

April 15, 2019

alf

Dear Reviewers

First of all we would like to thank you for the constructive comments on our article. They were very helpful in improving our paper and hope that you will accept the revised manuscript for publication. Please find below our responses (in black) to your comments (in blue). We added more detail to the numerical methodology and the description of the correction to improve the reproduce-ability of our work. For consistency, we now also use the same grid for all AL simulations independent of the smearing length scale. Please find at the end of this letter a marked-up version showing all changes in the paper.

Yours sincerely

AR. Meyer Forsting, G. Pirrung and N. Ramos-García

## Comments to Reviewer #1

### General Comments

The paper presents an correction to the Actuator Line (AL) model commonly employed for finite volume simulations of wake turbine aerodynamics. An idealized proof is provided showing that a smeared representation of the volume forces of the AL necessarily lead to a smearing of the velocity field, analogous to the effect of making use of a viscous core model in a lifting line (LL) code. The correction is clearly important, and leads to a necessary correction of the AL model, such that the forcing induced by the blade is more realistic, as realistic as a standard LL in fact. The paper is structured quite well, and most results are easy to follow, some discrepancies in the results are seen and the proof is quite idealized, so the general application to a fully 3D, viscous flow certainly cannot be claimed. The model is presented clearly and allows the reader to follow the arguments made generally quite well.

### Specific Comments

Page 1, Line 2: Would there really be any doubt that a smeared force distribution gives rise to a smeared velocity field? It seems quite natural, however until now the issue was the exact shape of the smeared velocity profile and how it correlates with the forcing smearing function. We are now more specific: *"In this paper we proof - theoretically and practically - that smearing the forces of the actuator line in the flow domain forms a viscous core in the bound and shed vorticity of the line."*

Page 2, Line 11: Why should the AL produce the same velocities as LL? The AL simulation will be generally viscous, as opposed to a lifting line, which (even with core model) really is based upon an inviscid external flow. In the very limit the AL should approach the LL. By reducing the smearing (and in-line the grid spacing) the force smearing acts eventually as a Dirac delta function and thus should be equivalent to a LL. Of course this is a purely theoretical exercise as a singular force is neither a correct physical representation nor desirable in a CFD context. This of course ignores the effect of viscosity, however in AL simulations the physical vortex core size is usually not attained. Sentence modified to: *"Ignoring viscous effects, the AL should in principle induce the same velocities as a LL - equivalent to the inviscid solution."*

Page 2, Line 19: Rephrase: "to exhibit the same viscous core behavior". . . Changed accordingly.

Page 3, Line 1: Perhaps more logical to use "tangential" velocity instead of vertical. Changed accordingly.

Page 4, Line 1: The assumption that the spanwise flow is negligible is violated at the tip and the blade root, where one expect the largest gradients, hence this proof is only idealized really. True and any LL representation suffers from this. Yet LL methods consistently yield accurate blade forces for large wind turbines (Qblade, MIRAS etc). We changed the sentence and specified the validity of our assumption: *"Away from root and tip, the flow around a high aspect ratio blade is nearly two-dimensional, as the span-wise flow is negligible."*

Page 4, Line 2: Simply because the BL is not resolved does not necessarily imply that we can ignore viscous effects, especially not for large inflow shear gradients. An unfortunate sentence, we

changed it to: *"Viscous effects are disregarded in light of the large Reynolds numbers encountered."* In the proof we are not claiming that our assumptions are holding in any kind of flow situation. The last sentence of this sections therefore reads: *"This marks the theoretical confirmation of the observations by [], which additionally indicates that a viscous core behaviour with an AL requires inviscid, two-dimensional and locally steady flow conditions."*

Page 4, Line 3: Can the assumption of quasi-steadiness be demonstrated with some sort of simple example, perhaps an order of magnitude argument using the Strouhal number perhaps? Simply this statement seems open to attack, especially for situations with large gradients/ flow deflection. The assumption of quasi-steady flow holds as long as the flow is attached to the airfoil surface and therefore can be modelled with a singular vortex line/sheet leaving the airfoil/blade. As soon as the flow starts to separate the quasi-steady assumption does not hold any longer and the flow dynamics cannot be captured by LL/AL methods. The Strouhal number becomes only relevant once the condition is violated. The text was changed to: *"Furthermore the relationship between body force and flow-field becomes quasi-steady assuming the flow is attached."*

Page 4, Line 16: Here tangential velocity is referred to, as opposed to the previous page with "vertical velocity" Changed to tangential everywhere.

Page 5, Line 9: Which grid size is referred to here? Are uniform grids generally used for this type of situation. Statement is ambiguous. Changed to: *"The smearing length scale is twice the uniform grid size surrounding the rotor as recommended by [] to guarantee numerical stability."*

Page 5, Line 17: Dirichlet and Neumann implies velocity and pressure? Or is there a reason to use the more general terms? We added more detail: *"All variables, except pressure and its correction which necessitate special treatment [], obey Symmetry conditions on the lateral boundaries, whereas at the inflow and outflow faces they follow Dirichlet and Neumann conditions, respectively"*.

Page 6, Line 29: Is there a reason to use a core size equal to the local chord? Otherwise this could appear to be a "tuning" parameter. Is this expected to produce the comparable velocities? The text reads: *"In accordance with Ramos-García et al. (2017), where it was found that a small core radius is necessary to have flow convergence, a **core radius of 0.1% the local chord** at the release station is used."* Usually the core radius employed in free wake vortex methods is of around 10% of the local chord, however in the referred paper we found that such large initial radius affected the model convergence for small azimuthal wake discretizations. With the core radius of 0.1% we got a very good convergence in terms of both blade forces and flow velocities all the way to an azimuthal discretization of the wake of 0.625 degrees (so about 576 time steps per revolution).

Page 9, Line 21: It is stated that upon activation of the smearing correction, vortices are trailed in-between sections. Is this as the model is treated as being steady/converged, and hence should not have trailing vorticity? Trailing vorticity between sections is due to the radial bound vorticity gradient and will thus also appear in steady state. However, we deleted this sentence, as it could be confusing and the correction and its activation was already explained in the previous section. The correction does start with little delay, only to allow the build up of induction at the blade after

inserting the forces in the flow field. At the end of the previous section it reads: *"Furthermore the activation of the correction is delayed until the starting vorticity of the rotor has been transported at least one blade length away from the rotor plane."*

Page 9, Line 25: Equation appears to be erroneous: Suggest removing (2) from bracketed term in radical We corrected the equation.

Page 15, Figure 10: Could the author please provide slightly more explanation as to why the differences at the root and tip are so drastic? Is the legend of Figure 9 the same as Figure 9? We included a discussion and a figure showing the effect the correction on the angle of attack, which causes the drop towards the root and tip. The legend is the same.

Page 16, Table 3: This results appears to be drastic as opposed to the AL. Shall the reader then assume that AL results using Ellipsis 3D thus far have been out by such a factor? Firstly this is not related to EllipSys3D specifically, but instead to the AL method in general. All AL implementations, no matter which CFD solver, show this kind of behaviour. Using highly resolved grids reduces the error, but does not eradicate it (see Jha et al. (2014) for instance). However, in practice the AL method is always used in connection with a tip correction (some kind of modified Glauert/Prandtl implementation), which is not valid for AL methods, as we argue in the introduction. The table is used to demonstrate the equivalence of the force smearing and viscous core radius for AL and LL.

Page 16, Line 1: "for any section along the blade." Is the correct color scheme used for these plots, as it appears that the trend is reversed in the tip region. The color scheme is the same as in the previous plots. Light blue should be compared to dark blue and light red with dark red. We modified the sentence to highlight that we observe the same variation with azimuthal position: *"Whilst the agreement is best towards the blade tip, the force variation with azimuthal position is similar between AL and LL simulations across all sections."* The next sentence clearly mentions that the overall level is not the same, however.

Page 16, Line 3: This doesn't appear to be true for the downwind section of the yawed turbine. There seems to be a misunderstanding of the figure. We averaged forces over three parts of the blade and then show their variation with azimuthal position. We made this clearer in the text and the caption. The normal forces are generally lower over the inner sections, which points towards higher induction in the AL results. The reason is unclear, but irrelevant in the context of our study.

Page 17, Line 4: Is this statement made as the "return" to  $F_{inf}$  results appears to set in quicker? The statement is related to the previous sentence that identifies a kink in the response, when 99% of the pitch step has been executed. There is a lift term proportional to the pitch rate as indicated by 2D unsteady airfoil theory, so while pitching there is increased lift, which stops with the end of the step.

Page 17, Line 6: If the physical effect of smearing is inspected, does one necessarily expect a large impact on dynamic response? Not at all, however for completeness and to test the numerical stability of our correction we included these pitch step cases as well. We now mention this in the text.

Page 19, Figure 13: Check color scale again. Results appear to not coincide with text (or I have interpreted them wrong). We adapted the colours to match all previous plots. In these plots its important to focus on the change from AL to AL with correction and LL with core to LL wihtout core. It is only the relatively impact of the correction/core we are focusing on in this case.

Page 19, Line 5: Restatement of reviewers earlier statement regarding inviscid approach of LL. As mentioned earlier in the very limit the AL should approach the LL.

Page 20, Line 1: indendepent of Changed.

**All other Editorial Comments have been reviewed and incorporated as much as possible.**

## Comments to Reviewer #2

### General Comments

The paper deals with a correction for the actuator line method. This subject is very interesting, since many codes are using actuator line method for multiscale modelling, in particular in the wind energy field. The paper is written not in a straight forward organization, that does not allow to easily follow the discussion. We believe - supported also by the comments of the other reviewer - that the organisation of our paper is appropriate for the problem at hand. We are surprised to find no specific comments on this matter that detail in which way the organisation is lacking clarity. However, we have added more detail in the numerical methodology and the presentation of our correction, which could perhaps help follow our arguments.

### Specific Comments

page 5 line 12: there is no figure indicating the domain for the rotor simulation nor the wind test case and there is no indication of the position of the rotor/wing in the domain. We chose not to include a figure of the computational domain, due to simplicity of the numerical setup. Instead we described in words the numerical domain from lines 12 to 19 on page 5 and also refer to other papers in which we used the same setup. We believe that a figure showing the grid convergence is of greater value to the reader, nevertheless we have added further detail to the numerical method.

page 5 line 15: maybe I'm missing it, but  $N_s$  is not specified. We now specify it.

page 5 line 22: the sensitivity study for AL should be reported as well since it is interesting as well. The aim of the paper is not to find the optimal discretisation of the AL, but to show the equivalence between the AL and LL, when the same discretisation is used. We will focus in future publications on this topic, however usually 20 points per blade yield sufficiently accurate results for wind farm simulations.

table 3: do you compare with state of the art calculation of NREL5MW actuator line computations? Our EllipSys3D AL implementation is state-of-the-art. The aim of this table is to show the equivalence between the AL without correction and the LL with a viscous core and the AL with the correction and the LL. All existing corrections for the AL rely on tuning some parameters or necessitate highly resolved grids, whereas our correction is purely based on aerodynamic theory. Obtaining a LL solution with an AL is desirable, as the LL method has proven to give accurate results for a large variety of wind turbines.

### Additional changes

- Doubled the grid resolution to increase the confidence in our results and use the same grid for both length scales to eliminate the possibility of grid effects influencing the results.
- Changed Fig. 2 to display grid convergence in terms of rotor thrust, as now more grid sizes and both length scales are shown.
- Removed  $x_{\perp}$  in Fig. 3
- Fixed Eq. 21, as the definition of  $x_{\perp}$  was incomplete
- Added algorithm overview at the end of Sect. 4.
- Fig. 6, removed some lines to improve readability.

## **Bibliography**

Jha, P. K., Churchfield, M. J., Moriarty, P. J., and Schmitz, S.: Guidelines for Volume Force Distributions Within Actuator Line Modeling of Wind Turbines on Large-Eddy Simulation-Type Grids, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*, 136, 031 003, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4026252>, URL <http://solarenergyengineering.asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/article.aspx?doi=10.1115/1.4026252>, 2014.



# A vortex-based tip/smearing correction for the actuator line

Alexander Raul Meyer Forsting<sup>1</sup>, Georg Raimund Pirrung<sup>1</sup>, and Néstor Ramos-García<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>DTU Wind Energy, Technical University of Denmark, Frederiksborgvej 399, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark

**Correspondence:** Alexander R Meyer Forsting (alrf@dtu.dk)

**Abstract.** The actuator line was intended as a lifting line technique for CFD applications. In this paper we ~~proof~~-prove - theoretically and practically - that smearing the forces of the actuator line in the flow domain ~~necessarily leads to smeared velocity fields~~forms a viscous core in the bound and shed vorticity of the line. By combining a near-wake representation of the trailed vorticity with a viscous vortex core model, the missing induction from the smeared velocity is recovered. This novel dynamic smearing correction is verified for basic wing test cases and rotor simulations of a multi-MW turbine. The latter cover the entire operational wind speed range as well as yaw, strong turbulence and pitch step cases. The correction is validated with lifting line simulations with and without viscous core, that are representative of an actuator line without and with smearing correction, respectively. The dynamic smearing correction makes the actuator line effectively act as a lifting line, as it was originally intended.

10 *Copyright statement.* ©Author(s) 2018.

## 1 Introduction

The actuator line (AL) technique developed by Sørensen and Shen (2002) is a lifting-line (LL) representation of the wind turbine rotor suitable for computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations. It captures transient physical features like shed and trailed vorticity (including root/tip vortices), without the computational cost associated with resolving the full rotor geometry. The AL model thus enables Large-eddy simulations (LES) of large wind farms in realistic, turbulent atmospheric boundary layers (Vollmer et al., 2017).

However, different to LL vortex formulations the blade forces are dispersed in the flow domain - most commonly in form of a Gaussian projection - to avoid numerical ~~instability~~instabilities. A length scale - also referred to as smearing ~~factor~~coefficient - controls this force redistribution, whose lower limit is linked to the grid size through numerical stability requirements (Trolborg et al., 2009). Mikkelsen (2003) observed a large sensitivity of the blade velocities to this length scale, which consequently also propagated to the blade forces. Especially in regions along the blade exhibiting stark load changes, as around the root and tip, forces are substantially over-predicted. ~~Meaning~~, meaning this effect is exacerbated by non-tapered and low aspect ratio blades. As actuator disc formulations suffer from similar issues towards the blade tip, their Glauert (1935) type tip corrections are also frequently applied to ALs (Shen et al., 2005). Yet, these correct discs for missing discrete blades and thus should be

unnecessary - strictly even invalid - for ALs. Shives and Crawford (2013) and Jha et al. (2014) achieved a reduction in the force over-prediction by varying the originally fixed smearing factor with respect to the blade chord. Yet, their methods cannot decouple the blade forces from the smearing length scale: a smeared force distribution in the flow domain necessarily leads to lower induction at the blade - increasing lift and drag - compared to an actual LL with a concentrated, spatially singular force.

