Influence of Interactions Between Turbulence and Radiation on Transmissivities in Hypersonic Turbulent Boundary Layers
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In the current paper, a high fidelity large eddy simulation solver is coupled to our modified line-by-line radiative transport equation solver to study the effects of absorption turbulence-radiation interactions in a hypersonic turbulent boundary layer, representative of the Orion CEV entering Earth’s atmosphere, at peak heating condition. The turbulent and radiation fields represent extreme conditions typical of Orion, as the simulated boundary layer represents the region of high turbulence coupled to region of highest incident radiation. A simplification in the calculation of molecular spectra with a single temperature property database allows for tractable calculation of spectral properties. A comparison of wall directed intensities show the effects of absorption turbulence-radiation interactions due to radiation emitted in the shock layer is minimal, although a slight decrease in boundary layer transmissivities is predicted.

Nomenclature

\( C_f \)  Skin friction, dimensionless
\( E \)  Emission energy, W/m³
\( F \)  Rotational term energy for a molecule, cm⁻¹
\( G \)  Vibrational term energy for a molecule, cm⁻¹
\( H \)  Shape factor, -
\( I \)  Radiative intensity, W/m²·sr
\( J \)  Rotational quantum number, -
\( L_{x,y,z} \)  Domain length, m
\( M \)  Mach number, -
\( N_{x,y,z} \)  Number of columns, -
\( N_{L,U} \)  State population number density, m⁻³
\( n_e \)  Electron number density, m⁻³
\( n_k \)  Number density of atoms or molecules, m⁻³
\( q \)  Turbulent kinetic energy, m²/s²
\( Q \)  Total partition function, -
\( Re_θ \)  Reynolds number, \( Re_θ \equiv \frac{\rho u_θ δ}{μ} \), dimensionless
\( Re_{ε_2} \)  Reynolds number, \( Re_{ε_2} \equiv \frac{μ_{ε_2}}{ρ u_θ δ} \), dimensionless
\( Re_τ \)  Reynolds number, \( Re_τ \equiv \frac{ρ u_τ δ}{μ_v} \), dimensionless
\( T \)  Temperature, K
\( u_τ \)  Friction velocity, m/s
\( V \)  Vibrational quantum number, -
\( z \)  Distance from body, m
\( δ \)  Boundary layer thickness, m
\( δ^* \)  Displacement thickness, m
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I. Introduction

Accurate simulation of the hypersonic flow field surrounding, and heating loads onto, spacecraft during entry into planetary atmospheres or Earth return requires high-fidelity modeling of thermal radiation from the plasma in the shock layer, as well as radiation from within the boundary layer itself. It has long been recognized that at velocities exceeding 10 km/s radiation contributes significantly to the overall heat load, and that its accurate determination requires meticulous modeling of the plasma’s and gas’ spectral emission and absorption properties.\(^1\) It is also well known today that, in the field of turbulent flames, there may be very strong interactions between radiation and the turbulent flow field, resulting in changes in radiative flux of 100% and more.\(^2\) Whether and how such turbulence–radiation interactions (TRI) in a turbulent boundary layer on a hypersonic spacecraft affect the flow field and the heating loads on the craft is still unknown today. The effects of TRI are often considered with respect to two terms, emission TRI, and absorption TRI. Emission TRI is a local term, related to the turbulent variation of local properties such as temperature and number density. Absorption TRI, on the other hand, depends upon both the variation in local properties, as well as the variation in incident radiation due to the fluctuating turbulent flow field. The influence of TRI on transmitted radiation has been studied previously in the combustion community.\(^3\),\(^4\) Prediction of TRI, and the associated radiative fluxes show strong sensitivity to the concentration and temperature, fields which vary greatly in the reacting regions of the flow. For emission TRI strong temperature variations result in significant changes in emission, due to the nonlinearity of emission with temperature (\(E \sim T^4\)). For absorption TRI turbulence chemistry interactions (TCI) also play a significant role owing to the less severe (more linear) dependencies of absorption coefficients on temperature and number densities.

