Numerical Modelling of Thermal Effects in Elastohydrodynamic Lubrication Solvers
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The numerical modelling of thermal effects in elastohydrodynamic lubrication solvers is addressed by extending the code of the authors. This code is used to investigate the important effect of shear upon the temperature profiles for both a steady state and a transient line reversal example and also for a steady state point contact problem. Additional equations for the modelling of mean and surface temperatures within an elastohydrodynamic lubrication contact are described and are added into the existing multigrid driven solver. Temperature profiles in steady line and point contact cases are presented and used to demonstrate that even small amounts of shear produce temperatures in excess of those in the pure rolling case.

1. Introduction

Within an elastohydrodynamically lubricated (EHL) contact the temperature of both the entrained fluid and the contact surfaces can vary dramatically. In the pure rolling case temperature rises of only a matter of degrees may be expected, however when shear occurs the temperature may rise in severe cases by in excess of a hundred degrees \cite{1}. Fluid temperature plays a direct role in governing the density and viscosity of a fluid, which in turn affects the pressure profile and surface deformation across the contact. Clearly, then, with temperature fluctuations of this magnitude occurring it is important to include thermal effects in EHL models.

These thermal effects have been extensively studied for many years since the initial theoretical work by Crook \cite{2} in 1961, with numerical methods for the thermal solutions in line contacts developed in the 1960's by Sternlicht \cite{3}, Cheng and Sternlicht \cite{4}, Cheng \cite{5} and by Dowson and Whitaker \cite{6}. Recent papers, for example, those by Lee \textit{et al} \cite{7}, \cite{8}, by Kim \textit{et al} \cite{9,10} and by Kazama \textit{et al} \cite{11} have utilised the multigrid techniques applied to EHL problems by Venner and Lubrecht \cite{12} to solve both line and point contact cases.

In this paper the transient EHL model developed in the CPDE Unit at Leeds, \cite{13,14} using the multigrid techniques applied to EHL problems by Venner and Lubrecht \cite{12} is extended to include thermal effects \cite{16}. This involves extensions to the non-Newtonian fluid model \cite{16} governing the density and viscosity and introducing three additional equations to the code, one for mean temperature and one for each of the two contact surfaces. Inclusion of these into the equation set for the line contact case will be discussed along with the solution method. An extension to the point contact case is also described.

Results are presented and discussed for an essentially steady state line contact showing the thermal effects at both pure rolling and at several shear rates, followed by thermal profiles in a line contact reversal problem, again for both pure rolling and varying shear rates. A thermal point contact solution will then be presented.

2. Notation

Dimensional Values

\begin{align*}
C_p & \quad \text{spec heat capacity} \ (J kg^{-1} K^{-1}) \\
C_p & : a \quad \text{spec heat capacity of roller} \ A \ (J kg^{-1} K^{-1})
\end{align*}
\(C_p: b\) spec heat capacity of roller B \((J kg^{-1} K^{-1})\)
\(p\) pressure \((Pa)\)
\(h\) film thickness \((m)\)
\(\rho\) density \((N m^{-1})\)
\(\rho_a, \rho_b\) density of roller A/B \((N m^{-1})\)
\(u_a, u_b\) velocity of roller A/B \((m s^{-1})\)
\(\eta\) film thickness \((m s^{-1})\)
\(\eta\) viscosity \((Pa s)\)
\(\theta\) temperature \((K)\)
\(x\) distance \((m)\)
\(t\) time \((s)\)
\(\mu\) Dowson-Higginson mu parameter \((Pa^{-1})\)
\(\nu\) Dowson-Higginson mu parameter \((Pa^{-1})\)
\(\beta_{e,0}\) thermal expansion coefficient \((K^{-1})\)
\(\kappa_e\) pressure coeff of thermal expansion \((Pa^{-1})\)
\(\theta_0\) reference temperature \((K)\)
\(b\) Hertanz radius \((m)\)
\(p_b\) maximum Hertzian pressure \((Pa)\)
\(R\) reduced radius \((m)\)
\(\rho_0\) standard density \((N m^{-1})\)
\(\eta_0\) standard viscosity \((Pa s)\)
\(\alpha_0\) pressure coefficient of viscosity \((Pa^{-1})\)
\(z_0\) Roelands 20 parameter
\(z_1\) Roelands z1 parameter
\(\theta_{ref}\) ref temp. in Roelands law \((K)\)
\(x\) thermal conductivity coeff \((W m^{-1} K^{-1})\)
\(k_{a, b}\) thermal con. coeff of A/B \((W m^{-1} K^{-1})\)