## 5 1.1 The vortex smearing hypothesis

Shives and Crawford (2013) noticed the similarity between the velocities induced across an actuator line and those predicted by a viscous vortex core model. These models include the limiting effect of viscous shear forces on the induced velocities around vortex cores. A similar comparison of the swirl velocities about an infinite vortex line are shown in Fig. 1 - here with a Lamb-Oseen vortex core model (Lamb, 1932; Oseen, 1911). Without viscosity (inviscid) the velocities approach infinity towards the vortex centre. The startling agreement between the Lamb-Oseen and AL velocities was first demonstrated by Dag et al. (2017). The Gaussian body force smearing in the AL technique thus produces similar swirl velocities as a viscous vortex. ~~As Ignoring viscous effects,~~ the AL should in principle induce the same velocities as a LL - equivalent to the inviscid solution - ~~the~~. ~~The~~ missing induced velocity in the AL model (marked area in Fig. 1) can be approximated following Dag et al. (2017) by:

$$15 \quad \Delta v_{\theta}(r) = \overbrace{\frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r}}^{\text{inviscid}} - \overbrace{\frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r} [1 - \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2)]}^{\text{viscous core}} = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r} \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2) \quad (1)$$


Here  $\Gamma$  represents the vortex line's circulation,  $r$  is the distance from the vortex core and  $\epsilon$  the length scale used in the force smearing. This formulation can be split into an inviscid and viscous/smearing contribution:

$$\Delta v_{\theta}(r) = \overbrace{v_{\theta}(r)}^{\text{inviscid}} \underbrace{f_{\epsilon}(r_{\epsilon})}_{\text{smearing}} \quad \text{with} \quad v_{\theta}(r) = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r}, \quad f_{\epsilon}(r_{\epsilon}) = \exp(-r_{\epsilon}^2), \quad r_{\epsilon} = \frac{r}{\epsilon} \quad (2)$$

If this viscous behaviour of the force smearing in AL simulations would be limited to the bound vortex representing the blade, then it would not influence the blade forces as long as the blade is straight. Yet Dag et al. (2017) argued the trailing vortices (in the wake) to exhibit the same viscous core, as they originate from the bound vortex. Hence, the wake of an AL is inducing lower velocities at the blade than in case of a LL. The missing velocity can be estimated from the viscous core equivalence and thus correct the velocities at the blade. This mostly impacts blade forces by changing the angle-of-attack at the blade sections.

## 1.2 Contributions of this paper

25 Dag et al. (2017) corrected AL simulations of a rectangular wing and two rotors with different aspect ratios by recuperating the missing induced velocity introduced by the viscous core. For all their simulations they were able to show the beneficial effect of the correction on the blade load distribution - represented by more physical behaviour, especially towards the tip and root. However, their implementation of the correction did not fully couple the flow-field with the blade forces and the induction correction.



**Figure 1.** Distribution of the vertical-tangential velocity component in a plane orthogonal to an infinite vortex line (along  $x$ ) obtained from either an inviscid or viscous (Lamb-Oseen) theoretical vortex and an actuator line CFD simulation.

The major contributions of this paper are:

- The development of an iterative tuning-free, dynamic and numerically stable smearing-correction robust smearing correction, that is fully coupled to the AL model.
- A theoretical proof of the force smearing - vortex core equivalence.
- 5 - Proof of the vortex core inheritance in trailed vorticity.
- The confirmation of the missing velocity assumption by comparing LL simulations with/without viscous core and AL results with/without correction.

The test cases include constantly and elliptically loaded wings as well as rotor simulations of a multi-MW turbine covering the entire operational wind speed range. As the AL model is especially attractive for wind farm simulations, the focus here is on coarsely resolved ALs. The correct dynamic behaviour of the new correction is verified through yawed inflow and pitch step simulations.

## 2 Proof of force smearing - vortex core equivalence

The equivalence between the velocity field induced by an AL and a viscous vortex can be derived directly from the incompressible Navier-Stokes (N-S) equations. This proof follows the approach by Forsythe et al. (2015) that successfully connected an

AL's vorticity field to its force projection. Starting by taking the curl of the incompressible momentum equation, the vorticity transport equation is obtained ( $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}$ )

$$\underbrace{\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\omega}}{\partial t}}_{=0 \text{ steady}} + (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \boldsymbol{\omega} = \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{\omega} \nabla) \mathbf{u}}_{=0 \text{ 2D}} + \underbrace{\nu \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\omega}}_{=0 \text{ inviscid}} + \nabla \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\rho} \quad (3)$$

Here  $\nu$  is the viscosity,  $\rho$  density and  $\mathbf{f}$  the body forces from the AL. ~~The~~ Away from root and tip, the flow around a high aspect ratio blade is nearly two-dimensional, as the span-wise flow is negligible. ~~Without modelling the blade boundary layer also viscous effects can be disregarded~~ Viscous effects are disregarded in light of the large Reynolds numbers encountered. Furthermore the relationship between body force and flow-field is becomes quasi-steady, ~~as they balance faster than the flow evolves~~ assuming the flow is attached. Cancelling the respective terms and noting that in 2D flow ( $y - z$  plane)  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \omega_x \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x$  and  $\nabla = (0, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z})$ :

$$10 \quad (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \omega_x \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x = \nabla \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\rho} \quad (4)$$

Assuming the drag to be negligible, the force - in the form of lift - exerted by the AL on the flow in terms of its circulation  $\Gamma$  becomes

$$\mathbf{f} = -\mathbf{f}_{\text{aero}} g(r) \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{aero}} = L = \rho \mathbf{u} \times \Gamma \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \quad g(r) = \frac{1}{\pi \epsilon^2} \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2) \quad (6)$$

15 Here  $g$  represents a 2-D Gaussian force projection with  $r$  indicating the distance from the AL. Inserting these expression into Eq. (4) and exploiting standard matrix transformation and mass conservation<sup>1</sup>

$$(\mathbf{u} \nabla) \omega_x \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x = \nabla (\Gamma g \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \times \mathbf{u}) = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \Gamma g \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \quad (7)$$

$$(\mathbf{u} \nabla) \omega_x = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \Gamma g \quad (8)$$

20 Due to mass conservation the  $\mathbf{u} \nabla$  term can be inverted thus giving a direct relationship between the force projection and vorticity:

$$\omega_x = \Gamma g = \frac{\Gamma}{\pi \epsilon^2} \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2) \quad (9)$$

As the body force is axially symmetric, the vorticity only induces tangential velocities

$$\omega_x(r) = \frac{1}{r} \left( \frac{\partial r u_\theta}{\partial r} - \underbrace{\frac{\partial u_r}{\partial \theta}}_{=0 \text{ axisymmetry}} \right) \Rightarrow u_\theta = \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r r \omega_x(r) dr \quad (10)$$

Inserting Eq. (9) and integrating gives the swirl velocity induced by a smeared body force

$$25 \quad u_\theta = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r} [1 - \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2)] \quad (11)$$

<sup>1</sup> $\nabla \times (\hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \times \mathbf{u}) = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x - (\hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \nabla) \mathbf{u} + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x (\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{u} (\nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x) = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x + 0 + 0 + 0$

This expression equals that of the Lamb-Oseen vortex, only with the viscous core radius replaced by the smearing coefficient<sup>2</sup>. This marks the theoretical confirmation of the observations by Dag et al. (2017), which additionally indicates that a viscous core behaviour with an AL requires inviscid, two-dimensional and locally steady flow conditions.

### 3 Numerical methodology

#### 5 3.1 Actuator-line simulations

The discretised incompressible Navier-Stokes equations are solved with DTU's CFD code EllipSys3D (Sørensen, 1995; Michelsen, 1994a, b). ~~Details on the~~ The flow is iteratively solved at each time instant by the SIMPLE algorithm (Patanker and Spalding, 1975). Depending on the turbulence model either the third-order accurate QUICK (Leonard, 1979) scheme (RANS) or a fourth-order CDS scheme (LES) discretises the convective terms. As the flow variables are located at the cell centres, a modified Rhie and Chow (Réthoré and Sørensen, 2012) algorithm avoids pressure-velocity decoupling. Further details on the numerical techniques are given in Meyer Forsting et al. (2017). For all comparisons with the LL code, the RANS equations are solved using the  $k$ - $\omega$  shear-stress transport turbulence closure of Menter (1993). Only the turbulent inflow cases in Sect. 5.2.4 are computed with the DES technique of Strelets (2001).

The AL model was implemented by Mikkelsen (2003) in EllipSys3D. We employ a version utilising three-dimensional Gaussian force projection, which follows the original formulation of Sørensen and Shen (2002). ~~The smearing length scale is twice the grid size as recommended by Troldborg et al. (2009) to guarantee numerical stability. To ensure the blade tip to remain inside a single cell during one time step  $\Delta t < \Delta x / (\Omega R)$ .~~ As the AL model is especially attractive for wind farm simulations, the focus here is on coarsely resolved ALs, with either 9 or 19 sections ( $N_s$ ) along the blade. They are uniformly spaced and discretise the blade starting from the root at 1.5 m to the tip at 63 m. The smearing length scale is connected to the number of sections, such that  $\epsilon = 2R / (N_s + 1)$  - with mesh spacing  $\Delta x$ , rotor radius  $R$  and rotational speed  $\Omega$ . Without rotation the term  $\Omega R$  is replaced by the advection speed of the wake, defining the rotor radius - which ensures the forces in the domain to change smoothly between sections (Nathan, 2018). Tower and nacelle are not modelled.

The numerical domain for the rotor simulations is discretised in a verified, standard manner (Meyer Forsting et al., 2017; Troldborg et al., 2009). It consists of a box with  $25R$  side length that contains an inner box with a uniformly spaced refined mesh of  $3.2R$  edge length at its centre surrounding the rotor. ~~The mesh spacing in this region is connected to the number of blade sections of the AL -  $\Delta x = R / (N_s + 1)$~~  To capture the velocity gradients around the AL correctly the mesh spacing is  $\Delta x = R / 40$ . This is twice the recommended minimum (Troldborg et al., 2009), yet it delivers more accurate angles-of-attack estimates at the section centres (Shives and Crawford, 2013). In total  $64 (N_s = 9)$  and  $128 (N_s = 19)$  ~~256~~ cells discretise the flow domain along each dimension, resulting in  $2.5 \times 10^5$  and  $2.1 \times 10^6$   ~~$16.8 \times 10^6$~~  degrees of freedom. ~~The boundaries off the main flow direction are of the Symmetry type, whereas~~ All variables, except pressure and its correction, which necessitate special treatment (Sørensen, 1995), obey symmetry conditions on the lateral boundaries, whereas at the inflow and outflow


<sup>2</sup>Note that in the  $x$ - $y$  plane the circulation would be  $-\Gamma$

faces obey-they follow Dirichlet and Neumann conditions, respectively. The wing test cases follow the same approach only with  $N_s = 32$  and an inner box edge length of  $3b$ , where  $b$  is the wing's half-span. This results in 80 cells along each dimension and  $5.1 \times 10^5$  degrees of freedom. To ensure the blade tip to remain inside a single cell during one time step  $\Delta t < \Delta x / (\Omega R)$  - with mesh spacing  $\Delta x$  and rotational speed  $\Omega$ . Without rotation the term  $\Omega R$  is replaced by the advection speed of the wake.

5 The kinematic viscosity and air density are kept constant at  $1.789 \times 10^{-5}$  kg/m/s and  $1.225$  kg/m<sup>3</sup>, respectively. Simulations are stopped when the thrust residual reaches  $10^{-5}$ .

The sensitivity of the blade-force-distribution-rotor thrust to the domain size, time step and grid size is explored in Fig. 2. The length of the domain edges is doubled to  $50R$ , time-step-and-grid-size-are-the time step is halved with respect to a setup obeying the method described above. As reference acts a simulation of the NREL 5MW at  $14.8$  ms<sup>-1</sup> with  $N_s = 9$  and  $\epsilon = 0.2R$  either

10 40 or 60 grid cells along the rotor depending on the smearing length scale. With  $\epsilon = R/10$  and  $R/20$ , this represents four and three times the recommended resolution, respectively (Troldborg et al., 2009). Though non-zero, the sensitivity of the results is acceptable in code comparison and should impact AL simulations with and without correction similarly.



**Figure 2.** Change in normal and tangential forces -- normalised by Thrust sensitivity of the respective blade average -- on the NREL 5MW blades-AL simulations at  $14.8$  ms<sup>-1</sup> wind speed when with grid size, doubling the domain size, and halving the time step or grid size in the AL simulations at two smearing length scales. ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $N_s = \{9, 19\}$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ ,  $\bar{F}_n = 2.60 \times 10^3$ ,  $\bar{F}_t = 7.38 \times 10^2$   $T_{ref} = \{4.20, 4.06\} \times 10^5$  N)

### 3.2 Free-wake lifting-line rotor simulations

The in-house solver MIRAS has been employed to perform the free-wake lifting-line simulations. MIRAS is a multi-fidelity computational vortex model, which is mainly used for predicting the aerodynamic behaviour of wind turbines and its wakes. It has been developed at DTU during the last decade and it is been extensively validated for small to large size wind turbine rotors by Ramos-García et al. (2017, 2014a, b).

The free-wake vortex method essentially models the wake of a wind turbine by a bundle of infinitely thin vortex filaments. To avoid numerical singularities, it is required to introduce a viscous core, which represents a more physical distribution of the velocities induced by each vortex filament, desingularizing the Biot-Savart law near the center of the filament. The velocity

20

induced by each one of the elements is obtained directly by evaluating the Biot-Savart law, and by summing the velocity induced by all filaments, the total wake induction is obtained.

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N K_{ij} \frac{\gamma_j \mathbf{t}_j \times \mathbf{r}_{ij}}{4\pi r_{ij}^3} \quad \text{where} \quad K_{ij} = \frac{r_{ij}^2}{(\varepsilon_j^{2z} + r_{ij}^{2z})^{1/z}} \quad (12)$$

where  $N$  is total number of filaments that form the wake,  $\mathbf{r}_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_j$  is the distance vector from the vortex element  $\mathbf{y}_j$  to the evaluation point  $\mathbf{x}_i$ .  $\gamma_j$  is the circulation of the filament,  $\mathbf{t}_j$  is the unit orientation vector of the  $j$ -th filament and  $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_{ij}|$ .  $\varepsilon_j$  is the vortex core radius of the filament and  $z$  defines the cut-off velocity profile where the Lamb-Oseen model (Lamb, 1932; Oseen, 1911),  $z = 2$ , has been employed.

A viscous core model is applied to emulate the effect of viscosity by changing the vortex core radius as a function of time Leishman et al. (2002)

$$\varepsilon_i(t) = \sqrt{4\alpha_v \delta_v \nu t_i} + \varepsilon_0 \quad (13)$$

Here  $\alpha_v$  is a constant set to 1.25643 (Ananthan and Leishman, 2004),  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity and  $t_i$  is the time elapsed since the generation of the  $i$ -th filament. In order to represent the diffusive time scales, the viscous core radius is set to change with the vortex age by adding a turbulence eddy viscosity,  $\delta_v$ , first proposed by Squire (1965), and in this work set to  $10^{-3}$ . To avoid the singular behaviour of newly released vortex elements, an initial core radius,  $\varepsilon_0$ , is introduced. In accordance with Ramos-García et al. (2017), where it was found ~~out~~ that a small core radius is necessary to have flow convergence, a core radius of 0.1% the local chord at the release station is used.


For the sake of the present study, two different approaches to compute the ~~angle-of-attack~~ angle-of-attack have been followed.

- Inviscid (LL), where the non-regularized Biot-Savart law is used to compute the induction from the wake filaments at the quarter-chord location. This is the standard method used in a lifting line solvers.
- Viscous (LL+core), where the regularized Biot-Savart law is used to compute the induction at the quarter-chord location. A viscous core with radius equal to the actuator line smearing factor is used for a direct comparison of the methods.

This ~~makes possible~~ enables a double validation of the models. On one hand the corrected actuator line simulations can be validated against the LL calculations, and on the other hand the raw actuator line model, without tip correction, can be compared against the LL+core simulations which include the smearing effect in the free-wake model.