In hypersonic flows radiation from the shock layer and from within the boundary layer will, due to radiation’s “action at a distance,” diminish local temperature fluctuations. But it is not known by how much, and how this feeds back to velocity fluctuations and overall turbulence levels. Existing RANS models require modification to account for the interrelationship between radiation, chemistry, and turbulence to a fidelity required for design analysis. In order to ensure accuracy, such modifications must be developed from first principles analysis, such as direct numerical simulation and large eddy simulation (DNS and LES, respectively) techniques coupled to high order nonequilibrium radiative transport solvers. Once the relevant terms have been identified via these analyses, their importance to design can be determined. If they are a significant source of uncertainty for Constellation mission objectives the results will be used to develop RANS-compatible subgrid models that can be incorporated into existing NASA design tools. The Constellation program which features manned missions to near Earth orbit, the Moon, and possibly Mars, are planned for the Orion crew exploration vehicle (CEV).

In the current work, LES is used to assess the effects of turbulence on the transmissivity of the boundary layer of radiation from the shock layer, using conditions typical of Orion crew exploration vehicle (CEV) during Earth entry. While significant absorption in the boundary layer is predicted, the effects of absorption TRI are predicted to be quite small.

II. Methodology

A. Model flow conditions

The Orion CEV is chosen as a representative flow for the study, and the finite volume code DPLR was used to model the full 3-D flow field as well as to establish boundary conditions for the flowfield and radiation analysis. The
DPLR solution was generated by NASA Ames and was obtained using a two temperature model \((T, T_f)\) by Park\(^3\) and considers chemical reaction processes of 11 species: N, O, N\(^2\), O\(^+\), N\(^2\), O\(_2\), NO, N\(_2\), O\(_2^+\), NO\(^+\) and \(e^-\). The flow field is based on the CEV entering Earth’s atmosphere at 9.5 km/s, at an altitude of 53 km, and angle of attack of 18°. These conditions represent Earth entry, at peak heating. Turbulence is modeled using the two equation Menter SST model with compressibility correction. Figure 1 shows the entire computational domain for the DPLR finite-volume solution for Orion at peak heating, and Figs. 2(a,b) show the LES subdomain identified to explore turbulence-radiation interaction. The LES subdomain lies toward the front of the craft, where the temperature and electron number density are high and radiation is strong, as shown in Figs. 3, where the temperatures as well as number densities of radiating species (N, O, N\(_2\), O\(_2\), NO, N\(_2^+\) for Earth reentry) along the line-of-sight indicated in Figs. 2(b) are plotted. For the presently estimated Orion peak heating conditions, it was found that the strong turbulence is limited to the aft region of the spacecraft, where radiation is weak. Therefore, to investigate a worst case scenario, a relatively large turbulence level \((\sqrt{\Delta T}/u_\tau \simeq 2.2 \text{ or } \sqrt{\Delta T}/U_\delta \simeq 7\%)\), typical of that in the aft region, is prescribed to the selected LES sub-domain, where \(q = u'^2 + v'^2 + w'^2\) is the turbulent kinetic energy. The analysis then represents a combination of strong turbulence together with strongest radiation to present a worst case scenario for an Earth entry of Orion, or of a hypothetical case of a larger vehicle, to determine whether or not TRI may be of importance.

The boundary layer edge conditions and wall parameters for LES are given in Table 1, which provides boundary layer edge Mach number, density, and temperature \((M_\delta, \rho_\delta, \text{ and } T_\delta, \text{ respectively})\). The table also gives the following boundary layer properties: momentum thickness, \(\theta\), shape factor, \(H = \delta'/\theta\) (\(\delta'\) is the displacement thickness), boundary layer thickness, \(\delta\) (defined as the location where the flow velocity is 99% of that of the free stream), and Reynolds numbers are \(Re_\theta \equiv \frac{\mu_\delta}{\mu_\tau} u_\tau \theta\), \(Re_\tau \equiv \frac{\mu_\delta}{\mu_\tau} u_\tau \delta\), and \(Re_\delta \equiv \frac{\mu_\delta}{\mu_\tau} u_\tau \), where \(\mu_\delta\) is the boundary layer edge viscosity, \(\mu_w\) is the viscosity at the wall, \(\rho_\tau\) density at the wall, and \(u_\tau\) is the friction velocity.

