

Manuscript

Modelling the influence of streamwise flow field acceleration on the aerodynamic performance of an actuator disc

Response to reviewer 2

Clemens Paul Zengler, Niels Troldborg, Mac Gaunaa

March 27, 2025

All changes to the manuscript can be tracked in the attached document. In the following, **bold text** is the reviewer’s comments, while regular text is the author’s answer.

General remarks:

- **The paper is quite focused. This is beneficial in some respects; however, there seems to be room for additional content. More detailed or a variation of comparison cases or a comparison with results from the literature would be valuable improvements.**

A comparison with results from literature was originally intended to be added. However, it was difficult to identify a good comparison which would on the one side represent a comparable flow situation and on the other side provide sufficient data for an easy comparison without the need of more assumptions about the model or about the comparison data. The authors are afraid that a comparison with too many new assumptions would impair comprehensibility and clearness of the manuscript.

For completeness, we would like to present a comparison with literature here and discuss which exact challenges arise. The work by Revaz and Porté-Agel [2024] is used for this purpose. They performed LES of a wind turbine modelled as an actuator disc including rotational effects and distributed blade forces. It was operating on a quasi-two dimensional hill described by a trigonometric function and they varied geometrical features of the setup such as hill height, hill width, length of the plateau and hub height of the turbine. Besides reporting essential turbine performance data as C_P , C_T , and a , they also report the non-dimensional pressure gradient of the undisturbed flow, which they estimate as $-U_\infty \frac{dU_\infty}{dx} \frac{D}{U_{\infty,R}^2}$. Although the available data appears suitable for validating the simple model with it, there are certain challenges involved in this, which are outlined below.

First, in the LES, the turbine is operated with a controller and thus without knowing the details of it, it is possible that the controller itself modifies the relation between induction, thrust coefficient and power coefficient in non-uniform flow fields. This problem is difficult to avoid when comparing analytical models with high-fidelity models or measurement data. However, the information they provide is that the turbine is always operating at optimal conditions. It is not clear if by this it is referred to that the controller should theoretically always operate optimally, or if the controller is actually tuned for each respective flow case. The former appears more likely to the authors. Without questioning whether a controller is always operating optimally, we adopt this assumption in the following.

Second, to make predictions with the presented model for situations in which not only C_T and C_P changes, but also the induction factor a as it is the case in the work by Revaz and Porté-Agel [2024], it is necessary to know the full thrust-induction curve in a non-accelerating flow field. Because this is not provided, one needs to assume a relation, adding another layer of uncertainty to the comparison. For the present comparison and for the sake of simplicity, we assume that $C_P(a)$ is a third-order polynomial and use the knowledge about optimal induction and C_P and

the assume that at an induction of zero and of one, the power performance vanishes. The function $C_T(a)$ is afterwards approximated by dividing $C_P(a)$ by the rotor velocity $(1 - a)$ and a constant factor, which we assume to be the aerodynamic efficiency. The resulting curves are presented in Fig. 1 (a).

Third, for a perfect comparison, the acceleration should be constant. As this is an idealization, and for example in complex terrain it is very unlikely to find these conditions, additional research is necessary to determine how to apply the simple model in these cases. In an article which is currently being prepared, we investigate this question further. In their work, Revaz and Porté-Agel [2024] report a pressure gradient of the base flow in the near wake, which is calculated as $-U_\infty \frac{dU_\infty}{dx} \frac{D}{U_{\infty,R}^2}$. For the authors, it is not fully clear, how this gradient was exactly evaluated, nonetheless, a first approximation to make this data applicable to the simple model could be

$$-U_\infty \frac{dU_\infty}{dx} \frac{D}{U_{\infty,R}^2} \approx -\frac{dU_{\infty,R}}{dx} \frac{D}{U_{\infty,R}} = -\beta, \quad (1)$$

which is just a flip of the sign due to the inverse relationship of pressure gradient and velocity gradient.

One last question arising is how exactly the power coefficient should be modelled in the simple model in case of a non-ideal turbine. Following the approach of replacing $4a(1 - a)$ by the thrust coefficient of a turbine and $4a(1 - a)^2$ by the power coefficient, we hypothesize the following relation for the power coefficient in an accelerating flow field

$$C_P(a) = C_{P,u}(a) + C_{T,u}(a)l\beta. \quad (2)$$

Predictions are visualized in Fig. 1 (b) for two different ways of calculating l . In the first way, it is, as in the manuscript just set to $l = 1$, in the other case the calculation of l is based on the discussion in the manuscript, where it is calculated as a measure of error between the prediction and the data. Grey markers indicate cases, in which a recirculation zone developed in the wake of the turbine in the LES. Interestingly, in the RANS simulations presented in the manuscript, the development of recirculation zones was already observed for $\beta < -0.03$, which is significantly earlier than in the discussed LES and also led to the fact that the model was only validated down to $\beta \approx -0.03$. This raises the question whether the calculation of β is consistent between both cases and which other factors might influence the wake breakdown except only the deceleration itself. Further, the spread in the LES data makes it difficult to conclude how well the model works, although the model seems to somewhat capture the measured trends, depending on what part of the data one looks at.

Because of the numerous difficulties and required approximations/guesses in the comparison, it was decided to not include any comparison with the literature and instead to develop the model further in the future to find ways to apply it consistently across different use cases. An application of the model to practical flow situations in complex terrain is currently prepared for publication in a conference proceeding.

- **Introduction/Literature: The consideration of existing literature seems superficial. This does not necessarily mean that the authors did not consider it, but as a reader, I felt the literature was listed rather perfunctorily. The discussion of this literature in the context of the proposed model is very brief.**

The introduction was adjusted by discussing the presented literature on the effect of acceleration in more detail. Specific attention was put on literature which directly refers to the problem of the paper.

Abstract:

- **The abstract is short and precise, which is good from my point of view. However, adding one or two sentences on the usefulness of the new development (e.g., which realistic flow situations can now be modeled?) might increase potential readers' interest.**

A sentence was added to the beginning of the abstract to directly draw the attention of the reader to the possible application.




Figure 1: **(a)** Optimum C_P^* and C_T^* as reported by Revaz and Porté-Agel [2024] and analytical approximations fitted to the data. **(b)** Comparison of the simple model with LES results from Revaz and Porté-Agel [2024]. Grey markers indicate cases which showed the development of a recirculation zone in the wake and are not considered in the linear fit of the data.

- **The last sentence is meaningful but indirect. It could be beneficial to state what the consequence of this finding would be for wind turbine design, for example.**
A sentence was added to the end of the abstract. It is indeed a good point, that this would also affect turbine design based on BEM codes, since it usually relies on the classical thrust-induction relation from momentum theory. Explaining this in detail however, might be too long for an abstract.

Specific lines:

- **Lines 27-48: As I understand, the sentences before were related to corrections/improvements of the momentum theory to capture the physical impacts of different flow situations. From the text, it seems a bit off-topic to cite a publication that deals with the improvement of the wind turbine performance rather than the improvement of a modelling approach.**

The reason these publications are cited or rather that the topic of a diffuser-augmented turbine is touched upon is, that one could consider a diffuser also as a device which introduces a streamwise acceleration at and in the vicinity of the wind turbine disk. However, due to the well-defined boundary conditions in this case, it is different to model.

- **Line 43: The term ‘linearized flow solver’ sounds rather general to me. What kind of model is used here? This information is crucial to understand the ‘computational burden’ mentioned later.**

They used a model based on linear perturbation theory developed for the flow over hills, which divides the flow into several regions. Eventually they solved a Laplace equation for the outer region, where shear stresses can be neglected. Considering the speed how fast a Laplace equation can be solved, one can certainly argue about how big this computational burden is for a single model evaluation. However, in design studies or wind farm design considerations and optimization, the additional computational burden could easily accumulate. An additional description was added to the article to ease the understanding for the reader here.

Model derivation:

- **To gain a better understanding, it would be helpful to describe the basic idea of the approach before delving into the mathematical derivation. I feel that there should be included that you assume a stream tube and how it is modified due to the accelerated flow field.**

The general idea is now described at the beginning of the section and it is specifically highlighted how the derivation is different from classical momentum theory.

- **From my point of view, the shape of the stream tube is modified by the accelerated flow field. As a consequence, the sketch should be modified. Or is there any reason why this should not be the case?**

The authors agree that the shape of the stream tube is modified by the accelerated flow field. Since the exact shape depends also on the exact acceleration, for example whether it is positive or negative, it was decided to leave the shape rather generic to improve the clarity of the figure.

