1 Introduction

Ancient models in computational fluid dynamics (CFD) are founded on the straight discretization of conservation of momentum and energy equations. These techniques have a macroscopic approach in the field of fluid dynamics simulations. On the other hand, the kinetic techniques for CFD, like the lattice Boltzmann method, take a microscopic approach and are derived from the Boltzmann equation [1-4]. One particular application of the lattice Boltzmann method is to simulate fluid under the influence of body force. Some cases of such flows are magneto-hydrodynamic fluid flow [5], buoyancy driven flow [6], multi-phase or multi-
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component fluid flows [7, 8] and the flow of non-ideal gases obeying a van der Waals type of equation of state [9, 10]. Different schemes which is used to simulate the body forces are allocated into three groups. The first approach, called Scheme 1 in this study, is based on the suggestion of Luo [11] in which the effect of body forces are considered in the collision term as

$$\vec{F}_i = -\frac{1}{c_s^2}w_i \rho \vec{c}_i \vec{F}$$

(1)

Another method, referred to as Scheme 2 in the current study, is based on the work of Shan and Chen [12]. In order to account for body forces, they employed Newton’s second law and modified the fluid and equilibrium velocities as follows.

$$\vec{u}(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{u}'(\vec{r}, t) + \tau \frac{\vec{F}(\vec{r}, t)}{\rho}$$

(2)

$$\vec{u}^{eq}(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{u}'(\vec{r}, t) + \tau \frac{\vec{F}(\vec{r}, t)}{\rho}$$

(3)

It seems to be more accurate if both the collision term and the velocity equations are modified in order to account for external forces. This idea has been employed by Guo et al. [13] and forms what is called Scheme 3 in this study. This method leads to the same conservation equations reached by macroscopic solutions. To obtain the Navier-Stokes equations, Guo et al. [13] applied the following modifications in the force and velocity equations.

$$\vec{F}_i = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\tau}\right)w_i \left[\vec{c}_i - \vec{u}' + \left(\frac{c_i \vec{u}'}{c_i^2} - \vec{c}_i\right)\right] \vec{F}$$

(4)

$$\vec{u}(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{u}'(\vec{r}, t) + \frac{\vec{F}(\vec{r}, t)}{2\rho}$$

(5)

$$\vec{u}^{eq}(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{u}'(\vec{r}, t) + \frac{\vec{F}(\vec{r}, t)}{2\rho}$$

(6)

More recently, Mohamad and Kuzmin [14] examined a good number of formulations suggested by various investigators to assess the accuracy of different schemes. They showed that the method of Guo et al. [13] is noticeably more accurate than those of others. One of the best examples of body force is buoyancy force. To study a buoyancy-driven flow, the temperature distribution necessities to be calculated. The kinematic viscosity and the thermal diffusivity is considered changing with temperature near the critical region. More recently, Varmazayar and Bazargan [16] used a Chapman-Enskog analysis and illustrated that this model can simulate the influence of nonlinearity due to the variation of thermal diffusivity in the energy equation. Recently, the effects of the body forces schemes has been investigated by Varmazayar et al. [17]. The boundary conditions, as well as the body forces schemes necessity to be adjusted accordingly. The set of boundary conditions may be classified in terms of the order of magnitude of the error produced [18]. Since the accuracy of the LBM is of the second order inside the mesh points, the first order boundary conditions degrade the lattice Boltzmann method. Many efforts have been made to present higher order schemes for boundary conditions [19-23]. The bounce-back approach satisfies the mass conservation on the wall and assures the zero velocity on the boundary. However, a problem appears once the body forces are present.
They may cause a jump in the distribution function on the boundary. This has also been addressed by Li and Tafti [24] and Varmazyar et al. [17]. They showed that applying the common bounce-back boundary condition leads to an erroneous velocity jump at the wall in the presence of local forces due to liquid-vapor interactions. They developed a mass-conserving velocity-boundary condition in order to eliminate the unwanted velocity component. In current study, a new boundary condition proposed to remove the effect of the body forces near the wall which is based on the Bennett method.

To accomplish the goals mentioned above, the following steps are taken. First, the mathematical models for the fluid motion and the thermal heat transfer are presented. Then, numerical examples are applied to show the capability of the models. Next, the accuracy of the introduced boundary condition in the current study as well as various schemes used for body forces is evaluated in Poiseuille flow and Rayleigh-Benard convection case studies. Finally, the effect of variable kinematic viscosity on primary instability is investigated.