**Reference Values**

- \(u_0\) reference velocity \((m s^{-1})\)
- \(\eta_0\) ambient viscosity \((N m^{-1})\)
- \(\rho_0\) ambient density \((N m^{-1})\)
- \(\theta_x\) ambient temperature \((K)\)

**Non-Dimensional Values**

- \(B\) Hertzian radius \((B = 2b/R)\)
- \(H\) film thickness \((H = Rh/b^2)\)
- \(P\) pressure \((P = p/p_h)\)
- \(T\) time \((T = \tau_0 t/2b)\)
- \(X\) distance \((X = x/b)\)
- \(U_a\) velocity of roller A \((U_a = u_a/u_0)\)
- \(U_b\) velocity of roller B \((U_b = u_b/u_0)\)
- \(U_e\) entrainment velocity \((U_e = u_e/u_0)\)
- \(U_m\) mean velocity \((U_m = u_m/u_0)\)
- \(\bar{\rho}\) density \((\bar{\rho} = \rho/\rho_x)\)
- \(\bar{\eta}\) viscosity \((\bar{\eta} = \eta/\eta_x)\)
- \(\bar{\theta}\) temperature \((\bar{\theta} = \theta/\theta_x)\)
- \(\Gamma_m\) mean shear rate \((\Gamma_m = \left[U_b - U_a\right]/H)\)

**3. Governing Equations**

There are five governing equations for the standard non-thermal line contact EHL problem, those of pressure, film thickness, force balance, density and viscosity. In addition there are three equations linked with the thermal model, these being the energy equation and a surface temperature equation for each surface.

The pressure distribution is modelled by the Reynolds Equation [17]. In non-dimensional form this is:

\[
\frac{\partial (\rho H)}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial}{\partial X} \left( \frac{\rho H^3}{\eta \lambda} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} \right) - U_e(T) \frac{\partial (\rho H)}{\partial X},
\]

where

\(U_e(T) = U_a(T) + U_b(T),\)

and

\[
\lambda = \frac{6\eta_0 u_e R^2}{\theta^3 p_h}
\]

The Film Thickness Equation represents the geometry of the roller and is given, in non-dimensional form, by:

\[
H(X) = H_0 + \frac{X^2}{2} - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{X}^{\infty} \ln|X - X'| P(X')dX',
\]

where \(H_0\) is the central offset film thickness, which defines the relative positions of the surfaces if no deformation was to occur. The parabolic term represents the undeformed shape of the rollers, and the integral defines the deformation of the surfaces due to the pressure distribution across the domain.

The Force Balance Equation relates the pressure distribution across the domain to the applied load. It is given by:

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(X)dX = \frac{\pi}{2}.
\]
The density of the fluid is normally modelled as a function of pressure only using the Dowson and Higginson [18] model. In this work we consider the density as being a function of both pressure and temperature and use an extended form of the Dowson and Higginson model in dimensional form:

\[ \rho(p, \theta) = \rho_0 \left(1 + \frac{\mu p}{1 + v_p}\right) \{1 - \beta_v(p)(\theta - \theta_0)\}, \tag{6} \]

where

\[ \beta_v(p) = \beta_v(0) \exp(-\kappa_v p). \tag{7} \]

Similarly to the density, in this work the viscosity is considered to be a function of both pressure and of temperature, instead of merely pressure. As a result the viscosity model used is a modified version of the Roelands law [19], this is:

\[ \eta(p, \theta, \gamma) = \eta_0 \exp(y), \tag{8} \]

where

\[ y = \frac{\alpha_0 \rho_0}{\alpha_0 \rho_0} \left\{ \left(1 + \frac{p}{\rho_0}\right)^{z(\theta)} \left(\frac{\theta - \theta_r}{\theta_0 - \theta_r}\right)^{-s} - 1 \right\}, \tag{9} \]

\[ z(\theta) = z_0 - z_1 \ln \left(\frac{\theta - \theta_r}{\theta_0 - \theta_r}\right), \tag{10} \]

and

\[ s = \frac{\beta_0 z_0}{\alpha_0 \rho_0} (\theta_0 - \theta_r). \tag{11} \]

Temperature varies not only in the direction of flow through the contact which is solved for but also in the direction across the flow, between the rollers which is not solved for. Consequently an approximation must be made to take this into account. We assume a parabolic temperature approximation [15].