- **You state that the force acting on the stream tube is non-zero. On the other hand, you use the assumption of as zero pressure difference between inner and outer part of the stream tube (which is evident). Therefore, the force needs to act on the in and outlet. Is a non-zero force on the in- and outlet in accordance with your idea? Wouldn't the stream tube itself be accelerated then? Please explain.**

The zero pressure difference assumption is only applied at the inlet and the outlet of the stream tube, and this is a zero pressure difference in the direction perpendicular to the axial/main flow direction. There exist a pressure gradient in the axial direction in everywhere in the backbone flow, which is related to the velocity gradient (application of Bernoulli shows that $\partial p_\infty / \partial x = -\rho U_\infty \partial U_\infty / \partial x$). In other words, the extent of the stream tube is defined by the streamwise position at which the pressure between stream tube and surrounding flow equalizes in the direction perpendicular to the streamwise direction. This allows to link the free stream velocity to the wake velocity. The pressure at the inlet and the outlet is different due to the acceleration of the background flow field. To further clarify this idea, the derivation of the pressure term in the model is presented below.

The exact determination of the pressure term would require the evaluation of the following integral over the surface of the stream tube

$$F_p = - \oint_{CV} p d\vec{A} \cdot \vec{e}_x. \quad (3)$$

This integral can be split into three parts, the stream tube inlet, the stream tube outlet and the sides of the stream tube, thus

$$F_p = - \oint_{A_0} p d\vec{A} \cdot \vec{e}_x - \oint_{A_S} p d\vec{A} \cdot \vec{e}_x - \oint_{A_1} p d\vec{A} \cdot \vec{e}_x. \quad (4)$$

While the integrals over A_0 and A_1 can be easily estimated, the integral over the side requires knowledge about the exact shape of the stream tube as well as the local value of the pressure at that point (which has contributions from both the disk as well as the "accelerating backbone flow"). We chose to approximate the total integral as

$$F_p \approx (p_{\infty,0} - p_1) A_R. \quad (5)$$

This relation can be obtained from the previous integral as

$$F_p \approx p_{\infty,0} A_0 - p_1 A_1 + p_{\infty,0} (A_R - A_0) - p_1 (A_R - A_1). \quad (6)$$

Here the first two terms represent the contributions of the inlet and outlet, which can be considered as exact, while the last two terms can be contributed to the outer surface. In that sense, the approximation of the pressure term in the model derivation is equivalent to assuming that the inlet pressure acts on the stream tube ahead of the disc, while the outlet pressure acts on the stream tube behind the disc.

We hope this explanation clarifies the ideas behind the model.

- **Lines 100 ff.: Intermediate steps would be helpful to understand exactly what has been done here. I feel there are quite some steps to go. E.g. there is a T in equation 13 which vanished in equation 14. However, no T is given in 9,10,11 and 12. Maybe**

$T = dp^*Ar$ is used. It might be that I am mistaken. Please explain.

The relationship for the thrust is mentioned in the line 80 of the manuscript, however not explicitly stated as a separate equation. Nonetheless, the authors agree with the comment, that intermediate steps are helpful, and modified the manuscript accordingly at multiple points.

- **Line 106: It seems that $L\beta$ equals the relative velocity increase over a certain distance l . Naming it like this could make it easier for the reader to understand the meaning of equation 15.**

A sentence was added after Eq. 15 mentioning this.

Specific lines:

- **Line 165: Doesn't this contradict the sentence above? ("If it is desired to better agree with the momentum theory results, it is necessary to increase the grid resolution...")**

The formulation of grid independence might be misleading in the context of the previous sentence. By grid independence we refer in this context to two things. First, the overall conclusions of the paper are not affected by the chosen grid and second the change in induction in a local sense, thus by considering only the next level of refinement is very small ($< 0.3\%$). Nonetheless, the sentence was modified to avoid this confusion.

- **Line 207: What is the 'first-order behaviour of an actuator disc'?**

By this sentence it was meant that it seems to capture the general physics involved and correctly predicts the trends. The manuscript was modified to reflect this more detailed description.

- **It would be helpful to clearly write down which of the assumptions are inconsistent/wrong. Strictly speaking, even the assumption of an inviscid fluid is 'wrong'. However, I believe that this is not one of the assumptions which is intended to be doubted here.**

The most important assumption within the model derivation is the contribution of the pressure term since it eventually leads to an equation for the rotor velocity u_R which depends on the upstream velocity and the wake velocity, with both depending on where exactly one evaluates them. The discussion was modified to highlight this fact.

4.3 On the length scale:

- **In the whole text, it is somehow suggested that the length scale is something like a physical parameter, that needs to be estimated. I am not quite sure if this is really the case. One could also see it as an arbitrary value that linearly influences the induction on the new model. In fact, omitting the physical derivation, one could see the whole model as a linear deviation of the induction with the flow acceleration and a second linear tuning parameter. The main assumption of the model would then be that the deviation of the induction is linearly dependent on the flow acceleration while the extent can be tuned by the length scale. Figure 6 shows that the required length scale to match the simulation results is strongly dependent on different parameters. (Right?) Therefore, the figure gives a hint on how strong the assumptions made in the model derivation differ from the (simulated) reality. The fact that there are two branches and a range of L between 0.5 and 2 for realistic operation conditions gives an hint on how strong reality differs from the proposed model. This is not a problem in my eyes. But if this is correct, it should be stated as it is.**

The authors agree with the general observation, that the length scale does not necessarily need to be a physical parameter. It is mostly meaningful in the context of a constant acceleration where it can be directly associated with a certain change in velocity over a certain distance, making it interpretable as a length scale. But for the more general case, it can be seen as a factor which influences the induction. And although the overall form of the model leaves the impression that it is purely a linearization, it is important to notice, that the exact functional form presented cannot be obtained by a simple linear expansion. This can be seen by solving the

model for the induction, which also leads to a non-linear contribution of the acceleration term to the induction. Further, the authors also agree with the observation, that Fig. 6 shows how strong the model differs from reality and which factors actually play a role. This is now also noted in the manuscript.

Conclusion:

- **I find the conclusion rather short. Actually, there are no conclusions on the major question of the paper: How did the proposed model work? What are the major limitations for practical use?**

The paper is now updated, so that both questions are addressed in the conclusion.

Further considerations based on highlighted text in the attached document

- **Proposed formal correction of the citation of Froude and Froude in a single citation**
Indeed, the two cited publications are by two different authors, the father William Froude [1878] and his son Robert Edmund Froude [1889], which is why the citations are listed separately.
- **Usage of the term *measured* to describe simulation results**
The term is now changed to the verb *predicted*.

References

- Tristan Revaz and Fernando Porté-Agel. Effect of hills on wind turbine flow and power efficiency: A large-eddy simulation study. *Physics of Fluids*, 36(9):095180, September 2024. ISSN 1070-6631, 1089-7666. doi: 10.1063/5.0226544.
- W. Froude. On the Elementary Relation between Pitch, Slip and Propulsive Efficiency. *Transaction of the Institute of Naval Architects*, 19:22–33, 1878.
- R.E. Froude. On the part played in propulsion by difference of fluid pressure. *Transaction of the Institute of Naval Architects*, 30:390–405, 1889.

Modelling the influence of streamwise flow field acceleration on the aerodynamic performance of an actuator disc

Clemens Paul Zengler¹, Niels Troldborg¹, and Mac Gaunaa¹

¹Department of Wind and Energy Systems, Technical University of Denmark. Frederiksborgvej 399, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark

Correspondence: Clemens Paul Zengler (clezen@dtu.dk)

Abstract. Wind turbines operating in complex terrain can be subject to a background flow field which varies in the streamwise direction. This variation can influence the induced velocity at the turbine, and thus also the power performance. In the present work, a simple model is derived for the situation of an actuator disc (AD) operating in a background flow field featuring a constant streamwise velocity gradient. Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) simulations of this scenario are performed, showing that a positive acceleration yields a reduction of induction and vice versa, a negative acceleration leads to an increase of induction. The new model accurately captures this behavior and significantly reduces the prediction error compared to classical momentum theory, where the effect of the background flow acceleration is disregarded. The model indicates that the maximum power coefficient and the corresponding values of the optimal induction and thrust coefficient depend on the flow acceleration. This possibly impacts optimal operational strategies under such conditions as well as wind turbine and wind farm design considerations, which often rely on the assumption of a streamwise uniform flow field.

