may vary significantly depending on the airfoil and the Reynolds number. McCroskey and his colleagues investigated the details of the dynamic stall phenomenon (Ko and McCroskey, 1997; McCroskey, 1981, 1982) for more than two decades. Also, many experimental (Ohmi et al., 1991; Lee and Gerontakos, 2004; Gardner et al., 2016) and numerical (Akbari and Price, 2003; Wang et al., 2010; Mohan et al., 2016) studies have been reported in this area.

The most common method to simulate the flow with a complicated solid boundary is to use a body-fitted technique with grids fitting and clustering along the complex boundary. Most of time, the solid object may not be at rest, and it requires further technique to deal with a moving object. The mesh updating or re-meshing is usually computationally expensive. The immersed boundary (IB) method (Peskin, 1972) is a numerical method for the simulation of fluid–structure interaction problems. The main capability of IB is to handle simulations of a moving boundary with less computational cost and memory requirements than the conventional body-fitted method, especially in low Reynolds number problems. In this method, a fixed Cartesian grid is used for fluids, and a Lagrangian grid is applied for the immersed solid object. Instead of using a delta function, Mohd-Yusof (1996) introduced the direct-forcing immersed boundary (DFIB) method. In this method, a virtual forcing term is determined by the difference between the interpolated velocities at the boundary points and the desired boundary velocities. The idea of DFIB has been used and developed successfully in many
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The present study describes a DFIB model (following Chern et al., 2015) of the dynamic stall behavior for the Eppler 387 (E387) airfoil. Low-Reynolds-number aerodynamics and airfoils (like the E387) are important in applications such as small airplanes, sailplanes, wind turbines and propellers. There are plenty of studies about the static stall behavior of the E387 airfoil (McGhee et al., 1988; Shahin et al., 2008); but based on the authors’ knowledge, there is no investigation about the dynamic stall phenomenon of this airfoil. Also, The NACA 0012 airfoil is used for some validation cases. The solid object immersed within a flow field is denoted by the volume of solid function $\eta$. A cell occupied by solids will be denoted as $\eta = 1$, while the one fully occupied by fluids will be $\eta = 0$. A ray-casting algorithm (Sutherland et al., 1974) is used to define the airfoil geometry and find the value of $\eta$. The aim of the present work is the study of the capability of the DFIB method as a distinguished numerical method on a complex geometry in handling fluid–solid interactions. Also, the effects of the main parameters on the dynamic stall of the E387 airfoil are studied. It should be noted that the present study is in two-dimensional domain and also just valid for low-Reynolds-number cases.

Mathematical formulae and numerical methods

The governing equations for an incompressible Newtonian fluid are represented in the following non-dimensional forms as:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,$$

(1)

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}) = -\nabla p + \frac{1}{Re} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} + \eta \mathbf{f},$$

(2)

where $\mathbf{u}$ and $p$ are non-dimensional velocity and pressure, respectively; $\mathbf{u}$ is nondimensionalized by the inlet free stream velocity ($u_{in}$). Also, $\eta \mathbf{f}$ shows the virtual force only applied to solids. The forcing term $\mathbf{f}$ is determined by the difference between the interpolated velocity on the boundary point and the desired boundary velocity. It is defined by:

$$\mathbf{f} = \frac{\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{u}^{**}}{\Delta t},$$

(3)

where $\mathbf{u}^*$ and $\mathbf{u}^{**}$ are denoted as the velocity at the center of the solid geometry and the second intermediate velocity, respectively.

Numerical method

A staggered grid arrangement is used in this study. The second-order central difference scheme and the third-order quadratic upstream interpolation for convective kinetics scheme (Leonard, 1979) are used to discretize the diffusive and the convective terms of equation (2), respectively. Also, the Adam–Bashforth scheme is used for temporal terms.

The integration of virtual force is used to calculate the resultant force exerted on the solid object by fluid:

$$\mathbf{F} = -\iiint_{cv} \eta \mathbf{f} dV,$$

(4)

where the control volume is around the solid geometry. The dimensionless drag and lift force coefficients, $C_D$ and $C_L$, can be denoted as:

$$C_D = \frac{2F_x}{\frac{1}{2} \rho \bar{u}^2 A},$$

and:

$$C_L = \frac{2F_y}{\frac{1}{2} \rho \bar{u}^2 A},$$

respectively. Full details of the discretized equations are given by Chern et al. (2014, 2015).