## 25 4 Tip/Smearing correction for the actuator line

Applying the velocity correction methodology introduced in Sect. 1.1 in three-dimensional space yields a velocity correction vector. The viscous core behaviour of the AL bound vorticity - proven in Sect. 2 to originate from the force smearing - is inherited by the trailing vortices, as will be demonstrated in Sect. 5.1.1. Therefore the induction from the trailed ~~vorticity~~ vorticity at the blade is lower than without force smearing. Fig. 3 shows the path of trailed vorticity shed from in-between two



**Figure 3.** Trailed vorticity path. The blade rotates in the  $x$ - $y$  plane and  $z$  points downstream. The vortex element  $\delta l$  with strength  $\Gamma_s - \Gamma_{s+1}$  is shed at  $r$  and transported downstream by the local velocity. The distance from the shedding location  $r$  to a point  $C$  along the blade is  $h$  ( $h = r - C_x$ ), where  $\delta l$  induces tangential and axial velocities.

sections of a blade with a strength of  $\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma_s - \Gamma_{s+1}$  with

$$\Gamma_s = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{v_s^2 + w_s^2} C_l(\alpha) c \phi = -\tan^{-1} w_s / v_s \quad (14)$$

Here  $s$  defines the blade section index,  $l$  is the vortex following coordinate,  $c$  the section chord and  $\alpha$  the angle-of-attack, which depends on the vortex inflow angle / helix pitch  $\phi$  inflow angle in combination with blade pitch and twist at the section. The

5 missing induction from this single trailed vortex at a point  $C$  is obtained by integrating along the vortex line

$$\mathbf{u}^* = \int_0^\infty f_\epsilon \delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}} dl \quad (15)$$

Here  $\delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  is the velocity induced by an infinitesimal element  $\delta l$  of the vortex line at point  $C$ , which is given by the Biot-Savart law:

$$\delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\Delta\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{\delta \mathbf{l} \times \mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|^3} \quad (16)$$

10 where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the vector pointing from the element towards  $C$ . The smearing factor for this vortex element becomes

$$f_\epsilon = \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_\perp)^2}{\epsilon^2}\right) \quad (17)$$

The viscous core only acts in the plane orthogonal to the vortex element  $\delta l$ , hence  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_\perp$  projects  $\mathbf{x}$  onto this plane. Using the distance here instead This is different to using the distance,  $|\mathbf{x}|$ , as Dag et al. (2017) proposed, which violates the two-dimensional nature of the viscous core.



The total missing induction at a blade section  $s$  is obtained by summing the contribution from all trailed vortices. The number of trailed vortices  $N_v$  is directly related to the number of blade sections  $N_v = N_s + 1$ . Discretising the vortices in time, the missing induction at a certain blade section becomes

$$\mathbf{u}_s^* = \sum_v^{N_v} \sum_n^{N_t} f_{s,v}^n \Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{s,v}^n \quad (18)$$

- 5 Here  $v$  denotes the trailed vortex index,  $n$  the time index and  $N_t$  the number of time steps. Note that  $n = 1$  is the most recently shed vortex element. As a tip/smearing correction should remain computationally inexpensive, numerically solving the Biot-Savart law in Eq. 16 to obtain  $\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{s,v}^n$  is unfeasible. This would necessitate  $N_t N_v N_s$  or  $N_t (N_s + 1) N_s$  evaluations. An accurate, yet fast alternative to solving the Biot-Savart law directly is the near-wake model (NWM) for trailed vorticity by Pirrung et al. (2016, 2017b), which also includes downwind convection. It performs well for dynamic flow cases and exhibits great numerical
- 10 stability as it was originally developed to enhance the aerodynamic accuracy of BEM models. Its formulation is based on a lifting line representation of the blade's trailed vorticity as [depicted](#) in Fig. 3 and approximates the induced velocities from a single trailed vortex line by two indicial functions. The velocity induced by a vortex element is given in the NWM as

$$\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{s,v}^n = (X_{s,v}^n + Y_{s,v}^n) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sin(\phi^n) \\ -\cos(\phi^n) \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

- with  $\phi$  representing the helix angle ~~and the indicial functions taking the form of the vorticity shed in the CFD domain~~ (see Fig. [3](#)). [The indicial functions take the form](#)

$$\{X_{s,v}^n, Y_{s,v}^n\} = a_{\{X,Y\}} \frac{r_v}{4\pi h_s |h_s|} \Delta \Gamma_v^n \phi_{s,v}^{*n} \left[ 1 - \exp\left(-b_{\{X,Y\}} \frac{\Delta \beta^{*n}}{\phi_{s,v}^{*n}}\right) \right] \exp\left(-b_{\{X,Y\}} \sum_i^{n-1} \frac{\Delta \beta^{*i}}{\phi_{s,v}^{*i}}\right) \quad (20)$$

- The definitions of  $a_{\{X,Y\}}$ ,  $b_{\{X,Y\}}$ ,  $\beta^*$  and  $\phi^*$  are those of Pirrung et al. (2016, 2017b). The indicial functions allow time-advancing the solution by a mere multiplication, considerably reducing the model evaluations to  $N_v N_s + N_v$ . In the original formulation this removes the need for bookkeeping, however as the smearing factor also changes with the position of the vortex
- 20 element all previously shed elements are advanced individually in this specific implementation. This is only an experimental feature for testing the smearing correction and should be simple to remove in a future, [more](#) practical implementation.

Following the lifting line formulation of the NWM shown in Fig. 3 ([refer to Appendix A for a detailed mathematical description](#)) the perpendicular distance from the vortex element to C becomes

$$\underline{\mathbf{x}}_{\perp} \mathbf{x}_{\perp} = \frac{\delta l}{|\delta \mathbf{l}|} \times \mathbf{x} = \underline{\underline{r}} \underline{\underline{1 - (1 - h/r) \cos(\beta)}} \begin{pmatrix} \tan \phi (\beta \cos \beta - \sin \beta) \\ -\tan \phi (-1 + h/r + \cos \beta + \beta \sin \beta) \\ [-1 + (1 - h/r) \cos \beta] \end{pmatrix} \quad (21)$$

- 25 Thus the smearing factor becomes

$$f_{s,v}^n = \exp\left(-\frac{r_v^2 [1 - (1 - h_s/r_v) \cos(\beta^n)]^2 |\underline{\mathbf{x}}_{\perp}(r_v, \beta^n, h_s, \phi^n)|}{\epsilon^2} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right) \quad (22)$$

When discretising in time,  $\beta^n$  is taken to be at the mid-point of the vortex element.

Finally the missing velocities computed in Eq. 18 correct the original velocities from the CFD simulations

$$\mathbf{u}_s = \mathbf{u}_s^{\text{CFD}} + \mathbf{u}_s^* \quad (23)$$

The correction therefore influences the blade forces through the angle-of-attack and the velocity magnitude, yet its the former

5 that dominates. It also changes the circulation at each blade section through Eq. 14 and thus the shed vorticity and its induction. Hence determining the correction velocity is an iterative procedure. The correction algorithm is executed after flow-field is solved and takes the following form:

1. Interpolate the velocity vector  $\mathbf{u}^{\text{CFD}}$  at the section centres from the CFD flow-field.
2. Compute the helix angles  $\phi$ , where  $\phi_v = -\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{w_{v-1}^{\text{CFD}} + w_v^{\text{CFD}}}{v_{v-1}^{\text{CFD}} + v_v^{\text{CFD}}}\right)$  and  $\phi_{\{1, N_s\}} = -\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{w_{\{1, N_s\}}^{\text{CFD}}}{v_{\{1, N_s\}}^{\text{CFD}}}\right)$ .
- 10 3. Combine the CFD velocities with the respective correction from the previous time step  $n-1$ , such that  $\mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_n^{\text{CFD}} + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*$ .
4. Compute the smearing factor  $f_c$  for all time steps, sections and elements (Eq. 22).
5. Determine the angle-of-attack and velocity magnitude from  $\mathbf{u}_n$  to determine  $\Gamma_s$  (Eq. 14).<sup>3</sup>
6. Compute the velocities from the newly released vortex element  $\Delta\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n$  (Eq. 19).
- 15 7. At the first iteration of each time step, advance the previous elements in time.
8. Compute the velocity correction at the current time step  $\mathbf{u}_n^*$  (Eq. 18).
9. Update the velocity at the sections with some form of relaxation  $\mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_n^{\text{CFD}} + \mathbf{u}_n^*$ .
10. Repeat steps 5.-9. until convergence is reached.


We use the technique by Pirrung et al. (2017a) established for the NWM to accelerate and ensure its convergence. Furthermore  
 20 the activation of the correction is delayed until the starting vorticity of the rotor has been transported at least one blade length away from the rotor plane. This enhances its numerical stability, as induction has already build up at the blade-blades by its time of activation.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Basic wing test cases

25 To verify the smearing hypothesis presented (Sect. 1.1) and the novel smearing correction (Sect. 4) two basic wing flow cases with known theoretical solutions are modelled using CFD. Either a rectangular or elliptic wing is represented by an AL as

<sup>3</sup>Strictly, the influence of the shed vorticity on the velocity at the AL should be removed as remarked by Martínez-Tossas and Meneveau (2019), however its influence is negligible.



**Figure 4.** Definition of the wing test cases with either a rectangular or elliptic planform. Vortices are trailed in-between sections and the actuator line forces are computed and exerted at the sections' centres.

**Table 1.** Input parameters common to both rectangular and elliptic wing simulations.

$w_\infty$ [ms <sup>-1</sup> ]	$2b$ [m]	$r_{v=1}$ [m]	$\Omega$ [rads <sup>-1</sup> ]
10	10	0.5	0

shown in Fig. 4, where the coordinate system is unchanged from the definition in Fig. 3. The AL is discretised in uniformly spaced sections in-line with the underlying flow grid and the smearing parameter is twice the section width, which ensures a continuous force distribution along the wing. ~~Is the smearing correction activated, vortices are trailed in-between sections.~~ The common simulation parameters are given in Table 1. Unless specifically stated the sectional lift coefficient  $C_l = 1$  and drag is zero along the wing, independent of the angle-of-attack. The chord of the rectangular wing is set to 1m and the elliptical chord distribution is

$$c(x) = c_0 \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{2(x - r_{v=1})}{b}\right)^2} \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{x - (b + r_{v=1})}{b}\right)^2} \quad (24)$$


with the root chord  $c_0 = 4\text{m}$ . All simulations are performed within the same computational domain, defined in Sect. 3.1.

The theoretical predictions of the the velocity field are achieved by representing the vortex system of Fig. 4 with vortex filaments. The velocity induced by a filament with a viscous vortex core at an arbitrary point C is

$$\mathbf{u} = f_\epsilon(x_\perp) \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{(x_1 + x_2)(\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2)}{x_1 x_2 + \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_2} \quad (25)$$

$$x_\perp = \frac{|\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2|}{|x_2 - x_1|} \quad \text{and} \quad x_i = |\mathbf{x}_i| \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_1$  points from the start of the filament to C and  $\mathbf{x}_2$  from its end. For a definition of  $f_\epsilon(x_\perp)$  refer to Eq. 17; without viscous core  $f_\epsilon(x_\perp) = 1$ . The contribution from different segments is summed to give the overall velocity field. As the wing is lightly loaded we assume all vortex segments to remain in the  $x$ - $z$  plane.



**Figure 5.** Velocities induced perpendicular to a rectangular wing predicted by an actuator line (AL) without correction and by vortex segments with a viscous core (Vortex) with different smearing parameters. Velocities are shown along lines cutting the bound and trailed vortices at right angles and  $y = 0$ . Only half of the horseshoe vortex is depicted as  $x' = x - (b + r_{v=1})$ .


### 5.1.1 Trailed vorticity smearing

The vortex smearing hypothesis assumes the trailed vorticity inheriting the smeared velocity field from the bound vortex. ~~This is tested~~, which was confirmed theoretically by Martínez-Tossas and Meneveau (2019) for straight wings. We test this further by simulating a rectangular wing without any correction. All vorticity is shed from the wing tips, creating the well known horseshoe vortex. For the hypothesis to be valid the velocity distribution in the plane orthogonal to the trailed vortices should thus be identical to the one of the bound vortex .

Fig. 5 compares the velocities induced by a rectangular wing predicted by an AL and three vortex segments (one bound, two trailed) for five different smearing parameters. Only half of the wing is presented, due to symmetry. Velocity distributions are shown for lines cutting the vortex segments at right angles for  $y = 0$ . Clearly the velocity smearing is identical between trailed and bound vorticity, confirming the smearing hypothesis. Slight differences are linked to the numerical discretisation of the Gaussian force projection (Shives and Crawford, 2013) and numerical diffusion.

### 5.1.2 Smearing correction verification

As mentioned in Sect. 4, the new smearing correction uses a lifting-line representation of the trailed vorticity. Thus the prediction of the velocity correction with our model or vortex segments should be identical. To simultaneously verify its numerical implementation, our model receives solely the sampled velocities from the flow domain to compute the circulation at the sections. The body forces are not applied inside the domain, though, to avoid influencing the trailed vortex paths nor are the



**Figure 6.** Analytical (An.) and corresponding model prediction of the velocity correction for varying force smearing ( $\epsilon = 2b/(N_v - 1)$ ) along a rectangular and elliptic wing, where  $x' = x - (b + r_{v=1})$ .

correction velocities added to the CFD velocities to keep the circulation unchanged. This holds the trailed vortices in the  $x$ - $z$  plane, simplifying the representation of the wake with vortex segments. The segments' circulation is exactly the same as in the smearing correction to avoid any numerical effects influencing the comparison. Fig. 6 compares the velocity correction predicted by the ~~(ana)lytical-analytical~~ vortex segments and our model at each section along a rectangular and elliptic wing for 5 different smearing factors (i.e.  $\epsilon = 2b/(N_v - 1)$ ). With decreasing force smearing the velocity correction concentrates towards the tips, as the induced velocity gradients are increasing. Therefore even at higher resolution the smearing correction remains significant, yet more localised. Generally the model slightly over-predicts the missing induction at the wing, becoming more prominent with increasing resolution. With  $N_v = 64$  the difference maximally reaches 6.7% (rectangular) and 1.7% (elliptic) with respect to the inflow velocity. The average error does not breach 0.5% in any case. The velocity jump towards the tip 10 sections of the elliptical wing is related to the equidistant discretisation of the wing (Pirrung et al., 2014).

### 5.1.3 Coupled AL-smearing correction verification

The coupling between velocity correction and the flow domain is verified by comparing the corrected downwash at an elliptical wing to the theoretical expectation. The downwash should be constant along the wing and is given by


$$v_{\text{th}} = -\frac{\Gamma_0}{4b} = -\frac{w_\infty c_0 C_l}{8b} \quad (27)$$

15 where  $\Gamma_0$  is the circulation at the wing root. Similar to Shives and Crawford (2013) the  $C_l$  was not fixed, but instead followed the theoretical lift curve slope for thin airfoils  $C_l = 2\pi$ . For the wing to operate at a constant lift coefficient  $C_l = 1$ , its angle-of-attack needed to include the effect of the induced velocities:

$$\alpha = \alpha_{\text{eff}} + \alpha_i = \frac{C_l}{2\pi} + \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{c_0 C_l}{8b} \right) \quad (28)$$

This represents ~~are a~~ more rigorous test of the coupled system ~~then than~~ prescribing the loading along the wing, as only the 20 correct downwash leads to the desired, constant sectional lift coefficients.

Fig. 7 shows the downwash predicted by AL simulations with different smearing parameters and active correction. The CFD component of the velocities are shown ( $v^{\text{CFD}}$ ) separately to emphasise the contribution of the correction to arrive at the correct, constant downwash of  $1 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ . Clearly without the correction, the induced velocities are a function of the smearing factor and only arrive at the theoretically expected value for  $N_v = 32$ . Including the correction greatly reduces the dependence of the downwash on the force smearing. The insufficient correction towards the tips feeds back to the equidistant discretisation of the AL (Pirrung et al., 2014), which is linked to the uniform spacing of the underlying flow grid.



**Figure 7.** Downwash at an elliptical wing predicted by AL simulations with different smearing factors and smearing correction. The CFD component of the velocities are shown ( $v^{\text{CFD}}$  dashed) as well as the total downwash incorporating the correction ( $v^{\text{CFD}} + v^*$  solid). The theoretical value acts as reference.

