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Abstract

Direct numerical simulations (DNS) of a turbulent channel flow with 2D wedges of random height on the bottom wall have been performed. In addition, two other simulations have been carried out to assess the effect of the geometry on the overlying flow. In the first simulation, the four smallest elements were removed while in the other, a uniform distribution of wedges with the same area was used. Two Reynolds numbers were studied, $Re_b = 2500$ and $Re_b = 5000$ which correspond in case of smooth walls to $Re_\tau = 180$ and 300, respectively. Roughness on the wall induces separated regions, the reattachment occurring on the walls of the wedges or on the bottom wall. The pressure gradients on the walls increase the ejections and inrushes towards the wall. As a consequence the flow is more isotropic. The mechanism inducing an improved isotropy has been explained in term of the spectra and budgets of Reynolds stress. The comparison of the 3 surfaces has shown that near the wall, the uniformly distributed roughness represents only a poor approximation of the surface with wedges of random height. The Reynolds stresses, pressure distribution and spectra on the modified wall agree well with those on the random surface. Energy spectra show the pitch to height ratio of the largest elements to be the more appropriate geometrical parameter to describe the geometry.

1. Introduction

Roughness plays a key role in many industrial applications including flows in pipelines as oil and gas. In addition, roughness becomes important in high Reynolds number flows. Many studies have attempted to quantify the effect of roughness on the overlying flow. According to the classical literature (i.e. Nikuradse (1933), Clauser (1954), Rotta (1962), Perry et al. (1969)), the effect of the roughness is to shift the mean velocity profile, scaled in wall units, downward with respect to that on a smooth wall:

$U^* = \kappa^{-1} \ln y^* + C - \Delta U^*$

where $C$ and $\kappa$ are constants and “$*$” denotes normalization by wall variables $U_\tau (\equiv \sqrt{\tau_w/\rho})$, where $\tau_w$ is the wall shear stress equal to the sum of the viscous (or skin frictional) drag and the form drag) and $y/U_\tau$. The roughness function, $\Delta U^*$, contains the effect of roughness and depends on the density (defined as the total roughness frontal area per unit wall area), height (k) and nature of the roughness.

Most of the research on rough walls relies on 2D or 3D deterministic roughness (square bars, Perry et al. (1969), Leardini et al. (2003), Kroghstad et al. (2005), Ikeda and Durbin (2007)). However the roughness encountered in nature is random, i.e. the roughness height and pitch to height values vary randomly. Many experiments have been performed using sand grain roughness as a model of random roughness, from the pioneering work of Nikuradse (1933), to the recent contribution of McKeon et al. (2004), Flack et al. (2005), Schultz and Flack (2005) and Brzek et al. (2007, 2008). Schlichting (1960) was critical in the use of sand grain roughness since it was difficult to be reproduced and quantified. Shockling et al. (2006) studied honed pipe and introduced the high spot count wavelength, $\lambda_{HSC}$, as an estimate of the typical distance between the large roughness elements, to characterize random roughness. In fact, the distance between the higher roughness elements must be an important parameter to characterize the flow since small roughness elements should not play an important role when shielded by the larger elements. A systematic study of random roughness was carried out by Cheng and Castro (2002). They used x-wire anemometry in a wind tunnel to measure the flow over a number of urban-blocks all having 25% plan and frontal area density. Comparisons were made between a homogeneous (regular element array) surface and one consisting of random height elements of the same total volume. Aligned and staggered patterns of rectangular prisms were considered as roughness elements. Staggered cube arrays provided greater drag than the aligned cube arrays. In addition, it was demonstrated that random height roughness of the same plan...
arrangement and total volume as a regular array produced higher shear stress.

