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1 Introduction

As energy appetites around the world continue to grow, hydrocarbon fuels will contribute substantially to the energy portfolio for the foreseeable future. At the same time, concerns of climate change are increasingly motivating the development of energy sources that contribute less to atmospheric carbon levels, motivating use of carbon capture technologies. Oxy-fuel fired power plants offer substantially lower carbon capture costs than traditional flue gas scrubbing[1]. Recent interest in this combustion type has been focused on CO$_2$ rich environments[2] such as supercritical CO$_2$ (sCO$_2$) power cycles, which additionally allow for improved thermodynamic efficiency and more compact facilities. sCO$_2$ power cycles have been found to provide 99% carbon capture at a 21% reduction in cost compared to supercritical steam cycles [3]. Using supercritical carbon dioxide (sCO$_2$) as a working fluid in power cycles also enables operation at higher thermodynamic efficiency. Indeed, according to [4], sCO$_2$ cycles can improve upon the efficiency of traditional steam Rankine cycles by 5%.

As sCO$_2$ cycles are designed, evaluated, and deployed, modeling and simulation (M&S) activities are carried out alongside experimental studies to support safe, economically optimized design and operation. Among existing computational approaches to turbulence, only Direct Numerical Simulation (DNS) methods fully resolve turbulent effects. Unfortunately, DNS methods are prohibitively expensive for most cases. Large Eddy Simulation (LES), which resolves some scales of turbulence, is too expensive and time consuming for applications including design and optimization, which require from $10^3$ to $10^6$ (or more) simulations. Despite this, LES is ideal in specific situations when intricate flow details are required, such as resolving thermal striping phenomena. Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) turbulence models are ideal for design and optimization applications that either require large numbers of simulations or do not require resolution of very fine scales of the flow field. RANS models are not universally applicable, therefore we have developed models in OpenFOAM specifically for supercritical flows.

Supercritical fluid modeling is required for a number of processes in power plants. The United States Department of Energy (DOE) has identified several components of direct-fired cycles that are specifically in need of additional research and development. Among the components identified are pressurized oxy-combustion and sub-critical CO$_2$ pumping and compression [5]. Combustion within the working fluid generates strong temperature and density gradients, leading to a number of phenomena including strongly enhanced turbulent mixing and potentially strong buoyancy effects. Control of turbomachinery is difficult near the critical point, which necessitates precise and accurate models for pump design. Furthermore, thermal transport in heat exchangers leads to strong near-wall temperature gradients and buoyancy effects. The models in this paper were formulated to specifically address the simulation of buoyant supercritical flows. Development of the models involved combining the shear stress transport models with an advanced formulation of the turbulence-temperature correlation, or buoyancy production term, then explicitly tuning coefficients to sCO$_2$ flows.

The work in this paper employs an Algebraic Flux Model (AFM) formulation for the turbulence-temperature correlation. Because this approach requires the solution of additional transport equations alongside the standard two equation turbulence models, the generated models are collectively referred to as “four equation models.” To the knowledge of the authors, the formulation of the additional transport equations used here is novel. Relevant publications typically use a $k_t-\varepsilon_t$ ($k_t = T^2$ and the $t$ subscript refers to temperature $T$) formulation analogous to the $k-\varepsilon$ turbulence model [6, 7, 8], while we employ a $k_t-\omega_t$ formulation analogous to the $k-\omega$ turbulence model. This
formulation was chosen to leverage the superior near-wall performance of the $k-\omega$ model. Models were tested in two regimes based on flow rates. We have found that models developed on heated tube experiments with low flow rates did not perform well when applied to higher flow rates, and vice versa. In general, we established that the algebraic flux model was critical for low flow rate applications and also particularly important for more moderate flow cases.

