



Deep Learning for Surrogate Models of Turbulence

Fernando Gonzalez

fernando.gonzalez@coria.fr



Why the interest in predicting turbulence?



Deck, S., Gand, F., Brunet, V., & Ben Khelil, S. (2014). High-fidelity simulations of unsteady civil aircraft aerodynamics: stakes and perspectives. Application of zonal detached eddy simulation. *Philosophical Transactions* Of The Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical And Engineering Sciences, 372(2022), 20130325. doi: 10.1098/rsta.2013.0325



Cyclones at Jupiter's north pole. NASA, JPL-Caltech, SwRI, ASI, INAF, JIRAM



The opportunity for Machine Learning in Turbulence Modelling

Considers a wide range of flow conditions Minimal error with regards to existing experimental and high fidelity data

Optimal

Model

Optimal costbenefit of implementation "It would be extremely valuable to develop a general methodology to determine optimal models" –

Pope, Stephen (1999) . A Perspective On Turbulence Modelling



Uses of ML in Computational Fluid Dynamics



Vinuesa, R., & Brunton, S. L. (2021). The Potential of Machine Learning to Enhance Computational Fluid Dynamics. ArXiv:2110.02085 [Physics]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2110.02085



Reduced-order Modelling of Turbulent flows

Control Design Applications Optimization

Accelerating Simulations

Risk Analysis



Methods

1. Fully Data-Driven approach: Convolutional Autoencoder + LSTM

2. Physics-Informed Machine Learning: DeepONet



Data: 2D Turbulence

$$egin{aligned} \partial_t w(x,t) + u(x,t) &\cdot
abla w(x,t) =
u \Delta w(x,t) + f(x), & x \in (0,1)^2, t \in (0,T] \
abla \cdot u(x,t) &= 0, & x \in (0,1)^2, t \in [0,T] \
w(x,0) &= w_0(x), & x \in (0,1)^2 \end{aligned}$$



Li, Z., Kovachki, N., Azizzadenesheli, K., Liu, B., Bhattacharya, K., Stuart, A., & Anandkumar, A. (2021). Fourier Neural Operator for Parametric Partial Differential Equations. *ArXiv*:2010.08895 [Cs, Math]. <u>http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.08895</u>

https://github.com/zongyi-li/fourier_neural_operator





Convolutional Autoencoder + LSTM



Data-driven ROM: CAE + LSTM

A convolutional Autoencoder lowers the dimensionality of the problem.

Learns unsteady behavior

Tensor-Train decomposition for better long range predictions

Mohan, A., Daniel, D., Chertkov, M., & Livescu, D. (2019). Compressed Convolutional LSTM: An Efficient Deep Learning framework to Model High Fidelity 3D Turbulence. *ArXiv:1903.00033 [Nlin, Physics:Physics]*. http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.00033





Convolutional Autoencoder for dimensionality reduction





Recurrent Neural Network





Long Short Term Memory Network (LSTM)



$$egin{aligned} & i_t = \sigma(W_{ii}x_t + b_{ii} + W_{hi}h_{t-1} + b_{hi}) \ f_t = \sigma(W_{if}x_t + b_{if} + W_{hf}h_{t-1} + b_{hf}) \ g_t = anh(W_{ig}x_t + b_{ig} + W_{hg}h_{t-1} + b_{hg}) \ o_t = \sigma(W_{io}x_t + b_{io} + W_{ho}h_{t-1} + b_{ho}) \ c_t = f_t \odot c_{t-1} + i_t \odot g_t \ h_t = o_t \odot anh(c_t) \end{aligned}$$