A first attempt to consider numerically roughness elements of different height was carried out by Ikeda and Durbin (2007). They performed a DNS of turbulent flow over rectangular ribs transversely mounted on one wall of a channel, the other being smooth. The ribs are widely separated with $\lambda/k = 9$, ($\lambda$ being the pitch, $k$ the height of the roughness elements). To mimic random roughness, another case with two rib-heights was considered. Unevenness was imposed by alternatively increasing and decreasing the original square rib height by 15%. For the uneven case, a shorter recirculation region for the smaller rib provides a longer distance to form a fully rough velocity profile. This increases the mass flux upstream of the taller rib within the roughness sublayer, and explains why the pressure drag acting on a taller rib is about 42% larger than that on a square rib (even case), with only a 15% increase in rib height.

The present paper further corroborate previous studies by clarifying how 2D roughness elements with random height affects the overlying flow. This has been investigated by performing a Direct Numerical Simulation of the flow in a channel with a lower wall made of 10 wedges of constant base and random height (hereafter random). Using a random number generator 10 numbers were obtained and scaled so as to have a maximum height of $k = 0.2h$ and a minimum height of $k = 0$. Two other simulations have been carried out as reference cases, one removing the four smallest elements of the random surface (hereafter modified), the other with a uniform distribution of wedges (hereafter uniform) of equivalent total area. The database here obtained allows us to assess if a generic random roughness can be represented more simply by the larger elements or by the average roughness density. The results have practical applications when modeling large areas of rough surfaces, where it is worth reducing the number of parameters necessary to describe the surface.

2. Numerical procedure

The incompressible non-dimensional Navier–Stokes and continuity Eqs. may be written as,

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = - \nabla p + \frac{1}{\Re} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} + \nabla \cdot \nabla \Pi, \ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,$$

where $\Pi$ is the pressure gradient required to maintain a constant flow rate; $\mathbf{u}$, the component of the velocity vector in the $i$–direction and $P$ the pressure. All the quantities have been normalized by a combination of the centerline velocity, $U_c$, and one half of channel's height, $h$. The Navier–Stokes equations have been discretized in an orthogonal coordinate system using the staggered central second-order finite difference approximation. Here we recall only the main features since details of the numerical method can be found in Orlandi and Leonardi (2000). The discretized system is advanced in time using a fractional-step method with viscous terms treated implicitly and convective terms explicitly. The large sparse matrix resulting from the implicit terms is inverted by an approximate factorization technique. At each time step, the momentum equations are advanced with the pressure at the previous step, yielding an intermediate non-solenoidal velocity field. A scalar quantity $\Phi$ projects the non-solenoidal field onto a solenoidal one. A hybrid low-storage third-order Runge–Kutta scheme is used to advance the equations in time.

The roughness is treated by the immersed boundary technique described in detail by Fadlun et al. (2000). This approach allows the solution of flows over complex geometries without the need of computational intensive body-fitted grids. It consists of imposing $U_l = 0$ on the body surface, which does not necessarily coincide with the grid (• in Fig. 1). The terms in the Navier–Stokes equations, at the first point outside the body, are discretized taking into account the real distance between the grid and the body (Orlandi and Leonardi, 2006). This is to avoid the roughness being described in a stepwise way. Periodic boundary conditions apply in the streamwise and spanwise directions, as well as a non-slip condition at the wall in the normal direction. In addition, the flow rate has been kept constant in all simulations. The computational box is $6h \times 2h \times \pi$ in $x$–$y$–$z$, respectively.

The simulation is started from an initial condition imposing a Poiseuille mean velocity profile plus a random disturbance in the streamwise direction ($x$). A uniform coarse grid is used during the transient period, after which velocities are interpolated on a finer grid. The process is repeated until the results are grid independent. In Fig. 2 the mean and rms of streamwise velocity for random roughness are shown for three different grids: $\Re = 400$, 600 and 7000 where $U$ is the maximum velocity and correspond to $Re_b = 2500$ and $Re_b = 5000$ when the bulk velocity is used as reference velocity. The equivalent turbulent Reynolds number is $Re_t = \frac{U_d}{\nu} = 180$ (as in Kim et al., 1987) and 300 when both walls are smooth.