2 Modeling Approach

This section describes the modeling framework used in the presented work. The thermal properties of the supercritical fluids were found to play a very significant role, and the approach to including the temperature dependence for important properties such as density, specific heat, and viscosity is discussed in Section 2.1. The motivation behind the selection of AFM for the buoyancy production term is discussed in Section 2.2 and the specific formulation used is detailed in Section 2.3.

2.1 Equation of State

A key characteristic of supercritical fluid is the variation of thermodynamic variables with temperature. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) freely provides accurate, tabulated values for these properties\footnote{http://webbook.nist.gov/cgi/cbook.cgi?ID=C124389}. The version of OpenFOAM used for this work (v4.1) did not natively support using lookup tables for Equation of State (EOS). Fortunately, a member of the large OpenFOAM user community has provided this functionality\footnote{https://github.com/ldenies/tabulatedProperties}, which was incorporated into the software used in this work. For the cases studied in this work, we assumed a pseudo-isobaric EOS. Specifically, we evaluated temperature-dependent properties at a single pressure for each simulation. For sCO$_2$, properties were evaluated at pressures of 8.194 MPa and 8.419 MPa. The OpenFOAM formulation uses density ($\rho$), enthalpy ($h$), isobaric specific heat ($c_p$), isobaric specific heat minus isochoric specific heat ($c_p - c_v$), dynamic viscosity ($\mu$), thermal conductivity ($\kappa$), and thermal expansion coefficient ($\beta$). These data are taken from the NIST resource and processed via Python into lookup tables suitable for OpenFOAM. We found that using a single representative constant for properties was insufficient. We briefly studied fitting thermodynamic properties to polynomial functions, but quickly found this unsuitable to capture supercritical flow physics.

2.2 Motivation for Algebraic Flux Model

Due to the sensitive variation of thermophysical properties with temperature, supercritical fluids exhibit complex behavior. For example, consider flow of supercritical fluid through a heated channel in a gravitational field, a problem well supported by a wealth of published data [9]. For upward flow, the buoyancy production term plays a key role in heat transfer deterioration arising from laminarization. Bae et al. [10] showed through DNS that any increase in wall temperature following heat transfer deterioration is limited by axial profile flattening with accompanying decreased shear stress production. This can lead to a change in sign of buoyant forces, which can dominate shear stress effects in the boundary layer. Bae et al. also found that, in downward flows, the buoyancy
effect increases the turbulence level, which enhances heat transfer. Standard models have been found generally unable of simulating these phenomena [11]. A more sophisticated algebraic flux model approach has been investigated by a number of authors over the past several decades [7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. In general, the simulation of highly buoyant flows, such as those expected with supercritical fluids, is a particularly active field of inquiry [17, 18, 19].

One such study, performed by Kim and Kim[20], is summarized in Fig. 1. This figure shows experimentally measured wall temperatures along the heated section of upward sCO$_2$ flow for three cases with “low” flow rates. The cases are differentiated modestly in terms of system pressure, flow rate, and applied heat flux. As is clear from the figure, the qualitative and quantitative behavior of the heat transfer can be exceedingly sensitive to the flow conditions. Case c featured the lowest flow rate and highest heat flux of the set. Consequently, these data exhibit interesting behavior in the form of a striking temperature peak within the heated section, a phenomenon also observed in the DNS simulations of Bae et al. [10].

Zhang et al. [7] performed compelling analyses of the utility of using AFM for buoyancy production of turbulence. The authors performed experimental measurements of wall temperatures along heated channels of supercritical water. They additionally performed simulations of the experiment with the intention of assessing various turbulence models’ ability to capture physics relevant to supercritical flows.

Consider Fig. 2 as a summary of their results. In this case, the SST model strongly overpredicted wall temperatures. However, the Zhang formulation of AFM (using $k$-$\epsilon$ turbulence and $k_t$-$\epsilon_t$ AFM) quite accurately captured the experimental data qualitatively and quantitatively.