The appropriate Energy Equation for EHL problems [16] assuming the parabolic temperature approximation is given in non-dimensional form as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{P} & \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} + U_m \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial X} + \frac{(\theta - \theta_k)(U_m - U_k) \partial H}{H} \right\} \\
& = \frac{3 \beta \pi}{2 \beta^2 H^2} \left(\bar{\theta}_m + \bar{\theta}_k - 2 \bar{\theta}\right) + \frac{\beta \pi}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} \right) \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} + \frac{B \pi}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial X} \left(\bar{\theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial m}\right) \\
& - 2 \beta \pi \left(U_m - \frac{U_k}{2}\right) \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} + \frac{B \pi}{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \left(\bar{\theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial m}\right).
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[ U_m = -\frac{H^2}{2\kappa T} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} + \frac{U_k}{2}, \tag{13} \]

\[ \bar{\mu} = \frac{p_h R}{C_p \rho \alpha \theta_x b}, \tag{14} \]

\[ \bar{k} = \frac{6 \eta_x u_x R^2}{b^3 p_h}, \tag{15} \]

\[ \beta_v = \frac{p_h \beta_v}{C_p \rho x}, \tag{16} \]

and

\[ \overline{\kappa} = \frac{k}{C_p \rho \alpha u_0 b}. \tag{17} \]

The term on the left is heat convection, while the terms on the right of the equation model thermal conductivity, compression heating, viscous heat generation due to Pousseille flow and viscous heat generation due to Couette flow.

There are two equations for surface temperature, one for each surface. In the pure rolling case, these will be identical. The equations are given in non-dimensional terms as:

\[ \overline{\theta}_u(X) = 1 + 2 \frac{\kappa X_u}{\sqrt{U_u}} \int_{-\infty}^{X} \frac{(X - \overline{\theta}_u - \overline{\theta}_k) d \overline{\theta}}{(X - \overline{\theta})^{1/2} H(X)}, \tag{18} \]

\[ \overline{\theta}_b(X) = 1 + 2 \frac{\kappa X_b}{\sqrt{U_b}} \int_{-\infty}^{X} \frac{(X - \overline{\theta}_b - \overline{\theta}_k) d \overline{\theta}}{(X - \overline{\theta})^{1/2} H(X)}, \tag{19} \]

where

\[ \overline{\tau} = \frac{\overline{\beta} \rho \nu}{12 R^2 \eta_x \nu}, \tag{20} \]

\[ \overline{\kappa} = \frac{k}{\rho \overline{C_p \nu}}, \tag{21} \]

\[ \overline{\tau} = \frac{6 R^2}{\overline{\beta}^2}, \tag{22} \]

\[ \overline{\chi}_u = \frac{\rho \overline{C_p \nu R}}{\sqrt{\pi \rho \overline{C_p \nu \alpha}} k \overline{u_0}}, \tag{23} \]

\[ \overline{\chi}_b = \frac{\rho \overline{C_p \nu R}}{\sqrt{\pi \rho \overline{C_p \nu \alpha}} k \overline{u_0}}, \tag{24} \]
Extension for Point Contact

The equations for the isothermal point contact model are well documented. After non-dimensionalisation, additional y-directional terms occur in the Reynolds equations, and the force balance equation is altered and there are changes to the integral in the film thickness equation. The density and viscosity equations remain unchanged.

The Reynolds equation (1) becomes,

\[
\frac{\partial(\tau H)}{\partial T} = \frac{\partial}{\partial X} \left( \frac{\tau H^3}{\eta \lambda} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \left( \frac{\tau H^3}{\eta \lambda} \frac{\partial P}{\partial Y} \right) - \frac{U_i(T) \partial(\tau H)}{U_i(0) \partial X}, \tag{25}
\]

The Force Balance equation in the point contact case is given by:

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(X,Y) dX dY = \frac{2\pi}{3}. \tag{26}
\]

The film thickness equation is given by,

\[
H(X,Y) = H_0 + \frac{X^2}{2} + \frac{Y^2}{2} - \frac{2}{\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{P(X',Y')}{\sqrt{(X-X')^2 + (Y-Y')^2}} dX' dY'. \tag{27}
\]