3. Mean flow

Mean streamlines averaged in time and spanwise direction are shown in Fig. 3. At the upper vertex of the wedges a separation occurs. When the pitch to height ratio is small, $\lambda/k < 6$, reattachment is on the windward side of the following wedge. When the pitch to height ratio is large, $\lambda/k > 6$, reattachment occurs on the bottom wall. For example, the wedge 5 produces a separation, and the flow reattaches just upstream of wedge 7. The modified roughness surface (obtained by removing the 4 smallest elements) presents very similar streamlines. However, having removed wedge 7, the flow remains parallel to the bottom wall for a larger distance. Rattachment occurs at about $b/k_b = 5$, where $b$ is the horizontal distance measured from the separation point B and $k_b$ is the height of the fifth wedge (Fig. 3b). This agrees with results in literature. In fact, Le et al. (1997) performed a DNS of a turbulent flow over a backward facing step with inlet and outlet boundary conditions. They showed that the instantaneous reattachment location, averaged in $z$, oscillates between $X_c/k = 4.8$ and $X_c/k = 8$ ($X_c$ is measured from the step) with an averaged value of about $6.3k$. Liu et al. (1966) reported a reattachment length of $6k$ for $w/k = 23$. For longitudinal square bars, Leonardi et al. (2003) found a reattachment length of $5.8k$. The
rough surface with a uniform distribution of wedges present a pitch to height ratio of 6.2. The width of the cavity on the bottom wall is 5.2k and it is too short to allow a reattachment on the bottom wall.

Pressure contours are shown in Fig. 4. The pressure has a peak in correspondence of the stagnation point on the windward side of the wedges. For the random and modified wall the pressure contours reach almost the centerline, whereas for the uniform roughness the disturbance remains limited to the near wall region. In fact, the higher peaks of pressure occur when the pitch to height ratio is larger, for example between wedge 1–3 and 5–8 of the random and modified surfaces. The difference between the highest and lowest values of pressure is $D_P = 0.127, 0.117$ and $0.103$ for modified, random and uniform rough surfaces, respectively. This is due to the distribution of pitch to height ratio in the different surfaces. In fact, when the pitch to height ratio increases, the momentum of the flow within the roughness layer increases and so does $D_P$. The $\lambda/k$ value relative to the uniform distribution is the average of the $\lambda/k$ relative to the random distribution. Therefore, in the random surface, some wedges have a larger $\lambda/k$ and as a consequence a stronger $D_P$. Near the wall, the pressure distribution of a uniform rough wall is a poor approximation of that over a random surface. The pressure distribution relative to the modified wall, compares well with that over the original-random wall.

The pressure distribution on the three rough walls is shown in Fig. 5a. In correspondence to the stagnation points, peaks of pressure are observed. Downstream of the stagnation point, a large favorable pressure gradient occurs. This produces an increase of velocity up to the crest of the element, where the flow separates due to the discontinuity in the geometry. For a large part at the beginning of the separated region the pressure is constant, and downstream it increases by approaching the stagnation point of the following element. The pressure distribution $P(x)$ on the frontal faces raises slightly when the smallest wedges are removed. However, $P(x)$ raises drastically when the removed wedge is a bit higher (i.e. 10th wedge). The slope of the adverse pressure gradient becomes lower and extends through larger distances. For the uniformly-spaced wedges, the pressure distribution is periodic with period $\lambda = 1.2h$ (the wedges spacing).

The projection in the streamwise direction of the pressure on the wall $\langle P \rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{x} \mathbf{d}s$ represents the streamwise force exerted by pressure over the infinitesimal surface elements $\mathbf{d}s$. The sum of these contributions, $P_\lambda(x) = \int_0^\lambda \langle P \rangle \cdot \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{x} \mathbf{d}s$, represents the form drag. In Fig. 5b, $P_\lambda(x)$ is shown to understand which elements contribute more to the total drag. The maximum pressure drag corresponds to the uniformly-spaced profile. Leonardi et al. (2003) explained that the maximum drag occurs when $\lambda/k = 8$. The pitch to height value for the uniform case is $\lambda/k = 6$. On the other hand, the random roughness has a wide range of $\lambda/k$. For example, for...
1.5 < x < 3, λ/k = 3, and the relative form drag is small. When the smallest elements are removed, the pitch to distance value increases and so does the form drag.

