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Abstract

The application of mathematical modeling in sedimentological studies is still in its infancy for practical purposes due to several reasons: complexity of the problems, lack of theoretical models, simplicity and drawbacks of mathematical models, and suspicion by the geological community. Despite that, the growing evidence of these studies as a complementary approach is being demonstrated by the increasing number of papers dealing with the subject in the last years.

The mechanism of turbulent flows transporting and depositing a huge amount of sand is a good example of a relevant problem being investigated by numerical models. Historically, Depth-Averaged models have been extensively used to represent the Navier-Stokes equation that governs fluid flows. The Depth-Average models are a simplified version in the sense that they do not take into account the vertical variability of flow properties. More recently, Direct Numerical Simulations (DNS) have been used, in which the full 3D Navier-Stokes is solved, allowing the vertical reproduction of the flow properties as well as the complete scale representation of the turbulence, because of the adoption of very refined grid. The main drawback of the DNS is the computational time, because the full 3D equation is solved for a grid built to represent every scale of the turbulence. This alternative reduces the ability to simulate geological situations, because of the time involved for reproducing each flow.

In this work we present a method to simulate a full 3D Navier-Stokes equation in unstructured grids, in which the turbulence is solved only for the larger scales, with a technique named Large Eddy Simulation (LES). This allows the reproduction in 3D of the flow properties, and it can be run in a significantly coarser grid than the DNS.
The sedimentation obtained in our model is quantitatively validated against the more precise DNS results. We implemented a dynamic interaction between the flow and the bottom that allows the flow to be influenced by the previous sedimentation, either in one or multiple flows, without the necessity of remeshing.

We validate the reproduction of the depositional elements (lobes and channel levee systems) against quantitative outcrop data, and we performed a preliminary comparative study of steady vs. unsteady flows. We also tested the flow over irregular surfaces, mimicking real cases, benefiting from the unstructured grid characteristics to deal with complex geometries.
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Objectives

**Objectives of the Work:**

- intend to apply a new way to solve a known problem

**Objectives of the presentation:**

- present the code
- show a quantitative validation
- show some qualitative results
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1 – MOTIVATION

Based on inspection in the literature, we can arbitrarily classify the turbidite numerical models in two general trends:

a – LAYER – AVERAGED MODELS

- 2D models
- use vertically averaged velocity and concentration
- no explicit turbulence model
- easy to handle
- run very fast

b – 3D – DIRECT NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

- 3D model
- 3D description of velocity and concentration profile
- turbulence solved in all scales
- difficult to handle (need parallel super-computers)
- run very slowly
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We developed a turbidite numerical model in which:

a – LAYER – AVERAGED MODELS

- 2D models
  - use the vertical mean velocity and concentration
  - simplified turbulent model
  - easy to handle
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We developed a turbidite numerical model in which:

a – LAYER – AVERAGED MODELS

- 2D models
- use the vertical mean velocity and concentration
- simplified turbulent model
- easy to handle
- run very fast

b – 3D – DIRECT NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

- 3D model
- 3D description of velocity and concentration profile
- all turbulent scales included
- difficult to handle (need parallel super-computers)
- run very slowly

C – 3D Large Eddy Simulation – FINITE ELEMENT METHOD

- 3D model
- Solve large scale turbulence (model low scale)
- Run much faster than DNS
- Easily deals with complex topography
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2 – DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Manica (2009)

Concentration

Shale fraction

Região I
Região II
Região III
Região IV
Região V
Região VI

Newtoniano
Limiar reológico
Não Newtoniano

Manica (2009)
REGION I Characteristic:

Low concentration
THIS CODE Characteristic:

Low concentration
No shale

Concentration
2 – DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Main Aspects of the Current

Geometry:

Instabilities:

-KH (Kelvin - Helmholtz)

-Lobes and clefts

Del Rey (2006)

Ooi (2006)
2 – DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Main Aspects of the Current

Geometry:

Instabilities:

-KH (Kelvin - Helmholtz)
-Lobes and clefts

Del Rey (2006)

Ooi (2006)
2 – DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Main Aspects of the Current Geometry:

- Instabilities: 
  - KH (Kelvin-Helmholtz)
  - Lobes and clefts

Del Rey (2006)

Ooi (2006)
2 – DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Main Aspects of the Current

Geometry:

Instabilities:

-KH (Kelvin - Helmholtz)
-Lobes and clefts

Del Ray (2006)

Ooi (2006)
2 – DEFINING THE PROBLEM

Main Aspects of the Current

Geometry:

Instabilities:

-KH (Kelvin - Helmholtz)
-Lobes and clefts

Del Rey (2006)

Ooi (2006)
OUTLINE:

1 – MOTIVATION

2 – DEFINING THE PROBLEM

3 – NUMERICAL MODEL

4 – SAND TRANSPORT AND DEPOSITION

5 – DEPOSITION

6 – FLOW - BOTTOM INTERACTION

7 – CASE STUDIES

8 – CONCLUSIONS

9 – NEXT STEPS
3 – NUMERICAL MODEL – 2 sets of EQUATIONS

1 – INCOMPRESSIBLE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATION

A – momentum conservation

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla u = \rho g + \nabla \cdot \sigma
\]