Ray-casting algorithm

The ray-casting method is used to define a solid part of the computational domain in the present study. In this algorithm, first the geometry of the solid should be defined by connection of the points that create it. Next, the separation of the solid and the fluid sections is accomplished by the ray-casting algorithm, which is one of the point-in-polygon methods. The ray-casting algorithm tests how many times a ray, starting from the point and moving in any fixed direction, intersects the edges of the solid geometry. The ray intersects the edge an odd number of times if the point is on the inside of the solid section. Also, for the outside points, the ray intersects its edge even (or zero) number of times. A pseudocode can be written as:

```
count ← 0
foreach side in polygon:
    if ray_int._seg.(P, side) then
        count ← count + 1
    if is_odd(count) then
        return inside
else
    return outside
```

The function “ray_int._seg.” is true if the horizontal ray starting from the point $P$ intersects the side (segment), false otherwise. In the present study, the airfoil is defined with X-Y coordinates in a geometry data file. The solid part is specified with the ray-casting algorithm. Figure 1 shows an example of the method. After defining the airfoil, all points of the domain are checked by the ray-casting algorithm. More details can be found in a study published by Sutherland et al. (1974).

Pitching airfoil

In the dynamic stall cases, a pitching airfoil is considered. The instantaneous angle of attack (AOA) is given by:

$$\alpha = \alpha_{mean} + \alpha_{amp} \sin(2 \pi f t).$$

(7)

Figure 1 Example of the ray-casting algorithm to separate the solid and fluid parts
where $\alpha_{\text{mean}}$, $\alpha_{\text{amp}}$, and $f$ represent the mean angle of attack, the pitch oscillation amplitude and the oscillation frequency, respectively. Also, the reduced frequency is defined as:

$$k = \frac{\pi f c}{U_\infty}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

**Results and discussion**

The simulation results and the parameter studies of the dynamic stall flow are presented in this section. A full description is given by Chern et al. (2015) of the basic computational model (without the ray-casting section) validation for a heated circular cylinder placed in an unbounded uniform flow investigated by many researchers.

The first two cases of this section are validations of the present model in the static stall mode of the NACA 0012 and the Eppler 387 airfoils. Next, the dynamic stall flow of the NACA 0012 airfoil studied and the flow field is compared with former results. Then, the E387 airfoil is considered. The dynamic stall behavior and the effect of three main parameters of that are investigated and discussed.

**Case 1: static airfoil – NACA 0012**

The typical geometric set up in the computational domain is shown in Figure 2. The Dirichlet boundary condition is applied at the inlet boundary, and Neumann boundary conditions are applied at lateral and outlet sides. In this case, the drag and lift coefficients are predicted at $\alpha = 8^\circ$ for Reynolds number $Re = 50,000$ for a NACA 0012 airfoil. Table I lists the parameters used to test for mesh and size convergence test. It may be observed from Table I that the predicted drag and lift coefficients are almost insensitive to the number of grid points, except for the two cases. The minimum size of the domain with reasonable results is $8c \times 4c$. Also, for all next cases, the grids number $1000 \times 1000$ are chosen. It should be noted that all the present study cases are simulated in low Reynolds number flow. Based on the previous studies and general understanding in this area, larger computational domains are needed for high Reynolds number flow simulation. The non-dimensional time step for all cases is $10^{-4}$ and the CFL number is 0.0125 for the selected domain and grid size. The simulation is performed on a workstation with two 3.40 GHz CPU and 3 GB RAM and required less than 10 h CPU time to compute results up to a non-dimensional time ($t^* = t \frac{u_\infty}{c}$) of 2. Figure 3 shows the non-dimensional pressure contours around the airfoil, which is in agreement with general understanding in this area.

**Case 2: static airfoil – Eppler 387**

In the second static condition case, the E387 airfoil with $Re = 60,000$ is considered. Drag and lift coefficients are computed in different angles of attacks from $-2^\circ$ to $12^\circ$. Figures 4 and 5 show the comparisons of the present study with the