### 2.3 Illinois Rocstar Formulation

The specific model used in this paper uses Shear Stress Transport (SST) for Reynolds stress closure and a $k$-$\omega_t$ AFM formulation for the buoyancy production term. The SST model combines the $k$-$\omega$ and $k$-$\epsilon$ turbulence models such that the models behave like $k$-$\omega$ in the boundary layer and $k$-$\epsilon$ in the interior, free shear flow region [21]. Over recent years, this model has gained traction and is a major model supported by many CFD packages. The SST model implemented in OpenFOAM was based on the description provided by Menter and Esch [22] with updated coefficients [23] and an optional term for rough walls adapted from Hellsten [24].

While the majority of AFM implementations found in the literature use a $k_t$-$\epsilon_t$ formulation, we employed a $k_t$-$\omega_t$ formulation. We hypothesized that the superior near wall behavior of $k$-$\omega$ would translate to improved behavior of the entire four-equation model. Existing $k$-$\epsilon$-$k_t$-$\epsilon_t$ models employ
a number of damping functions to improve near wall model. By using fewer function entities, the applicability of this model is likely to be wider. The $k_t\omega_t$ AFMs were implemented by adding the transport equations of Eq. 1 and Eq. 2 to existing turbulence models:

$$\frac{\partial \rho \omega_t}{\partial t} + \rho \nabla \cdot (\rho \omega_t \nabla T) - \nabla \cdot [\rho (\alpha_{\omega_t} \nu_T + \nu) \nabla \omega_t] = \rho \gamma_t \omega_t \frac{\omega_t}{k_t} - \frac{2}{3} \rho \gamma_t \nabla \cdot \nabla \omega_t - \beta_t \rho \omega_t^2,$$

(1)

$$\frac{\partial \rho k_t}{\partial t} + \rho \nabla \cdot (\rho k_t \nabla T) - \nabla \cdot [\rho (\alpha_{k_t} \nu_T + \nu) \nabla \omega_t] = \rho G_t - \frac{2}{3} \rho \nabla \cdot \nabla \omega_t - C_{t,t} \rho \omega_t k_t,$$

(2)

where $G_t$ is given by:

$$G_t = u_i' T_i' \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_i},$$

(3)

and the turbulence anisotropy tensor is given by

$$a_{ij} = \frac{u_i' u_j'}{k_t} - \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij}.$$  

(4)

The addition of these transport equations allows for the calculation of $\bar{T}^2 = k_t$ which, in turn, allows for the calculation of the $u_j' \bar{T}^2$ correlation as defined by Eq. 5:

$$\bar{u}_j' \bar{T}^2 = -C_{t \tau} \left[ C_{t1} u_i' u_j' \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_i} + (1 - C_{t2}) u_i' T_i' \frac{\partial \sigma_{ji}}{\partial x_i} + (1 - C_{t3}) \beta_{ij} \bar{T}^2 \right] + c_{t1} a_{ij} u_i' \bar{T}^2,$$

(5)

where $\beta$ is given by:

$$\beta = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial T}.$$  

(6)

Once calculated, $u_i' \bar{T}^2$ actually affects the flow through source terms to the $k$ and $\omega$ transport equations. Some published values for the AFM coefficients are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$C_t$</th>
<th>$C_{t1}$</th>
<th>$C_{t2}$</th>
<th>$C_{t3}$</th>
<th>$c'_{t1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenjereš [16]</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang [7]</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Results

In Section 2, the turbulence models used and developed for the efforts described in this paper were described theoretically. In this section, we tailor the models to realistic simulations and compare the results to previously published experimental data. Section 3.1 discusses the approach taken to develop the models, with the produced models presented in Section 3.2. Broadly speaking, the
approach uses experimental data from sCO$_2$ flows to inform model formulations. By developing models from sCO$_2$ data, we seek to create RANS models that are uniquely suited to capture the complex physical phenomena characteristics of supercritical fluids.