B – mass conservation

\[
\nabla \cdot u = 0
\]
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1 – INCOMPRESSIBLE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATION

A – momentum conservation

\[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla u = \rho g + \nabla \cdot \sigma \]

B – mass conservation

\[ \nabla \cdot u = 0 \]

\[ \rho = \frac{(\bar{\rho}_1 - \bar{\rho}_2)}{\bar{\rho}_1} \]
2 - ADVECTION – DIFFUSION EQUATION OF THE CONCENTRATION

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla \phi - \nabla \left( \left( \frac{1}{Sc \sqrt{Gr}} \right) \nabla \phi \right) = 0
\]

\[
Sc = \frac{\bar{v}}{k}
\]

\[
Gr = \left( \frac{\bar{u} \bar{l}}{\bar{v}} \right)^2
\]
2 - ADVECTION – DIFFUSION EQUATION OF THE VARIABLE DENSITY

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla \phi - \nabla \left( \left( \frac{1}{Sc \sqrt{Gr}} \right) \nabla \phi \right) = 0
\]

concentration calculated from densities

\[ Sc = \frac{\bar{v}}{k} \]

\[ Gr = \left( \frac{\bar{u}_b \bar{l}}{\bar{v}} \right)^2 \]

\[ \phi = \frac{(\bar{\rho} - \bar{\rho}_2)}{(\bar{\rho}_1 - \bar{\rho}_2)} \]
3 – NUMERICAL MODEL

TURBULENCE CONSIDERATION

1 – DNS (Direct Numerical Simulation)
   - Extremely refined mesh. NSE solves turbulence explicitly in all scales

2 – LES (Large Eddy Simulation)
   - Refined mesh. NSE solves turbulence in the mesh scale. Sub-mesh scale is modeled
     - Explicit LES – An additional dissipation models the sub-mesh effects
     - Implicit LES – The numerical method dissipation models the sub-mesh effects
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\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla \phi - \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{1}{Sc \sqrt{Gr}} \right) \nabla \phi = 0
\]
- incorporation of *fall velocity* \((u_\phi)\) on the transport equation

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u \nabla \phi - \nabla \left( \frac{1}{Sc \sqrt{Gr}} \nabla \phi \right) = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + (u + u_S) \nabla \phi - \nabla \left( \frac{1}{Sc \sqrt{Gr}} \nabla \phi \right) = 0
\]
- incorporation of *fall velocity* \((u_s)\) on the transport equation

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla \phi - \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{1}{Sc \sqrt{Gr}} \right) \nabla \phi = 0
\]

- calculation of the volume deposited for every time-step for each mesh element

\[
D_t^h = \int_A u_s c^h \, dA
\]

*sediment flow at the very bottom*
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5 – DEPOSITION

VALIDATION

1 – DNS PLANAR CASE

5 – DEPOSITION

VALIDATION

1 – DNS PLANAR CASE

\[ x = 19 \text{ units} \]
\[ y = 2 \text{ units} \]
\[ z = 2 \text{ units} \]
\[ Re = 10^3 \]

REFERENCE MODEL (DNS): 63,648,000 POINTS (25x bigger)

THIS WORK: 2,530,090 POINTS
5 – DEPOSITION

VALIDATION

3 CRITERIA OF COMPARISON

A – Visual aspect of the current

B – Sedimentation rate

C – Sedimentation volume along x direction
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VALIDATION

COMPARISON CRITERIA

A – Visual aspect of the current

\[ \text{DNS reference} \quad \text{This work} \]
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B – Sedimentation rate

Blue – DNS reference
Red – This Work
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C – Sedimentation volume along x direction

volume deposited

Blue – DNS reference
Red – This Work
5 – DEPOSITION

VALIDATION

COMPARISON CRITERIA

C – Sedimentation volume along x direction

General Comparison:

- good reproduction of the shape of the curves;

- bad reproduction of details (smooth effect caused by differences in the mesh refinement)

Blue – DNS reference
Red – This Work
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WHAT IS IT?? Create an interaction of the current and the bottom during the flow

Geometrical aspect
Physical aspect
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WHAT IS IT ??

Initial position of the mesh

elements at the bottom
6 – FLOW - BOTTOM INTERACTION

WHAT IS IT ??

Initial position of the mesh

elements of the bottom

General situation during simulation

elements at the bottom with sediments
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HOW TO CONSIDER ??

Geometrical Aspect

elements at the bottom with sediments
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Geometrical Aspect

elements of the bottom with sediments

elements at the bottom FILLED with sediments
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Geometrical Aspect

elements of the bottom with sediments

NEW elements at the bottom

elements of the bottom FILLED with sediments
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HOW TO CONSIDER ??

