The lubrication approximation of the friction force for the simulation of measured surfaces
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Abstract

Models of the friction force are assessed by direct comparison with two-dimensional Navier–Stokes results. A three-term formula obtained from asymptotic expansion provides a reasonable estimate of the hydrodynamic friction of rough runners even at sub-micron clearances. Simulations of a measured honed surface are then reported using the conservative time-dependent Elrod–Adams model with spatial resolutions as fine as 0.25 μm per cell (4000 × 800 mesh). Mesh convergence of the numerical method is observed. Cell sizes between 0.5 μm and 1 μm appear as a reasonable compromise of accuracy and cost for the simulation of honed runners. The significance of each term of the friction formula is discussed, so as to assess the error involved in neglecting terms of the friction formula.
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1. Introduction

Theoretical and numerical studies of lubricated devices often represent the contacting surfaces as smooth. While this approximation stands under some conditions, this is not the case when the film thickness is comparable to the roughness amplitude, as in heavily loaded journal bearings, seals, piston ring/cylinder liner contacts, among others. The introduction of surface roughness into lubrication models can be traced back to the stochastic model of Tzeng and Saibel [1]. In their work, a probability distribution is adopted for the surface roughness and formulas of the expected values. These results were limited to transverse or longitudinally oriented variations in roughness.

Later, Patir and Cheng [3,4] introduced a new approach. An average Reynolds equation for rough surfaces was defined in terms of pressure and shear flow factors, which were empirical functions of the non-dimensional roughness. Elrod [5] later extended this model to account for roughness anisotropy.

All of these techniques are based on the intuitive idea of decoupling the global length scale, corresponding to the whole bearing, from the local length scale of the roughness. Homogenization theory formalizes this intuition. It develops an average equation valid throughout the domain, with its coefficients computed from solutions of local problems. The homogenization method has been studied in depth both for incompressible [6,7] and compressible [8–10] fluids. It exhibits good accuracy when the roughness is periodic in space and its period is much smaller than the bearing size. Unfortunately, no rigorous homogenization model considers general roughness shapes with cavitation effects.

A current trend is to study the hydrodynamics of lubrication devices resolving all scales of the problem down to the roughness scale, using the measured topography and without resorting to averaged or stochastic models. These so-called deterministic or measured-surface simulations [11–14] avoid ambiguities in the definition of average coefficients at the expense of solving Reynolds equation with a discretization finer than the resolution of the measurements. A central result of the simulations is the hydrodynamic force exerted by the fluid, defined by

\[ F = \int_S \sigma \cdot \hat{n} \, dS, \]

of which the component parallel to the movement is the friction force. Different formulae for the lubrication approximation of Eq. (1) appear in the literature. Patir and Cheng [4] identify the existence of three terms in this approximation, which we denote here as Couette term \( F_{\text{cou}} \), Poiseuille term \( F_{\text{pre}} \) and pressure term \( F_{\text{pr}} \).
the first two being shear forces, while the latter is the projection of the pressure force on the surface along the movement direction. While some authors consider all three terms [15–17], there exist publications in which only $F_{\text{pw}}$ is considered (thus not requiring knowledge of the pressure [18–22]) and others in which $F_{\text{pre}}$ is neglected [23,24], i.e., just considering the shear stresses.

This paper, after the necessary definitions, introduces the complete three-term formula from a formal asymptotic expansion in Section 2. Its accuracy is confirmed in Section 3 by performing a direct comparison against Navier–Stokes results. Section 4 then contains deterministic simulations with measured data from a honed surface representative of automotive cylinder liners. To our knowledge, these are the first mesh-converged simulations that consider the unsteadiness that results from the motion of the rough surface through the computational domain. It is shown that all three terms in the friction formula are significant for clearances below 1 or 2 microns, both for conformal and non-conformal contacts. Further discussions and the conclusions are left for Section 5.