1 Introduction

Classical momentum theory as developed by Rankine (1865), Froude (1878), and Froude (1889) yields insights into the relation between thrust and induction of an idealized wind turbine operating in a uniform flow field. Also, the theoretical limit of aerodynamic performance, referred to as the Betz-Joukowski limit, can be derived from it (Betz, 1920; Joukowski, 1920; Okulov and Van Kuik, 2012). The aerodynamic performance referred to here is the aerodynamic power, which is ~~a~~ the product of thrust and ~~velocity in~~ axial velocity through the turbine plane. ~~By today~~ Today, momentum theory ~~is a fundamental part of the aeroelastic design of wind turbines and of~~ plays a fundamental role in design, power performance predictions ~~and~~ aeroelastic analysis of wind turbines. However, due to its simplifying assumptions, which do not necessarily apply to the actual operating conditions of modern wind turbines, various modifications to it were proposed in the past. When turbines operate in the atmospheric boundary layer, they are usually subject to wind shear, i.e. a variation of streamwise velocity over height. Various models exist to account for this. Wagner et al. (2011) suggested using a reference velocity for performance predictions based on the kinetic energy flux through the turbine disc plane and validated this model with measurements of a full-scale turbine. Later, Chamorro and Arndt (2013) derived an analytical correction of the Betz limit by including the effect of shear upstream and downstream of the wind turbine in momentum theory. Since shear would also lead to a variation of thrust force ~~along~~ over the disc, Draper et al. (2016) included this additional effect in their model. Based on a vortex theory framework, Gaunaa et al.

(2023) showed that momentum theory should be applied locally within momentum-based design and analysis tools to properly account for the effect of shear. The problem of yaw misalignment and its effect on induction was approached in the early days by Glauert (1926) and more recently by Heck et al. (2023) and then by Tamaro et al. (2024), who incorporate both, shear and yaw misalignment in their model. Mikkelsen and Sørensen (2002) developed a correction to account for the effect of wind tunnel blockage on the aerodynamic performance of turbines in wind tunnels. The potential of using a diffuser to improve the aerodynamic turbine performance was for example studied by Jamieson (2009). Sørensen (2016) discusses the theory of both wind tunnel blockage and diffuser modelling in detail.

~~In~~ What has not yet been considered in modelling is the effect of a flow which is generally inhomogeneous in the streamwise direction. This can be the case in complex terrain or in dense wind farms, wind turbines may be subject to streamwise variations of the background flow field. Various where obstacles or turbines interact with the atmospheric boundary layer. However, various authors have shown that these variations in the streamwise flow field development can have a significant impact on the aerodynamic performance of a wind turbine. ~~Troldborg et al. (2022)~~, suggesting that it could also be beneficial to approach this problem from an analytical perspective. The previous literature has mainly focused on describing the phenomenon, while only few have attempted to model it. Troldborg et al. (2022) drew attention to this phenomenon in a Large Eddy Simulation (LES) study, in which they investigated the power performance of a full-scale wind turbine ~~on~~ placed on top of the first ridge of the two ridges, which were part of the Perdigão field campaign. In the study, they varied the surface roughness and showed that this affects both the separation and the flow development behind the ridge: For low surface roughness, the flow stayed attached, while it detached for high values. However, the undisturbed wind speed at the turbine position when it was not operating remained nearly the same in all cases. Despite this, once the turbine was operating, the predicted mean power performance varied significantly between the different cases of surface roughness. This indicated, that the way the wake is advected downstream behind the turbine also affects the performance. Zengler et al. (2024) performed idealized Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) simulations of an actuator disc (AD) located on top of a quasi-two dimensional Gaussian hill. Simulations were conducted for both different surface roughness and hill widths. The thrust force was distributed evenly over the AD and no turbine controller was involved, allowing a clearer picture of how exactly the performance of the AD is influenced by the flow field. Similar to Troldborg et al. (2022), they found that for low roughness the flow remained attached to the surface behind the ridge, leading to a deceleration and eventually to a higher induction at a given thrust coefficient, which is equivalent to a lower power performance. Here, the thrust coefficient was based on the total thrust due to the AD acting on the flow and the rotor-averaged wind speed at the position of the turbine when it was not operating. This approach is also adopted in the present work. With an increasing surface roughness, the situation became more complicated, especially when the undisturbed background flow detached from the surface already at the top of the ridge as was the case when the hill width was very small; in this case a deceleration was still noticeable at hub height; however, the induction would be lower compared to the flat reference case, which is equivalent to an increase in power performance. Dar et al. (2023) performed wind tunnel experiments of a more idealized scenario to study how wakes behave under streamwise pressure gradients. The pressure gradient was imposed by placing the turbine model on a ramp in the tunnel, causing the flow to accelerate or decelerate, depending on whether the ramp was tilted upward or downward. In addition, the power coefficient was reported showing an

increase for an accelerating background flow and a decrease in a decelerating background flow. Revaz and Porté-Agel (2024) performed LES of a wind turbine on the ~~ridge of ridge~~ of a hill through Large Eddy Simulations (LES) and found that depending on the streamwise development of the undisturbed flow field behind the ridge, significant variations in performance could be measured. Similar results were found in an experimental campaign by Dar et al. (2023). Most recently, Zengler et al. (2024); and later in the same year Revaz and Porté-Agel (2024), systematically performed simulations of wind turbines on idealized hills which confirmed the effect of streamwise flow variations on aerodynamic performance. quasi-two-dimensional hill parametrized by a trigonometric function and varied geometrical features of the setup such as hill height, hill width, plateau length, and turbine hub height. In all cases, the background flow field decelerated behind the ridge, and they reported a trend of decreasing power performance with increasing deceleration. An outlier from this trend was identified for a steep hill and a strong separation forming behind it, which is consistent with the previously mentioned findings by Zengler et al. (2024). Further works in which the influence of streamwise flow variations on power performance is reported exist (Cai et al., 2021; Mishra et al., 2024). However, it is often the case that the effect is not investigated in isolation, making it difficult to draw conclusions. ~~In general,~~ For example, the presence of a controller raises the question of how this reacts in an accelerating flow field. In addition, it is often unclear what the reference wind speed is at the turbine position, which is essential to investigate the bias in power performance due to the development of the flow field downstream. Currently, most research shows that ~~negative flow-acceleration (deceleration)~~ flow deceleration behind the turbine can lead to a decrease of ~~in~~ performance, while ~~positive~~ flow acceleration results in an increase of performance.

Efforts to include the effect of acceleration in turbine modelling have been mainly focused on the wake behavior under such circumstances (Shamsoddin and Porté-Agel, 2018; Dar and Porté-Agel, 2022; Dar et al., 2023). Only Cai et al. (2021) attempted to also model the power performance in the presence of pressure gradients, which is in a sense equivalent to modelling flow acceleration. For this purpose, they used a wake model developed for pressure gradients in combination with a linearized flow solver and a control volume analysis. Their approach is based on the linear perturbation theory for the flow over hills (Jackson and Hunt, 1975; Hunt et al., 1988) and solves a Laplace equation for the disturbance in the velocity field. Although this model can predict both wake profiles and power performance, which are in sound agreement with measurements, their approach comes with ~~a computational burden~~ an additional computational burden compared to fully analytical models and also cannot be directly incorporated into aeroelastic design as it does not yield local information about the flow state in the turbine plane. Apart from these efforts, no other work, to the authors' knowledge, has aimed at developing an analytical model to account for the effect of streamwise flow acceleration on aerodynamic performance. The present work is an attempt to model the effect of a constant streamwise flow acceleration on the induction and thus on the aerodynamic performance of a wind turbine.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. First, a simplified model is derived to account for the effect of streamwise flow acceleration in momentum theory. Second, the model is validated with Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) simulations of an actuator disc (AD) exposed to various constant velocity gradient flows. Last, implications and modelling details are discussed.




Figure 1. Sketch of the problem and notation for theoretical analysis.

95 2 Model derivation

In the following, a model is derived which relates the induced velocity in the AD plane with the thrust coefficient of the AD in an accelerating flow field. It should be stressed that the derivation is not without contradictions from a strict, physical perspective, which will be discussed in more detail in Sec. 5.1. However, the final model proves to yield comparably accurate predictions, and the derivation itself allows for a clearer understanding of which effects the model captures. The theory development is based on the idea of modifying momentum theory to account for the fact that the underlying background flow field changes between the inlet and outlet of the streamtube surrounding the AD. The derivation is very similar to classical momentum theory and mainly differs when it comes to the treatment of the pressure forces acting on the streamtube and when one needs to relate the undisturbed velocities at the streamtube inlet, the AD position and the streamtube outlet with each other. The latter step is not necessary in momentum theory, since the undisturbed background flow field does not change between these positions.