### 3.1 Coefficient Optimization

Turbulence models generally contain a number of semi-empirical or empirical coefficients. Common models such as $k$-$\varepsilon$ or $k$-$\omega$ are often considered alongside standard sets of coefficients, which are generated by comparing model results against sets of canonical flow problems. Because this set of problems is finite, the traditionally quoted sets of model coefficients cannot be applied to every possible flow with an expectation of high quality results. Therefore, a key aspect of developing turbulence models specific to sCO$_2$ flows involves calculating optimized sets of model coefficients.

Optimization of coefficients based on experimental data was carried out in Python using the SciPy package. A wrapper was written to allow the "least_squares" function to run OpenFOAM with a set of input parameters. A function within the Python wrapper wrote the input parameters into the "turbulenceProperties" file that OpenFOAM uses to select the turbulence model and to change coefficients.

As discussed by Duffey and Pioro [9], a wide variety of studies on supercritical flow through heated channels have been reported in the literature over the past few decades. The model development effort discussed here was guided by the objective of simulating the experiment performed by Kim and Kim [20], wherein data is presented from a number of experimental cases. This particular study was utilized because the experiments were straightforward to explore and the reported results included complex phenomena. We chose two cases from Kim and Kim’s study (key parameters are listed in Table 2, both for upward flows) to guide the turbulence modeling work. The “lowFlow” case is characterized by a low flow rate such that buoyancy effects are expected to play a substantial role. A more moderate flow rate case is referred to as “modFlow”. Buoyant effects are expected to play a less critical role in this scenario. Considering both cases enables us to analyze multiple physical mechanisms and to chart a path forward for developing RANS models capable of simulating wide ranges of supercritical fluid flows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Inlet Velocity [m/s]</th>
<th>Pressure [MPa]</th>
<th>Heat Flux [kW/m$^2$]</th>
<th>Fluid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lowFlow</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>8.194</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modFlow</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>8.419</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “lowFlow” case (Case c in Fig. 1) exhibits a local temperature peak a short distance downstream of the inlet of the heated section. This feature is a result of “heat transfer deterioration”, a phenomenon discussed by several authors [6, 7]. While many factors contribute to heat transfer deterioration, it is a key factor in buoyant supercritical flows and test cases were specifically chosen to include it.

---

3https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy-0.19.1/reference/generated/scipy.optimize.least_squares.html
3.2 Model Development

A “coarse” mesh was used for a wall-modeled simulation. This mesh features 3 prism layers near the edge as the turbulent boundary layer is primarily modeled. The coarse mesh is 395,600 cells in total with an average of $\approx 7.12$ faces per cell. This total includes 154,800 hexahedra and 240,800 polyhedra.

The models we created are further discussed in Section 3.2.1, in the context of the Kim and Kim data used to generate them. In Section 3.2.2, the models are used to compute the Kim and Kim scenarios that they were not developed from (i.e., a model tuned from “lowFlow” data is used to simulate the “modFlow” case). We refer to this as “testing” rather than validation because the data are part of the same experiment and are subject to common cause faults. Lastly, an additional model referred to as AFMSST.Ilfm.1 was developed using both sets of data.

In the sections to follow, we present results in terms of wall temperature along a heated section of upward axial flow. Note that all experimental data were captured from thermocouple measurements. An axial distance of 0 represents the entrance of the heated section and larger axial distances represent higher elevations.

3.2.1 Model Tuning

Fig. 3 shows the results of model coefficient fitting for sCO$_2$ turbulence models based on the SST model. With the exception of the default SST (SST.d) curve, all plots were calculated with coefficients calculated from fitting the experimental data from Kim and Kim [20]. The specific data used from the “lowFlow” case of Table 2 are also plotted in Fig. 3. The SST.d poorly represents the data, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

The SST model with optimized coefficients (SST.lf) is significantly better at representing the curve. The left edge of the internal temperature peak is particularly well predicted while the right edge is less well represented. The remainder of the curve provides a reasonable, qualitative reproduction of the overall trend of the data. We added the algebraic flux model to the standard SST model and optimized to generate several sets of coefficients.