2. Model

2.1. Hydrodynamic lubrication model

We consider two surfaces in close proximity and in relative motion with velocity $V$. The upper surface is assumed rigid, its elevation with respect to the (reference) plane $x_1 - x_2$ being given by a known function $h_0(x_1, x_2)$ (Fig. 1). The lower surface, also considered rigid, moves along the axis $x_1$. If its elevation at time $t=0$ is given by the function $h_1(x_1, x_2)$, also known, then the gap between the surfaces is

\[ h(x_1, x_2, t) = h_0(x_1, x_2) - h_1(x_1, x_2) - V t, x_2. \]  

To model starvation and cavitation effects, the lubricating fluid is assumed to fill a fraction $\theta(x_1, x_2, t)$ of the gap $h(x_1, x_2, t)$. In this situation, and most especially if the gap thickness $h$ exhibits small-scale features, it is important to adopt a mass-conserving model [25]. We use here the Elrod–Adams model [26], which incorporates into a single formulation the Reynolds equation and the Jacobson–Floberg–Olsson boundary conditions. Two scalar fields must be solved at every point of the domain: the hydrodynamic – The Elrod Adams model, from which the classical Reynolds equation is recovered by taking $\theta=1$, can be justified physically under the so-called lubrication hypotheses [27], i.e.,

\[ \frac{h}{\varepsilon} \ll 1, \quad \forall h \ll \varepsilon, \]  

where $\varepsilon$ is a length scale of the problem in the $x_1 - x_2$ plane.

2.2. Lubrication approximation of the friction force

The total force exerted by an incompressible Newtonian fluid on a surface $S$ is given by

\[ F = \int_S \sigma \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dS = \int_S \left[ -p + \mu (\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T) \right] : \mathbf{n} \, dS, \]  

where $I$ is the identity matrix, $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ is the velocity field of the fluid and $\nabla \mathbf{u}$ is its gradient, and $\mathbf{n}$ is the inward normal. The component of $\mathbf{F}$ along the direction of motion (i.e., the first component) is the friction force $F$. Computing $F$ on the lower surface, since the normal is given by

\[ \mathbf{n} = \frac{\left(-\partial h_1/\partial x_1, \partial h_1/\partial x_2, 1\right)}{\sqrt{1 + (\partial h_1/\partial x_1)^2 + (\partial h_1/\partial x_2)^2}} \]  

one gets

\[ F_1 = \int_{\Omega} \left[ -\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_1} \left( -p + 2\mu \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_1} \right) - \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_2} \mu \left( \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x_1} \right) + \mu \left( \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x_1} \right) \right] \, dx_1 dx_2. \]  

Let us now consider a change of variables $z = x_3/\varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon$ is arbitrarily small. As done in [28], assume that $p$ and $\mathbf{u}$ can be written as a power series in $\varepsilon$:

\[ u = u^{(0)} + \varepsilon u^{(1)} + \varepsilon^2 u^{(2)} + \ldots \]  

\[ p = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} p^{(0)} + \varepsilon p^{(1)} + p^{(2)} + \ldots. \]  

Substitution into Eq. (8) produces

\[ F_1 = \int_{\Omega} \left( -\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_1} \left( -p^{(0)} + 2\mu \frac{\partial u^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) - \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_2} \mu \left( \frac{\partial u^{(0)}}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial u^{(1)}}{\partial x_1} \right) + \mu \left( \frac{\partial u^{(0)}}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial u^{(1)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \right) \, dx_1 dx_2. \]  

Knowing that $u^{(0)}_1$ satisfies [28]

\[ u^{(0)}_1 = \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{\partial p^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} (z - h) + \left( \frac{1 - z}{h} \right) V \]  

and going back to the original variable $x_3$, Eq. (10) becomes

\[ F_1 = \int_{\Omega} \left( -\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_1} \left( -p^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{\partial h^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) + \varepsilon \left( \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{\partial h^{(0)}}{\partial x_1} \right) + \varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{\partial h^{(1)}}{\partial x_1} \right) \right) \, dx_1 dx_2. \]  

The leading order asymptotic approximation of the friction force as computed on the lower surface is thus given by

\[ F_1(t) \simeq -\int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\mu V}{h} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_3} \right) \, dx_1 dx_2. \]  

Similarly, for the upper surface,

\[ F_U(t) \simeq -\int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\mu V}{h} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_3} \right) \, dx_1 dx_2. \]  