100 As in momentum theory, a steady, incompressible, and inviscid flow past an AD is considered. Figure 1 shows a sketch of the problem and its notation, which is based on the following logic: U and u ~~is~~ are the undisturbed and disturbed ~~velocity~~ velocities, respectively. A subscript ∞ refers to quantities in the undisturbed flow, while the subscript $_0$ denotes quantities ahead of the disc plane, $_R$ denotes quantities in the disc plane, and $_1$ denotes the ultimate wake. In addition, the subscript $_u$ denotes the case of a uniform flow field without a velocity gradient. The undisturbed flow field is subject to a constant velocity gradient, i.e.

$$110 \quad \frac{dU_\infty}{dx} = C. \quad (1)$$

Since an infinite axial extent of the gradient would eventually lead to negative velocities up- or downstream of the AD, the extent of the stream tube considered in Fig. 1 is bounded to regions of positive velocities. The limiting case of negative velocities in the wake is discussed in Appx. B. For now, the model derivation is continued, keeping this detail in mind.

By virtue of the Bernoulli equation, the pressure jump Δp across the AD fulfills

$$115 \quad \Delta p = \frac{1}{2} \rho U_{\infty,0}^2 + p_{\infty,0} - \frac{1}{2} \rho u_1^2 - p_1. \quad (2)$$

Further, the undisturbed flow quantities ahead and behind the disc are related by the Bernoulli equation as well by

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho U_{\infty,0}^2 + p_{\infty,0} = \frac{1}{2}\rho U_{\infty,1}^2 + p_{\infty,1}, \quad (3)$$

which yields for the pressure jump

$$\Delta p = \frac{1}{2}\rho U_{\infty,1}^2 + p_{\infty,1} - \frac{1}{2}\rho u_1^2 - p_1. \quad (4)$$

- 120 By assuming, as in classical momentum theory (Rankine, 1865; Froude, 1878; Froude, 1889), that the pressure difference between the wake and the free stream is zero (i.e. $p_1 = p_{\infty,1}$) the pressure drop over the AD is seen to represent the ultimate difference in kinetic energy between free stream and wake

$$\Delta p = \frac{1}{2}\rho (U_{\infty,1}^2 - u_1^2). \quad (5)$$

Next, momentum balance on the stream tube sketched in Fig. 1 is considered yielding

$$125 \rho A_1 u_1^2 - \rho A_0 U_{\infty,0}^2 = -T + F_p, \quad (6)$$

with the thrust force T related to the pressure jump as ~~$T = \Delta p A_R$~~

$$\underline{T = \Delta p A_R} \quad (7)$$

and the axial contribution of the pressure acting on the stream tube, F_p . The inlet and outlet areas of the stream tube A_0 and A_1 are related to the rotor area A_R by conservation of mass

$$130 U_{\infty,0} A_0 = u_R A_R = u_1 A_1. \quad (8)$$

In contrast to classical momentum theory, the pressure term F_p is not zero, because the pressure in the undisturbed flow is not constant in axial direction. Here, it is approximated to be

$$F_p \approx (p_{\infty,0} - p_1) A_R. \quad (9)$$

- Combining the equation for ~~kinetic energy Eq. (5) with momentum~~ ~~momentum balance Eq. (6) with the mass~~ balance Eq. ~~(6)~~
135 ~~and including the previously introduced terms for pressure force Eq. (9), mass balance (8) yields~~

$$\underline{\rho A_R u_R u_1 - \rho A_R u_R U_{\infty,0} = -T + F_p} \quad (10)$$

~~Further, the thrust force T is replaced by the product of pressure jump and disc area as defined in Eq. (7) and the term for the pressure force (9) is introduced into the momentum balance as well~~

$$\underline{\rho A_R u_R u_1 - \rho A_R u_R U_{\infty,0} = -\Delta p A_R + (p_{\infty,0} - p_1) A_R.} \quad (11)$$

140 Expressing Δp via Eq. (8), and energy balance in the free stream (5) and $p_{\infty,0} - p_1$ via Eq. (3), yields yields

$$\begin{aligned} \rho A_R u_R u_1 - \rho A_R u_R U_{\infty,0} &= -\frac{1}{2} \rho (U_{\infty,1}^2 - u_1^2) A_R \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \rho (U_{\infty,1}^2 - U_{\infty,0}^2) A_R. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

This equation can be solved for the rotor velocity leading to

$$u_R = \frac{1}{2} (U_{\infty,0} + u_1). \quad (13)$$

This result is similar to the classical result by Froude (1889) which says that in non-accelerating flows the velocity in the rotor plane is the average between the undisturbed, upstream velocity and wake velocity. In case of an accelerating flow, the velocity varies in the streamwise direction. Thus, it needs to be decided where to evaluate U_{∞} to obtain $U_{\infty,0}$, but also $U_{\infty,1}$, which is necessary to obtain the wake velocity u_1 based on Eq. (5). For this purpose, a length scale L is introduced, which relates the undisturbed velocity in the disc plane with the undisturbed velocities up- and downstream of the disc due to the constant gradient condition by

$$150 \quad U_{\infty,0} = U_{\infty,R} - L \frac{dU_{\infty}}{dx}, \quad (14)$$

$$U_{\infty,1} = U_{\infty,R} + L \frac{dU_{\infty}}{dx}. \quad (15)$$

These relations close the presented system of equations for a given length scale. Lastly, the induction factor and the thrust coefficient are introduced as

$$a = 1 - \frac{u_R}{U_{\infty,R}}, \quad (16)$$

$$155 \quad C_T = \frac{T}{\frac{1}{2} \rho A_R U_{\infty,R}^2}. \quad (17)$$

Finally, Eq. (5) is combined Combining Eq.(17) with Eq.(13), Eq. (14), Eq.(15), (5) and Eq. (13) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_T &= \frac{\Delta p A_R}{\frac{1}{2} \rho A_R U_{\infty,R}^2} = \frac{U_{\infty,1}^2 - u_1^2}{U_{\infty,R}^2} \\ &= \frac{U_{\infty,1}^2 - 4u_R^2 + 4u_R U_{\infty,0} - U_{\infty,0}^2}{U_{\infty,R}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The free stream velocities ahead and behind the AD are replaced by the relations in Eqs. (14) and (15) and after some rearranging one obtains

$$160 \quad C_T = \frac{4u_R(U_{\infty,R} - u_R) + 4(U_{\infty,R} - u_R)L \frac{dU_{\infty}}{dx}}{U_{\infty,R}^2}. \quad (19)$$

Applying the definition of the induction Eq. (16) ~~and Eq. (17) resulting in~~

$$C_T = 4a(1 - a) + 4al\beta,$$

~~with $l = L/D$ and introducing~~ the non-dimensional length scale ~~and $\beta = \frac{D}{U_{\infty,R}} \frac{dU_{\infty}}{dx}$ $l = L/D$ and~~ the non-dimensional velocity gradient $\beta = \frac{D}{U_{\infty,R}} \frac{dU_{\infty}}{dx}$ with D denoting the AD diameter ~~yields the final form of the model~~

165 $C_T = 4a(1 - a) + 4al\beta.$ (20)

From this equation, it can be seen that for an accelerating flow field, the relation for the thrust in a uniform flow field is modified by an additive term proportional to the free stream velocity gradient and the induction. The ~~length scale l is unknown~~ $l\beta$ is equivalent to a relative change in velocity over the distance l , with l itself being unknown. Crespo et al. (1999) stated that the length of the initial wake expansion region, thus the region where wake and free stream pressure equalize, is effectively approximately one diameter long, a value which was also adopted by Dar and Porté-Agel (2022). Since the present derivation also assumes that the pressures equalize at the non-dimensional position l , a reasonable first estimate of this value correspond to one diameter, $l = 1$. The central assumptions to obtain this result are symmetry with respect to the axial extent of the control volume and the approximation of the pressure contribution to the momentum balance. Since the first component of the right-hand side of Eq. (20) simply is the thrust-induction relation in a uniform flow, a reasonable generalization might be that arbitrary thrust-induction curves obtained in a uniform flow field can be corrected for acceleration by simply adding the last

175 term of the right-hand side of Eq. (20). Thus

$$C_T(a) = C_{T,u}(a) + 4al\beta,$$
 (21)

with the thrust-induction relation $C_{T,u}(a)$ for a uniform background flow field. Equation (21) is the new model, which will be validated in ~~the next section.~~ Sec. 4.

180 3 ~~Model validation~~ Simulation setup

~~The derived model is validated by performing three-dimensional~~ Three-dimensional RANS simulations of an AD operating in a flow field featuring a constant velocity gradient in the streamwise direction ~~are performed in order to validate the simple model later in Sec. 4.~~ The thrust-induction curves for a wide range of positive and negative accelerations are evaluated. In the following, the simulation setup is presented in detail.