### B. Simulation details for LES

The governing unsteady fluid motion equations, namely chemical species mass, momentum and energy equations, are solved in conservative form. The LES form of the governing equations as well as subgrid-scale (SGS) terms are discussed in detail by Martin & Candler.\(^6\) Since vibrational temperature is equal to translational temperature throughout the boundary layer (Fig. 3(a)), a one-temperature model is used for LES. Similar to DPLR, an 11-species reaction mechanism\(^3\) is employed for gas-phase reactions and the Gupta-Yos mixing rule\(^7\) is used for transport coefficients in LES. Complete thermal equilibrium of all species is assumed with equilibrium gas properties calculated using NASA LeRC curve fits;\(^8\) an equilibrium catalytic boundary condition is used for species, i.e. species go to their equilibrium state at the given wall temperature.

The spatial derivatives are computed numerically using a fourth-order accurate, bandwidth-optimized WENO scheme.\(^9\) To perform the numerical integration, a third-order accurate low-storage Runge-Kutta method by Williamson\(^10\) is used. The viscous terms are computed using a fourth-order accurate central scheme. A description of the code and its validation is given in Martin\(^11\) and Duan & Martin.\(^12\)

The SGS terms are modeled using the one-coefficient dynamic mixed model of Martin, Piomelli and Candler,\(^13\) which uses scale similarity terms coupled with a dynamic eddy viscosity and dynamic turbulent Prandtl number to model the SGS stresses and SGS heat flux. The SGS turbulent diffusion of kinetic energy is modeled as in Knight et al.\(^14\) The SGS viscous diffusion of kinetic energy is expected to be of a smaller order of magnitude and is not modeled. The code has been validated in high speed boundary layer flow.\(^15\)

The initial LES flow field is obtained by first initializing a DNS flow field and then filtering the DNS data and mapping it onto the LES grid. The DNS flow field is initialized following the initialization procedure by Martin,\(^11\) with mean flow field parameters from the CEV solution, as described in Section A. The domain size \((L_x \times L_y \times L_z)\), the grid size \((\Delta x \times \Delta y \times \Delta z)\) and the number of grid points \((N_x \times N_y \times N_z)\) for the initial DNS field are given in Table 2. The streamwise, spanwise, and wall-normal directions are taken to be \(x\), \(y\), and \(z\), respectively. Uniform grid spacings are used in the streamwise and spanwise directions with constant \(\Delta x^*\) and \(\Delta y^*\), where the superscript (*) indicates scaling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(M_\delta)</th>
<th>(\rho_\delta) (kg/m(^3))</th>
<th>(T_\delta) (K)</th>
<th>(T_w) (K)</th>
<th>(Re_\theta)</th>
<th>(Re_\tau)</th>
<th>(Re_\delta)</th>
<th>(\theta) (mm)</th>
<th>(H)</th>
<th>(\delta) (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>9614</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Dimensional boundary layer edge and wall parameters for large-eddy simulations
with inner, or wall values. Geometric stretching is used in the wall-normal direction, with \( z_k = z_2(\alpha^{k-1} - 1)/(\alpha - 1) \) with \( \alpha \) chosen such that \( z_{Nz} = z_{BL} \) (outer end of the LES sublayer).

After obtaining the initial DNS flow field, a top-hat filter is applied to each DNS variable along the three directions using

\[
\bar{T}_i = \frac{1}{2n} \left( f_{i-\frac{\Delta}{2}} + 2 \sum_{i-\frac{\Delta}{2}+1}^{i+\frac{\Delta}{2}-1} f_i + f_{i+\frac{\Delta}{2}} \right).
\]

Therefore, \( \bar{\Delta}_i = n \Delta_i \), where \( \bar{\Delta}_i \) and \( \Delta_i \) are the LES and DNS grid spacings, respectively, and \( n \) represents the non-dimensional filter width. The trapezoidal rule is used in the wall-normal direction to account for the grid stretching. The filter width is \( 8 \times 4 \times 2 \) in the streamwise, spanwise and wall-normal directions, respectively. With this filter width, the SGS carry about 20% of the turbulent kinetic energy.

Periodic boundary conditions in both streamwise and spanwise directions are used. Averages are computed over streamwise and spanwise directions of each field; then an ensemble average is calculated over 11 fields spanning around one nondimensional time unit. The time is nondimensionalized by \( \delta/\mu_e \). Figure 4 shows the temperature profile and number density profiles of N and O in the flow field, along with RMS values for the fluctuating quantities for a single snapshot in time. As discussed in Duan et al.\textsuperscript{16} the level of turbulence-chemistry interactions is very low in the present flowfield. As a result the RMS values for the fluctuating quantities are also fairly low (< 15% of mean quantities), with the greatest variation being for N, while RMS values for temperature are about 10%.