The previous approximations, having started from Eq. (6) and thus considering a single-phase incompressible fluid between the surfaces, do not consider cavitation effects. Friction models in cavitated areas are controversial. We adopt here a slight modification of the formulas above, in which the first term is multiplied by a heuristic factor $g(\theta)$, which in this work we take as

\[ g(\theta) = \begin{cases} \theta & \text{if } \theta > \theta_0 = 0.95 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \]  

The parameter $\theta_0$ is a threshold for the onset of friction, which can be interpreted as the minimum oil fraction for shear forces to be transmitted from one surface to the other. The results are not qualitatively sensitive to $\theta_0$, as reported in [15]. The other two terms are left unmodified, and thus are equal to zero in the cavitated region. The final heuristically modified model arising from
the asymptotic expansion reads
\[
F_{II}(t) = -\int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\nabla g(\theta)}{h} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \right) dx_1 dx_2, \tag{16a}
\]
\[
F_{III}(t) = -\int_{\Omega} \left( -\frac{\nabla g(\theta)}{h} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \right) dx_1 dx_2. \tag{16b}
\]

Three terms are identified in the previous equations. For the lower surface they are the Couette term:
\[
F_{III}^{\text{cou}}(t) = -\int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\nabla g(\theta)}{h} \right) dx_1 dx_2, \tag{17}
\]
the Poiseuille term
\[
F_{III}^{\text{poi}}(t) = -\int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \right) dx_1 dx_2, \tag{18}
\]
and the pressure term
\[
F_{III}^{\text{pre}}(t) = \int_{\Omega} \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \right) dx_1 dx_2. \tag{19}
\]

We consider three models for the friction force. The first model is the one obtained from the asymptotic expansion:
\[
F_{I}^{*} = F_{III}^{\text{cou}} + F_{III}^{\text{poi}} + F_{III}^{\text{pre}}. \tag{20}
\]
The second one [23,24],
\[
F_{II}^{*} = F_{III}^{\text{cou}} + F_{III}^{\text{poi}}, \tag{21}
\]
neglects the normal contribution of the pressure, while the third model [18–22],
\[
F_{III}^{*} = F_{III}^{\text{cou}}, \tag{22}
\]
computes the friction force with just the Couette term. Analogous definitions can be made for \( F_{II}^{*} \), \( F_{III}^{*} \) and \( F_{III}^{*} \).

It is to be noticed that only models \( F^{*} \) and \( F^{III} \) satisfy that the forces on the upper and lower surfaces add up to zero. For model \( F^{III} \) this is obvious, while for model \( F^{*} \) it is verified as follows:
\[
F_{I}^{*}(t) + F_{II}^{*}(t) = -\int_{\Omega} \left( h \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} - p \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \right) d\Omega \tag{23}
\]
\[
= -\int_{\Omega} \left( h \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1} + h \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \right) d\Omega \tag{24}
\]
\[
= -\int_{\Omega} \left( h \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \right) d\Omega \tag{25}
\]
\[
= -\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} d\Omega = -\int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1} \mathbf{e}_1 d\Gamma = 0, \tag{26}
\]
where \( \Omega^+ \) is the region where \( p > 0 \) and \( \partial \Omega^+ \) its boundary.

2.3. Numerical method

The conservative finite volume method described in [29] is used to solve problem (3)–(4). The complementarity conditions are imposed iteratively in a Gauss–Seidel-type algorithm. Computational times are alleviated through multigrid acceleration [30,11]. This method has been validated against semi-analytic solutions and used in technological applications such as journal bearings and the piston-ring/liner contact [25,29,15,16].

3. Assessment of friction force formulae against single-phase Navier-Stokes simulations

In the previous section, we have presented three models for the calculation of the friction force from the results \( (p \text{ and } \theta) \) of the Elrod–Adams model. The first one, denoted by \( F^{*} \), was obtained from an asymptotic expansion, while the other two \( (F^{III} \text{ and } F^{II}) \) omit terms that appear in \( F^{*} \) and have been taken from the literature. In this section, we assess the accuracy of the three models against accurate numerical solutions of the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations. Similar assessments have been reported previously [31,32], though not addressing the friction calculation. A remark must be made here: the comparison presented in this section neglects both inertia and cavitation effects. Neglecting cavitation implies \( \theta \equiv 1 \), so that the Elrod–Adams result is, in fact, the solution of the Reynolds equation. To deal with the cavitation issue more sophisticated CFD simulations involving moving boundaries and phase change would be necessary.