185 3.1 Grid design

For every considered velocity gradient, a separate computational grid is generated. In all grids, the Cartesian coordinate system is centered around the AD with x , y and z denoting the streamwise, lateral and vertical directions, respectively. The cross-sectional area $A_S(x)$ of each grid is defined from mass conservation by the constant velocity gradient condition, i.e.

$$A_S(x) = \frac{U_R A_{S,R}}{U_R + x \frac{dU_{\infty}}{dx}},$$
 (22)




Figure 2. (a) Boundaries of the computational domains considered simulating a constant velocity gradient. In the lateral direction, the domain width is 11.390 D. The gray area indicates a region of mostly cubic cells of a side length of approximately 0.047 D. Dashed lines indicate two domain configurations which are not considered within the model validation. The color-coding for the different domains is used consistently in all subsequent figures. (b) Comparison of Eulerian and RANS simulation for the baseline uniform case with theoretical results from momentum theory:




Figure 3. Computational grid for a deceleration, with only every eighth grid line shown. (a) grid in the x - z plane, and grid in the y - z plane at x equal to (b) -20 D, (c) 0 D, and (d) 50 D.

190 with U_R and $A_{S,R}$ being the undisturbed velocity and the cross-sectional area in the AD plane. These quantities are held constant for all grids. The latter is quadratic with a side length of 11.390 D resulting in a blockage ratio of 0.605 %¹. Based on Eq. (22), the upper and lower boundaries of the grids are modified vertically for the different velocity gradients. The lateral boundaries are not modified, resulting in a quasi-two dimensional domain. The diffuser region has a length of 34.170 D with

¹The seemingly arbitrary value of 11.390 D is the consequence of the radial smearing of the AD thrust force as described by Zengler et al. (2024). If just the radial extent of the force distribution was used as reference length, the side length would be 10 D. However, to make the results comparable, the normalization diameter is calculated based on an equivalent AD with a uniform loading over the entire extent of the AD.




Figure 4. Comparison of Eulerian and RANS simulation for the baseline uniform case with theoretical results from momentum theory.




Figure 5. Simulation results with (a) the undisturbed streamwise velocity along the centerline of the AD, (b) the streamwise gradient, and (c) the ~~measured~~-predicted thrust-induction curves.

195 the AD being placed at the end of its first third. Inlet and outlet regions are appended to the diffuser with a length of 11.390 D and 34.170 D, respectively, and the transitions between these regions are smoothed by a Laplacian smoothing algorithm. The vertical boundaries of the domains are shown in Fig. 2(a). In the situation of negative velocity gradients, it has been found that a recirculation zone can develop in the wake. In the case of the strongest negative velocity gradient simulated (later identified as the case $\beta = -0.029$), a recirculation zone forms 8 D behind the disc at $C_T = 0.6$ and moves as close as 3 D towards the disc

at $C_T = \frac{8}{9}$. In some more moderate scenarios of negative acceleration, the recirculation does not seem to affect the induction significantly, as it will be shown later in Sec. 4.1. Since recirculation is not taken into account within momentum theory and also the presented model, the cases which seem to affect the induction noticeably are disregarded in the model validation process and marked by dashed lines in Fig. 2 ~~(a)~~ and all subsequent figures. A more thorough discussion on this can be found in Appx. B. Returning to the domain design, the generated grids are curvilinear and consist of $320 \times 128 \times 128$ cells in x , y , and z direction, respectively. Refinement regions exist at the transitions between the diffuser and the inlet and outlet regions. Further, from a distance of $1.708 D$ ahead of the AD to $5.125 D$ behind it, a refinement region with a lateral and vertical side length of approximately $2.278 D$ exists. In this region, cells are nearly cubic, with a resolution of approximately 21 cells per diameter. [In Fig. 3, a computational grid for the case of a deceleration \(later identified as \$\beta = -0.015\$ \) is shown.](#)

3.2 Actuator disc model

The AD is simulated with a uniform ~~force distribution~~ [distribution of thrust force per disk area](#). As described by Zengler et al. (2024), the outer 25 % of the radial boundaries are linearly smeared out to improve solution convergence. The induction is evaluated as the area weighted mean induction over the part of the disc, which is not affected by the smearing. The actuator shape method is applied to project the force onto the computational grid (Réthoré et al., 2014; Troldborg et al., 2015).

3.3 Boundary conditions, RANS closure and solver

Inlet and outlet conditions are applied at the streamwise boundaries. The inlet velocity is specified such that U_R is reached in the AD plane. The chosen U_R corresponds to a diameter-based Reynolds number of 3.798 million. Inlet turbulence properties correspond to a turbulence intensity of 1 % with the specific dissipation rate ω set to one million. The lateral boundaries are periodic and slip conditions are applied at the upper and lower boundaries. As RANS closure, the two-equation k - ω - SST model without modification of the standard model coefficients is applied (Menter, 1994). The incompressible, three-dimensional, Navier-Stokes solver EllipSys3D (Sørensen, 1995; Michelsen, 1992) is employed. The used solution algorithm is a SIMPLE-like procedure based on the non-relaxed momentum equations (Sørensen, 2018). Rhie-Chow interpolation is included to avoid decoupling of the pressure and velocity fields (Rhie and Chow, 1983) and the convective terms are discretized with the QUICK scheme (Leonard, 1979).

3.4 ~~Validation~~ [Verification](#) and sensitivity of simulation setup

In Fig. 2 ~~(b)~~ [4](#), the thrust-induction curves obtained using RANS and Euler equations for a uniform background flow are compared with momentum theory. It is seen, that the Eulerian and RANS simulations do not perfectly agree with momentum theory. This discrepancy can be attributed to the numerical discretization as it has been reported in the past (Hodgson et al., 2021; Mikkelsen, 2004). If it is desired to better agree with the momentum theory results, it is necessary to increase the grid resolution or to probe the induction slightly behind the position of the AD [as done in a previous study \(Zengler et al., 2024\)](#)




Figure 6. Model predictions for $l = 1$: **(a)** collapsed induction curves for $C_T - 4al/\beta$ and **(b)** MAE for induction predictions without and with correction for acceleration.

230 . However, within this work, no correction is performed, thus the curve representing the RANS results is used as the zero-acceleration/uniform curve in the following.

In Appx. A a detailed sensitivity study of the simulation setup is performed. These results can be summarized as follows. A mesh sensitivity analysis shows that ~~simulation results are nearly independent of the cell size, with the relative error with respect to the exact solution estimated to be 0.266~~ change of induction due to halving the cell length in all direction is less than 0.3 %. Domain blockage and the radial smearing influence the results in the order of one percent, while the effect of the 235 diffuser length on the results is negligible.

4 Model validation

First, the simulation results from the previously introduced RANS simulations are presented for the various velocity gradients considered. Subsequently, the model predictions for these cases are analyzed in detail.

4.1 Simulation results

240 Simulation results are presented in Fig. 35. The color-coding is used consistently with Fig. 2 (a) and the subsequent Fig. 46 and Fig. 68 where each color represents one specific velocity gradient. In panels (a) and (b) of Fig. 35 the normalized streamwise velocities U_∞ along the centerline and the respective normalized gradients for the different domains presented previously are shown. In all cases, a nearly constant streamwise gradient is obtained ahead and behind the AD. Panel (c) shows the ~~measured~~ predicted thrust-induction curves obtained by applying a certain thrust coefficient and evaluating the corresponding induction.

245 With an increasing thrust coefficient, the differences between the individual curves grow. In cases of a positive acceleration, the induction is reduced, while it is increased in cases of a negative acceleration. For the two cases with the strongest negative acceleration – dashed lines in Fig. 3-5 and not considered for model validation – a more complex induction behavior can be observed for thrust coefficients higher than 0.5. This can be related to the development of a recirculation zone in the wake and is discussed in Appx. B in more detail.

250 4.2 ~~Modelling results~~ Model predictions

In the following, it is investigated to what extent the model represented by Eq. (21) is capable of predicting the trends observed in Fig. 35. The non-dimensional velocity gradient β is evaluated in the undisturbed flow field at the position of the AD in the center, thus in Fig. 3-5 (b) at $x/D = 0$. ~~Further~~ As stated before, the length ~~scale l needs to be determined.~~ ~~Crespo et al. (1999) stated that the length~~ of the initial wake expansion region ~~, thus the region where wake and free stream~~ ~~pressure equalize, is~~ is approximately one diameter long ~~, a value which was also adopted by Dar and Porté-Agel (2022). Thus,~~ ~~without further justification, $l = 1$ is used in the following.~~ ~~The validity of this assumption will be discussed later in Sec. 5.3.~~ (Crespo et al., 1999).