For the periodic profile, the high pressure gradient occurs periodically along the windward faces (except between the stagnation point and the peak) and back faces of the wedges. Also, the minimum pressure drag for the original-random geometry is due to the flow around the smallest wedges for which the acceleration between the stagnation points and their vertices is relatively small and the local drag at their back faces is negative (wedges 7, 9, and 10) or mostly negative (wedge 2).

4. Roughness function

Direct Numerical Simulations allow the friction velocity, $U_f$, to be estimated reliably as $U_f = \sqrt{\tau_w}$ where $\tau_w = \sqrt{P_d + C_f}$ is the sum of the pressure and frictional drag, respectively (the overbar means averaging in $x$, $z$, and time, $C_f = \lambda^{-1} \int_0^\infty (C_f) ds$). An alternative method, described in detail by Leonardi et al. (2005) determines $U_f$ once the zero crossing of $uv$ and the total pressure drop of the channel (II) are known. Table 1 shows that the values of $U_f$ computed with both methods agree well. The table shows also the $C_f/P_d$ ratio. The frictional drag is much lower than the pressure drag, the minimum $C_f/P_d$ occurring for the wall with uniformly distributed wedges. In fact, being the frictional drag small, the minimum $C_f/P_d$ corresponds to the wall with the maximum form drag (the wall with wedges uniformly spaced). Brzek et al. (2008) showed similar decomposition for a turbulent boundary layer in transitional regime and fully rough. The maximum $U_f$ corresponds to the uniform wedges because it has the higher pressure drag.

The effect of roughness on the overlying flow is usually quantified by the roughness function $\Delta U^+$ (eq.1), the downward shift of the velocity profile in wall units with respect to the smooth wall.

Table 1

| $C_f/P_d$ ratio and values of $U_f$ calculated as the sum of the pressure and frictional drag and using the zero crossing of $uv$ ($h_1$ and $h_2$ are the distances from the wall to $y_{150}$). |
|---|---|---|
| Geometry | Random | Modified | Uniform |
| $C_f/P_d$ ($\lambda$) | 0.477 | 0.382 | 0.273 |
| $U_f = \sqrt{\tau_w}$ | 0.0738 | 0.0801 | 0.0689 |
| $U_f = \sqrt{\tau_w}$ | 0.0731 | 0.0785 | 0.0879 |
| Uncertainty (%) | 0.93 | 2.15 | 1.16 |

The velocity profiles in wall units are shown in Fig. 6a. The origin for $y$ has been determined by matching the slopes in the log-law region with the value 1/0.41. The shift in the origin in terms of the maximum roughness height $k = 0.2$ is about $\epsilon/k = 0.4$. The velocity profiles relative to random and modified rough walls almost overlap both at $Re_b = 2500$ and $Re_b = 5000$. The uniform rough surface exhibits the largest roughness function at both Reynolds numbers. The modified rough surface represents well the random rough wall while the wall with wedges uniformly spaced is only a poor approximation of the random geometry. Therefore, it is more accurate to model a random roughness by removing the smallest elements (filtering at a particular height) rather than using the equivalent average roughness density.

For a k-type surface, in the fully rough regime, $\Delta U^+$ is a function of the roughness height scaled in wall units (Perry et al., 1969): $\Delta U^+ = \kappa^{-1} \ln k^+ + B$. (3)

Fig. 6b shows the roughness function as a function of the roughness height. Since two of the walls present non uniform roughness height, $\epsilon = 0.4k$ has been taken as the reference roughness height. All the points agree well with Eq. (3) denoting that the flow is in the fully rough regime.