The AFMSST.Ilf.3 curve shows the best representation of the experimental data: the left edge of the internal temperature peak is well resolved and the local maximum is also quite well reproduced. The right edge of the internal peak is somewhat poorly...
predicted once again. The remainder of the experimental data are well represented, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The AFMSST.lfmf.1 model, tuned from both sets of data, matches the internal temperature peak very well. However, this model shows another peak around the axial distance of 0.5 that is likely an artifact from the “modFlow” case.

All coefficients are given in Table 3, which shows the coefficients for the $k_t$ and $\omega_t$ transport equations and Table 4, which shows the coefficients from the SST portion of the AFM model (i.e., $k$ and $\omega$ transport equations). It should be noted that these results do not provide information about the predictive capability of the models since they are being compared to data to which they are fit. However, this figure does provide information about which models are able to actually resolve the physics of the model. These results suggest that the addition of AFM to the SST model improves our ability to resolve heated, supercritical fluid behaviors.

### Table 3: AFM coefficients for RANS models developed for sCO$_2$ flows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$C_t$</th>
<th>$C_{t1}$</th>
<th>$C_{t2}$</th>
<th>$C_{t3}$</th>
<th>$c_{t1}'$</th>
<th>$\beta_c$</th>
<th>$\beta_t$</th>
<th>$C_{\mu_t}$</th>
<th>$\gamma_t$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{k_t}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{\omega_t}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFMSST.lf.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMSST.mf.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMSST.lfmf.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These coefficients were used in conjunction with the corresponding coefficients in Table 4.

### Table 4: SST Coefficients coefficients for RANS models developed for sCO$_2$ flows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\alpha_{k_1}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{k_2}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{\omega_1}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{\omega_2}$</th>
<th>$\gamma_1$</th>
<th>$\gamma_2$</th>
<th>$\beta_1$</th>
<th>$\beta_2$</th>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$b_1$</th>
<th>$c_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SST.d</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST.lf</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST.mf</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMSST.lf.3</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMSST.mf.2</td>
<td>0.0827</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMSST.lfmf.1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4 shows the results of fitting exercise based on the “modFlow” case from Table 2. Once again, the standard SST model (SST.d) does not well represent the wall temperature along the heated section and exhibits strongly exaggerated features. An optimized SST model (SST.mf) is significantly better at representing the target data. The AFMSST.mf.2 model with AFM transport equations was also tuned to the “modFlow” data and was able to represent the data moderately better than the optimized SST model.

### 3.2.2 Model Testing and Discussion

Fig. 5 shows the results of testing “modFlow” tuned cases on the “lowFlow” scenario. All models line up well with the left edge of local peaking. However, only AFMSST.lfmf.1 is able to capture the lower temperature after the peak. The default SST model (SST.d) and models tuned to only the “modFlow” data fail to represent key physics of the supercritical fluid. Comparing the AFM coefficients (Table 3) shows that the primary difference between AFMSST.mf.2 and AFMSST.lfmf.1 are the $C_{t1}$ and SST transport equation coefficients, highlighting the importance of the temperature gradient and turbulent mixing. The $c_{t1}'$ coefficient is also somewhat different, but SST is a
linear model and the turbulence anisotropy tensor will not contribute. This term was included for completeness and the value produced is likely a fitting artifact.

Fig. 6 shows the results of testing “lowFlow” tuned cases on the “modFlow” scenario. The AFMSST.If.3 model behaves smoothly but significantly underpredicts the wall temperature and misses all qualitative features of the data. The SST.lf model approximately captures the small peak towards the left of the plot but underpredicts the wall temperature throughout the remainder of the heated section. In this case, the best performing model is the SST model with standard coefficients. SST.d qualitatively captures the peak near the inlet of the heated section and captures wall temperature “on average,” in that the calculated temperature remains near the measured temperature.