Model predictions are presented in Fig. 46. If the model works as expected, solving Eq. (21) for $C_{T,u}(a) = C_T(a) - 4al\beta$ and inserting the respective simulation results into the right-hand side of this formula should lead to a collapse of all simulation results on the same curve. This is presented in panel (a) of Fig. 46. Indeed, it can be seen that all curves previously shown in Fig. 3-5 (c) tend to collapse on the zero-acceleration curve. However, at thrust coefficients higher than 0.75, increasing discrepancies between the single curves can be observed.

To quantify the model accuracy, the mean absolute error (MAE) is evaluated as

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |a - a_{pred}|}{n} \quad (23)$$

265 over all thrust coefficients and all $n = 11$ simulations. While a is the induction evaluated from a simulation at a specific acceleration at a given C_T , a_{pred} is the predicted induction for this acceleration either based on the thrust-induction curve obtained from the uniform case or from the thrust-induction curve corrected by the acceleration term. Since the power coefficient is calculated as $C_P = C_T(1 - a)$, the MAE directly translates to a variation in C_P for a given C_T . Results are presented in Fig. 4-6 (b). If no correction is considered, the mean error increases with an increasing thrust coefficient up to a value of around 270 0.024. Correcting the predictions for flow acceleration yields a reduction of error for all thrust coefficients. Specifically, for $C_T < 0.5$ the error is reduced by 54 % on average, while for $C_T > 0.5$ the error is reduced by over 78 % on average. The maximum error in this case at high thrust is approximately 0.007. A significant increase in the mean error is noticeable above a thrust coefficient of 0.75. At this point, it is important to note two things. First, the MAE was only calculated for the presented simulations. It does not yield insights into specific cases, but rather gives an estimate for the potential error reduction. Second, 275 $l = 1$ was set without further investigation. Based on the presented simulations, it is possible to extract the length scale, which would lead to an exact collapse of thrust-induction curves obtained in a non-uniform flow on the uniform flow curve. This will be discussed in Sec. 5.3.

5 Discussion

The above results demonstrate that the presented model ~~describes the first-order behavior of an actuator disc in a constant~~
280 ~~gradient flow case~~ captures the essential physical mechanisms influencing the induction of an AD subject to a flow featuring
a constant velocity gradient. The model structure indicates ~~;~~ that in an accelerating flow field, the axial induction behaves
approximately as if the uniform case was subject to an additional thrust coefficient proportional to $-4al\beta$.

5.1 Modelling assumptions

~~To derive the analytical model, the~~ Within the derivation of the model, it was assumed that the pressure force acting on
285 the streamtube can be easily quantified as the product of the disc area and the pressure difference between upstream and
downstream pressure. This assumption eventually led to Eq. (13), which states that the rotor velocity depends on the undisturbed
velocity upstream and the wake velocity downstream. With both being dependent on the axial distance, the model results would
depend on their position of evaluation. To overcome this problem, the length scale l , which closes the system of equations,
was introduced. For ~~finite nonzero~~ values of l , model predictions depend on this free parameter, ~~revealing the effect of the~~
290 ~~inconsistencies in the model assumptions~~. If all elements of the model were strictly correct, the arbitrary choices of the position
of the inlet and ~~outlets~~ outlet of the control volume would not affect the model results, as long as they were chosen far
enough away from the disc to justify the assumption of a negligible pressure disturbance from the disc, $p_1 = p_{\infty,1}$, used in the
derivation. Further, rearranging Eq. (13) and applying Eq. (14) indicates that the wake velocity varies as follows

$$u_1 = 2u_R - U_{\infty,R} + L \frac{dU_{\infty}}{dx}. \quad (24)$$

295 For arbitrary values of L respectively l , the energy equation yields

$$u_1 = \sqrt{U_{\infty,1}^2 - \frac{\Delta p}{\frac{1}{2}\rho}}. \quad (25)$$

According to Eq. (24), the wake velocity varies linearly with L . Whereas Eq. (25), which is based on first principles, shows a
nonlinear dependency of L . These observations above reveal the effects of the inconsistencies in the ~~assumptions~~ assumption
about the pressure force on which the model is built on.

300 For the used simulation setup, it was inherently assumed, that the extent of the gradient is sufficiently large, so variations
of the gradient further up or downstream do not affect the induction. Or in other words, that the control volume of the model,
with its axial extent defined by l , always lies completely within the constant velocity gradient region. In the sensitivity analysis
in Appx A/ppx. A it can be seen that ~~for varying shortening~~ the diffuser length ~~on larger scales, barely any influence on the~~
~~induction can be noticed~~ 33 % has an insignificant effect on the resulting induction. For a future work, it would be interesting
305 to investigate how short the extent of the velocity gradient can be without affecting the induction. This could shed light on
understanding the length scale l .




Figure 7. Thrust and power coefficients C_T and C_P based on Eq. (20) in dependency of the induction for various β and $l = 1$. Solid lines represent the uniform background flow curve.

The influence of the pressure force F_p was in Eq. (9) assumed to be approximately the net force acting on the AD due to the pressure difference up- and downstream. Its exact calculation would require the evaluation of the integral

$$F_p = - \oint_{CV} p d\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{e}_x, \quad (26)$$

310 over the stream tube with the infinitesimal surface area $d\mathbf{A}$ and the normal vector in axial direction \mathbf{e}_x . To solve this, the exact development of the flow field within the stream tube would need to be known, which on the other hand requires the evaluation of this integral.

Despite the inconsistencies of the simple model pointed out in the discussion above, the model has shown to capture the **first order behavior of the influence of flow field acceleration** relevant physics that an accelerating flow field has on the induction of
 315 an ADwell. This justifies **the** further investigations using the model in the next section.

5.2 Influence on power performance

Since aerodynamic power can be generally calculated as the product of thrust and velocity, the modification of the relationship between these two also yields a different power performance of wind turbines. Based on the general relation between thrust and power coefficient

$$320 \quad C_P = C_T(1 - a), \quad (27)$$

their curves in dependency of induction are shown in Fig. 5-7 for several velocity gradients. It can be readily seen, that a negative acceleration leads to a general degradation of power performance, while a positive acceleration leads to an improvement. This




Figure 8. Extracted length scale l from ~~measured~~simulated thrust-induction curves.

is consistent with previous findings (Troldborg et al., 2022; Dar et al., 2023; Zengler et al., 2024; Revaz and Porté-Agel, 2024) and stresses the insight, that ~~the optimal turbine location is not necessarily the one with the highest mean wind speed at hub~~
 325 ~~height.~~Especially especially in complex terrain, the power performance gain due to terrain speed up ahead of a turbine on a hill might be reduced due to flow deceleration behind the hill.

An obvious question is, whether the optimal operational point, thus the optimal thrust and hub height velocity are altered as well. This can be answered within the scope of the simple model by solving for the optimal induction based on Eq. (20) and Eq. (27) yielding for a constant l

$$330 \quad a_{opt} = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3}l\beta - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{1 + l\beta + l^2\beta^2}. \quad (28)$$

In case of a vanishing acceleration $a_{opt} = \frac{1}{3}$, which is the classical result from momentum theory. However, for a non-vanishing acceleration, the optimal induction changes with the acceleration and the length scale. This is also shown in Fig. 57. In fact, the optimum induction increases in case of a positive acceleration and decreases in case of a negative acceleration. With respect to the previously mentioned situation of a wind turbine operating on a hill, this also means that besides the physical limitation of maximum extractable energy, also optimal turbine operation is altered, which depending on the turbine controller may lead to
 335 ~~further performance degeneration~~performance degeneration relative to the highest reachable performance.

5.3 On the length scale

Up to now, it was assumed that the length scale l has a constant value, which was adopted from literature (Crespo et al., 1999; Dar and Porté-Agel, 2022). However, it is possible to determine it for the presented simulations by solving Eq. (21) for l . In this
 340 context, it is important to mention that l does not necessarily need to be interpreted as a physical parameter but can be seen as as

a free parameter which determines how strong the influence of acceleration on the induction is. Calculating l based on Eq. (21) therefore quantifies how far the model deviates from the simulated physics. This is shown in Fig. 6-8, where l is plotted as a function of the thrust coefficient. It can be seen that l depends on both the thrust coefficient and the velocity gradient, indicating that both are not sufficiently represented in the present model formulation. It is remarkable, that two separate branches of l develop, depending on whether the acceleration is negative or positive. Both branches grow towards larger values of l with an increasing thrust coefficient, indicating that within the simplified modelling framework, the influence of flow field acceleration on aerodynamic performance increases with an increasing thrust coefficient. At low thrust – ignoring the two separate branches – l is nearly independent of the acceleration. Very close to zero thrust, the general behavior seems to be highly non-linear, and the two branches tend to diverge from each other with the thrust coefficient approaching zero. The explanation for this behavior is not known to the authors. Note that this branching effect is not directly noticeable on the $a - C_T$ curves in Fig. 35. It should be emphasized that the length scale estimation close to zero thrust are sensitive to the grid design and numerical errors due to the small numbers involved.