C. Radiation Modeling

In order to study the effects of turbulence on the transmissivity of radiation from the shock layer, which enters the boundary layer domain from the outside, an irradiation boundary condition must be established. For this purpose the line-by-line (LBL) tangent slab solver of Feldick et al.\textsuperscript{17} has been modified to first provide the spectral intensities hitting the edge of the boundary layer subdomain \( I_z(z_{BL}) \), and also calculate snapshots of the turbulent boundary layer transmissivity of the incoming radiation as it travels toward the CEV’s surface.

The intensity of radiation emitted in the shock layer, traveling along a single direction toward the CEV’s surface, attenuated by self-absorption along the way, may be written as\textsuperscript{18}

\[
I_{z}(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{z} e_{z}(z') \exp \left( - \int_{z}^{z'} \kappa(z') \right) dz'
\]

where \( z \) is distance from the CEV surface along the surface normal, \( e_z \) is the emission coefficient and \( \kappa_z \) the absorption coefficient in the shock layer, with contributions from all radiating species (N, O, N\(_2\), NO, O\(_2\) and N\(_2\) for Earth reentry). Eq. (2) applies to the region from the edge of the boundary layer subdomain to outside of the shock layer, from \( z(BL) \) in Fig. 5 to outside the computational domain To determine the transmissivity within the LES boundary layer, from \( z(0) \) to \( z(BL) \) in Fig. 5 local emission is not considered and, therefore, the local intensity inside the LES layer, due to radiation incident upon the outer edge of the boundary layer, attenuated by absorption, may be written as

\[
I_{z}(z) = I_{z}(z_{BL}) \exp \left( - \int_{z}^{z_{BL}} \kappa(z') \right) \tag{3}
\]

The solution of Eqs. (2), and (3) requires emission and absorption coefficients for all relevant spectral wavelengths. For emission and absorption coefficients of N, O, along with continuum contributions from N\(^+\) and O\(^+\), the databasing techniques of Sohn et al.\textsuperscript{19} are used, including the effects of Stark broadening. Molecular species of N\(_2\), NO, O\(_2\) and N\(_2\) are also considered, with the important bands included shown in Table 3. As described in Park\textsuperscript{5} and Sohn et al.\textsuperscript{19} molecular spectra depend upon 7 primary variables \( (T_T, T_E, T_R, T_V, N_e, N_a/N_m, \lambda) \), and each molecular band contains many lines (O(10\(^3\) – 10\(^6\))). The complexity of molecular spectra can add considerably to the computational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( L_x/\delta )</th>
<th>( L_y/\delta )</th>
<th>( L_z/\delta )</th>
<th>( \Delta x^+ )</th>
<th>( \Delta y^+ )</th>
<th>( \Delta z^+ )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( N_x )</th>
<th>( N_y )</th>
<th>( N_z )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Grid resolution and domain size for the initial DNS field
Table 3. Molecular Bands Included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molec. Name</th>
<th>Spectral Range (Å)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N^+_2$</td>
<td>1$^{-1}$ (1st negative) 2547 ~ 12000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N^+_2$</td>
<td>Meinel 2749 ~ 12000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>1$^+$ (1st positive) 2547 ~ 12000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>2$^+$ (2nd positive) 2602 ~ 7229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>Birge-Hopfield 870 ~ 1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>Birge-Hopfield 2 827 ~ 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>Carrol-Yoshino 845 ~ 1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2$</td>
<td>Schummann Runge 1763 ~ 5919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Beta 1681 ~ 9210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Gamma 1653 ~ 5402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows that for the entirety of the boundary layer, the vibrational temperature is essentially equal to the total temperature. If it is assumed that all temperatures are equal, the complexity can be reduced significantly. This assumption does not necessarily imply equilibrium radiation, with all states defined by Boltzmann distribution. The quasi-steady-state (QSS) approximation of Park is still used, because the population of electrons, atoms, ions and molecules may or may not be in thermo-chemical equilibrium. In the current analysis, the LES boundary layer is composed of 110 cells in the $x$-direction, 120 cells in the $y$-direction, and 40 cells in the $z$-direction. Because the analysis is carried out at 11 separate flow times, $110 \times 120 \times 11 = 145200$ line-of-site calculations are required. Simplification of molecular spectral property retrieval is necessary to make accurate calculations tractable.