The results suggest that the models tuned to one data set perform best within a flow rate regime. For example, the AFMSST.If.3 model represents the “lowFlow” data especially well, shown in Fig. 3, but essentially fails to capture the temperature profile of the “modFlow” case, shown in Fig. 6. The same trend was provided for the cases tuned to the “modFlow” data. These observations motivated the creation of the AFMSST.lfmf.1 model, which was informed by both sets of data. While this model does not perfectly match either set of data, it outperforms the standard SST model as well as the other fitted models.

The models created during this work were subject to several iterations of the fitting procedure, as indicated by the number at the end of each model name. Continued iteration on the lfmf model in the form of adjustments made to the starting set of coefficients or fitting subsets of coefficients separately is likely to improve the performance of the model. At this point, the predictive capacity of these models is uncertain. Validation through comparisons to experimental data will be subject to substantial future efforts. However, preliminary testing has shown that a version of the AFMSST.mf.X series of models exhibits predictive properties for supercritical fluids with moderate flow rates. These results will be published in an upcoming paper. The continued development and assessment of these models is the subject of ongoing and future work.

As discussed in detail in Sections 2 and 3, this work uses pre-published experimental data from the scientific literature which primarily consists of forced flow through heated tubes. The additional physics added to the RANS models through the $k_t$-$\omega_t$ transport equations has demonstrated the ability to simulate thermal phenomena of supercritical fluids, such as heat transfer deterioration. At this point, the models have only been tested on upward flow. With downward flow, heat transfer enhancement occurs because the buoyant effects increase turbulent mixing. The applicability of
the presented models to such scenarios is a question of future inquiry. The targeted application of
the work in this paper is power cycles using supercritical working fluids in which we foresee three
primary sub-applications: (1) heat exchangers, (2) turbomachinery, and (3) combustors.

4 Conclusions and Future Work

We designed, implemented, and optimized a framework for the production of RANS turbulence
models based on existing experimental data published in the scientific literature. This framework
produced several novel four-equation $k$-$\omega_t$ turbulence models based on SST RANS models along
with the algebraic flux model for the buoyancy production term. We developed the models iter-
atively by tuning coefficients to published data from experimental programs conducted on heated
tubes with forced sCO$_2$ flow. Optimized models with AFM transport equations were shown better
able to represent complex phenomena such as heat transfer deterioration than standard RANS
models without AFM. The predictive capacity of these models is presently uncertain. Validation
will be the subject of substantial future efforts. However, preliminary testing has shown that a
version of the AFMSST.mf.X series of models exhibits predictive properties for supercritical fluids
with moderate flow rates, to be published in an upcoming paper.

Our ongoing work will focus on expanding the data set to which the models are tuned with hopes
of widening the range of applicability. For example, optimizing coefficient sets with both “lowFlow”
and “modFlow” data is hoped to produce a predictive model with less restriction on system flow
rate. Further, we are interested in developing improved wall treatment formulations for future
models. The treatment used here was based on existing formulations for the standard $k$ and
$\omega$ fields. More advanced wall functions may be constructed to include buoyant effects that can
potentially increase the fidelity of these models [25, 26, 27] with sensitivity to anisotropic turbulence
and streamline curvature added through nonlinear constitutive models. We anticipate that adding
these into supercritical flow models will improve capabilities for highly complex flows such as those
found in combustors or turbomachinery.

The isobaric assumption employed here for material properties is unlikely to hold in combustors.
Therefore, these models will be integrated with more advanced equations of state to broaden the
applications of the model. See Section 4.1.1 for more details. The data we used to optimize model
coefficients were composed only of wall temperatures. In future work, we intend to leverage more
detailed data as it becomes available to optimize specific correlations alongside system-scale
quantities.