## 5.2 Rotor simulations - NREL 5MW


The validity of the smearing hypothesis and its correction in rotor applications is demonstrated with simulations of the NREL 5MW turbine (Jonkman et al., 2009) using actuator (AL) and lifting line (LL) models. The input parameters to these simulations are given in Table 2.

### 5.2.1 Uniform inflow

Fig. 8 compares the AL results with and without the novel smearing correction to the LL with and without viscous core. At this wind speed of  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  the thrust coefficient is highest ( $C_T = 0.84$ ) - and hence induction - thus lending itself as a strong verification case. Clearly, there is an equivalence between the original AL and the LL with a viscous core and the corrected AL with the LL. The smearing correction thereby makes the AL effectively act as a LL, as originally intended by Sørensen and Shen (2002). The impact of the viscous core is most prominent towards blade root and tip. The sudden drop in the forces predicted by the AL/LL+core for the tip section of the blade - located at  $r/R = 0.97$  - is not triggered by any aerodynamic tip effects, but relates to a pronounced reduction in chord. [Fig. 9 shows the diminishing effect of the correction on the angle-of-attack](#)

**Table 2.** Input parameters to the NREL 5MW simulations.

$V_\infty$ [ms <sup>-1</sup> ]	$\Omega$ [rpm]	Pitch [°]
4	4.6	0.00
6	6.9	0.00
8	9.2	0.00
14	12.1	2.59
25	12.1	23.09




**Figure 8.** Normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. ( $N_s = 19$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.1R$ )

towards the root and tip. As the correction velocities are negligible with respect to the rotational velocity - they impact the velocity magnitude by less than 0.1% in the lifting region of the blade - it is ultimately the change in the angle-of-attack that explains the observations in the force distributions. While not greatly affecting the magnitude of the forces in the mid-section


of the blade, the viscous core does introduce greater fluctuations in the force distribution. The missing induction introduced by the viscous core hence reduces the coupling between neighbouring blade sections. The smearing correction also recovers this behaviour of the LL.

Surpassing rated wind speed, forces increase inboard until cut-out. Just before cut-out at  $25 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  loading thus reaches a maximum towards the root, causing an equally pronounced influence of the smearing correction in this region as demonstrated in Fig. 10. Again, the equivalence of the AL and LL implementations is remarkable. This high wind-speed case also demonstrates our correction is not only a *tip correction*.

The comparison of AL and LL is summarised in Fig. 11 in the form of local thrust and power distributions at different wind speeds. Note that for the wind speeds below rated ( $< 11.4 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ ), the coefficients are identical. The results are only presented




**Figure 9.** Angle-of-attack with/without smearing correction on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ . ( $N_s = 19, \epsilon = 0.1R$ )



**Figure 10.** Normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $25 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. ( $N_s = 9, \epsilon = 0.2R$ )

for simulations with  $N_s = 9$  for visibility, but compare equally well at higher resolution. As mentioned earlier, the smearing corrections acts predominantly towards tip and root. An additional overview of all results is given in Table 3. Here the total rotor thrust  $T$  and power  $P$  predicted by the corrected actuator line (AL\*) and the lifting line (LL) are listed as well as the influence of adding the viscous core relative to AL\* and LL, respectively. The AL and LL solutions are not directly compared to avoid including any mean bias in the comparison. The impact of the correction on the AL forces is nearly identical to removing the viscous core in the LL simulations at any wind speed, which further supports our correction methodology. In light of the large errors incurred without any correction, unsurprisingly, some form of tip correction is usually applied in AL simulations.





**Figure 11.** Local thrust and power coefficients along the NREL 5MW blades at different wind speeds predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without core. ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ )


**Table 3.** An overview of the simulation inputs and results for the NREL 5MW in uniform inflow. Results are grouped by blade/grid resolution. For the actuator line (AL) and lifting line (LL) the simulation time step  $\Delta t$ , the total thrust  $T$  and power  $P$  and the relative change in these quantities caused by the correction/removing the viscous core are listed. Note that AL\* represents the corrected AL results and change is expressed relative to the rotor thrust and power.

$N_s$	$\epsilon/R$	$V_\infty$ [ $\text{ms}^{-1}$ ]	$\Delta t \times 10^{-2}$ [s]		$T \times 10^5$ [N]		$\Delta T$ [%]		$P \times 10^6$ [W]		$\Delta P$ [%]	
			AL	LL	AL*	LL	$\Delta$ AL	$\Delta$ LL	AL*	LL	$\Delta$ AL	$\Delta$ LL
9	0.2	4	15.90	18.12	1.01	1.02	<del>4.26</del> <u>3.50</u>	<del>4.02</del> <u>3.21</u>	0.26	0.26	<del>10.6</del> <u>9.19</u>	<del>9.67</del> <u>8.74</u>
		6	13.82	12.08	2.27	2.30	<del>4.30</del> <u>3.78</u>	<del>4.02</del> <u>3.20</u>	0.89	<del>0.87</del> <u>0.88</u>	<del>10.7</del> <u>8.91</u>	<del>9.66</del> <u>8.72</u>
		8	10.36	9.06	4.08	<del>3.93</del> <u>4.09</u>	<del>3.67</del> <u>2.84</u>	<del>4.02</del> <u>3.20</u>	2.13	<del>2.05</del> <u>2.08</u>	<del>9.1</del> <u>7.51</u>	<del>9.66</del> <u>8.71</u>
		14	7.87	6.89	4.64	4.77	<del>4.96</del> <u>4.00</u>	<del>4.51</del> <u>3.19</u>	5.39	5.54	<del>7.03</del> <u>5.64</u>	<del>6.04</del> <u>4.90</u>
		25	7.87	6.89	2.84	2.99	<del>10.1</del> <u>2.77</u>	<del>10.20</del> <u>8.2</u>	5.40	5.68	<del>12.7</del> <u>3.08</u>	<del>11.9</del> <u>1.65</u>
19	0.1	4	10.37	18.12	0.98	<del>1.02</del> <u>0.99</u>	<del>3.56</del> <u>2.80</u>	<del>3.66</del> <u>2.13</u>	0.25	0.25	<del>8.89</del> <u>7.48</u>	<del>8.87</del> <u>5.81</u>
		6	6.90	12.08	2.21	<del>2.30</del> <u>2.22</u>	<del>3.55</del> <u>2.79</u>	<del>3.64</del> <u>2.12</u>	0.83	<del>0.86</del> <u>0.85</u>	<del>8.87</del> <u>7.45</u>	<del>8.83</del> <u>5.79</u>
		8	5.17	9.06	3.92	3.95	<del>3.56</del> <u>2.81</u>	<del>2.93</del> <u>2.13</u>	1.98	2.02	<del>8.88</del> <u>7.49</u>	<del>6.85</del> <u>5.81</u>
		14	3.93	6.89	4.52	<del>4.76</del> <u>4.61</u>	<del>4.11</del> <u>3.09</u>	<del>3.97</del> <u>5.98</u>	5.22	<del>5.51</del> <u>5.35</u>	<del>6.09</del> <u>4.71</u>	<del>5.72</del> <u>7.50</u>



### 5.2.2 Yawed inflow

As the smearing correction does not include yaw effects - the wake is assumed to advect normal to the rotor plane - we tested its influence at yaw angles  $\chi$  of 15, 30 and 45 degrees at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ . Again the LL with and without viscous core acted as reference.



**Figure 12.** Normal (upper panels) and tangential (lower panels) force variation during one rotation as a function of azimuthal position of the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  and  $45^\circ$  yaw. The forces are averaged over three sections of the blade and are predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. The blade is facing upwind at  $\chi = 0^\circ$  and is pointing vertically up at  $\chi = 90^\circ$ . ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ )

The time steps remained the same as in uniform inflow. Here only the results for the most extreme case at  $45^\circ$  yaw are shown, as then the differences are most severe. Fig. 12 presents the normal and tangential force variation during one rotation, averaged over three distinct regions of the blade, at a wind speed of  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ . Whilst the agreement is best towards the blade tip, the ~~variation in the force with blade~~ force variation with azimuthal position is similar between AL and LL simulations ~~for any~~ section along the blade across all sections. AL results are shifted downwards with respect to the LL predictions at the inner sections, hinting at the AL experiencing higher induction in this region. But for the verification of the smearing correction this shift is irrelevant, instead its impact on the AL forces needs to be judged relative to the difference between LL with and without core. In this respect the smearing correction is behaving correctly, increasing forces in a similar fashion as a LL without core in the mid-section of the blade and reducing them towards the root and tip.

**Table 4.** Inputs defining the pitch step.

$V_\infty$ [ms <sup>-1</sup> ]	$\Omega$ [rpm]	$\psi_0$ [°]	$\Delta\psi$ [°]	$k$
14	12.1	2.59	$\pm 2$	16

### 5.2.3 Pitch step

The pitch step is defined as

$$\psi = \psi_0 + \frac{\Delta\psi}{2} [1 + \tanh(k(t - t_0))] \quad (29)$$

with  $\psi_0$  defining the pitch angle before the step,  $t_0$  the time instant of the step and  $\Delta\psi$  the pitch change. Here an extremely violent step is chosen - determined by  $k$  - to encourage an equally pronounced blade force response [and thus tests the numerical stability of our correction](#). The parameters governing this comparison are given in Table 4, which realise a pitch step of  $\pm 2^\circ$  in 0.14 s (10% to 90% pitch). To capture the swift change in pitch, the time step is adjusted in both AL and LL simulations to  $3.94 \times 10^{-2}$  s. The blade force response is normalised as


$$\hat{F}(t) = \frac{F(t) - F_0}{F_\infty - F_0} \quad (30)$$

with  $F_0$  and  $F_\infty$  denoting the steady-state values before and after the pitch step, respectively.


Here only the tangential force response after a  $+2^\circ$  step for the mid and tip blade sections are shown in Fig. 13, as they capture the main features of the response. As the definition here is positive pitch to feather, the force decreases along the blade for positive pitch changes. The AL simulations exhibit a faster response with a kink at 0.14 s, coinciding with the pitch change reaching 99% of the step. The AL therefore seems to capture the pitch rate lift. The LL does not show this feature so - as in yaw - the correct behaviour of the smearing correction on the AL force response should be assessed relative to the influence of removing the viscous core in the LL model. Overall, the correction has limited effect on the dynamic response, which is also confirmed by the LL simulations, but the correction essentially acts on the forces as removing the core in the LL. In the mid-section it reduces the forces by maximally 1% during the first 2 s, dropping to 0.5% afterwards. At the tip section it intensifies the response by maximally 1%, diminishing to 0.3% at 4 s.

### 20 5.2.4 Turbulent inflow

Highly turbulent inflow should challenge the numerical stability of the new smearing correction by introducing strong and abrupt changes in the angle-of-attack. Comparing simulations with and without inflow turbulence should furthermore reveal, whether turbulence alters the nature of the correction. Fig. 14 shows the impact of the smearing correction on the time-averaged normal and tangential blade forces at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  mean wind speed for AL simulations with uniform and turbulent inflow. With a turbulence intensity (TI) of 15%, the forces are unsurprisingly slightly larger ( $\approx 20 \text{ Nm}^{-1}$ ) than in uniform inflow. However




**Figure 13.** Normalised tangential force response at two blade sections (middle and tip) of the NREL 5MW following a pitch step of  $+2^\circ$  in 0.14 s at  $14 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ )



**Figure 14.** Time-averaged normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  mean wind speed and changing inflow turbulence predicted by the AL model with and without smearing correction. ( $N_s = 35$ ,  $\epsilon = R/8$ )

the change in forces introduced by the correction is nearly identical ( $< 2 \text{ Nm}^{-1}$ ). When comparing the standard deviation of the forces with and without correction in Fig. 15 the smoothing and dampening effect of the smearing correction on the forces also in highly turbulent inflow becomes apparent. Madsen et al. (2018) observed a corresponding reduction of the force variations on the whole rotor blade when comparing near wake model results against BEM results for the NM 80 rotor in turbulent inflow. This illustrates that the smearing correction leads to the same dynamic coupling between neighbouring blade sections as a lifting line model.



**Figure 15.** Variation of normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  mean wind speed and turbulence intensity of 15% predicted by the AL model with and without smearing correction. ( $N_s = 35$ ,  $\epsilon = R/8$ )

## 6 Conclusions

The actuator line was intended as a lifting line technique for CFD applications. In this paper we ~~proof~~prove - theoretically and practically - that smearing the forces of the actuator line in the flow domain necessarily leads to smeared velocity fields. For the typical Gaussian force projection the widely known Lamb-Oseen (Lamb, 1932; Oseen, 1911) viscous core appears in both bound and trailed vorticity. This core reduces the velocities approaching the vortex centre compared to the inviscid solution of the lifting line. The trailed vorticity of an actuator line thus induces lower velocities at the blade owing to the force projection. We recover this missing induction by combining a near-wake model of the trailed vorticity with Lamb-Oseen's viscous core model and coupling it with the actuator line model. Basic wing test cases with theoretical solutions verify the correction, as it recovers nearly all induction independent ~~from~~of the severity of the force smearing. Rotor simulations furthermore show the applicability and strength of the correction over the entire operational wind speed range as well as in yaw, strong turbulence and undergoing pitch steps. Here the correction is validated with lifting line simulations with and without viscous core, that are representative of an actuator line with and without smearing correction, respectively. The agreement between the respective actuator and lifting line results is remarkable.

The current implementation of the smearing correction relies on heavy bookkeeping. In future versions the latter will be removed without jeopardising stability nor accuracy, making it suitable for wind farm simulations in realistic atmospheric flows. Potentially, the correction might also enable accurate rotor simulations at lower discretisation.

*Code and data availability.* All data and parts of the code covering the smearing correction are available on request. Commercial and research licenses for EllipSys3D can be purchased from DTU.

## Appendix A: Fixed wake equations

The equations governing the fixed wake approach underlying the smearing correction (see Fig. 3) are summarised for completeness.

Direction vector from the vortex element to a control point along the blade:

$$5 \quad \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} -r \cos \beta + r - h \\ r \sin \beta \\ -v_h \beta / \Omega \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Definition of the vortex element:

$$\delta \mathbf{l} = \delta l \cos \phi \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \beta \\ -\cos \beta \\ v_h / (\Omega r) \end{pmatrix} \quad \delta l = \frac{r \delta \beta}{\cos \phi} \quad (\text{A2})$$

Note that

$$\cos \phi = \frac{\Omega r}{\sqrt{(\Omega r)^2 + v_h^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{v_h}{\Omega r}\right)^2}} \quad \tan \phi = \frac{v_h}{\Omega r} \quad (\text{A3})$$

### 10 Incremental velocity induced by the vortex element

$$\delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\Delta \Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{\delta \mathbf{l} \times \mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|^3} = A r \begin{pmatrix} (v_h / \Omega r) (\beta \cos \beta - \sin \beta) \\ -(v_h / \Omega r) (-1 + h_r + \cos \beta + \beta \sin \beta) \\ [-1 + (1 - h_r) \cos \beta] \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A4})$$

with

$$A = \frac{\Delta \Gamma r \delta \beta}{4\pi} \underbrace{\left[ r^2 \left( 1 + (1 - h_r)^2 - 2(1 - h_r) \cos \beta + \left( \frac{v_h \beta}{\Omega r} \right)^2 \right) \right]}_{|\mathbf{x}|^2}^{-\frac{3}{2}} \quad h_r = \frac{h}{r} \quad (\text{A5})$$

15 *Author contributions.* AMF was responsible for writing the paper, except for Sect. 3.2 which was authored by NRG. The original numerical implementation of the near-wake model by GP was adapted by AMF to incorporate the smearing correction with the help of GP. NRG performed all simulations with the lifting-line and AMF those with the actuator line. All authors decided on the flow cases to simulate and commented on the document.

*Competing interests.* The authors declare no conflict of interest.