To further simplify the comparison, we consider all variables independent of \( x_2 \) and solve the flow at the single instant \( t=0 \) in the two-dimensional domain:
\[
\{(x_1, x_3) | 0 \leq x_1 \leq \lambda, \quad h_l(x_1) \leq x_3 \leq h_u(x_1)\}, \tag{27}
\]
using a finite element in-house code which has been extensively validated (see [33–35]). The unknowns are the velocity field \( \mathbf{u} \) and the pressure field \( p \). The boundary conditions are: (a) \( \mathbf{u} = (0, 0) \) on the upper surface. (b) \( \mathbf{u} = (V, 0) \) on the lower surface. (c) periodic boundary conditions at \( x_1 = 0 \) and \( x_1 = \lambda \). The pressure is thus determined up to an additive constant, which has no effect on the value of the friction force. Once \( \mathbf{u} \) and \( p \) have been solved for, a nodal approximation of
\[
\sigma_n = -p \mathbf{e}_3 + \mu (\nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \mathbf{u}^T) \tag{28}
\]
is built. The friction force on a surface \( S \) is then computed from
\[
F_{NS} = \int_S (\sigma_n \cdot \mathbf{n}) \mathbf{e}_1 \ dS \tag{29}
\]
assuming \( \sigma_n \) independent of \( x_2 \). Above, \( \mathbf{e}_1 \) denotes the horizontal unit vector \( (1, 0, 0) \). In all simulations, it was checked that mesh...
convergence of the Navier–Stokes solver had been attained, with discretization error not larger than 1% in all relevant variables. The numerical experiments consider sinusoidal profiles for both the upper and lower surfaces:

\[ h_U(x_1) = A \left[ 1 + \alpha \cos \left( \frac{2 \pi x_1}{\lambda} \right) \right] \]
\[ h_L(x_1) = A \left[ 1 + \alpha \cos \left( \frac{4 \pi x_1}{\lambda} \right) \right] \]

(30)

where \( 2A \) is the mean distance between the surfaces and \( \alpha A \) the waviness amplitude for both surfaces. The wavelength in the upper surface is \( \lambda \), while that of the lower surface is \( \lambda/2 \). A scheme of the geometrical setting is shown in Fig. 3.

The simulations consider \( A = 0.3 \, \mu m \), \( \lambda = 200 \, \mu m \), and several values of \( \alpha \) between 10^{-3} and 0.75. From the definitions of Eq. (30) one observes that

\[ h_{\text{max}} = \frac{2(1+\alpha)A}{\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \| \nabla h \|_{\text{max}} = \frac{17.2 \alpha A}{\lambda} \]

For our values \( A/\lambda = 1.5 \times 10^{-3} \), so that conditions (5) are satisfied and good agreement between the Navier–Stokes solution and the Reynolds solution is expected.

The Navier–Stokes solver was run on a very fine mesh consisting of 160,000 linear triangular elements. Its results were compared with those of the Reynolds solver run on a mesh of 2000 one-dimensional cells. Fig. 4 shows that both models predict exactly the same pressure field.

Let us now compare the three friction models \( F', F'' \) and \( F''' \), as computed from the Reynolds pressure solution, with the force \( F^{NS} \) obtained from the Navier–Stokes solution. This is plotted in Fig. 5. One observes that model \( F' \) agrees with \( F^{NS} \) in the whole range of the relative amplitude \( \alpha \). The other two models, though coincident with \( F^{NS} \) when \( \alpha = 0 \) (parallel bearing), completely fail to reproduce the dependence of the friction force with \( \alpha \).