The previously employed value of a reference length of one diameter (corresponding to $l = 1$) is in the range of values l takes within the full range of thrust coefficients and velocity gradients. In the light of the prediction results presented earlier, this value can be seen as a compromise between low and high thrust cases.

5.4 Limitations and future work

As very idealized simulations were performed, a natural limitation is that the model still needs to prove its general applicability for more complex flow cases. As such, the atmospheric flow over complex terrain or the flow within a dense wind farm come to mind as mentioned earlier. However, in these scenarios, it is likely that the streamwise velocity gradient is not constant. One way to apply the presented model in these cases would be to devise a method to obtain an effective value for the combined quantity l/β from the more generally varying undisturbed background velocity.

As seen in Fig. 57, the optimal point of operation changes when a turbine is subjected to an accelerating flow field. This gives rise to the question –if existing control strategies can cope with this or if it would result in the turbine operating in a suboptimal state with respect to both –loads and power performance; a question which should be addressed in future works.

Lastly, only scenarios of a comparably low induction ($a < 0.5$) were investigated numerically. It is of interest how the model performs at-in high-induction scenarios.

6 Conclusions

Streamwise acceleration of the background flow field is usually not considered for wind turbine performance predictions or design of controllers. In this work, it was shown that neglecting this effect can have a significant impact on the relation between induction and thrust and therefore on aerodynamic performance predictions. A simple model, which extends classical momentum theory to the case of a constantly accelerating streamwise flow field, was presented and validated with RANS simulations. The model reduces the average prediction error in comparison with classical momentum theory for thrust coefficients

	dx [D]	0.024	0.047	0.095
Cell size	a [-]	0.301	0.300	0.295
	Δa [%]	0.229		-1.626
	b [-]	0.00151	0.00605	
Blockage ratio	a [-]	0.304	0.300	
	Δa [%]	1.378		
	L_{Diff} [D]	22.780	28.475	34.170
Diffuser length	a [-]	0.305	0.304	0.305
	Δa [%]	-0.025	-0.244	
	α [-]	0.150	0.250	0.350
Radial smearing	a [-]	0.304	0.300	0.297
	Δa [%]	1.143		-1.051

Table A1. Sensitivity of the simulation results to cell size, blockage ratio, diffuser length, and radial smearing. Bold values are used within this study.

lower than 0.5 by 54 % and for thrust coefficients higher than 0.5 by more than 78 %. The model indicates that the induced velocity for a given thrust ~~depend~~ depends on the background flow acceleration. The axially induced velocity decreases when the background flow has a positive streamwise acceleration, and increases for a negative streamwise acceleration. The model furthermore shows that the maximum power coefficient as well as the corresponding values of optimal induction and thrust coefficients depend on the flow acceleration. This implies that wind turbines on sites with streamwise velocity gradients may not operate optimally under such conditions. Nonetheless, the idealized conditions considered within this work do not represent realistic operating conditions of wind turbines indicating a need for further research in order to check the applicability of the presented model in practice.

Code and data availability. EllipSys3D used for the simulations is a proprietary software developed at DTU Wind and Energy Systems and distributed under licence. The data used in this paper are publicly available at the following DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11583/DTU.27222912>

Appendix A: Sensitivity analysis

To ensure that the presented conclusions are independent of the computational settings and geometrical choices in the RANS simulations, the sensitivity of the results with respect to cell size dx , blockage ratio b , diffuser length L_{Diff} , and radial smearing factor α at a thrust coefficient of $\frac{8}{9}$ is analyzed. All results are summarized in Tab. A1. All sensitivity investigations were carried out in a non-accelerating flow ($\beta = 0.0$), except in the diffuser length study, which assumed $\beta = -0.004$.

The influence of the cell size is studied by performing two additional simulations. One at a grid which has only half the number of cells in each dimension ($160 \times 64 \times 64$) and another one which contains twice the number of cells in each dimension (390 $640 \times 256 \times 256$), thus effectively halving or doubling the cells per diameter in the disc region. The first row in Tab. A1 shows that doubling the cell resolution in the disc region leads to a change of induction of 0.229 %. Based on the grid convergence index, the relative error with respect to the exact solution is estimated to be 0.266 % with an estimated order of convergence of $p = 2.831$ (Roache, 1994, 1997).

To investigate the blockage effect, thus the influence of the flow confinement due to the limited domain size, a disc with half (395 the radius of the original disc in a domain with twice the cell resolution is simulated, therefore keeping the cells per diameter constant in the disc region. The blockage ratio is defined as $b = \frac{A}{A_{S,R}}$ with the disc area A and the cross-sectional area in the disc plane $A_{S,R}$. Results in Tab. A1 indicate, that reducing the blockage ratio by a factor of four leads to an increase of induction of 1.378 %.

Within the derived model, it is assumed that the velocity in the background has a constant axial gradient. In the simulations, (400 it is necessary to limit the axial extent of the acceleration region. To investigate if this has an influence on the simulation results, two additional simulations with a decreasing diffuser length are performed. The reference diffuser is 34.170 D long, while the two shorter ones are 28.475 D and 22.780 D long, respectively. The AD is always positioned 11.390 D behind the beginning of the diffuser. In all cases, the mildest negative velocity gradient is simulated. The change in induction, as reported in Tab. A1 is for both of the short diffusers less than one percent, indicating a negligible influence on the results. One might notice that the (405 variation in induction is lower for the shortest diffuser compared to the intermediate one. A possible explanation for this is that the grid in both cases is slightly different, mainly because the transition regions between the diffuser and the inlet and outlet need additional cell refinement, leading to the grid itself influencing the results here as well.

To improve solution convergence, a radial smearing factor α of the thrust force as described by Zengler et al. (2024) is applied in the AD model. It has a range between zero and one, where zero means that no smearing is applied while one (410 results in smearing along the entire radius. Besides the employed value of 0.25, simulations with 0.15 and 0.35 are conducted. Table A1 shows that the expected variation in induction is in the order of one percent. It must be noted, that changing the smearing factor eventually leads to a variation of the blockage ratio and also of the cell resolution in the disc area, an effect which is not considered here.

Overall, it can be concluded, that the results are nearly independent of the cell size and diffuser length while domain blockage (415 and disc smearing influence the evaluated induction in the order of one percent. Further, since the simulations results are mainly compared among each other within this study, systematic errors in the simulation setup cancel each other out in these cases.

Appendix B: Wake breakdown

For the cases of highest negative acceleration, it can be observed that a recirculation region develops in the wake at certain thrust coefficients. This is shown in Fig. 7-B1 where the axial velocity along the centerline at $C_T = \frac{8}{9}$ is shown. At a certain (420 axial distance, the velocity becomes negative. This is referred to as breakdown of the wake. This observation can be roughly




Figure B1. Normalized centerline velocity for $C_T = \frac{8}{9}$ for different background velocity gradients. Grey area indicates negative velocities.

explained by an energy balance between the wake and the surrounding flow. Equation (5) shows that for a fixed pressure jump across the disc, the energy difference between free stream and wake velocity is constant. When the free stream velocity decrease, also the wake velocity needs to decrease. Since kinetic energy per mass scales with velocity squared, the fixed energy difference between free stream and wake results in a larger decrease of the lower wake velocity than the free stream. At a certain point, this velocity becomes zero, leading to a breakdown of the wake and the development of a recirculation zone. From Eq. (5) one can therefore derive a criterion for this situation by setting $u_1 = 0$. This result can be expressed in terms of C_T as

$$\frac{U_\infty(x)}{U_{\infty,R}} < \sqrt{C_T}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

When the normalized free stream velocity reaches a value smaller than the square root of the thrust coefficient, a breakdown of the wake can be expected. At $C_T = \frac{8}{9}$ this is the situation for $U_\infty(x) < 0.94 U_{\infty,R}$. Comparing this value with Fig. 35, it would be expected that in the two strong deceleration cases, the velocity becomes negative around 1.94 D and 2.62 D behind the disc. Simulation results show that in both cases, this happens further downstream than predicted. This may be partly explained by the entrainment of momentum from the free stream into the wake. For future modelling, one could consider a high-thrust correction for the wake breakdown due to deceleration. ~~However, it is questionable, if such strong gradients occur in application; considering for example the flow over complex terrain a more likely scenario is that the flow separates from terrain, as it can be seen in the work by Zengler et al. (2024).~~

Author contributions. CPZ derived the model, performed the simulations and drafted the article. CPZ, NT and MG contributed to idea, theoretical analysis, methodology, and result interpretation and reviewed and edited the manuscript.