2 Governing Equations and Modeling

The LBM for an incompressible gas and corresponding thermal LBM have been described below. The variation of thermal diffusivity with temperature has been considered. Multi relaxation time scheme has been used to increase the stability and accuracy of the model.

2.1 Lattice Boltzmann Method

The lattice Boltzmann equation (LBE) is directly derived from the Boltzmann equation by discretization in both time and phase space [25]. The general form of the lattice Boltzmann equation in the $i^{th}$ direction with body forces included is

$$f_i(\vec{r}+\vec{c}_i, t+1)-f_i(\vec{r}, t) = \Omega_i + \vec{F}_i$$

where $\vec{r}$, $t$ and $\vec{F}_i$ are the location vector, time and body forces respectively. The term $f_i$ is the particle distribution function traveling with velocity $\vec{c}_i$. The collision operator $\Omega_i$ represents the rate of change of $f_i$ due to collision of particles. The particle distribution after propagation is relaxed towards the equilibrium distribution $f_i^{eq}(\vec{r}, t)$. The formulation of the Bhatnager-Gross-Krook method (BGK) [26] for collision operator has been used in this study as

$$\Omega_i = \frac{1}{\tau} (f_i(\vec{r}, t) - f_i^{eq}(\vec{r}, t))$$

The relaxation parameter $\tau$ has been calculated from the kinematic viscosity $\nu$, which is varied by temperature, according to the following equation [16].

$$\tau = 3\nu + \frac{1}{2}$$

The equilibrium density $f_i^{eq}(x, t)$ is calculated as [16]

$$f_i^{eq}(\vec{r}, t) = w_i \rho(\vec{r}, t) \times (1 + \frac{\vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{u}^{eq}}{c_s^2} + \left(\frac{\vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{u}^{eq}}{2c_s^4}\right)^2 - \frac{\vec{u}^{eq} \cdot \vec{u}^{eq}}{2c_s^2})$$

where $c_s$ is the speed of sound, and $w_i$ is the corresponding equilibrium density for $\vec{u}^{eq} = 0$. Taking the moment of the distribution function, the density and microscopic velocity may be obtained as follows [16].
The body force in the lattice Boltzmann model is calculated as below.

\[ \mathbf{F} = \left( \rho - \rho_m \right) \mathbf{G} \]  

where \( \rho_m \) and \( \mathbf{G} \) are the average fluid density and gravity acceleration respectively. Using the Boussinesq approximation, the body force (buoyancy) term in Rayleigh-Benard convection will be

\[ \mathbf{F} = -\rho \beta (T - T_m) \mathbf{G} \]

where \( T_m \) and \( \beta \) are the average fluid temperature and volumetric thermal expansion coefficients respectively.

### 2.2. Multi-Relaxation Time Scheme

A Multi-Relaxation Time (MRT) scheme has been applied in which the collision operator has the form of a diagonalizable matrix \( \Omega_{ij} \). The MRT collision operator interacts with equilibrium particle distribution functions as below.

\[
f_i(\vec{r} + \vec{e}_i, t+1) - f_i(\vec{r}, t) = -\sum_j \Omega_{ij} \left( f_j(\vec{r}, t) - f_j^{eq}(\vec{r}, t) \right) + \tilde{F}_i
\]

It has been claimed that the MRT scheme proposes a higher stability and accuracy than a single relaxation time scheme [27]. Hence, Equation (15) can be converted to the following equation.

\[
f_i(\vec{r} + \vec{e}_i, t+1) - f_i(\vec{r}, t) = -M^{-1} \Lambda \left( \tilde{f}_j(\vec{r}, t) - \tilde{f}_j^{eq}(\vec{r}, t) \right) + \tilde{F}_i
\]

where \( \tilde{f}_j(\vec{r}, t) \) and \( \tilde{f}_j^{eq}(\vec{r}, t) \) are the vectors of the moment. The mapping between the distribution function and moment vectors can be stated by the linear transformation shown below.

\[
f(\vec{r}, t) = M \tilde{f}(\vec{r}, t)
\]

The Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure may be employed to calculate the transformation matrix \( M \). The general form of the transformation matrix has been suggested by Ginzburg [28]. Consequently, the transformation matrix \( M \) for a D2Q9 type of lattice using an MRT model is expressed as below.

\[
M = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & +2 & +2 & +2 & 0 \\
0 & +2 & +2 & +2 & +2 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & -2 & 0 & +2 & 0 & +1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & +1 & +1 & 0 & 0 & +1 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & +1 & +1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]
The relaxation matrix $\Lambda$ used in Equation (14) is a diagonal matrix and is described as below [29].