In simulations of measured surfaces, however, the lubrication hypotheses (5) are close to their limit of validity, specially the second one. Fig. 2 illustrates a specific topography, corresponding
to a honed cylinder, which is an example of the kind of measured data for the function $h_c$. Part (c) of the figure shows the fractional distribution $a(\nabla h_c)$ on the surface. For any number $s$, the value $a(s)$ is the fraction of the surface which has $\|\nabla h_c\| > s$. The gradient is computed by discrete differentiation of the matrix of measured points. By direct inspection of Fig. 2(c), one observes that there are points where the hypothesis $\|\nabla h_c\| < 1$ is not satisfied.

It is thus also interesting to use our two-dimensional toy example to evaluate the accuracy of lubrication models against Navier–Stokes predictions for values of $\|\nabla h_c\|$ of order unity, focusing on the accuracy of friction predictions.

Fixing $A=0.3 \, \mu m$ and $\alpha = 0.75$, simulations with smaller values of $\lambda$ were performed, as shown in Table 1. For $\lambda=2 \, \mu m$ the maximum $\|\nabla h_c\|$ is 1.935, in clear violation of Eq. (5) and one observes that all lubrication friction formulas provide poor predictions. The pressure and velocity fields produced by the Navier–Stokes solver are shown in Fig. 6. Vertical gradients of the pressure field are evident, a clear sign that the lubrication approximation does not hold. For $\lambda \geq 10 \, \mu m$, which corresponds to $\|\nabla h_c\|_{\text{max}} \leq 0.387$, Table 1 shows that the lubrication approximation with friction model $P^S$ predicts the reference value $F_{NS}^S$ with good accuracy, while models $P^I$ and $P^M$ fail.

Going back to our surface of interest with honed finishing, one observes in Fig. 2(c) that 99.9% of its area has $\|\nabla h_c\| < 0.387$. Though with some caveats, this suggests also that using model $P^S$ the lubrication approximation may provide a reasonable estimate for the friction in a measured honed surface.

On the basis of these results, we conclude that the friction force model $P^S$, which can be obtained from an asymptotic expansion, is the best formula for approximating the friction force in lubrication models based on the Reynolds equation. This model, which consists of three terms (Couette, Poiseuille and Pressure terms), exhibits good accuracy when applied to surfaces with characteristics similar to those of honed surfaces and will be considered hereafter as correct. In the following section, we solve the Elrod–Adams model using the measured honed surface data so as to estimate the importance of each term in the friction formula under realistic conditions.

### Table 1

Comparison of the friction lubrication models $F^I$, $F^S$ and $F^M$ with the Navier–Stokes result $F_{NS}$ for short waviness wavelengths. For all cases $p=0.01 \, \text{Pa-s}$, $V=10 \, \text{m/s}$, $A=300 \, \mu m$ and $\alpha=0.75$. The second column is $max_\lambda \|\nabla h_c\|$. The friction force per unit width (along $x_2$), integrated over one wavelength $\lambda$ in $x_2$, is given in Newton/meter. Between parentheses the relative error of each model as compared to $F_{NS}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\lambda$ [\mu m]</th>
<th>$|\nabla h_c|_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>$F_{NS}^S$</th>
<th>$F_{I}^S$</th>
<th>$F_{I}^I$</th>
<th>$F_{I}^M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>-0.890</td>
<td>-0.603 (32%)</td>
<td>-0.337 (62%)</td>
<td>-0.378 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>-3.198</td>
<td>-3.016 (5.7%)</td>
<td>-1.687 (47%)</td>
<td>-1.891 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-6.148</td>
<td>-6.032 (1.9%)</td>
<td>-3.374 (45%)</td>
<td>-3.782 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-60.36</td>
<td>-60.32 (&lt; 0.1%)</td>
<td>-33.74 (44%)</td>
<td>-37.81 (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 6](image)

Fig. 6. Contours of pressure ($p$, top line) and velocity components ($u_x$, $u_y$, middle and bottom lines) corresponding to the Navier–Stokes simulations with $\lambda = 2$ (left column), 10 (center column) and 20 $\mu m$ (right column).
4. Numerical simulations of measured honed surfaces

We consider as upper surface a single barrel-shaped pad, inspired in the shape of compression piston rings of car engines. Its shape corresponds to an arc of circumference of radius R. Its height \( h_0 \) with respect to the reference plane is:

\[
h_0(x_1, x_2) = \begin{cases} 
Z + R - \sqrt{R^2 - \left(\frac{x_1 - L}{2}\right)^2} & \text{if } a \leq x_1 \leq b \\
e & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