*Acknowledgements.* We would like to acknowledge DTU Wind Energy's internal project "Virtual Atmosphere" for partially funding this research. Furthermore many thanks to Senior Researcher Dr. Mac Gaunaa for his insights on vortex aerodynamics and Senior Researcher Dr. Niels Troldborg for his input on actuator line simulations/modelling, both from DTU Wind Energy. Thanks also to Ang Li for his help on the near-wake model.

## References

- Ananthan, S. and Leishman, J. G.: Role of Filament Strain in the Free-Vortex Modeling of Rotor Wakes, *Journal of the American Helicopter Society*, 9, 176–191, 2004.
- Dag, K., Sørensen, J., Sørensen, N., and Shen, W.: Combined pseudo-spectral / actuator line model for wind turbine applications, Ph.D. thesis, DTU Wind Energy, Denmark, 2017.
- Forsythe, J. R., Lynch, E., Polsky, S., and Spalart, P.: Coupled Flight Simulator and CFD Calculations of Ship Airwake using Kestrel, in: 53rd AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2015-0556>, <https://app.dimensions.ai/details/publication/pub.1024384343>, exported from <https://app.dimensions.ai> on 2018/12/18, 2015.
- Glauert, H.: *Airplane Propellers*, pp. 169–360, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4_3), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4_3), 1935.
- Jha, P. K., Churchfield, M. J., Moriarty, P. J., and Schmitz, S.: Guidelines for Volume Force Distributions Within Actuator Line Modeling of Wind Turbines on Large-Eddy Simulation-Type Grids, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*, 136, 031 003, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4026252>, <http://solarenergyengineering.asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/article.aspx?doi=10.1115/1.4026252>, 2014.
- Jonkman, J., Butterfield, S., Musial, W., and Scott, G.: Definition of a 5-MW reference wind turbine for offshore system development, Tech. rep., NREL, 2009.
- Lamb, H.: *Hydrodynamics*, C.U.P, 1932.
- Leishman, J. G., Bhagwat, M. J., and Bagai, A.: Free-Vortex Filament Methods for the Analysis of Helicopter Rotor Wakes, *Journal of Aircraft*, 39, 759–775, 2002.
- Leonard, B.: A stable and accurate convective modelling procedure based on quadratic upstream interpolation, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 19, 59–98, 1979.
- Madsen, H. A., Sørensen, N. N., Bak, C., Troldborg, N., and Pirrung, G.: Measured aerodynamic forces on a full scale 2MW turbine in comparison with EllipSys3D and HAWC2 simulations, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1037, 022 011, <http://stacks.iop.org/1742-6596/1037/i=2/a=022011>, 2018.
- Martínez-Tossas, L. A. and Meneveau, C.: Filtered lifting line theory and application to the actuator line model, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 863, 269–292, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2018.994>, 2019.
- Menter, F. R.: Zonal two equation  $k - \omega$  turbulence models for aerodynamic flows, in: 23<sup>rd</sup> Fluid Dynamics, Plasmadynamics, and Lasers Conference, Fluid Dynamics and Co-located Conferences, Orlando, FL, <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.1993-2906>, 1993.
- Meyer Forsting, A., Troldborg, N., Bechmann, A., and Réthoré, P.-E.: Modelling Wind Turbine Inflow: The Induction Zone, Ph.D. thesis, DTU Wind Energy, Denmark, <https://doi.org/10.11581/DTU:00000022>, 2017.
- Michelsen, J.: Basis3D - a platform for development of multiblock PDE solvers, Tech. rep., Dept. of Fluid Mechanics, Technical University of Denmark, DTU, 1994a.
- Michelsen, J.: Block structured multigrid solution of 2D and 3D elliptic PDE's, Tech. rep., Dept. of Fluid Mechanics, Technical University of Denmark, DTU, 1994b.
- Mikkelsen, R.: Actuator Disc Methods Applied to Wind Turbines, Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark, 2003.
- Nathan, J.: Application of Actuator Surface Concept in LES Simulations of the Near Wake of Wind Turbines, Ph.D. thesis, École de Technologie Supérieure, 2018.



- Oseen, C.: Über Wirbelbewegung in einer reibenden Flüssigkeit, *Arkiv för matematik, astronomi och fysik*, Almqvist & Wiksells, <https://books.google.dk/books?id=wrCJPgAACAAJ>, 1911.
- Patanker, S. and Spalding, D.: A calculation procedure for heat, mass and momentum transfer in three-dimensional parabolic flows, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 1972.
- 5 Pirrung, G., Madsen, H. A., Kim, T., and Heinz, J.: A coupled near and far wake model for wind turbine aerodynamics, *Wind Energy*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.1969>, 2016.
- Pirrung, G., Riziotis, V., Madsen, H., Hansen, M., and Kim, T.: Comparison of a coupled near- and far-wake model with a free-wake vortex code, *Wind Energy Science*, 2, 15–33, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2-15-2017>, <https://www.wind-energ-sci.net/2/15/2017/>, 2017a.
- Pirrung, G. R., Hansen, M. H., and Madsen, H. A.: Improvement of a near wake model for trailing vorticity, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 555, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/555/1/012083>, 2014.
- 10 Pirrung, G. R., Madsen, H. A., and Schreck, S.: Trailing vorticity modeling for aeroelastic wind turbine simulations in standstill, *Wind Energy Science*, 2, 521–532, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2-521-2017>, <https://www.wind-energ-sci.net/2/521/2017/>, 2017b.
- Ramos-García, N., Shen, W. Z., and Sørensen, J. N.: Validation of a three-dimensional viscous-inviscid interactive solver for wind turbine rotors, *Renewable Energy*, Vol. 70, p. 78-92. DOI: 10.1016/j.renene.2014.04.001, 2014a.
- 15 Ramos-García, N., Shen, W. Z., and Sørensen, J. N.: Three-dimensional viscous-inviscid coupling method for wind turbine computations, Published online in *Wind energy*. DOI: 10.1002/we.1821., 2014b.
- Ramos-García, N., M. Møhlholm, J. N. S., and Walther, J. H.: Hybrid vortex simulations of wind turbines using a three-dimensional viscous-inviscid panel method, *Wind Energy*, Vol. 20, No. 11, p. 1187-1889., 2017.
- Réthoré, P.-E. and Sørensen, N.: A discrete force allocation algorithm for modelling wind turbines in computational fluid dynamics, *Wind Energy*, 15, 915–926, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.525>, 2012.
- 20 Shen, W., Sørensen, J., and Mikkelsen, R.: Tip loss correction for actuator/Navier Stokes computations, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*, 59, 209–213, 2005.
- Shives, M. and Crawford, C.: Mesh and load distribution requirements for actuator line CFD simulations, *Wind Energy*, 16, 657–669, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we>, 2013.
- 25 Sørensen, J. N. and Shen, W. Z.: Numerical modelling of wind turbine wakes, *Journal of Fluids Engineering*, 124, 393–399, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.1471361>, 2002.
- Sørensen, N.: General purpose flow solver applied to flow over hills, Ph.D. thesis, Risø National Laboratory, 1995.
- Squire, H. B.: The growth of a vortex in turbulent flow, *Aeronautical Quarterly*, 16, 302–306, 1965.
- Strelets, M.: Detached eddy simulation of massively separated flows, in: 39<sup>th</sup> AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, AIAA Paper 30 2001-0879, Reno,NV, 2001.
- Troldborg, N., Sørensen, J., and Mikkelsen, R.: Actuator Line Modeling of Wind Turbine Wakes, Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark, 2009.
- Vollmer, L., Steinfeld, G., and Kühn, M.: Transient LES of an offshore wind turbine, *Wind Energy Science*, 2, 603–614, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2-603-2017>, <https://www.wind-energ-sci.net/2/603/2017/>, 2017.

# A vortex-based tip/smearing correction for the actuator line

Alexander Raul Meyer Forsting<sup>1</sup>, Georg Raimund Pirrung<sup>1</sup>, and Néstor Ramos-García<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>DTU Wind Energy, Technical University of Denmark, Frederiksborgvej 399, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark

**Correspondence:** Alexander R Meyer Forsting (alrf@dtu.dk)

**Abstract.** The actuator line was intended as a lifting line technique for CFD applications. In this paper we prove - theoretically and practically - that smearing the forces of the actuator line in the flow domain forms a viscous core in the bound and shed vorticity of the line. By combining a near-wake representation of the trailed vorticity with a viscous vortex core model, the missing induction from the smeared velocity is recovered. This novel dynamic smearing correction is verified for basic wing  
5 test cases and rotor simulations of a multi-MW turbine. The latter cover the entire operational wind speed range as well as yaw, strong turbulence and pitch step cases. The correction is validated with lifting line simulations with and without viscous core, that are representative of an actuator line without and with smearing correction, respectively. The dynamic smearing correction makes the actuator line effectively act as a lifting line, as it was originally intended.

*Copyright statement.* ©Author(s) 2018.

## 10 1 Introduction

The actuator line (AL) technique developed by Sørensen and Shen (2002) is a lifting-line (LL) representation of the wind turbine rotor suitable for computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations. It captures transient physical features like shed and trailed vorticity (including root/tip vortices), without the computational cost associated with resolving the full rotor geometry. The AL model thus enables Large-eddy simulations (LES) of large wind farms in realistic, turbulent atmospheric boundary  
15 layers (Vollmer et al., 2017).

However, different to LL vortex formulations the blade forces are dispersed in the flow domain - most commonly in form of a Gaussian projection - to avoid numerical instabilities. A length scale - also referred to as smearing coefficient - controls this force redistribution, whose lower limit is linked to the grid size through numerical stability requirements (Trolborg et al., 2009). Mikkelsen (2003) observed a large sensitivity of the blade velocities to this length scale, which consequently also  
20 propagated to the blade forces. Especially in regions along the blade exhibiting stark load changes, as around the root and tip, forces are substantially over-predicted, meaning this effect is exacerbated by non-tapered and low aspect ratio blades. As actuator disc formulations suffer from similar issues towards the blade tip, their Glauert (1935) type tip corrections are also frequently applied to ALs (Shen et al., 2005). Yet, these correct discs for missing discrete blades and thus should be unnecessary - strictly even invalid - for ALs. Shives and Crawford (2013) and Jha et al. (2014) achieved a reduction in the

force over-prediction by varying the originally fixed smearing factor with respect to the blade chord. Yet, their methods cannot decouple the blade forces from the smearing length scale: a smeared force distribution in the flow domain necessarily leads to lower induction at the blade - increasing lift and drag - compared to an actual LL with a concentrated, spatially singular force.

## 5 1.1 The vortex smearing hypothesis

Shives and Crawford (2013) noticed the similarity between the velocities induced across an actuator line and those predicted by a viscous vortex core model. These models include the limiting effect of viscous shear forces on the induced velocities around vortex cores. A similar comparison of the swirl velocities about an infinite vortex line are shown in Fig. 1 - here with a Lamb-Oseen vortex core model (Lamb, 1932; Oseen, 1911). Without viscosity (inviscid) the velocities approach infinity towards the vortex centre. The startling agreement between the Lamb-Oseen and AL velocities was first demonstrated by Dag et al. (2017). The Gaussian body force smearing in the AL technique thus produces similar swirl velocities as a viscous vortex. Ignoring viscous effects, the AL should in principle induce the same velocities as a LL - equivalent to the inviscid solution. The missing induced velocity in the AL model (marked area in Fig. 1) can be approximated following Dag et al. (2017) by:

$$\Delta v_{\theta}(r) = \underbrace{\frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r}}_{\text{inviscid}} - \underbrace{\frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r} [1 - \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2)]}_{\text{viscous core}} = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r} \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2) \quad (1)$$

15 Here  $\Gamma$  represents the vortex line's circulation,  $r$  is the distance from the vortex core and  $\epsilon$  the length scale used in the force smearing. This formulation can be split into an inviscid and viscous/smearing contribution:


$$\Delta v_{\theta}(r) = \underbrace{v_{\theta}(r)}_{\text{inviscid}} \underbrace{f_{\epsilon}(r_{\epsilon})}_{\text{smearing}} \quad \text{with} \quad v_{\theta}(r) = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r}, \quad f_{\epsilon}(r_{\epsilon}) = \exp(-r_{\epsilon}^2), \quad r_{\epsilon} = \frac{r}{\epsilon} \quad (2)$$

If this viscous behaviour of the force smearing in AL simulations would be limited to the bound vortex representing the blade, then it would not influence the blade forces as long as the blade is straight. Yet Dag et al. (2017) argued the trailing vortices (in the wake) to exhibit the same viscous core, as they originate from the bound vortex. Hence, the wake of an AL is inducing lower velocities at the blade than in case of a LL. The missing velocity can be estimated from the viscous core equivalence and thus correct the velocities at the blade. This mostly impacts blade forces by changing the angle-of-attack at the blade sections.

## 1.2 Contributions of this paper

Dag et al. (2017) corrected AL simulations of a rectangular wing and two rotors with different aspect ratios by recuperating the missing induced velocity introduced by the viscous core. For all their simulations they were able to show the beneficial effect of the correction on the blade load distribution - represented by more physical behaviour, especially towards the tip and root. However, their implementation of the correction did not fully couple the flow-field with the blade forces and the induction correction.

The major contributions of this paper are:



**Figure 1.** Distribution of the tangential velocity component in a plane orthogonal to an infinite vortex line (along  $x$ ) obtained from either an inviscid or viscous (Lamb-Oseen) theoretical vortex and an actuator line CFD simulation.

- The development of a tuning-free, dynamic and numerically robust smearing correction, that is fully coupled to the AL model.
- A theoretical proof of the force smearing - vortex core equivalence.
- 5 – Proof of the vortex core inheritance in trailed vorticity.
- The confirmation of the missing velocity assumption by comparing LL simulations with/without viscous core and AL results with/without correction.

The test cases include constantly and elliptically loaded wings as well as rotor simulations of a multi-MW turbine covering the entire operational wind speed range. As the AL model is especially attractive for wind farm simulations, the focus here is on coarsely resolved ALs. The correct dynamic behaviour of the new correction is verified through yawed inflow and pitch step simulations.

## 2 Proof of force smearing - vortex core equivalence

The equivalence between the velocity field induced by an AL and a viscous vortex can be derived directly from the incompressible Navier-Stokes (N-S) equations. This proof follows the approach by Forsythe et al. (2015) that successfully connected an AL's vorticity field to its force projection. Starting by taking the curl of the incompressible momentum equation, the vorticity

transport equation is obtained ( $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \nabla \times \mathbf{u}$ )

$$\underbrace{\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\omega}}{\partial t}}_{\substack{=0 \\ \text{steady}}} + (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \boldsymbol{\omega} = \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{\omega} \nabla) \mathbf{u}}_{\substack{=0 \\ 2D}} + \underbrace{\nu \nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\omega}}_{\substack{=0 \\ \text{inviscid}}} + \nabla \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\rho} \quad (3)$$

Here  $\nu$  is the viscosity,  $\rho$  density and  $\mathbf{f}$  the body forces from the AL. Away from root and tip, the flow around a high aspect ratio blade is nearly two-dimensional, as the span-wise flow is negligible. Viscous effects are disregarded in light of the large Reynolds numbers encountered. Furthermore the relationship between body force and flow-field becomes quasi-steady assuming the flow is attached. Cancelling the respective terms and noting that in 2D flow ( $y-z$  plane)  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \omega_x \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x$  and  $\nabla = (0, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z})$ :

$$(\mathbf{u} \nabla) \omega_x \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x = \nabla \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\rho} \quad (4)$$

Assuming the drag to be negligible, the force - in the form of lift - exerted by the AL on the flow in terms of its circulation  $\Gamma$  becomes

$$\mathbf{f} = -\mathbf{f}_{\text{aero}} g(r) \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{aero}} = L = \rho \mathbf{u} \times \Gamma \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \quad g(r) = \frac{1}{\pi \epsilon^2} \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2) \quad (6)$$

Here  $g$  represents a 2-D Gaussian force projection with  $r$  indicating the distance from the AL. Inserting these expression into Eq. (4) and exploiting standard matrix transformation and mass conservation<sup>1</sup>

$$(\mathbf{u} \nabla) \omega_x \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x = \nabla (\Gamma g \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \times \mathbf{u}) = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \Gamma g \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \quad (7)$$

$$(\mathbf{u} \nabla) \omega_x = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \Gamma g \quad (8)$$

Due to mass conservation the  $\mathbf{u} \nabla$  term can be inverted thus giving a direct relationship between the force projection and vorticity:

$$\omega_x = \Gamma g = \frac{\Gamma}{\pi \epsilon^2} \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2) \quad (9)$$

As the body force is axially symmetric, the vorticity only induces tangential velocities

$$\omega_x(r) = \frac{1}{r} \left( \frac{\partial r u_\theta}{\partial r} - \underbrace{\frac{\partial u_r}{\partial \theta}}_{\substack{=0 \\ \text{axisymmetry}}} \right) \Rightarrow u_\theta = \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r r \omega_x(r) dr \quad (10)$$

Inserting Eq. (9) and integrating gives the swirl velocity induced by a smeared body force

$$u_\theta = \frac{\Gamma}{2\pi r} [1 - \exp(-r^2/\epsilon^2)] \quad (11)$$

This expression equals that of the Lamb-Oseen vortex, only with the viscous core radius replaced by the smearing coefficient<sup>2</sup>. This marks the theoretical confirmation of the observations by Dag et al. (2017), which additionally indicates that a viscous core behaviour with an AL requires inviscid, two-dimensional and locally steady flow conditions.