Simplifying the molecular band spectral calculations involves separating the temperature dependencies of each individual line strength and shape from the band electronic state populations. The emission coefficient for a particular band can be found from

$$
\varepsilon_{\lambda} = \varepsilon_c N_U \phi_{\lambda i} \tag{4}
$$

where $i$ is the line index, $\varepsilon_{\lambda i}^c$ is a constant for line $i$, and $\phi_{\lambda i}$ is the line shape for line $i$. If $\phi_{\lambda i}$ is taken to be the Doppler profile, which is accurate in the considered flow, as Stark broadening coefficients are low and pressure broadening is minimal, then $\phi_{\lambda i}$ is a function of wavelength and translational temperature only. $N_U$ is the upper state population, which is different for each line in the band

$$
N_U = \frac{N_e^U (2J_U + 1)}{Q_{UWR}(2J_U + 1)} \exp \left[ -\frac{\hbar c}{k} \left( \frac{G(V_U)}{T_V} + \frac{F(J_U)}{T_R} \right) \right] \tag{5}
$$

where $N_e^U$ is the electronic upper state population, which can be determined via the quasi-steady state approximation, and is a constant for the entire band. $(Q_{UWR})_U$ is the upper state total partition function, $J_U$ is the rotational quantum number, $V_U$ is the vibrational quantum number, $F$ is the state rotational term energy, and $G$ is state vibrational term energy. If $T_T = T_V = T_R = T_E = T$, then the upper state population can be written as

$$
N_U = N_e^U B_1(T) \tag{6}
$$

where

$$
B_1(T) = \frac{1}{(Q_{UWR})_U} \left( 2J_U + 1 \right) \exp \left[ -\frac{\hbar c}{k} \left( \frac{G(V_U)}{T} + \frac{F(J_U)}{T} \right) \right] \tag{7}
$$

A temperature and wavelength dependent band emission cross-section can then be written as

$$
\varepsilon_{\lambda i}^*(T) = \sum_{i=1} \varepsilon_{\lambda i}^c \phi_{\lambda i}(T) B_1(T), \tag{8}
$$

and the emission coefficient for each band follows as

$$
\varepsilon_{\lambda i} = \varepsilon_{\lambda i}^*(T) N_e^U \tag{9}
$$
where $\epsilon_i^*(T)$ is a function of a single temperature and wavelength and $N_U^e$ is precalculated, and constant over the entire band.

In the same way the absorption coefficient can be written as,

$$\alpha_t = \sum_{i=1} e_i^* N_u^e \frac{\lambda_i^5}{2\hbar c^2} \left( \frac{N_L}{N_U} - 1 \right) \phi_{li}(T) \tag{10}$$

where

$$\frac{N_L}{N_U^e} = \frac{N_L}{N_U^e} \frac{(Q_{vr})_U}{2 J_L + 1} \exp \left[ \frac{\hbar c}{k} \left( \frac{G(V_U) - G(V_L)}{T_V} + \frac{F(J_U) - F(J_L)}{T_R} \right) \right] \tag{11}$$

Again, if one assumes the temperatures to be equal, then the lower-upper state population ratio can be expressed as

$$\frac{N_L}{N_U^e} = \frac{N_L}{N_U^e} B_2(T) \tag{13}$$

where

$$B_2(T) = \frac{(Q_{vr})_U}{(Q_{vr})_L} \frac{2 J_L + 1}{2 J_U + 1} \exp \left[ \frac{\hbar c}{k} \left( \frac{G(V_U) - G(V_L)}{T} + \frac{F(J_U) - F(J_L)}{T} \right) \right]$$

The absorption coefficient can then be found from

$$\alpha_t = \sum_{i=1} e_i^* N_u^e B_1(T) \frac{\lambda_i^5}{2\hbar c^2} \phi_{li}(T) \tag{14}$$