(31)

The parameter Z is the minimal distance between the surface and the \( x_1 = x_2 \) plane and \( e \) is a constant much larger than Z. This pad slides with constant velocity \(-V\) over the measured topography of a cross-hatched finished plane (honed runner). This finish is typical of cylinder liners of car engines. The measured surface is the one shown in Fig. 2(a). A proper way to characterize a honed surface is by means of its Abbott–Firestone curve [36]. This is given in Fig. 2(b) for the surface under study. Its related roughness parameters \( R_h \) (plateau height), \( R_{pk} \) (reduced peak height), \( R_{vk} \) (reduced valley height), \( M_{01} \) (percentage of \( R_{pk} \) peaks) and \( M_{02} \) (percentage of \( R_{vk} \) valleys) are shown in Table 2, along with the more conventional parameters \( S_{0} \) (roughness average), \( S_{q} \) (root mean square roughness), \( S_{k} \) (skewness) and \( S_{w} \) (kurtosis).

The measured surface dimensions are \( L_s \times L_s \) with \( L_s = 1.8 \) mm, sampled each 2 \( \mu \)m in both directions. In order to decrease the computational effort, instead of solving the problem on the whole surface, it is solved on three strips \( S_1, S_2 \) and \( S_3 \) of width \( B = 0.2 \) mm, as indicated in the same figure. The measured points provide a function \( x_3 = h(x_1, x_2) \). The reference plane \( (x_1 - x_2) = 0 \) is defined as the average height of the measured points, so that

\[
\int_0^{L_s} \int_0^{L_s} h(x_1, x_2) \, dx_1 \, dx_2 = 0.
\]

(32)

The domain of this function along \( x_1 \) is just the interval \([0, L_s] \), which is too small to conduct simulations. We extended it periodically to tackle this difficulty. Incorporating also the movement of the runner with respect to the simulation frame of reference (fixed to the pad) one gets the function \( h_t(x_1, x_2, t) \) as follows: Let \( n \) be an integer (negative in general) such that \( 2nL_s \leq x_1 - Vt < (n + 1)L_s \), then

\[
h_t(x_1, x_2, t) = \begin{cases} 
h(x_1 - Vt - 2nL_s, x_2) & \text{if } 0 \leq x_1 - Vt - 2nL_s < L_s \\
h(x_1, x_2) & \text{if } L_s \leq x_1 - Vt - 2nL_s \leq 2L_s \\
h(2L_s - (x_1 - Vt - 2nL_s), x_2) & \text{if } 2nL_s \leq x_1 - Vt \leq (n + 1)L_s \\
h(x_1 - Vt + 2nL_s, x_2) & \text{if } -2nL_s \leq x_1 - Vt < 0 \end{cases}
\]

(33)

The resulting function \( h_t \) is depicted at the top of Fig. 7, in which the sector covered by the computational domain at time \( t = 1.6 \times 10^{-4} \) s is indicated. The remaining physical parameters defining the domain size, pad dimensions, fluid viscosity and surface velocity are given in Table 3. Reflection boundary conditions (corresponding to zero normal derivative of the pressure) are imposed at \( x_2 = 0 \) and \( x_2 = B \). A constant film height \( d \) is assumed at the entrance, which amounts to enforce \( \theta = d/h \) at \( x_1 = x_{1r} \). The chosen \( d \) value ensured fully-flooded conditions for all the simulations performed. The pressure at \( x_1 = 0 \) is zero, since the film is incomplete, while outflow boundary conditions are set at \( x_1 = L \).

4.1. Mesh convergence study

The complex topography of the runner surface compels the use of a fine mesh, but it is unclear how fine it should be as compared to the spacing of the measured points (which is 2 \( \mu \)m in our case). A mesh convergence study is reported here to determine the level of discretization required to decrease the error in the solution to acceptable levels.