<sup>1</sup> $\nabla \times (\hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \times \mathbf{u}) = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x - (\hat{\mathbf{e}}_x \nabla) \mathbf{u} + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x (\nabla \mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{u} (\nabla \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x) = (\mathbf{u} \nabla) \hat{\mathbf{e}}_x + 0 + 0 + 0$

<sup>2</sup>Note that in the  $x-y$  plane the circulation would be  $-\Gamma$

### 3 Numerical methodology


#### 5 3.1 Actuator-line simulations

The discretised incompressible Navier-Stokes equations are solved with DTU's CFD code EllipSys3D (Sørensen, 1995; Michelsen, 1994a, b). The flow is iteratively solved at each time instant by the SIMPLE algorithm (Patanker and Spalding, 1972). Depending on the turbulence model either the third-order accurate QUICK (Leonard, 1979) scheme (RANS) or a fourth-order CDS scheme (LES) discretises the convective terms. As the flow variables are located at the cell centres, a modified Rhie and Chow (Réthoré and Sørensen, 2012) algorithm avoids pressure-velocity decoupling. Further details on the numerical techniques are given in Meyer Forsting et al. (2017). For all comparisons with the LL code, the RANS equations are solved using the  $k-\omega$  shear-stress transport turbulence closure of Menter (1993). Only the turbulent inflow cases in Sect. 5.2.4 are computed with the DES technique of Strelets (2001). The AL model was implemented by Mikkelsen (2003) in EllipSys3D. We employ a version utilising three-dimensional Gaussian force projection, which follows the original formulation of Sørensen and Shen (2002). As the AL model is especially attractive for wind farm simulations, the focus here is on coarsely resolved ALs, with either 9 or 19 sections ( $N_s$ ) along the blade. They are uniformly spaced and discretise the blade starting from the root at 1.5 m to the tip at 63 m. The smearing length scale is connected to the number of sections, such that  $\epsilon = 2R/(N_s + 1) - R$  defining the rotor radius - which ensures the forces in the domain to change smoothly between sections (Nathan, 2018). Tower and nacelle are not modelled.

The numerical domain for the rotor simulations is discretised in a verified, standard manner (Meyer Forsting et al., 2017; Troldborg et al., 2009). It consists of a box with  $25R$  side length that contains an inner box with a uniformly spaced refined mesh of  $3.2R$  edge length at its centre surrounding the rotor. To capture the velocity gradients around the AL correctly the mesh spacing is  $\Delta x = R/40$ . This is twice the recommended minimum (Troldborg et al., 2009), yet it delivers more accurate angles-of-attack estimates at the section centres (Shives and Crawford, 2013). In total 256 cells discretise the flow domain along each dimension, resulting in  $16.8 \times 10^6$  degrees of freedom. All variables, except pressure and its correction, which necessitate special treatment (Sørensen, 1995), obey symmetry conditions on the lateral boundaries, whereas at the inflow and outflow faces they follow Dirichlet and Neumann conditions, respectively. The wing test cases follow the same approach only with  $N_s = 32$  and an inner box edge length of  $3b$ , where  $b$  is the wing's half-span. This results in 80 cells along each dimension and  $5.1 \times 10^5$  degrees of freedom. To ensure the blade tip to remain inside a single cell during one time step  $\Delta t < \Delta x/(\Omega R)$  - with mesh spacing  $\Delta x$  and rotational speed  $\Omega$ . Without rotation the term  $\Omega R$  is replaced by the advection speed of the wake. The kinematic viscosity and air density are kept constant at  $1.789 \times 10^{-5}$  kg/m/s and  $1.225$  kg/m<sup>3</sup>, respectively. Simulations are stopped when the thrust residual reaches  $10^{-5}$ .

The sensitivity of the rotor thrust to the domain size, time step and grid size is explored in Fig. 2. The length of the domain edges is doubled to  $50R$ , the time step is halved with respect to a setup obeying the method described above. As reference acts a simulation of the NREL 5MW at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  with either 40 or 60 grid cells along the rotor depending on the smearing length scale. With  $\epsilon = R/10$  and  $R/20$ , this represents four and three times the recommended resolution, respectively (Troldborg et al.,

- 5 2009). Though non-zero, the sensitivity of the results is acceptable in code comparison and should impact AL simulations with and without correction similarly.



**Figure 2.** Thrust sensitivity of the NREL 5MW AL simulations at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  wind speed with grid size, doubling the domain size and halving the time step at two smearing length scales. ( $N_s = \{9, 19\}$ ,  $T_{\text{ref}} = \{4.20, 4.06\} \times 10^5 \text{ N}$ )

### 3.2 Free-wake lifting-line rotor simulations

The in-house solver MIRAS has been employed to perform the free-wake lifting-line simulations. MIRAS is a multi-fidelity computational vortex model, which is mainly used for predicting the aerodynamic behaviour of wind turbines and its wakes. It has been developed at DTU during the last decade and been extensively validated for small to large size wind turbine rotors by Ramos-García et al. (2017, 2014a, b).

The free-wake vortex method essentially models the wake of a wind turbine by a bundle of infinitely thin vortex filaments. To avoid numerical singularities, it is required to introduce a viscous core, which represents a more physical distribution of the velocities induced by each vortex filament, desingularizing the Biot-Savart law near the center of the filament. The velocity induced by each one of the elements is obtained directly by evaluating the Biot-Savart law, and by summing the velocity induced by all filaments, the total wake induction is obtained.

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^N K_{ij} \frac{\gamma_j \mathbf{t}_j \times \mathbf{r}_{ij}}{4\pi r_{ij}^3} \quad \text{where} \quad K_{ij} = \frac{r_{ij}^2}{(\varepsilon_j^{2z} + r_{ij}^{2z})^{1/z}} \quad (12)$$

where  $N$  is total number of filaments that form the wake,  $\mathbf{r}_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_j$  is the distance vector from the vortex element  $\mathbf{y}_j$  to the evaluation point  $\mathbf{x}_i$ .  $\gamma_j$  is the circulation of the filament,  $\mathbf{t}_j$  is the unit orientation vector of the  $j$ -th filament and  $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_{ij}|$ .  $\varepsilon_j$  is the vortex core radius of the filament and  $z$  defines the cut-off velocity profile where the Lamb-Oseen model (Lamb, 1932; Oseen, 1911),  $z = 2$ , has been employed.

A viscous core model is applied to emulate the effect of viscosity by changing the vortex core radius as a function of time Leishman et al. (2002)

$$\varepsilon_i(t) = \sqrt{4\alpha_v \delta_v \nu t_i} + \varepsilon_0 \quad (13)$$

5 Here  $\alpha_v$  is a constant set to 1.25643 (Ananthan and Leishman, 2004),  $\nu$  is the kinematic viscosity and  $t_i$  is the time elapsed since the generation of the  $i$ -th filament. In order to represent the diffusive time scales, the viscous core radius is set to change with the vortex age by adding a turbulence eddy viscosity,  $\delta_v$ , first proposed by Squire (1965), and in this work set to  $10^{-3}$ . To avoid the singular behaviour of newly released vortex elements, an initial core radius,  $\varepsilon_0$ , is introduced. In accordance with Ramos-García et al. (2017), where it was found that a small core radius is necessary to have flow convergence, a core radius of  
10 0.1% the local chord at the release station is used.

For the sake of the present study, two different approaches to compute the angle-of-attack have been followed.

- Inviscid (LL), where the non-regularized Biot-Savart law is used to compute the induction from the wake filaments at the quarter-chord location. This is the standard method used in a lifting line solvers.
  - Viscous (LL+core), where the regularized Biot-Savart law is used to compute the induction at the quarter-chord location.
- 15 A viscous core with radius equal to the actuator line smearing factor is used for a direct comparison of the methods.

This enables a double validation of the models. On one hand the corrected actuator line simulations can be validated against the LL calculations, and on the other hand the raw actuator line model, without tip correction, can be compared against the LL+core simulations which include the smearing effect in the free-wake model.

#### 4 Tip/Smearing correction for the actuator line

5 Applying the velocity correction methodology introduced in Sect. 1.1 in three-dimensional space yields a velocity correction vector. The viscous core behaviour of the AL bound vorticity - proven in Sect. 2 to originate from the force smearing - is inherited by the trailing vortices, as will be demonstrated in Sect. 5.1.1. Therefore the induction from the trailed vorticity at the blade is lower than without force smearing. Fig. 3 shows the path of trailed vorticity shed from in-between two sections of a blade with a strength of  $\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma_s - \Gamma_{s+1}$  with

$$10 \quad \Gamma_s = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{v_s^2 + w_s^2} C_l(\alpha) c \quad (14)$$


Here  $s$  defines the blade section index,  $l$  is the vortex following coordinate,  $c$  the section chord and  $\alpha$  the angle-of-attack, which depends on the inflow angle in combination with blade pitch and twist at the section. The missing induction from this single trailed vortex at a point C is obtained by integrating along the vortex line

$$\mathbf{u}^* = \int_0^\infty f_\epsilon \delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \, dl \quad (15)$$

15 Here  $\delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}$  is the velocity induced by an infinitesimal element  $\delta \mathbf{l}$  of the vortex line at point C, which is given by the Biot-Savart law:

$$\delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\Delta\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{\delta \mathbf{l} \times \mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|^3} \quad (16)$$





**Figure 3.** Trailed vorticity path. The blade rotates in the  $x$ - $y$  plane and  $z$  points downstream. The vortex element  $\delta l$  with strength  $\Gamma_s - \Gamma_{s+1}$  is shed at  $r$  and transported downstream by the local velocity. The distance from the shedding location  $r$  to a point  $C$  along the blade is  $h$  ( $h = r - C_x$ ), where  $\delta l$  induces tangential and axial velocities.

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the vector pointing from the element towards  $C$ . The smearing factor for this vortex element becomes

$$f_\epsilon = \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x}\hat{\mathbf{e}}_\perp)^2}{\epsilon^2}\right) \quad (17)$$

- 20 The viscous core only acts in the plane orthogonal to the vortex element  $\delta l$ , hence  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_\perp$  projects  $\mathbf{x}$  onto this plane. This is different to using the distance,  $|\mathbf{x}|$ , as Dag et al. (2017) proposed, which violates the two-dimensional nature of the viscous core.

The total missing induction at a blade section  $s$  is obtained by summing the contribution from all trailed vortices. The number of trailed vortices  $N_v$  is directly related to the number of blade sections  $N_v = N_s + 1$ . Discretising the vortices in time, the

- 25 missing induction at a certain blade section becomes

$$\mathbf{u}_s^* = \sum_v^{N_v} \sum_n^{N_t} f_{s,v}^n \Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{s,v}^n \quad (18)$$

Here  $v$  denotes the trailed vortex index,  $n$  the time index and  $N_t$  the number of time steps. Note that  $n = 1$  is the most recently shed vortex element. As a tip/smearing correction should remain computationally inexpensive, numerically solving the Biot-Savart law in Eq. 16 to obtain  $\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{s,v}^n$  is unfeasible. This would necessitate  $N_t N_v N_s$  or  $N_t (N_s + 1) N_s$  evaluations. An accurate, yet fast alternative to solving the Biot-Savart law directly is the near-wake model (NWM) for trailed vorticity by Pirrung et al.

- 5 (2016, 2017b), which also includes downwind convection. It performs well for dynamic flow cases and exhibits great numerical stability as it was originally developed to enhance the aerodynamic accuracy of BEM models. Its formulation is based on a

lifting line representation of the blade's trailed vorticity as depicted in Fig. 3 and approximates the induced velocities from a single trailed vortex line by two indicial functions. The velocity induced by a vortex element is given in the NWM as

$$\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{s,v}^n = (X_{s,v}^n + Y_{s,v}^n) \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sin(\phi^n) \\ -\cos(\phi^n) \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

10 with  $\phi$  representing the helix angle of the vorticity shed in the CFD domain (see Fig. 3). The indicial functions take the form

$$\{X_{s,v}^n, Y_{s,v}^n\} = a_{\{X,Y\}} \frac{r_v}{4\pi h_s |h_s|} \Delta \Gamma_v^n \phi_{s,v}^{*n} \left[ 1 - \exp\left(-b_{\{X,Y\}} \frac{\Delta \beta^{*n}}{\phi_{s,v}^{*n}}\right) \right] \exp\left(-b_{\{X,Y\}} \sum_i^{n-1} \frac{\Delta \beta^{*i}}{\phi_{s,v}^{*i}}\right) \quad (20)$$

The definitions of  $a_{\{X,Y\}}$ ,  $b_{\{X,Y\}}$ ,  $\beta^*$  and  $\phi^*$  are those of Pirrung et al. (2016, 2017b). The indicial functions allow time-advancing the solution by a mere multiplication, considerably reducing the model evaluations to  $N_v N_s + N_v$ . In the original formulation this removes the need for bookkeeping, however as the smearing factor also changes with the position of the vortex  
15 element all previously shed elements are advanced individually in this specific implementation. This is only an experimental feature for testing the smearing correction and should be simple to remove in a future, more practical implementation.

Following the lifting line formulation of the NWM shown in Fig. 3 (refer to Appendix A for a detailed mathematical description) the perpendicular distance from the vortex element to C becomes

$$\mathbf{x}_\perp = \frac{\delta \mathbf{l}}{|\delta \mathbf{l}|} \times \mathbf{x} = r \cos \phi \begin{pmatrix} \tan \phi (\beta \cos \beta - \sin \beta) \\ -\tan \phi (-1 + h/r + \cos \beta + \beta \sin \beta) \\ -1 + (1 - h/r) \cos \beta \end{pmatrix} \quad (21)$$

20 Thus the smearing factor becomes

$$f_{s,v}^n = \exp\left(-\frac{|\mathbf{x}_\perp(r_v, \beta^n, h_s, \phi^n)|}{\epsilon^2} \frac{|\mathbf{x}_\perp(r_v, \beta^n, h_s, \phi^n)|^2}{\epsilon^2}\right) \quad (22)$$


When discretising in time,  $\beta^n$  is taken to be at the mid-point of the vortex element.