Defining band absorption cross-sections as

$$\alpha_{11}^*(T) = \sum_{i=1} e_i^* B_1(T) B_2(T) \frac{\lambda_i^5}{2\hbar c^2} \phi_{li}(T) \tag{15}$$

and

$$\alpha_{12}^*(T) = \sum_{i=1} e_i^* B_1(T) \frac{\lambda_i^5}{2\hbar c^2} \phi_{li}(T) \tag{16}$$

the absorption coefficient for a band can be written

$$\alpha_t = \alpha_{11}^*(T) N_u^e - \alpha_{12}^*(T) N_u^e \tag{17}$$

The band emission and absorption cross-sections ($e_i^*, \alpha_{11}^*, \alpha_{12}^*$) can be precalculated and stored in tables in terms of temperature and wavelength. Obtaining spectral coefficients at run time is then reduced to 3 table interpolations, and 3 multiplications, and one subtraction, as the electronic state populations $N_u^e$ are calculated once and for all at the beginning of each line-of-sight calculation.

A strict LBL approach to resolving the spectral dependencies of RTE is computationally wasteful, as there are very few atomic lines, and the variation of continuum emission and absorption is minimal. Likewise, in the flow considered, the molecular absorption is optically thin, in all of the considered bands, with the exception of the bands of N$_2$, which emit very little, but absorb considerably in the Vacuum-Ultra-Violet regions. A variable step size is used in this application, with fine resolution of 120 points centered around each bound-bound line center, out to $+30$ Doppler half-widths of each atomic line, and a coarser resolution of 1.0 Å for the continuum–molecular regime. The Doppler width is based on the maximum translational temperature along the line-of-sight. The values for ($e_i^*, \alpha_{11}^*, \alpha_{12}^*$) are stored at all spectral locations, with averaged values used for the continuum–molecular region, and spectrally resolved values in the atomic bound-bound regions. A sample calculation is presented in Fig. 6, which shows the wall-directed intensity and local emission along the line-of-sight using temperatures and number densities taken directly from the DPLR solution. A LBL calculation is performed using the database of Sohn et al.$^{19}$ for both atomic and molecular spectra assuming the temperatures to be independent ($T_E = T_V$ and $T_T = T_R = T$). The LBL solution is performed using a fine resolution of 120 points centered around each bound-bound line center, out to $+30$ Doppler half-widths of each atomic line, and a resolution of 0.05 Å for the continuum–molecular regime. Figure 6 shows the local emission and wall–directed intensity for both the LBL and the averaged band-cross-section method. $I_{(LBL)}$ is predicted to be 4.780 10$^5$ W/m$^2$ sr for the LBL solution, and 4.777 10$^5$ W/m$^2$ sr for the averaged band-cross-section method, while $I_{(0)}$ is predicted to be 3.734 10$^5$ W/m$^2$ sr for the LBL solution, and 3.682 10$^5$ W/m$^2$ sr for the averaged band-cross-section method. The time required for the LBL calculation (130 cells) is 2000 seconds, while for the average band-cross-section method, the time required is 10 seconds.
The intensity along the line-of-sight was then solved for each z-column in the LES domain, at each time step recorded in the flow. A wavelength dependent upper boundary condition is calculated and stored at the beginning of each run, with a total incoming intensity at the upper boundary of $4 \times 10^5$ W/m$^2$ sr. The predicted values of the varying flow field was recorded ($⟨I(T, n)⟩$), where $\vec{n}$ is a vector containing all species number densities, along with their standard deviation in observed wall intensity $σ(I(T, n))$, for all 11 snap shots. Average flow quantities (temperatures and number densities) were computed, and the wall-directed $I_w = I(z = 0)$ intensity of the averaged flow values $I_w(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ was determined, the results of which are listed in Table 4. The predicted values for the standard deviation are shown to be quite small, 2-3 orders of magnitude smaller than the average values, and often smaller than the difference between $⟨I(T, n)⟩$ and $I(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$. This implies that there is very little variation in the intensity at the wall in the LES resolved solutions despite the much larger fluctuations in $T$ and $n$ (Fig. 4). While the difference between $⟨I(T, n)⟩$ and $I(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ is in most cases statistically significant, the differences are so small that they are not physically significant.