Table I Mesh convergence test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain size</th>
<th>Grid resolution</th>
<th>$C_L$</th>
<th>$C_D$</th>
<th>Abs. error of $C_L$ (%)</th>
<th>Abs. error of $C_D$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$16c \times 16c$</td>
<td>$2,000 \times 2,000$</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.0421</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16c \times 8c$</td>
<td>$2,000 \times 1,000$</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.0420</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4c \times 4c$</td>
<td>$500 \times 500$</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.0322</td>
<td>18.387</td>
<td>31.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8c \times 4c$</td>
<td>$500 \times 500$</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
<td>6.810</td>
<td>9.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8c \times 4c$</td>
<td>$1,000 \times 500$</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.0408</td>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>3.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8c \times 4c$</td>
<td>$1,000 \times 1,000$</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.0418</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8c \times 4c$</td>
<td>$1,500 \times 750$</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8c \times 4c$</td>
<td>$2,000 \times 2,000$</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.0420</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Xfoil code</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.0422</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $\alpha = 8^\circ$; $Re = 10,000$
The experimental results of McGhee et al. (1988) can be seen to be close to the results. Case 3: dynamic stall – NACA 0012

In the first dynamic stall cases, the oscillations of NACA 0012 airfoil with \( k = 0.25 \), \( Re = 10,000 \), \( \alpha_{\text{mean}} = 5^\circ \) and \( \alpha_{\text{amp}} = 20^\circ \) are considered. The pitching oscillation of the airfoil starts from the minimum value and the oscillation cycle is completed during the simulation based on the equation (7). Dynamic lift and drag loops are depicted in Figures 6 and 7. The results are compared with outcomes of Tuncer et al. (1990) and the simulation results of Akbari and Price (2003). It can be seen that an almost good similarity is observed between the present study and the former results. The maximum lift and drag coefficients of the present simulation are higher than those reported by Akbari and Price (2003). Also, the lift coefficient is decreased dramatically after the maximum angle of attack.

Case 4: dynamic stall – Eppler 387

Now, the oscillations of E387 airfoil with \( k = 2.0 \), \( Re = 3,000 \), \( \alpha_{\text{mean}} = 15^\circ \) and \( \alpha_{\text{amp}} = 30^\circ \) are studied. Figure 8 shows the time elevation of the unsteady wake past the airfoil. The difference of the wake patterns between the general insight of dynamic stall behavior and E387, especially at the shedding period, is clear. The initial wake follows an unsteady process consisting of the development of the large-scale leading-edge vortex over the upper surface. Also, some small vortices can be
observed at the down and also at the tip of the airfoil at the pitching up time. The main vortex is broken down to some smaller ones and do not leave completely the upper surface until the end of dynamic stall process. The primary and the large vortices have clockwise rotations; but the trailing edge vortices have both clockwise and counterclockwise rotations. The curl flow at the tip of the airfoil should be because of the asymmetric shape of E387 in the front area. Figure 9 shows enlarged sections of some of the main vortices in Figure 8. Figure 10 shows the non-dimensional pressure contours around the airfoil. Darker color means lower pressure. It can be seen that the high pressure area develops gradually at the pitching up time under the airfoil, but fades in the pitching down cycle.

Reduced frequency effect
In the present section, the E387 airfoil which oscillates at Re = 3,000, $\alpha_{\text{mean}} = 15^\circ$ and $\alpha_{\text{amp}} = 30^\circ$ is considered. Four reduced frequencies of $k = 0.2, 0.5, 1.0$ and 2.0 are concerned. Figures 11 and 12 show the comparisons of the drag and lift coefficients during the oscillation cycle. It is observed that the dropping of both coefficients at the maximum angle of attack
significantly depend on the value of the reduced frequency. For example, in $k = 2.0$, $C_D$ and $C_L$ drop almost 26 and 34 per cent respectively, but in $k = 1.0$ they are almost 6 per cent. The trend is reversed at the minimum angle of attack. When the reduced frequency is less than 1.0, the rate of the changing of the coefficients are almost close; but when the reduced frequency is increased, the nonlinearity effects are dominant and the surface forces have larger values. The same results have been reported for the low-Reynolds-number airfoils (but not the E387), such as those by Ohmi et al. (1991) and Akbari and Price (2003). This difference also can be seen in the flow field around the airfoil. Table II shows the variation of the main wake patterns in different values of $k$. The details of the classified patterns are explained as follows:

- **Type A**: The leading-edge vortex after being separated from the upper surface [please see Figures 8(b) and 9(a)].
- **Type B**: The large-scale upper surface vortex detaches from the airfoil slowly of breakdown and spread over the surface [please see Figure 9(b)].
- **Type C**: The down leading-edge vortex [please see Figure 8(b)].
- **Type D**: The trailing edge vortex that can be combined with the leading-edge vortices and finally sheds downstream [please see Figures 8(c) and 9(c)].
- **Type E**: The breakdown vortices that are usually created from the large-scale vortex and generally combined with the trailing edge vortex and finally separate the airfoil [please see Figures 8(g) and 9(d)].