Finally the missing velocities computed in Eq. 18 correct the original velocities from the CFD simulations

$$\mathbf{u}_s = \mathbf{u}_s^{\text{CFD}} + \mathbf{u}_s^* \quad (23)$$

25 The correction therefore influences the blade forces through the angle-of-attack and the velocity magnitude, yet its the former that dominates. It also changes the circulation at each blade section through Eq. 14 and thus the shed vorticity and its induction. Hence determining the correction velocity is an iterative procedure. The correction algorithm is executed after flow-field is solved and takes the following form:

1. Interpolate the velocity vector  $\mathbf{u}^{\text{CFD}}$  at the section centres from the CFD flow-field.
- 5 2. Compute the helix angles  $\phi$ , where  $\phi_v = -\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{w_v^{\text{CFD}} + w_v^{\text{CFD}}}{v_v^{\text{CFD}} + v_v^{\text{CFD}}}\right)$  and  $\phi_{\{1, N_v\}} = -\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{w_{\{1, N_s\}}^{\text{CFD}}}{v_{\{1, N_s\}}^{\text{CFD}}}\right)$ .



**Figure 4.** Definition of the wing test cases with either a rectangular or elliptic planform. Vortices are trailed in-between sections and the actuator line forces are computed and exerted at the sections' centres.

3. Combine the CFD velocities with the respective correction from the previous time step  $n - 1$ , such that  $\mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_n^{\text{CFD}} + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}^*$ .
4. Compute the smearing factor  $f_\epsilon$  for all time steps, sections and elements (Eq. 22).
5. Determine the angle-of-attack and velocity magnitude from  $\mathbf{u}_n$  to determine  $\Gamma_s$  (Eq. 14).<sup>3</sup>
- 10 6. Compute the velocities from the newly released vortex element  $\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_n$  (Eq. 19).
7. At the first iteration of each time step, advance the previous elements in time.
8. Compute the velocity correction at the current time step  $\mathbf{u}_n^*$  (Eq. 18).
9. Update the velocity at the sections with some form of relaxation  $\mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_n^{\text{CFD}} + \mathbf{u}_n^*$ .
10. Repeat steps 5.-9. until convergence is reached.
- 15 We use the technique by Pirrung et al. (2017a) established for the NWM to accelerate and ensure its convergence. Furthermore the activation of the correction is delayed until the starting vorticity of the rotor has been transported at least one blade length away from the rotor plane. This enhances its numerical stability, as induction has already build up at the blades by its time of activation.

**Table 1.** Input parameters common to both rectangular and elliptic wing simulations.

$w_\infty$ [ms <sup>-1</sup> ]	$2b$ [m]	$r_{v=1}$ [m]	$\Omega$ [rads <sup>-1</sup> ]
10	10	0.5	0

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Basic wing test cases

To verify the smearing hypothesis (Sect. 1.1) and the novel smearing correction (Sect. 4) two basic wing flow cases with known theoretical solutions are modelled using CFD. Either a rectangular or elliptic wing is represented by an AL as shown in Fig. 4, where the coordinate system is unchanged from the definition in Fig. 3. The AL is discretised in uniformly spaced sections in-line with the underlying flow grid and the smearing parameter is twice the section width, which ensures a continuous force distribution along the wing. The common simulation parameters are given in Table 1. Unless specifically stated the sectional lift coefficient  $C_l = 1$  and drag is zero along the wing, independent of the angle-of-attack. The chord of the rectangular wing is set to 1m and the elliptical chord distribution is

$$c(x) = c_0 \sqrt{1 - \left( \frac{x - (b + r_{v=1})}{b} \right)^2} \quad (24)$$

with the root chord  $c_0 = 4\text{m}$ . All simulations are performed within the same computational domain, defined in Sect. 3.1.

The theoretical predictions of the the velocity field are achieved by representing the vortex system of Fig. 4 with vortex filaments. The velocity induced by a filament with a viscous vortex core at an arbitrary point C is

$$\mathbf{u} = f_\epsilon(x_\perp) \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{(x_1 + x_2)(\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2)}{x_1 x_2 + \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_2} \quad (25)$$


$$x_\perp = \frac{|\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2|}{|x_2 - x_1|} \quad \text{and} \quad x_i = |\mathbf{x}_i| \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_1$  points from the start of the filament to C and  $\mathbf{x}_2$  from its end. For a definition of  $f_\epsilon(x_\perp)$  refer to Eq. 17; without viscous core  $f_\epsilon(x_\perp) = 1$ . The contribution from different segments is summed to give the overall velocity field. As the wing is lightly loaded we assume all vortex segments to remain in the  $x$ - $z$  plane.

#### 5.1.1 Trailed vorticity smearing

The vortex smearing hypothesis assumes the trailed vorticity inheriting the smeared velocity field from the bound vortex, which was confirmed theoretically by Martínez-Tossas and Meneveau (2019) for straight wings. We test this further by simulating a rectangular wing without any correction. All vorticity is shed from the wing tips, creating the well known horseshoe vortex.

<sup>3</sup>Strictly, the influence of the shed vorticity on the velocity at the AL should be removed as remarked by Martínez-Tossas and Meneveau (2019), however its influence is negligible.




**Figure 5.** Velocities induced perpendicular to a rectangular wing predicted by an actuator line (AL) without correction and by vortex segments with a viscous core (Vortex) with different smearing parameters. Velocities are shown along lines cutting the bound and trailed vortices at right angles and  $y = 0$ . Only half of the horseshoe vortex is depicted as  $x' = x - (b + r_{v=1})$ .

For the hypothesis to be valid the velocity distribution in the plane orthogonal to the trailed vortices should thus be identical to the one of the bound vortex .

25 Fig. 5 compares the velocities induced by a rectangular wing predicted by an AL and three vortex segments (one bound, two trailed) for five different smearing parameters. Only half of the wing is presented, due to symmetry. Velocity distributions are shown for lines cutting the vortex segments at right angles for  $y = 0$ . Clearly the velocity smearing is identical between trailed and bound vorticity, confirming the smearing hypothesis. Slight differences are linked to the numerical discretisation of the Gaussian force projection (Shives and Crawford, 2013) and numerical diffusion.

### 5 5.1.2 Smearing correction verification

As mentioned in Sect. 4, the new smearing correction uses a lifting-line representation of the trailed vorticity. Thus the prediction of the velocity correction with our model or vortex segments should be identical. To simultaneously verify its numerical implementation, our model receives solely the sampled velocities from the flow domain to compute the circulation at the sections. The body forces are not applied inside the domain, though, to avoid influencing the trailed vortex paths nor are the correction velocities added to the CFD velocities to keep the circulation unchanged. This holds the trailed vortices in the  $x$ - $z$  plane, simplifying the representation of the wake with vortex segments. The segments' circulation is exactly the same as in the smearing correction to avoid any numerical effects influencing the comparison. Fig. 6 compares the velocity correction predicted by the analytical vortex segments and our model at each section along a rectangular and elliptic wing for different smearing factors (i.e.  $\epsilon = 2b/(N_v - 1)$ ). With decreasing force smearing the velocity correction concentrates towards the tips, as



**Figure 6.** Analytical (An.) and corresponding model prediction of the velocity correction for varying force smearing ( $\epsilon = 2b/(N_v - 1)$ ) along a rectangular and elliptic wing, where  $x' = x - (b + r_{v=1})$ .

- 15 the induced velocity gradients are increasing. Therefore even at higher resolution the smearing correction remains significant, yet more localised. Generally the model slightly over-predicts the missing induction at the wing, becoming more prominent with increasing resolution. With  $N_v = 64$  the difference maximally reaches 6.7% (rectangular) and 1.7% (elliptic) with respect to the inflow velocity. The average error does not breach 0.5% in any case. The velocity jump towards the tip sections of the elliptical wing is related to the equidistant discretisation of the wing (Pirrung et al., 2014).

### 5.1.3 Coupled AL-smearing correction verification

- 5 The coupling between velocity correction and the flow domain is verified by comparing the corrected downwash at an elliptical wing to the theoretical expectation. The downwash should be constant along the wing and is given by

$$v_{\text{th}} = -\frac{\Gamma_0}{4b} = -\frac{w_\infty c_0 C_l}{8b} \quad (27)$$


where  $\Gamma_0$  is the circulation at the wing root. Similar to Shives and Crawford (2013) the  $C_l$  was not fixed, but instead followed the theoretical lift curve slope for thin airfoils  $C_l = 2\pi$ . For the wing to operate at a constant lift coefficient  $C_l = 1$ , its angle-of-attack needed to include the effect of the induced velocities:

$$\alpha = \alpha_{\text{eff}} + \alpha_i = \frac{C_l}{2\pi} + \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{c_0 C_l}{8b} \right) \quad (28)$$

- This represents a more rigorous test of the coupled system than prescribing the loading along the wing, as only the correct downwash leads to the desired, constant sectional lift coefficients.

Fig. 7 shows the downwash predicted by AL simulations with different smearing parameters and active correction. The CFD component of the velocities are shown ( $v^{\text{CFD}}$ ) separately to emphasise the contribution of the correction to arrive at the correct, constant downwash of  $1 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ . Clearly without the correction, the induced velocities are a function of the smearing factor and only arrive at the theoretically expected value for  $N_v = 32$ . Including the correction greatly reduces the dependence of the

10 downwash on the force smearing. The insufficient correction towards the tips feeds back to the equidistant discretisation of the AL (Pirrung et al., 2014), which is linked to the uniform spacing of the underlying flow grid.




**Figure 7.** Downwash at an elliptical wing predicted by AL simulations with different smearing factors and smearing correction. The CFD component of the velocities are shown (dashed) as well as the total downwash incorporating the correction (solid). The theoretical value acts as reference.

## 5.2 Rotor simulations - NREL 5MW

The validity of the smearing hypothesis and its correction in rotor applications is demonstrated with simulations of the NREL 5MW turbine (Jonkman et al., 2009) using actuator (AL) and lifting line (LL) models. The input parameters to these simulations are given in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Input parameters to the NREL 5MW simulations.

$V_\infty$ [ $\text{ms}^{-1}$ ]	$\Omega$ [rpm]	Pitch [ $^\circ$ ]
4	4.6	0.00
6	6.9	0.00
8	9.2	0.00
14	12.1	2.59
25	12.1	23.09




**Figure 8.** Normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. ( $N_s = 19$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.1R$ )

### 5.2.1 Uniform inflow


Fig. 8 compares the AL results with and without the novel smearing correction to the LL with and without viscous core. At this wind speed of  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  the thrust coefficient is highest ( $C_T = 0.84$ ) - and hence induction - thus lending itself as a strong verification case. Clearly, there is an equivalence between the original AL and the LL with a viscous core and the corrected AL with the LL. The smearing correction thereby makes the AL effectively act as a LL, as originally intended by Sørensen and Shen (2002). The impact of the viscous core is most prominent towards blade root and tip. The sudden drop in the forces predicted by the AL/LL+core for the tip section of the blade - located at  $r/R = 0.97$  - is not triggered by any aerodynamic tip effects, but relates to a pronounced reduction in chord. Fig. 9 shows the diminishing effect of the correction on the angle-of-attack towards the root and tip. As the correction velocities are negligible with respect to the rotational velocity - they impact the velocity magnitude by less than 0.1% in the lifting region of the blade - it is ultimately the change in the angle-of-attack that explains the observations in the force distributions. While not greatly affecting the magnitude of the forces in the mid-section of the blade, the viscous core does introduce greater fluctuations in the force distribution. The missing induction introduced by the viscous core hence reduces the coupling between neighbouring blade sections. The smearing correction also recovers this behaviour of the LL. Surpassing rated wind speed, forces increase inboard until cut-out. Just before cut-out at  $25 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  loading thus reaches a maximum towards the root, causing an equally pronounced influence of the smearing correction in this region as demonstrated in Fig. 10. Again, the equivalence of the AL and LL implementations is remarkable. This high wind-speed case also demonstrates our correction is not only a *tip correction*.

The comparison of AL and LL is summarised in Fig. 11 in the form of local thrust and power distributions at different wind speeds. Note that for the wind speeds below rated ( $< 11.4 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ ), the coefficients are identical. The results are only presented for simulations with  $N_s = 9$  for visibility, but compare equally well at higher resolution. As mentioned earlier, the smearing corrections acts predominantly towards tip and root. An additional overview of all results is given in Table 3. Here the total





**Figure 9.** Angle-of-attack with/without smearing correction on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ . ( $N_s = 19$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.1R$ )




**Figure 10.** Normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $25 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ )

rotor thrust  $T$  and power  $P$  predicted by the corrected actuator line (AL<sup>\*</sup>) and the lifting line (LL) are listed as well as the influence of adding the viscous core relative to AL<sup>\*</sup> and LL, respectively. The AL and LL solutions are not directly compared to avoid including any mean bias in the comparison. The impact of the correction on the AL forces is nearly identical to removing the viscous core in the LL simulations at any wind speed, which further supports our correction methodology. In light of the large errors incurred without any correction, unsurprisingly, some form of tip correction is usually applied in AL simulations.

### 5.2.2 Yawed inflow

As the smearing correction does not include yaw effects - the wake is assumed to advect normal to the rotor plane - we tested its influence at yaw angles  $\chi$  of 15, 30 and 45 degrees at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$ . Again the LL with and without viscous core acted as reference.




**Figure 11.** Local thrust and power coefficients along the NREL 5MW blades at different wind speeds predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without core. ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ )

**Table 3.** An overview of the simulation inputs and results for the NREL 5MW in uniform inflow. Results are grouped by blade/grid resolution. For the actuator line (AL) and lifting line (LL) the simulation time step  $\Delta t$ , the total thrust  $T$  and power  $P$  and the relative change in these quantities caused by the correction/removing the viscous core are listed. Note that AL\* represents the corrected AL results and change is expressed relative to the rotor thrust and power.

$N_s$	$\epsilon/R$	$V_\infty$ [ms <sup>-1</sup> ]	$\Delta t \times 10^{-2}$ [s]		$T \times 10^5$ [N]		$\Delta T$ [%]		$P \times 10^6$ [W]		$\Delta P$ [%]	
			AL	LL	AL*	LL	$\Delta$ AL	$\Delta$ LL	AL*	LL	$\Delta$ AL	$\Delta$ LL
9	0.2	4	15.90	18.12	1.01	1.02	3.50	3.21	0.26	0.26	9.19	8.74
		6	13.82	12.08	2.27	2.30	3.78	3.20	0.89	0.88	8.91	8.72
		8	10.36	9.06	4.08	4.09	2.84	3.20	2.13	2.08	7.51	8.71
		14	7.87	6.89	4.64	4.77	4.00	3.19	5.39	5.54	5.64	4.90
		25	7.87	6.89	2.84	2.99	2.77	0.82	5.40	5.68	3.08	1.65
19	0.1	4	10.37	18.12	0.98	0.99	2.80	2.13	0.25	0.25	7.48	5.81
		6	6.90	12.08	2.21	2.22	2.79	2.12	0.83	0.85	7.45	5.79
		8	5.17	9.06	3.92	3.95	2.81	2.13	1.98	2.02	7.49	5.81
		14	3.93	6.89	4.52	4.61	3.09	5.98	5.22	5.35	4.71	7.50

The time steps remained the same as in uniform inflow. Here only the results for the most extreme case at 45° yaw are shown, as then the differences are most severe. Fig. 12 presents the normal and tangential force variation during one rotation, averaged over three distinct regions of the blade, at a wind speed of 8 ms<sup>-1</sup>. Whilst the agreement is best towards the blade tip, the



**Figure 12.** Normal (upper panels) and tangential (lower panels) force variation during one rotation as a function of azimuthal position of the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  and  $45^\circ$  yaw. The forces are averaged over three sections of the blade and are predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. The blade is facing upwind at  $\chi = 0^\circ$  and is pointing vertically up at  $\chi = 90^\circ$ . ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ )

force variation with azimuthal position is similar between AL and LL simulations across all sections. AL results are shifted downwards with respect to the LL predictions at the inner sections, hinting at the AL experiencing higher induction in this region. But for the verification of the smearing correction this shift is irrelevant, instead its impact on the AL forces needs to be judged relative to the difference between LL with and without core. In this respect the smearing correction is behaving correctly, increasing forces in a similar fashion as a LL without core in the mid-section of the blade and reducing them towards the root and tip.