4.1 Consideration for Complex Applications

The models we have presented in this paper were targeted toward flows wherein buoyancy was
a key phenomenon. This technology can be directly applied to certain types of heat exchangers
which are well-described by pipe flow. Buoyancy may also play a role in compressors under certain
conditions when large pressure differences lead to large density differences. However, buoyancy
effects will not be dominant in many scenarios relevant to sCO$_2$ power cycles, such as those
characterized by very high flow rates. The work documented in this paper was carried out with the
intention of future extensions to power cycle applications with specific interest in turbomachinery
and combustor simulation.
4.1.1 Equations of State

For the work in this paper, we used an isobaric equation of state. This assumption is likely to break down for many turbomachinery and combustor applications. Therefore, incorporation of more sophisticated equations of state will be a crucial step moving forward. Manikantachari et al. identified the Soave-Redlich-Kwong EOS [28] as applicable to direct-fired sCO$_2$ combus- tor applications [29], while Ghosh compared this EOS to the Peng-Robinson model [30]. Future incorporation of these EOSs in our OpenFOAM sCO$_2$ models will be a straightforward affair.

4.1.2 Combustors

We will leverage the experience gained developing new turbulence models to extend the sCO$_2$ models to combustion environments. This effort will involve coupling advanced turbulence-species concentration correlations interaction with turbulent mixing from sCO$_2$ focused models and incorporation of advanced equations of state (EOS). To illustrate the importance of turbulence model selection for combustor simulation, we simulated methane combustion in a 3D concentric mixer combustor geometry using OpenFOAM with simplified single reaction kinetics: \( CH_4 + 2O_2 \rightarrow CO_2 + 2H_2O \). Fig. 7 shows the temperature fields calculated from two linear models and a quadratic model for the same configuration, including the same combustion model. All three models exhibit qualitatively different results. Turbulence model selection therefore plays a key role, motivating the generation of turbulence models specific to the flow physics characteristic of sCO$_2$ for combustion simulation. Chen et al. [2] tabulate the parameters of 12 authors’ efforts to perform CFD simulations of oxy-fuel combustion with the vast majority of these authors employing linear \( k-\varepsilon \) formulations. Establishing turbulence models appropriate for combustion in sCO$_2$ will therefore add substantial value to the community.

4.1.3 Turbomachinery

Compressors add energy to the fluid causing substantial rise in pressure, which in turn leads to a corresponding increase in density. Turbines remove energy from the fluid leading to lower pressure and density at the outlet. Thus, a proper choice of EOS is critical for both applications. For the anticipated operating conditions, the flow through turbines is expected to be far away from the critical point. At states marginally above the critical point CO$_2$ compressibility is low, however, and can therefore be pumped more economically. Because of this, many direct-fired Brayton cycles are currently being designed such that the compressor inlet conditions are marginally in the supercritical regime [31].
The primary compressor of a recompression sCO$_2$ cycle is expected to be of centrifugal type because of the design’s capacity to handle large fluid density variations [31]. To lay the groundwork for application to complex simulations, we simulated a simple centrifugal pump with OpenFOAM. The pressure gain across the pump is shown in Fig. 8 for a low impeller rotation rate (top) and a high rotation rate (bottom). As is evident from comparing the low and high rotation rates in the figure, the performance of the pump depends substantially on the operating conditions. While turbomachinery models for gases and liquids are quite mature [32], models for supercritical fluids are significantly more nascent. As pumps and turbines are designed for sCO$_2$ power cycles, accompanying computational models must be incorporated as part of the process. Optimization activities generally require many model evaluations and our future work will entail the development of RANS models specific to turbomachinery for sCO$_2$ working fluids.

Schobeiri and Abdelfattah [33] carried out a combined numerical-experimental study to ascertain the effectiveness of RANS models at modeling high pressure turbines. They noted that secondary flows amount to 40-50% of the pressure loss through a high pressure turbine with a small aspect ratio. RANS models for efficiency optimization must be able to resolve this phenomenon. Future work will involve evaluation of more sophisticated constitutive relations for sCO$_2$ turbulence.
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