As it can be seen from the table, the patterns in the large values of $k$ are more complex than the smaller ones. When the reduce frequency is less than 1.0, the main wake patterns are close to the other airfoils such as NACA 0012 case (Ohmi et al., 1991), but in the shedding period, the large scale vortex does not separate the airfoil surface until the end of the cycle. Also, the leading edge and the large scale vortices are created. But at higher values, different types of vortices are created, combined and finally separated from the airfoil. In the larger $k$s, the vortices are clockwise and counterclockwise.

**Pitch oscillation amplitude effect**

Now, the effect of the pitch oscillation amplitude on the dynamic stall behavior of the E387 airfoil is studied. The case of $Re = 3,000$, $\alpha_{\text{mean}} = 15^\circ$ and $k = 2.0$ is considered. $\alpha_{\text{amp}}$ is changed from $15^\circ$ to $45^\circ$. The main wake patterns are almost same in all cases, but the periodic small vortices from the two edges are enlarged. Also, the downstream wakes are more complex and spread. An example can be seen in Figure 13 [in comparison with Figure 8(f)]. It should be noted that this change is dependent on the value of the reduced frequency (Ohmi et al., 1991). The dynamic drag and lift loops also change with an increase in the amplitude. As it is expected, the maximum values of both coefficients increase with increasing of the amplitude; but the dropping values of them decrease. Also, to show that the significant coefficients drop happened after

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced frequency</th>
<th>Main patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$A \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$A$ and $C \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$A$ and $B \rightarrow A$ and $C \rightarrow A$ and $D \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow D \rightarrow E \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$A$ and $C \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow A$ and $D \rightarrow E \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow D \rightarrow A$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**: $A$: leading-edge vortex; $B$: large-scale vortex; $C$: down leading-edge vortex; $D$: trailing edge vortex; $E$: breakdown or combined vortices
15°, another case with $\alpha_{\text{mean}} = 5^\circ$, $k = 2.0$ and $\alpha_{\text{amp}} = 15^\circ$ is considered. In comparison with the other cases, the change in coefficients is not remarkable (Table III). In the table, the drops of $C_L$ and $C_D$ mean the percentage of the dropping when the pitching down cycle is started.

**Reynolds number effect**

In the last section, the effect of the Reynolds number on the dynamic stall behavior of the E387 airfoil is studied. In all cases, $\alpha_{\text{mean}} = 15^\circ$; $\alpha_{\text{amp}} = 30^\circ$ and $k = 2.0$. Three Reynolds numbers in the laminar fluid flow regime are selected: 1,500, 3,000 and 10,000. In general, the effect of the Reynolds number is small compared to other parameters. The basic wake patterns are almost the same. Some local fluctuations are observed at $Re = 10,000$, but they fade very fast. It should be noted that the present model is valid for low Reynolds numbers, and the absence of the turbulent model should be the main reason of the distortions. Also, the coefficients loops are almost similar, and no significant differences are seen (Figure 14).

**Conclusions**

A validated modified DFIB method has been used for simulating dynamic stall behavior of the Eppler 387 airfoil in the low Reynolds number regime. The ray-casting method has been established to define the airfoil geometry. Grid convergence test was carried out for the static airfoil, and the results demonstrate that the model provides reasonably accurate predictions of the lift and drag coefficients for most of the selected cases. Next, a dynamic stall case of the NACA 0012 has been considered. The good similarities were seen in the force loops. Next, The E387 dynamic stall behavior was studied. The wake patterns were discussed in detail. Finally, three main parameters in this phenomenon reduced frequency, pitch oscillation amplitude and the Reynolds number were considered. The results showed that the reduced frequency has the major effect on the flow field and the force coefficients of the airfoil. Results are in good agreements with the former studies. However, it was observed that the wake patterns at the shedding period and the main force coefficients are different. Eventually, it can be concluded that the combination of the DFIB method and the ray-casting algorithm offers considerable promise as a numerical technique for simulating flow interaction with a complex solid geometry.

**Table III** Drag and lift coefficients characteristics in different value of the pitch oscillation amplitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\alpha_{\text{amp}}$</th>
<th>Maximum $C_D$ Drop $C_D$ (%)</th>
<th>Maximum $C_L$ Drop $C_L$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 ($\alpha_{\text{mean}} = 5^\circ$)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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