The mean energy equation has extra terms in the two dimensional case. The two-dimensional form of this equation is given by,

\[
\overline{\rho} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \overline{\theta}}{\partial T} + U_m \frac{\partial \overline{\theta}}{\partial X} + V_m \frac{\partial \overline{\theta}}{\partial Y} \right\} + \frac{\overline{\theta} - \overline{\theta}_b}{H} \left( U_m - U_b \right) \frac{\partial H}{\partial X} + V_m \frac{\partial H}{\partial Y} \right\} = \frac{3k}{2BH^2\eta} \overline{\theta_a} + \frac{\overline{\theta} - \overline{\theta}_b}{2H} \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} + \frac{U_m \frac{\partial P}{\partial X} + V_m \frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}}{3 \eta m} \tag{28}
\]

where

\[
V_m = \frac{H^2}{2\pi \eta} \frac{\partial P}{\partial Y}. \tag{29}
\]

4. Discretisation

A uniform mesh is used with N elements where \( N = 2^k + 1 \). The level of refinement on a grid can then be described as grid level k refinement. The equations are discretised using first order upwind differencing, or second order central differencing where appropriate. This discretisation has been documented elsewhere [20] for the non-thermal equations, so here we shall only consider the energy and two surface temperature equations.

The Energy Equation (12) is discretised as:

\[
\overline{\rho} \left\{ \frac{\overline{\theta}_{i+1} - \overline{\theta}_{i-1}}{2\Delta T} + U_m \frac{\partial \overline{\theta}_i}{\partial X} \right\} + \frac{(\overline{\theta}_i - \overline{\theta}_b)}{H} \left( U_m - U_b \right) \frac{H_i - H_{i-1}}{\Delta X} = \frac{3k}{2BH^2\eta} \overline{\theta_a} + \frac{\overline{\theta} - \overline{\theta}_b}{2H} \frac{\partial P_i}{\partial X} + \frac{U_m (P_i - P_{i-1})}{3 \eta m} \tag{30}
\]

where,

\[
U_m = -\frac{H_i^2}{2\pi \eta} \frac{(P_i - P_{i-1})}{\Delta X} + \frac{U_i}{2}. \tag{31}
\]

The Surface Temperature Equations (18) and (19) become:

\[
\overline{\theta}_{a;i} = 1 + 2\pi X_i \sum_{j=1}^{i} \left\{ \frac{\theta_{A;j+1} + \theta_{A;j}}{H_{j-1} + H_j} \right\} 2\{(X_j - X_{j-1})^{1/2} - (X_i - X_j)^{1/2} \}, \tag{32}
\]

and

\[
\overline{\theta}_{b;i} = 1 + 2\pi X_i \sum_{j=1}^{i} \left\{ \frac{\theta_{B;j+1} + \theta_{B;j}}{H_{j-1} + H_j} \right\} 2\{(X_j - X_{j-1})^{1/2} - (X_i - X_j)^{1/2} \}, \tag{33}
\]

where,

\[
\overline{\theta}_A = 3\overline{\theta} - \overline{\theta}_a - \overline{\theta}_b, \tag{34}
\]

and

\[
\overline{\theta}_B = 3\overline{\theta} - \overline{\theta}_a - 2\overline{\theta}_b. \tag{35}
\]
5. Solution Method

The equations, excluding the thermal equations, are solved using multigrid techniques in in the standard manner as described in [21,20,22] and utilising the multilevel multi-integration algorithm of Brandt and Lubrecht [23].

The temperature, both at the surface and in the fluid is calculated only on the finest mesh. First the surface temperatures are calculated using equations (32) and (33). This can be an expensive process as at each point a summation along the line up to that point is required. Furthermore the calculation at each point is expensive when repeated. Following the surface calculation, the Energy Equation (30) is calculated at each point using a Newton method. The relaxation factor is initially small but can be allowed to increase once the solution is converging.

In the multigrid method the temperature is also required on the coarser grids. This is obtained by coarsening the temperature on the fine mesh, no temperature solve being carried out on these meshes.

6. Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moes Parameter M</td>
<td>27.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moes Parameter L</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Parameter U</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Parameter G</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Parameter W</td>
<td>$1.57 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure-viscosity index $\alpha$</td>
<td>$2.0 \times 10^{-8} , Pa^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Hertzian Pressure $p_h$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^6 , Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Domain Bound</td>
<td>$-4.6 \times 10^{-3} , m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Domain Bound</td>
<td>$4.6 \times 10^{-3} , m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Points</td>
<td>2049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Operating Parameters for Line Contact Case

Figure 1. Temperature Profile in Pure Rolling Case

6.1. Steady State Line Contact

Figure 1 shows the mean fluid and surface temperature profiles for a pure rolling case, as described in Table 1, with both rollers always travelling with an identical velocity of $3.0 \, ms^{-1}$. The mean temperature can be seen to smoothly rise to a peak upstream of the contact region, before rapidly decreasing as the contact region is entered. The temperature then slowly decreases across the contact region until a spike coinciding with the exit of the contact region. The surface temperature follows the same profile but at a lower temperature and translated slightly further downstream than the mean temperature profile.

If small amounts of shear occur then very different solution profiles are obtained. Figure 2 shows three mean fluid temperature solutions, the first solution is for pure rolling and the subsequent two are with slight amounts of shear. The structure of the pure rolling profile can barely be made out as the rise in temperature in the middle of the contact region is so large. The shear profile does exhibit these features but they remain of the same size as in the rolling case.

6.2. Transient Line Contact

The behaviour of the model in Table 1 under transient conditions is investigated using a reversal case. Each roller at $t = 0$ has a velocity and over a time period this is gradually changed until
finally it is travelling at the opposite velocity.

In the first case pure rolling is considered with both rollers always travelling at identical velocities to each other. Initially they are travelling at $3.0ms^{-1}$ and decrease linearly over a period of 0.2s to a final velocity of $-3.0ms^{-1}$. There are 500 timesteps of 0.0004s taken.

In the second and third cases shear is introduced, at a low level and at a high level. The second model has the rollers initially with velocities of $2.5ms^{-1}$ for Roller A and $3.5ms^{-1}$ for Roller B, the third with velocities of $1.0ms^{-1}$ for Roller A and $5.0ms^{-1}$ for Roller B. In both cases these velocities vary linearly with time over a period of 0.2s to final opposite velocities. There are 500 timesteps of 0.0004s taken.

Figures 4 show the temperature profiles for all three cases at 5 points during the reversal run. As can be seen the temperature of the model with the largest shear dominates the profiles displaying a maximum rise in excess of 100 degrees. This decreases as the velocity is reduced and at the point of reversal the temperature has reduced to ambient throughout the domain.

A similar effect can be seen with the temperatures at the surface of the roller. Figures 5 show the surface temperatures on the two rollers. The temperature profile on each roller is clearly the same as for the other roller, but at different values. Roller A, the slower of the two rollers clearly has lower temperature profiles than the faster roller.

7. Steady Point Contact

Figure 6 shows two mean fluid temperature solutions in the point contact case with operating parameters detailed in Table 2. The lower of the two solutions is for the pure rolling case, the higher solution is for a case with a small amount of shear. The pure rolling model has both rollers travelling with a velocity of $4.0ms^{-1}$, the shear case has roller velocities of $4.01ms^{-1}$ and $3.99ms^{-1}$ giving a shear rate of $s = 0.005$. In the pure rolling solution the temperature can be seen to rise upstream of the contact region, falling to ambient within this region, before a spike at the exit of the contact region. The case with the shear
Figure 4. Mean Fluid Temperature Profiles at $t=0.0s, 0.05s, 0.15s, 0.20s$

Figure 5. Surface Temperature Profiles at $t=0.0s, 0.05s, 0.15s, 0.20s$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moes Parameter M</td>
<td>33.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moes Parameter L</td>
<td>17.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Parameter U</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Parameter G</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Parameter W</td>
<td>$2.58 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure-viscosity index $\alpha$</td>
<td>$2.1 \times 10^{-8} Pa^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Hertzian Pressure $p_h$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^6 Pa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Domain Bound</td>
<td>$-4.86 \times 10^{-3} m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Domain Bound</td>
<td>$2.50 \times 10^{-3} m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Points</td>
<td>257 $\times$ 257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Operating Parameters for Point Contact Case

displays the same features except that there is a large temperature rise in the centre of the contact region relative to the rolling case, the ambient temperature being 373$K$ and the peak temperature 384$K$.

8. Conclusions

It has been shown that an energy equation can be successfully incorporated into the EHL solver of [14] to obtain mean and surface temperature solutions for both steady state and transient cases. The importance of shear in an EHL contact has also been demonstrated with even small amounts of shear producing temperatures far in excess of those found within the contact under pure rolling conditions. This increase in temperature can also be seen to influence the spike in the pressure profile.
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