Competing interests. The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

440 *Acknowledgements.* This work has been partially supported by the EU project MERIDIONAL with grant agreement No. 101084216. We also gratefully acknowledge the computational and data resources provided on the Sophia HPC Cluster at the Technical University of Denmark (<https://doi.org/10.57940/FAFC-6M81>).

References

- Betz, A.: Das Maximum der theoretisch möglichen Ausnützung des Windes durch Windmotoren, *Zeitschrift für das gesamte Turbinenwesen*, 26, 307–309, 1920.
- 445 Cai, T., Cheng, S., Segalini, A., and Chamorro, L. P.: Local topography-induced pressure gradient effects on the wake and power output of a model wind turbine, *Theoretical and Applied Mechanics Letters*, 11, 100297, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.taml.2021.100297>, 2021.
- Chamorro, L. P. and Arndt, R.: Non-uniform velocity distribution effect on the Betz–Joukowski limit, *Wind Energy*, 16, 279–282, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.549>, 2013.
- 450 Crespo, A., Hernández, J., and Frandsen, S.: Survey of Modelling Methods for Wind Turbine Wakes and Wind Farms, *Wind Energy*, 2, 1–24, [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1824\(199901/03\)2:1<::AID-WE16>3.0.CO;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1824(199901/03)2:1<::AID-WE16>3.0.CO;2-7), 1999.
- Dar, A. S. and Porté-Agel, F.: An Analytical Model for Wind Turbine Wakes under Pressure Gradient, *Energies*, 2022, 5345, <https://doi.org/10.3390/en15155345>, 2022.
- Dar, A. S., Gertler, A. S., and Porté-Agel, F.: An experimental and analytical study of wind turbine wakes under pressure gradient, *Physics* 455 of Fluids, 35, 045140, <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0145043>, 2023.
- Draper, S., Nishino, T., Adcock, T. A. A., and Taylor, P. H.: Performance of an ideal turbine in an inviscid shear flow, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 796, 86–112, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2016.247>, 2016.
- Froude, R.: On the part played in propulsion by difference of fluid pressure, *Transaction of the Institute of Naval Architects*, 30, 390–405, 1889.
- 460 Froude, W.: On the Elementary Relation between Pitch, Slip and Propulsive Efficiency, *Transaction of the Institute of Naval Architects*, 19, 22–33, 1878.
- Gaanaa, M., Troldborg, N., and Branlard, E.: A simple vortex model applied to an idealized rotor in sheared inflow, *Wind Energy Science*, 8, 503–513, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-8-503-2023>, 2023.
- Glauert, H.: A general theory of the autogyro, Tech. Rep. 1111, Scientific Research Air Ministry, 1926.
- 465 Heck, K., Johlas, H., and Howland, M.: Modelling the induction, thrust and power of a yaw-misaligned actuator disk, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 959, A9, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2023.129>, 2023.
- Hodgson, E. L., Andersen, S. J., Troldborg, N., Forsting, A. M., Mikkelsen, R. F., and Sørensen, J. N.: A Quantitative Comparison of Aeroelastic Computations using Flex5 and Actuator Methods in LES, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1934, 012014, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1934/1/012014>, 2021.
- 470 Hunt, J. C. R., Leibovich, S., and Richards, K. J.: Turbulent shear flows over low hills, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 114, 1435–1470, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49711448405>, 1988.
- Jackson, P. S. and Hunt, J. C. R.: Turbulent wind flow over a low hill, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 101, 929–955, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49710143015>, 1975.
- Jamieson, P. M.: Beating Betz: Energy Extraction Limits in a Constrained Flow Field, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*, 131, 031008, 475 <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3139143>, 2009.
- Joukowski, N. E.: Windmill of the NEJ type, *Transactions of the Central Institute for Aero-hydrodynamics of Moscow*, 1920.
- Leonard, B.: A stable and accurate convective modelling procedure based on quadratic upstream interpolation, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 19, 59–98, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0045-7825\(79\)90034-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0045-7825(79)90034-3), 1979.

- Menter, F. R.: Two-equation eddy-viscosity turbulence models for engineering applications, *AIAA Journal*, 32, 1598–1605, 480 <https://doi.org/10.2514/3.12149>, 1994.
- Michelsen, J.: *Basis3D - a Platform for Development of Multiblock PDE Solvers*, Tech. rep., Technical University of Denmark, 1992.
- Mikkelsen, R.: *Actuator disc methods applied to wind turbines*, Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark, 2004.
- Mikkelsen, R. F. and Sørensen, J. N.: *Modelling of Wind Tunnel Blockage*, in: 15th IEA Symposium on the Aerodynamics of Wind Turbines, FOI Swedish Defence Research Agency, Paris, 2002.
- 485 Mishra, A., Arya, N., and Bhattacharya, A.: Wake steering of wind turbine in the presence of a two-dimensional hill, *Physics of Fluids*, 36, 045 125, <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0185842>, 2024.
- Okulov, V. L. and Van Kuik, G. A.: The Betz–Joukowsky limit: on the contribution to rotor aerodynamics by the British, German and Russian scientific schools, *Wind Energy*, 15, 335–344, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.464>, 2012.
- Rankine, W.: *On the Mechanical Principles of the Action of Propellers*, *Transaction of the Institute of Naval Architects*, 6, 13–39, 1865.
- 490 Réthoré, P.-E., Van Der Laan, P., Troldborg, N., Zahle, F., and Sørensen, N. N.: Verification and validation of an actuator disc model, *Wind Energy*, 17, 919–937, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.1607>, 2014.
- Revaz, T. and Porté-Agel, F.: Effect of hills on wind turbine flow and power efficiency: A large-eddy simulation study, *Physics of Fluids*, 36, 095 180, <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0226544>, 2024.
- Rhie, C. M. and Chow, W. L.: Numerical study of the turbulent flow past an airfoil with trailing edge separation, *AIAA Journal*, 21, 1525–495 1532, <https://doi.org/10.2514/3.8284>, 1983.
- Roache, P. J.: Perspective: A Method for Uniform Reporting of Grid Refinement Studies, *Journal of Fluids Engineering*, 116, 405–413, <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2910291>, 1994.
- Roache, P. J.: Quantification of Uncertainty in Computational Fluid Dynamics, *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 29, 123–160, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.fluid.29.1.123>, 1997.
- 500 Shamsoddin, S. and Porté-Agel, F.: A model for the effect of pressure gradient on turbulent axisymmetric wakes, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 837, R3, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2017.864>, 2018.
- Sørensen, J. N.: *General momentum theory for horizontal axis wind turbines*, no. volume 4 in *Research topics in wind energy*, Springer, Cham Heidelberg New York, 1st ed edn., ISBN 978-3-319-22113-7, 2016.
- Sørensen, N. N.: *General purpose flow solver applied to flow over hills*, Ph.D. thesis, Risø National Laboratory, 1995.
- 505 Sørensen, N. N.: *EllipSys2D/3D User Manual*, Tech. rep., DTU Wind Energy, Roskilde, Denmark, 2018.
- Tamaro, S., Campagnolo, F., and Bottasso, C. L.: On the power and control of a misaligned rotor – beyond the cosine law, *Wind Energy Science*, 9, 1547–1575, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-9-1547-2024>, 2024.
- Troldborg, N., Sørensen, N., Réthoré, P.-E., and Van Der Laan, M.: A consistent method for finite volume discretization of body forces on collocated grids applied to flow through an actuator disk, *Computers & Fluids*, 119, 197–203, 510 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compfluid.2015.06.028>, 2015.
- Troldborg, N., Andersen, S. J., Hodgson, E. L., and Meyer Forsting, A.: Brief communication: How does complex terrain change the power curve of a wind turbine?, *Wind Energy Science*, 7, 1527–1532, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-7-1527-2022>, 2022.
- Wagner, R., Courtney, M., Gottschall, J., and Lindelöw-Marsden, P.: Accounting for the speed shear in wind turbine power performance measurement, *Wind Energy*, 14, 993–1004, <https://doi.org/10.1002/we.509>, 2011.
- 515 Zengler, C. P., Troldborg, N., and Gaunaa, M.: Is the free wind speed sufficient to determine aerodynamic turbine performance in complex terrain?, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2767, 092 049, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2767/9/092049>, 2024.