The study was performed on the strip \( S_1 \) with parameters \( Z = 2 \) \( \mu \)m and \( R = 128 \) mm. A typical snapshot of the solution is shown in Fig. 7. Part (a) shows the pressure over the computational domain, while part (b) shows a cross-section along \( x_2 = B/2 \). Parts (c) and (d) show the saturation field \( H \), in which regions with \( \theta < 1 \) identify cavitated zones. Finally, parts (e) and (f) show the friction force density \( f \), defined as

\[
f = \mu p \frac{V}{C_0} \frac{\theta}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x_1}} + \frac{\mu p}{C_0} \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x_1^2},
\]

(34)

which is observed to be highly oscillatory in both space and time.

The computational domain \( \Omega \) was discretized using 500 \( \times \) 1000, 1000 \( \times \) 2000, 2000 \( \times \) 4000 and 4000 \( \times \) 8000 finite volumes. This corresponds to \( \Delta x_1 = \Delta x_2 = 2 \), 1, 0.5 and 0.25 \( \mu \)m, respectively. A recent measured surface simulation by Bouassida [11] used \( \Delta x_1 = \Delta x_2 = 0.78 \) \( \mu \)m and a mesh of 1400 \( \times \) 512 cells. The time step was taken such that the Courant number \( C = (V/2)\Delta t/\Delta x_1 \) equals unity for all meshes, that is \( \Delta t = 0.4, 0.2, 0.1 \) and 0.05 \( \mu \)s corresponding to 1500, 3000, 6000 and 12,000 time steps for each mesh, respectively.

Convergence was numerically verified for all variables. Fig. 8 (a) and (b) show the hydrodynamic lift,

\[
L(t) = \int_0^B \int_0^B p(x_1, x_2, t) \, dx_1 \, dx_2,
\]

(35)

and the friction force \( F(t) \) as functions of time for the four meshes. Clearly, the difference between the two finest meshes is negligible for practical purposes.

Part (c) of the figure contains a cross-section of \( p \) along \( x_2 = B/2 \) at an arbitrary instant \((t = 1)\), showing that pointwise convergence is also (almost) verified with the same refinement.

This study suggests that the 2000 \( \times \) 400 mesh, with mesh spacing taken as one fourth of the measurement spacing, is practically converged and correctly represents the exact solution between the pad and the measured topography. This mesh is thus adopted in all results that follow.

4.2. Term-by-term contribution to friction

Results were obtained for the three strips \( S_1, S_2 \) and \( S_3 \), two different curvature radii \( R = 8 \) and 128 mm, and for four separations between the pad and the runner: \( Z = 0.5, 1.0, 2.0 \) and 4.0 \( \mu \)m, totaling 24 runs of the code. Each run takes about 3.0 h on a six-}

Parts (a) and (b) correspond to the Couette term for \( R = 8 \) and 128 mm, respectively. The general trend is that the Couette term becomes increasingly dominant as \( Z \) is increased, and also less oscillatory in time due to the higher average clearance. For the higher curvature pad, \( R = 8 \) mm, the time-averaged contribution of the Couette term is 68% for \( Z = 0.5 \) \( \mu m \), growing to 89% for \( Z = 4 \) \( \mu m \). For the lower curvature pad, \( R = 128 \) \( \mu m \), it is 89% for \( Z = 0.5 \) \( \mu m \) and 99% for \( Z = 4 \) \( \mu m \).

Parts (c) and (d) of Fig. 9 correspond to the Poiseuille term. Its contribution to the total friction force diminishes as \( Z \) increases, opposite to the trend seen with the Couette term. This term’s relative contribution changes significantly with time at low \( Z \). Interestingly, it is positive for the higher curvature pad and negative for the lower curvature one, which can be considered a conformal contact. For the rough surface chosen for this study, the Poiseuille term is thus seen to compensate to some extent the Couette term in conformal contacts at low clearance, reducing the friction force computed by the model.

The pressure term, on the other hand, is mostly positive (see parts (e) and (f) of the figure), as explained in [15]. Furthermore, it...
From the relative contribution of each term one can quantify the error resulting from adopting models $F^I$ or $F^{II}$:

$$e^{III} = \frac{F^{III} - F^I}{F^I},$$

(37a)

$$e^{III} = \frac{F^{III} - F^I}{F^I}$$

(37b)

The average values of these errors for the twenty-four conditions considered are shown in Table 4. Results for the three strips are quite similar.