5. Turbulence intensities and Reynolds stress

The roughness on the wall induces favorable and adverse pressure gradients in correspondence of stagnation and separation points. As a consequence, the ejections and inrushes towards the wall increase. The root mean square of streamwise ($u_{rms}$) and of wall normal velocity ($v_{rms}$) increase with respect to those over a flat wall. High levels of $u_{rms}$ and $v_{rms}$ are observed at the crest plane, at about the center of the cavities (Fig. 7). On the wall with wedges of random height (Fig. 7a), the cavities have several aspect ratios. When the pitch over height ratio is large, the $u_{rms}$ and $v_{rms}$ are larger than those over a small aspect ratio cavity. Waviness in the contours of $u_{rms}$ and $v_{rms}$ can be observed up to $y/h = -0.5$, about $5k$ over the crests plane. The rough wall acts as a perturbation on the overlying flow, and the penetration of such disturbances varies with the aspect ratio of the cavities. When the cavity width is small the disturbance remains confined in the near wall region, whereas when the cavities are large, it extends outward the wall for about 3–4 roughness heights. The peak of $u_{rms}$ for smooth walls occurs at about $y/h = -0.7$. For rough walls it takes place at about $y/h = -1$ (crests plane). This gives an indication that production of the Reynolds stress for smooth and rough wall occurs in different regions.
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To quantify the overall effect of the roughness surfaces, the $\text{rms}$ have been averaged in $x, z, t$ and normalised with the friction velocity (Fig. 8). Even if the streamwise velocity $\text{rms}$ increases with respect to a flat wall, when the $\text{rms}$ is scaled with the friction velocity, $u_{\text{rms}}$, near the rough wall becomes smaller than that over a flat wall (Fig. 8). The opposite occurs for $v_{\text{rms}}$. Since the ratio $u_{\text{rms}}/v_{\text{rms}}$ decreases, over a rough wall the flow is more isotropic than over a flat surface. This has been observed by several other experimental and numerical experiments (see Smalley et al. (2002) for a review). Turbulent intensities ($w_{\text{rms}}$ not shown here for sake of brevity) scaled in wall units overlap reasonably well, regardless of the geometrical distribution and of the Reynolds number. Therefore, despite the different spatial distribution, the random, modified and uniform surface present the same overall $\text{rms}$ (averages in $x, z, t$).

The Reynolds shear stress, averaged in $x, z, t$, scaled with the friction velocity ($\overline{uv_{\text{rms}}}$), are shown in Fig. 9. The curves overlap closely regardless of Reynolds number and the shape of the surface. With respect to the flat wall, the zero crossing ($y_u$) of the Reynolds stresses is shifted upward and the slope of the curve is smaller. This is due to different values of the wall shear stress being one wall rough, the other smooth (Leonardi et al., 2005). The maximum value of the Reynolds stress is at the crest plane, as shown also in Fig. 8. While over a flat wall the maximum Reynolds stress represents about 70% of the total stress, here the peak is about 90% of the total stress. Leonardi et al. (2003) showed that $uv$ is correlated
with the form drag of the rough surface. Therefore, over a rough wall, the total stress is almost entirely due to the form drag of the surface. This is consistent with recent observations by Brzek et al. (2008) on boundary layers.

Since the present $u'$ profile has a zero crossing ($y_{uv}$) shifted upward with respect to the centerline, to compare it more effectively with the smooth channel, the wall normal direction has been normalised with $y_{uv}$ (Fig. 9b). The agreement with the smooth wall distribution is remarkable up to $y/y_{uv} = 0.2$ where the profile relative to the smooth wall has a peak and moving towards the wall decreases.