### 5.2.3 Pitch step

The pitch step is defined as

$$\psi = \psi_0 + \frac{\Delta\psi}{2} [1 + \tanh(k(t - t_0))] \quad (29)$$

**Table 4.** Inputs defining the pitch step.

$V_\infty$ [ms <sup>-1</sup> ]	$\Omega$ [rpm]	$\psi_0$ [°]	$\Delta\psi$ [°]	$k$
14	12.1	2.59	$\pm 2$	16

- 5 with  $\psi_0$  defining the pitch angle before the step,  $t_0$  the time instant of the step and  $\Delta\psi$  the pitch change. Here an extremely violent step is chosen - determined by  $k$  - to encourage an equally pronounced blade force response and thus tests the numerical stability of our correction. The parameters governing this comparison are given in Table 4, which realise a pitch step of  $\pm 2^\circ$  in 0.14 s (10% to 90% pitch). To capture the swift change in pitch, the time step is adjusted in both AL and LL simulations to  $3.94 \times 10^{-2}$  s. The blade force response is normalised as


$$\hat{F}(t) = \frac{F(t) - F_0}{F_\infty - F_0} \quad (30)$$

with  $F_0$  and  $F_\infty$  denoting the steady-state values before and after the pitch step, respectively.


- Here only the tangential force response after a  $+2^\circ$  step for the mid and tip blade sections are shown in Fig. 13, as they capture the main features of the response. As the definition here is positive pitch to feather, the force decreases along the blade for positive pitch changes. The AL simulations exhibit a faster response with a kink at 0.14 s, coinciding with the pitch change reaching 99% of the step. The AL therefore seems to capture the pitch rate lift. The LL does not show this feature so - as in yaw - the correct behaviour of the smearing correction on the AL force response should be assessed relative to the influence of removing the viscous core in the LL model. Overall, the correction has limited effect on the dynamic response, which is also confirmed by the LL simulations, but the correction essentially acts on the forces as removing the core in the LL. In the mid-section it reduces the forces by maximally 1% during the first 2 s, dropping to 0.5% afterwards. At the tip section it intensifies the response by maximally 1%, diminishing to 0.3% at 4 s.

#### 5.2.4 Turbulent inflow

- Highly turbulent inflow should challenge the numerical stability of the new smearing correction by introducing strong and abrupt changes in the angle-of-attack. Comparing simulations with and without inflow turbulence should furthermore reveal, whether turbulence alters the nature of the correction. Fig. 14 shows the impact of the smearing correction on the time-averaged normal and tangential blade forces at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  mean wind speed for AL simulations with uniform and turbulent inflow. With a turbulence intensity (TI) of 15%, the forces are unsurprisingly slightly larger ( $\approx 20 \text{ Nm}^{-1}$ ) than in uniform inflow. However the change in forces introduced by the correction is nearly identical ( $< 2 \text{ Nm}^{-1}$ ). When comparing the standard deviation of the forces with and without correction in Fig. 15 the smoothing and dampening effect of the smearing correction on the forces also in highly turbulent inflow becomes apparent. Madsen et al. (2018) observed a corresponding reduction of the force variations on the whole rotor blade when comparing near wake model results against BEM results for the NM 80 rotor in



**Figure 13.** Normalised tangential force response at two blade sections (middle and tip) of the NREL 5MW following a pitch step of  $+2^\circ$  in 0.14 s at  $14 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  predicted by AL simulations with/without smearing correction and LL with/without viscous core. ( $N_s = 9$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.2R$ )




**Figure 14.** Time-averaged normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  mean wind speed and changing inflow turbulence predicted by the AL model with and without smearing correction. ( $N_s = 35$ ,  $\epsilon = R/8$ )

turbulent inflow. This illustrates that the smearing correction leads to the same dynamic coupling between neighbouring blade sections as a lifting line model.

## 6 Conclusions

- 5 The actuator line was intended as a lifting line technique for CFD applications. In this paper we prove - theoretically and practically - that smearing the forces of the actuator line in the flow domain necessarily leads to smeared velocity fields. For the typical Gaussian force projection the widely known Lamb-Oseen (Lamb, 1932; Oseen, 1911) viscous core appears in both bound and trailed vorticity. This core reduces the velocities approaching the vortex centre compared to the inviscid solution of the lifting line. The trailed vorticity of an actuator line thus induces lower velocities at the blade owing to the force projection.



**Figure 15.** Variation of normal and tangential forces on the NREL 5MW blades at  $8 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  mean wind speed and turbulence intensity of 15% predicted by the AL model with and without smearing correction. ( $N_s = 35$ ,  $\epsilon = R/8$ )

- 10 We recover this missing induction by combining a near-wake model of the trailed vorticity with Lamb-Oseen’s viscous core model and coupling it with the actuator line model. Basic wing test cases with theoretical solutions verify the correction, as it recovers nearly all induction independent of the severity of the force smearing. Rotor simulations furthermore show the applicability and strength of the correction over the entire operational wind speed range as well as in yaw, strong turbulence and undergoing pitch steps. Here the correction is validated with lifting line simulations with and without viscous core, that
- 15 are representative of an actuator line with and without smearing correction, respectively. The agreement between the respective actuator and lifting line results is remarkable.

The current implementation of the smearing correction relies on heavy bookkeeping. In future versions the latter will be removed without jeopardising stability nor accuracy, making it suitable for wind farm simulations in realistic atmospheric flows. Potentially, the correction might also enable accurate rotor simulations at lower discretisation.

- 20 *Code and data availability.* All data and parts of the code covering the smearing correction are available on request. Commercial and research licenses for EllipSys3D can be purchased from DTU.

## Appendix A: Fixed wake equations

The equations governing the fixed wake approach underlying the smearing correction (see Fig. 3) are summarised for completeness.

Direction vector from the vortex element to a control point along the blade:

$$5 \quad \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} -r \cos \beta + r - h \\ r \sin \beta \\ -v_h \beta / \Omega \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Definition of the vortex element:

$$\delta \mathbf{l} = \delta l \cos \phi \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \beta \\ -\cos \beta \\ v_h / (\Omega r) \end{pmatrix} \quad \delta l = \frac{r \delta \beta}{\cos \phi} \quad (\text{A2})$$

Note that

$$\cos \phi = \frac{\Omega r}{\sqrt{(\Omega r)^2 + v_h^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{v_h}{\Omega r}\right)^2}} \quad \tan \phi = \frac{v_h}{\Omega r} \quad (\text{A3})$$

10 Incremental velocity induced by the vortex element

$$\delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\Delta \Gamma}{4\pi} \frac{\delta \mathbf{l} \times \mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|^3} = A r \begin{pmatrix} (v_h / \Omega r) (\beta \cos \beta - \sin \beta) \\ -(v_h / \Omega r) (-1 + h_r + \cos \beta + \beta \sin \beta) \\ [-1 + (1 - h_r) \cos \beta] \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A4})$$

with

$$A = \frac{\Delta \Gamma r \delta \beta}{4\pi} \underbrace{\left[ r^2 \left( 1 + (1 - h_r)^2 - 2(1 - h_r) \cos \beta + \left( \frac{v_h \beta}{\Omega r} \right)^2 \right) \right]^{-\frac{3}{2}}}_{|\mathbf{x}|^2} \quad h_r = \frac{h}{r} \quad (\text{A5})$$

*Author contributions.* AMF was responsible for writing the paper, except for Sect. 3.2 which was authored by NRG. The original numerical implementation of the near-wake model by GP was adapted by AMF to incorporate the smearing correction with the help of GP. NRG performed all simulations with the lifting-line and AMF those with the actuator line. All authors decided on the flow cases to simulate and commented on the document.

*Competing interests.* The authors declare no conflict of interest.

*Acknowledgements.* We would like to acknowledge DTU Wind Energy's internal project "Virtual Atmosphere" for partially funding this research. Furthermore many thanks to Senior Researcher Dr. Mac Gaunaa for his insights on vortex aerodynamics and Senior Researcher Dr. Niels Trolborg for his input on actuator line simulations/modelling, both from DTU Wind Energy. Thanks also to Ang Li for his help on the near-wake model.

## References

- Ananthan, S. and Leishman, J. G.: Role of Filament Strain in the Free-Vortex Modeling of Rotor Wakes, *Journal of the American Helicopter Society*, 9, 176–191, 2004.
- 15 Dag, K., Sørensen, J., Sørensen, N., and Shen, W.: Combined pseudo-spectral / actuator line model for wind turbine applications, Ph.D. thesis, DTU Wind Energy, Denmark, 2017.
- Forsythe, J. R., Lynch, E., Polsky, S., and Spalart, P.: Coupled Flight Simulator and CFD Calculations of Ship Airwake using Kestrel, in: 53rd AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting, <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2015-0556>, <https://app.dimensions.ai/details/publication/pub.1024384343>, exported from <https://app.dimensions.ai> on 2018/12/18, 2015.
- 20 Glauert, H.: *Airplane Propellers*, pp. 169–360, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4_3), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-91487-4_3), 1935.
- Jha, P. K., Churchfield, M. J., Moriarty, P. J., and Schmitz, S.: Guidelines for Volume Force Distributions Within Actuator Line Modeling of Wind Turbines on Large-Eddy Simulation-Type Grids, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*, 136, 031 003, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4026252>, <http://solarenergyengineering.asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/article.aspx?doi=10.1115/1.4026252>, 2014.
- 25 Jonkman, J., Butterfield, S., Musial, W., and Scott, G.: Definition of a 5-MW reference wind turbine for offshore system development, Tech. rep., NREL, 2009.
- Lamb, H.: *Hydrodynamics*, C.U.P, 1932.
- Leishman, J. G., Bhagwat, M. J., and Bagai, A.: Free-Vortex Filament Methods for the Analysis of Helicopter Rotor Wakes, *Journal of Aircraft*, 39, 759–775, 2002.
- 30 Leonard, B.: A stable and accurate convective modelling procedure based on quadratic upstream interpolation, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 19, 59–98, 1979.
- Madsen, H. A., Sørensen, N. N., Bak, C., Troldborg, N., and Pirrung, G.: Measured aerodynamic forces on a full scale 2MW turbine in comparison with EllipSys3D and HAWC2 simulations, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1037, 022 011, <http://stacks.iop.org/1742-6596/1037/i=2/a=022011>, 2018.
- 35 Martínez-Tossas, L. A. and Meneveau, C.: Filtered lifting line theory and application to the actuator line model, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 863, 269–292, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2018.994>, 2019.
- Menter, F. R.: Zonal two equation  $k - \omega$  turbulence models for aerodynamic flows, in: 23<sup>rd</sup> Fluid Dynamics, Plasmadynamics, and Lasers Conference, Fluid Dynamics and Co-located Conferences, Orlando, FL, <https://doi.org/10.2514/6.1993-2906>, 1993.
- Meyer Forsting, A., Troldborg, N., Bechmann, A., and Réthoré, P.-E.: Modelling Wind Turbine Inflow: The Induction Zone, Ph.D. thesis, DTU Wind Energy, Denmark, <https://doi.org/10.11581/DTU:00000022>, 2017.
- 5 Michelsen, J.: Basis3D - a platform for development of multiblock PDE solvers, Tech. rep., Dept. of Fluid Mechanics, Technical University of Denmark, DTU, 1994a.
- Michelsen, J.: Block structured multigrid solution of 2D and 3D elliptic PDE's, Tech. rep., Dept. of Fluid Mechanics, Technical University of Denmark, DTU, 1994b.
- Mikkelsen, R.: Actuator Disc Methods Applied to Wind Turbines, Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark, 2003.
- 10 Nathan, J.: Application of Actuator Surface Concept in LES Simulations of the Near Wake of Wind Turbines, Ph.D. thesis, École de Technologie Supérieure, 2018.



- Oseen, C.: Über Wirbelbewegung in einer reibenden Flüssigkeit, *Arkiv för matematik, astronomi och fysik*, Almqvist & Wiksells, <https://books.google.dk/books?id=wrCJPgAACAAJ>, 1911.
- Patanker, S. and Spalding, D.: A calculation procedure for heat, mass and momentum transfer in three-dimensional parabolic flows, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 1972.
- 15 Pirrung, G., Madsen, H. A., Kim, T., and Heinz, J.: A coupled near and far wake model for wind turbine aerodynamics, *Wind Energy*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.1969>, 2016.
- Pirrung, G., Riziotis, V., Madsen, H., Hansen, M., and Kim, T.: Comparison of a coupled near- and far-wake model with a free-wake vortex code, *Wind Energy Science*, 2, 15–33, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2-15-2017>, <https://www.wind-energ-sci.net/2/15/2017/>, 2017a.
- 20 Pirrung, G. R., Hansen, M. H., and Madsen, H. A.: Improvement of a near wake model for trailing vorticity, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 555, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/555/1/012083>, 2014.
- Pirrung, G. R., Madsen, H. A., and Schreck, S.: Trailing vorticity modeling for aeroelastic wind turbine simulations in standstill, *Wind Energy Science*, 2, 521–532, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2-521-2017>, <https://www.wind-energ-sci.net/2/521/2017/>, 2017b.
- Ramos-García, N., Shen, W. Z., and Sørensen, J. N.: Validation of a three-dimensional viscous-inviscid interactive solver for wind turbine rotors, *Renewable Energy*, Vol. 70, p. 78-92. DOI: 10.1016/j.renene.2014.04.001, 2014a.
- 25 Ramos-García, N., Shen, W. Z., and Sørensen, J. N.: Three-dimensional viscous-inviscid coupling method for wind turbine computations, Published online in *Wind energy*. DOI: 10.1002/we.1821., 2014b.
- Ramos-García, N., M. Møhlholm, J. N. S., and Walther, J. H.: Hybrid vortex simulations of wind turbines using a three-dimensional viscous-inviscid panel method, *Wind Energy*, Vol. 20, No. 11, p. 1187-1889., 2017.
- 30 Réthoré, P.-E. and Sørensen, N.: A discrete force allocation algorithm for modelling wind turbines in computational fluid dynamics, *Wind Energy*, 15, 915–926, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.525>, 2012.
- Shen, W., Sørensen, J., and Mikkelsen, R.: Tip loss correction for actuator/Navier Stokes computations, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*, 59, 209–213, 2005.
- Shives, M. and Crawford, C.: Mesh and load distribution requirements for actuator line CFD simulations, *Wind Energy*, 16, 657–669, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.2013>.
- 460 Sørensen, J. N. and Shen, W. Z.: Numerical modelling of wind turbine wakes, *Journal of Fluids Engineering*, 124, 393–399, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.1471361>, 2002.
- Sørensen, N.: General purpose flow solver applied to flow over hills, Ph.D. thesis, Risø National Laboratory, 1995.
- Squire, H. B.: The growth of a vortex in turbulent flow, *Aeronautical Quarterly*, 16, 302–306, 1965.
- Strelets, M.: Detached eddy simulation of massively separated flows, in: 39<sup>th</sup> AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, AIAA Paper 465 2001-0879, Reno,NV, 2001.
- Troldborg, N., Sørensen, J., and Mikkelsen, R.: Actuator Line Modeling of Wind Turbine Wakes, Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark, 2009.
- Vollmer, L., Steinfeld, G., and Kühn, M.: Transient LES of an offshore wind turbine, *Wind Energy Science*, 2, 603–614, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2-603-2017>, <https://www.wind-energ-sci.net/2/603/2017/>, 2017.