Training of CAE+LSTM







Physics-Informed DeepONet



A primer on Physics-Informed Neural **Networks**

Computed Using



15

 $x \in \Omega$



Finite Element Method vs. Physics-Informed Neural Networks

	PINN	FEM
Basis function	Neural Network	Piecewise polynomial
Parameters	Weights and Biases	Point Values
Discretization	Scattered Points (Mesh-free)	Mesh points
PDE Embedding	Loss Function	Algebraic System
Parameter Solver	Gradient Based Optimizer	Linear Solver
Errors	$\varepsilon_{app}, \varepsilon_{gen}, \varepsilon_{opt}$	Approximation/quadrature errors
Error bounds	Not available yet	Partially available

Lu, L., Meng, X., Mao, Z., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2021). DeepXDE: A Deep Learning Library for Solving Differential Equations. SIAM Review, 63(1), 208–228. https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1274067



Physics Informed Machine Learning: Learning Operators

Let A, U are Bancah Spaces of functions defined on bounded Domains $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $D' \subset \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ respectively.

Suppose we have acces only to observations $\{a_j, u_j\}_{i=1}^N$

Where $a_j \sim \mu$ are samples drawn from some probability measure supported on A .

And $u_j = G(a_j)$ is possibly corrupted with noise.

 $\mathcal{G}_{ heta}:\mathcal{A}
ightarrow\mathcal{U},\quad heta\in\mathbb{R}^p$



Learning the solution operator of a PDE

Given a non-linear PDE like:

 $\frac{du}{dt} + N(u) = f(x)$

We can approximante the solution operator for the PDE that solves the initial value problem for a distribution of initial conditions:

$$G_{\theta}: u_0 \to u(x, t + \Delta t), \qquad u_0 \sim p(\mu) \in A$$



Method: DeepONet



Lu, L., Jin, P., Pang, G., Zhang, Z., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2021). Learning nonlinear operators via DeepONet based on the universal approximation theorem of operators. Nature Machine Intelligence, 3(3), 218–229. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00302-5



Physics Informed DeepONet



Wang, S., Wang, H., & Perdikaris, P. (2021). Learning the solution operator of parametric partial differential equations with physics-informed DeepOnets. ArXiv:2103.10974 [Cs, Math, Stat]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.10974



Neural Network Architecture: Fourier Feature Network



 $\gamma(\mathbf{v}) = ig[a_1 \cosig(2\pi \mathbf{b}_1^{ ext{T}} \mathbf{v}ig), a_1 \sinig(2\pi \mathbf{b}_1^{ ext{T}} \mathbf{v}ig), \dots, a_m \cosig(2\pi \mathbf{b}_m^{ ext{T}} \mathbf{v}ig), a_m \sinig(2\pi \mathbf{b}_m^{ ext{T}} \mathbf{v}ig)ig]^{ ext{T}}$

Tancik, M., Srinivasan, P. P., Mildenhall, B., Fridovich-Keil, S., Raghavan, N., Singhal, U., Ramamoorthi, R., Barron, J. T., & Ng, R. (2020). Fourier Features Let Networks Learn High Frequency Functions in Low Dimensional Domains. ArXiv:2006.10739 [Cs]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10739



PI-DeepONet for the N-S equation







Results



 $\nu = 1e - 4$



Ground truth vs. CAE-LSTM





Ground truth

Prediction









root relative MSE for each predicted time-step



Results for PI-DeepONet

t = 5 t = 10 t = 0t = 15 30 40 50 · 10 -30 40 20 · 50 -

Ground truth vs. PI-DeepONet



Results for PI-DeepONet





Results for PI-DeepONet





Limitations

CAE-LSTM

- Dependent on discretization
- Difficulty for long-term predictions.
- No physical knowledge imposed to the model.
- Needs lots of data

PI-DeepONet

- Tricky to train
- Not accurate enough (yet!)
- Many parameters to tune, including the type of architecture.
- Long training times



Perspectives

1. Try other architectures for Neural Operators (Fourier Neural Operator, Graph Neural Operator, etc) and use them with PINNs.

2. Different training algorithms could improve results, for example recurrent training or transfer learning.

3. Use physics Informed Neural Operators for a 3D turbulent case.

4. Apply these methods in a CFD application.





Thank you for listening