It has been observed in the field of combustion that turbulence-radiation interactions are negligible in the absence of chemical reactions. Similarly here with relatively small fluctuations of $T$ and $n$ due to negligible turbulence chemistry interactions, turbulence radiation interactions are found to be negligible for transmitted intensities. The transmissivity of the averaged flow values was calculated $τ(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$, as was the average transmissivity based on the fluctuating values $⟨τ(T, n)⟩$. The transmissivity shows that there is significant absorption in the boundary layer. Again as seen from Table 4, there is very little difference in the transmissivity of averaged flow values and average transmissivity, with ratios of $1.000 \pm 0.009$. In general, a slight decrease in transmissivity as a result of TRI is observed. This is in contrast to the results obversed in combustion applications by Krebs et al. The effect, however, is quite small, again due to low variations in the turbulent flow field. A slight nonstationarity in the solution can also be observed, as $I(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ and $τ(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ gradually increases. This effect is small, and due to the slowly evolving turbulent field.

### III. Results

The intensity along the line-of-sight was then solved for each z-column in the LES domain, at each time step recorded in the flow. A wavelength dependent upper boundary condition is calculated and stored at the beginning of each run, with a total incoming intensity at the upper boundary of $4 \times 10^5$ W/m$^2$ sr. The predicted values of the varying flow field was recorded ($⟨I(T, n)⟩$), where $\vec{n}$ is a vector containing all species number densities, along with their standard deviation in observed wall intensity $σ(I(T, n))$, for all 11 snap shots. Average flow quantities (temperatures and number densities) were computed, and the wall-directed $I_w = I(z = 0)$ intensity of the averaged flow values $I_w(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ was determined, the results of which are listed in Table 4. The predicted values for the standard deviation are shown to be quite small, 2-3 orders of magnitude smaller than the average values, and often smaller than the difference between $⟨I(T, n)⟩$ and $I(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$. This implies that there is very little variation in the intensity at the wall in the LES resolved solutions despite the much larger fluctuations in $T$ and $n$ (Fig. 4). While the difference between $⟨I(T, n)⟩$ and $I(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ is in most cases statistically significant, the differences are so small that they are not physically significant.

It has been observed in the field of combustion that turbulence-radiation interactions are negligible in the absence of chemical reactions. Similarly here with relatively small fluctuations of $T$ and $n$ due to negligible turbulence chemistry interactions, turbulence radiation interactions are found to be negligible for transmitted intensities. The transmissivity of the averaged flow values was calculated $τ(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$, as was the average transmissivity based on the fluctuating values $⟨τ(T, n)⟩$. The transmissivity shows that there is significant absorption in the boundary layer. Again as seen from Table 4, there is very little difference in the transmissivity of averaged flow values and average transmissivity, with ratios of $1.000 \pm 0.009$. In general, a slight decrease in transmissivity as a result of TRI is observed. This is in contrast to the results observed in combustion applications by Krebs et al. The effect, however, is quite small, again due to low variations in the turbulent flow field. A slight nonstationarity in the solution can also be observed, as $I(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ and $τ(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ gradually increases. This effect is small, and due to the slowly evolving turbulent field.

### IV. Concluding Remarks

In the current paper, a high fidelity LES solver is coupled to our modified line-by-line RTE solver to study the effects of absorption TRI in a hypersonic turbulent boundary layer, representative of the Orion CEV entering Earth’s atmosphere. The turbulent and radiation boundary conditions used in this study represent extreme conditions, as the simulated boundary layer represents the region of highest turbulence coupled to region of highest incident radiation. A simplification in the calculation of molecular spectra with a single temperature property database in allows for tractable calculation of spectral properties. The effects of absorption TRI in the form of boundary layer absorption of radiation emitted in the shock layer are predicted to be small for the studied conditions with $τ(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)/τ(⟨T⟩, ⟨n⟩)$ being very near to unity. The effects of absorption TRI due to non-local emission are therefore predicted to be negligible for
any possible Earth entry conditions encountered by Orion.
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Figure 1. Contours of Mach number for a three-dimensional DPLR solution of Orion at peak-heating reentry conditions.

Figure 2. LES subdomain from CEV solution.
Figure 3. Temperatures and number densities along the line-of-sight indicated in Figure 2(b).

Figure 4. Boundary Profiles of Mean with RMS variations of Temperature and Number Density of N and O.
Figure 5. Schematic diagram of radiative intensity along a line-of-sight

Figure 6. Radiative intensity along a line-of-sight located near the shoulder of the vehicle