6. Velocity and pressure spectra

To assess how the wall geometry determines the energy distribution among the wavelengths, the energy spectra in the streamwise direction have been calculated. Fig. 10 shows the velocity spectra in the $k_x$ wave number near the smooth wall, random, modified, and uniform rough walls. Near the smooth wall, the spectra of the wall normal velocity is an order of magnitude smaller than the streamwise and spanwise spectra due to the roughness of the wall. Near the rough walls, the spectra relative to the 3 velocity components almost overlap denoting that the flow is more isotropic. The influence of roughness is characterized by energy peaks which mostly occur inside the large eddies scale ($k_x \leq L^{-1}$). This implies, that at least near the wall, the roughness affects the large scales. In both the random and modified rough walls the highest peak of the spectra correspond to a wavelength close to the distance between the two higher peaks (5th and 8th). For the modified geometry, the peak of energy is more concentrated near $k_x = 1.8$. This should be due to the small element between edge 5 and 8 in the random wall which has the...
effect of flattening the distribution of energy near the peak. The comparison between the random and modified geometries show a little effect of the smaller elements on the distribution of energy. Overall, the modified geometry represents well the random roughness. For the uniformly-spaced wedges, the highest peak of energy correspond to the distance between two consecutive wedge's peaks ($\lambda = 1.2$). These peak values correspond to the large eddy range and, for the normal direction, can reach values up to 42.7% and 60% higher than for the modified and original-random geometry, respectively. The random and uniform rough wall, despite the different geometries, present both a peak at similar wave numbers.

The spectra of pressure is shown in Fig. 11 near the rough wall, at the centerline and near the upper smooth wall. Near the wall, peaks of energy are observed and corresponds to the distance of the wedges. Moving upward, the energy distribution becomes smoother and the effect of roughness disappears to a close approximation. The energy of pressure is much higher near the rough wedge than over the smooth wall. In fact, as shown in the previous sections, roughness increases the pressure drag. In previous studies, Leonardi et al. (2003) showed that the maximum pressure drag and roughness function occur for a pitch to height ratio between 4 and 10. They also showed how the form drag scale with $k$. Since a random roughness presents ideally all the wavelengths, energy should be maximum for the highest $k$ in correspondence of a $4 < \lambda/k < 10$. Being for the present case $k < 0.2$, the maximum energy should be for $0.8 < \lambda < 2$. This is in fact the range where the maximum energy is observed. The case with uniform elements present similar results to those obtained for the random geometry because its dominant length scale is in the same range.

7. Reynolds stresses budgets

The transport equations for the Reynolds stresses are (Mansour et al., 1988)

$$\frac{D u_i u_j}{D t} = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (u_i u_j u_k) + v \nabla^2 (u_i u_j) + P_{ij} + \Pi_{ij} - \epsilon_{ij}$$

where $T_{ij} = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (u_i u_j u_k)$ is the turbulent transport term, $D_{ij} = \frac{1}{\alpha_0} (u_i u_j u_k)$ is the viscous diffusion, $P_{ij} = - (u_i u_j u_k) - (u_i u_j) u_k$ is the production term, $\Pi_{ij} = - \frac{1}{\rho} (u_i \nabla u_j + u_j \nabla u_i)$ is the velocity-pressure gradient tensor and $\epsilon_{ij} = 2 \nu (u_i u_j u_k) u_k$ is the dissipation tensor.

Reynolds stress budgets of $(u^2)$ and $(\bar{u}^2)$ are shown in Figs. 12–14, where the transport Eqs. have been non-dimensionalized with $u_i / v$. Since the interest is in the overall effects of roughness on the vertical flow, above the roughness sublayer, averages have been done in $x, z$ and $t$.

$P_{ij}$ is the dominant production term in the $(u^2)$ budget (Fig. 12). Despite the increase of $(\bar{u}^2)$, the production term, scaled in wall units decreases with respect to that relative to the smooth wall. In fact, the velocity gradient is much smaller over a rough wall, and the drag is almost entirely due to the pressure drag. More importantly, maximum production of $(u^2)$, for a smooth wall, occurs at about $y^+ = 12$ while for the rough surfaces it takes place on the crests plane. The curves relative to the 3 surfaces considered (random, modified, uniform) overlap to a good approximation. Near the crest plane, a Reynolds number effect can be observed. By increasing the Reynolds number, the production, in wall units, decreases. The form drag and as a consequence $(\bar{u}^2)$ and $P_{ij}$ are little dependent on the Reynolds number. The value of $u_i^2/v$ increases with the Reynolds number ($u_i$ being independent of $Re$). Therefore, the decrease of the production (when scaled in wall units) with the Reynolds number is due to an increase of the scale $u_i/v$.