The error of $F^I$ for the results computed with $R=8$ (first column) are the lowest in the table, which can be explained by the small pressure terms, as seen in Fig. 9(e). The second lowest are the $F^{III}$ errors for the results computed with $R=128$ (last column). This can be explained by: (a) the aforementioned cancellation of the Poiseuille and pressure terms for $R=128$ and (b) lower average Poiseuille and pressure terms (Fig. 9(d) and (f)) at low Z values. For the same model, the errors computed for $R=8$ are the largest in the table. While the pressure term drops rapidly with $Z$ (Fig. 9(e)) the Poiseuille term remains relatively high (approximately 10% for $Z=4.0$), thus making $e^{III}$ of about the same order as the Poiseuille term for high $Z$ values.

The error $e^I$ represents the omission of the pressure term in $F^I$. The contribution of the pressure term decreases with increasing $Z$, the errors are below 4% and also comparable in size for both $R$ values and $Z \geq 2.0$. Larger errors are observed for lower $Z$ values.

In general, omitting terms in the friction force has a significant impact on friction evaluation, especially at low clearances. For $Z=0.5$ the errors are of about 10% or as large as 30%.

If $Z$ is large enough compared with the surface’s roughness, it is expected that the problem solution will be governed by the length scale of the bearing. Thus, it is interesting to compute the difference between the results of the average friction force $F^I$ and hydrodynamic lift $L(t)$ extracted from the fully deterministic simulations $F_{untext}$ and $L_{untext}$, computed neglecting the surface roughness ($h(x_1,x_2,t) = 0$):

$$e_{untext}^I = \frac{F^I_{untext} - F^I}{F^I},$$

(38)

$$e_{untext}^I = \frac{L_{untext} - L}{L}$$

(39)

This is shown in Table 5. For $Z=0.5$, $e_{untext}^I$ is above 10% and as high as 30%. However, for $Z \geq 2.0$ the errors in friction are lower or equal to 7%. The latter results are remarkable due to the low errors attained and to the fact that a computationally inexpensive problem is being solved instead of a complex measured-surface simulation. However, the results for the hydrodynamic lift error $e_{untext}^I$ are more ambiguous. For $R=8$ and $Z \leq 2.0$ they are lower than 3% and fast decreasing with $Z$. For the lower curvature pad, the errors for $Z=4$ are higher than 8%, which is considerable. This was already pointed out by Bouassida [11] while comparing results of deterministic simulations of various honed surfaces with one-dimensional untextured-runner simulations.

5. Conclusions

In this work we have discussed two important issues in lubrication analysis: (i) models for the friction force for non-planar surfaces, and (ii) high-resolution simulations of measured surfaces.

The first issue was addressed by direct comparisons of lubrication models with two-dimensional Navier–Stokes results (inertia and cavitation effects were neglected). It was found that the
three-term formulas (16a) and (16b) are the most accurate ones, providing a reasonable estimate of the hydrodynamic friction of rough surfaces at sub-micron clearances, even when the lubrication hypotheses (5) are not being met.

Regarding the second issue, simulations of a measured honed surface were reported using the conservative time-dependent Elrod–Adams model with spatial resolutions as fine as 0.25 μm per cell (4000 × 800 mesh). This allowed us to confirm the mesh convergence of the numerical method for the challenging topographies of measured data, and suggested cell sizes of a quarter or
even half of the measurement resolution (here 0.5 \mu m and 1 \mu m respectively) as a reasonable compromise of accuracy and cost for the simulation of honed runners. It was also seen that for large clearances, good accuracy can be achieved by performing low-cost simulations in which the surface roughness is neglected.

In the measured-surface simulations, the significance of each term of the friction formula (16a) was computed, so as to assess the error introduced by some incomplete models found in the literature. It was observed that, for clearances much larger than the roughness amplitude, the Couette term of the friction force is dominant and can be taken as an acceptable approximation. For high loads (small clearances), only the complete formulas (16a) and (16b) yield accurate results.
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