Physical Aspect: Rheology of mixtures (water & sediments).

Changes in viscosity of the elements
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HOW TO CONSIDER ??

Physical Aspect: Rheology of mixtures (water & sand particles).

\[ \eta_r = (1 + 2.5c) \]

*equations adjusted from lab data*
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HOW TO CONSIDER ??

Physical Aspect: Rheology of mixtures (water & sand particles).

Fei (1982) \[ \eta_r = (1 - k'c)^{-2.5} \]

\[ k' = \frac{1}{1 - \phi} \]

empirical relationship

Manica (2009)
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HOW TO CONSIDER ??

Physical Aspect: Rheology of mixtures.

\[ \mu_{el} = \frac{V_{sed}}{V_{el}} \mu_{sed} + \frac{(V_{el} - V_{sed})}{V_{el}} \mu_f \]
Hydrodynamic effect
Hydrodynamic effect

shift upward
Hydrodynamic effect

*shift upward*
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Elements: 1,121,125
Nodes: 238,472

Lx = 4
Ly = 4
Lz = 1
Lock = 0.65 x 0.50
7 – CASE STUDIES

FRONTAL SPLAYS
7 – CASE STUDIES

FRONTAL SPLAYS

**Anisotropy Ratio**

$$\text{Anisotropy Ratio} = \frac{\text{Length}}{\text{Width}}$$

**Aspect Ratio**

$$\text{Aspect Ratio} = \frac{\text{Width}}{\text{Thickness}}$$
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FRONTAL SPLAYS

Anisotropy Ratio

Aspect Ratio
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FRONTAL SPLAYS – PULSE - CONTINUOUS FLOW
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FRONTAL SPLAYS – PULSE - CONTINUOUS FLOW

PULSE

CONTINUOUS

Height

Velocity

waxing

waning

Velocity

Height

Velocity

Concentration

Concentration
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FRONTAL SPLAYS – PULSE - CONTINUOUS FLOW

![Graphs showing average velocity and concentration against height.](image)

- **Average Velocity**
- **Average Concentration**
## 7 – CASE STUDIES

### FRONTAL SPLAYS – PULSE - CONTINUOUS FLOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PULSE</th>
<th>CONTINUOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of deposit material</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of material in suspensio</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of deposit</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Case Studies

## Frontal Splays – Pulse - Continuous Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pulse</th>
<th>Continuous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of deposit material</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of material in suspension</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of deposit</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graphs showing waning]
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**FRONTAL SPLAYS – PULSE - CONTINUOUS FLOW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PULSE</th>
<th>CONTINUOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of deposit material</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of material in suspension</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of deposit</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graphs showing concentration distribution for pulse and continuous flow](image-url)
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FRONTAL SPLAYS – PULSE - CONTINUOUS FLOW

pulse flume experiments

continuous flume experiments

sharp curve
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LEVEE CONSTRUCTION

Elements: 1,121,125
Nodes: 238,472
Lx = 4
Ly = 4
Lz = 1
Lock = 0.65 x 1.00
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LEVEE CONSTRUCTION
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LEVEE CONSTRUCTION

\[ Ri = \frac{1}{Fr} \propto \frac{c}{u^2} \]
7 – CASE STUDIES

LEVEE CONSTRUCTION – QUALITATIVE APPROACH

Straub & Mohrig (2008) – Levee Construction Model

Case B - Main deposition inside the channel
R goes down - Taper goes up

Taper = (y₁-y₂)/x
Case B - Main deposition inside the channel
R goes down - Taper goes up
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LEVEE CONSTRUCTION – QUALITATIVE APPROACH

Caso B
7 – CASE STUDIES

LEVTEE CONSTRUCTION – QUALITATIVE APPROACH

\[ Ri = \frac{1}{Fr} \propto \frac{c}{u^2} \]
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LEVEE CONSTRUCTION – QUALITATIVE APPROACH

\[ Ri = \frac{1}{F_r} \propto \frac{c}{u^2} \]
7 – CASE STUDIES

LEVEE CONSTRUCTION – QUALITATIVE APPROACH

flume experiment

numerical experiment
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8 – CONCLUSIONS

• LES is less accurate than DNS, as seen in the results, either in the visual inspection or in the more quantitative sedimentation rate and spatial distribution;

• LES could provide very realistic models in simple configurations, in 2 hours time simulation running in less than 25 cores;

• some sedimentological results could be discussed, like different geometries generated by flow characteristics in a levee configurations, as well as a different deposition aspects related to pulse x continuous flows;

• LES, when compared to DNS, proved to be useful for the study of sedimentological characteristics of deposits, for very simple cases;
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We envisage:

• Simulation of multiple grain sizes;

• Erosional model;

• More precise turbulence models

• A more robust quantitative validation scheme
We envisage:

• Simulation of multiple grain sizes;
• Erosional model;
• More precise turbulence models
• A more robust quantitative validation scheme

• *Perform processes studies in a reasonable computational time*