The main sink in the $(u^2)$ budget, in most of the channel, is the velocity-pressure gradient term (Fig. 13b). The non-slip condition at the crests plane applies in a very small portion of the domain, and then the velocity gradients and $\epsilon_{ij}$ are reduced (note that the smooth wall distribution of $\epsilon_{ij}$ has been cut to allow the same scale on the vertical axis on both figures). In fact, only near a crest plane the dissipation $\epsilon_{ij}$ overcomes $\Pi_{ij}$.

The velocity–pressure correlation redistributes energy from the streamwise component to the spanwise and normal-wall velocity components. In fact $\Pi_{ss}$ is the production term in the budget of

---

Please cite this article in press as: Bailon-Cuba, J., et al. Turbulent channel flow with 2D wedges of random height on one wall. Int. J. Heat Fluid Flow (2009), doi:10.1016/j.ijheatfluidflow.2009.03.017
Far from the wall, $P_{22}$ resembles that over a flat surface. Near the wall $P_{22}$ has a maximum while that relative to the smooth surface goes to zero. The excess of energy transferred from $h_{uu}$ to $h_{vv}$ is dissipated near the wall. In fact, for $y^+ < 15$, $C_{22}$ is larger than that relative to the smooth wall (the latter being zero on the wall).

To summarize, over a rough wall, pressure is more effective in extracting energy from the streamwise component and redistributing it to the other stresses, thus improving isotropy. Geroge and Castillo (1997) showed that this is one of the important roles of the pressure–strain rate terms. The turbulent transport terms $T_{22}$ as $T_{11}$ have opposite sign with respect to that over the smooth wall. Energy is therefore transported upward where it is dissipated.

In general, the qualitative behavior of the budgets of $u^2$ and $v^2$ is the same over the three different surfaces (random, modified, and uniform). The turbulent transport term $T_{22}$ as $T_{11}$ has the opposite sign than that over the smooth wall. Energy is therefore transported upward where it is dissipated.

8. Conclusions

A DNS for a turbulent channel flow with a 2D random roughness on the lower wall has been performed. The roughness elements are 2D wedges of random height. The roughness geometry has been modified removing the small wedges. Also, a rough profile composed of uniformly-spaced wedges with the same longitudinal area as the random case has been considered for comparison.

It was shown that roughness on the wall induces separated regions, the reattachment occurring on the walls of the wedges or on the bottom walls. The stagnation pressure on the walls of the wedges determine a form drag which is much larger than the viscous drag.

Moreover, the pressure gradients on the walls increase the ejections and inrushes towards the wall. As a consequence the flow is more isotropic. The mechanism inducing to an improved isotropy has been explained in the paper through the Reynolds stress budgets. The pressure redistributes energy between $\langle u^2 \rangle$ and $\langle v^2 \rangle$. As a consequence $\langle u^2 \rangle$ and $\langle w^2 \rangle$ increase and isotropy is better approximated on the rough walls.

Near the wall, the energy spectra presents peaks in correspondence of the pitch over height ratio of the wedges. For the random geometry, the peaks of energy occurs at low wave numbers (i.e. large scales) corresponding to pitch over height ratios in the range $4 < \lambda/k < 10$. Other pitch to height ratio do not affect significantly the energy distribution. As a consequence a random distribution of elements can be simplified by considering only those having a pitch over height in the range $4 < \lambda/k < 10$.

Near the wall, the uniformly distributed roughness represents only a poor approximation of the surface with wedges of random height. The Reynolds stresses, pressure distribution and spectra on the modified wall agree well with those on the random rough wall.
surface. Far from the wall, all the surfaces have similar results. Therefore, if one is interested in the behavior far from the wall, the average density of the edges can be taken as first approximation. However, if the interest is in the near wall region, or within the roughness layer, only the “modified” wall represents a close approximation of the real rough surface. By removing the small elements on the wake of the larger the overlying flow is not much affected. The geometrical characterization of a rough wall can be simplified to the pitch to height ratio of the largest elements.
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