$$\Lambda = \text{DIAGONAL} \begin{pmatrix} 0.0, & 1.63, & 1.14, & 1.92, & 1.92, & \frac{2}{1+6\mu}, & \frac{2}{1+6\mu} \end{pmatrix}$$ (19)

where $\mu$ is the viscosity. Here, $\Lambda_4$ and $\Lambda_6$ are arbitrary values. The values of equilibrium of the moment $\tilde f^{eq}$ are listed below.

$$\begin{align*}
\tilde f_1^{eq} &= \rho \\
\tilde f_2^{eq} &= -2\rho + 3(\bar{u}' \bar{u}') \\
\tilde f_3^{eq} &= \rho - 3(\bar{u}' \bar{u}') \\
\tilde f_4^{eq} &= \rho \bar{u}'_x \\
\tilde f_5^{eq} &= -\rho \bar{u}'_x \\
\tilde f_6^{eq} &= \rho \bar{u}'_y \\
\tilde f_7^{eq} &= -\rho \bar{u}'_y \\
\tilde f_8^{eq} &= (\rho \bar{u}'_x)^2 - (\rho \bar{u}'_y)^2 \\
\tilde f_9^{eq} &= \rho \bar{u}'_x \bar{u}'_y \\
\end{align*}$$ (20)

where $\bar{u}'_x$ and $\bar{u}'_y$ are the components of microscopic velocity.

2.3. Thermal LBM with Variable Thermal Diffusivity

To simulate the energy equation with variable thermal conductivity, the general form of the LBE has been used. To account for variations in conductivity in the heat transfer equation, the equilibrium distribution function needs to be modified as below [16].

$$g_i^{eq}(\bar{r}, t) = w_i \left( T + \frac{1}{c_s^2} \rho \bar{c}_i \bar{u} - \frac{D}{c_s^2} \bar{c}_i \nabla T \right)$$ (21)

where $D$ is the variable part of the thermal diffusivity and $T$ is the temperature. The relaxation time ($\lambda$) is related to the constant part of the diffusion coefficient with equation (22).

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{c_s^2} \alpha_0 + \frac{1}{2}$$ (22)

where $\alpha_0$ is the constant part of thermal diffusivity. The Temperature is calculated by equation (23).

$$T = \sum_i g_i(\bar{r}, t)$$ (23)

2.4. Boundary Conditions

For the Dirichlet boundary condition in thermal LBM, it is assumed that the flux is balanced in any direction ($g_i - g_i^{eq} = g_j - g_j^{eq}$). The subscript $i$ shows the direction of particles after being reflected back to the domain. Subscript $j$ shows the corresponding mirror direction of particles. For nodes on the wall, the balanced flux can be written as $g_i = (w_i + w_j) T_w - g_i^{eq}$ in which $T_w$ is the wall temperature.
The introduced hydrodynamic boundary condition in this study is based on the Bennett extension. The moment-based model of Bennett [30] is a generalization of the method of Noble et al. [22] which formulates the boundary conditions in terms of the moments of the distribution functions, rather than on the distribution functions directly. In the moment-based approach, the nine independent moments can be defined as below.

\[
m = (\Pi_0, \Pi_x, \Pi_y, \Pi_{xx}, \Pi_{yy}, \Pi_{xy}, \Pi_{xxy}, \Pi_{xyy}, \Pi_{xxyy})
\]

where \( m \) may be expressed in the computational scale as \( m = M' \times f \) and \( M' \) is a transform matrix defined as follows.

\[
M' = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

By this approach, the boundary condition method can be categorized. In the current study, a new boundary condition based on Allen and Reis approach [31] are proposed by using the moment-based model of Bennett method. In this scheme, it is assumed that the solid boundaries are impermeable, rigid and stationary, and subjected to the no-slip condition. For calculating the three unknowns in each horizontal wall in terms of the moment constraints and the known distributions, it is required to consider three equations. The unknown values of \( f_2, f_5, \) and \( f_6 \) pointing outwards with respect to the southern wall are to be calculated by using the after streaming values of \( f_0, f_1, f_3, f_4, f_7, f_8 \).

In order to implement the conservative momentum equations in computational domain, it is required to take the hydrodynamic moments. It consists of two components of momentum (\( \Pi_x, \Pi_y \)) and the remaining independent component of the momentum flux (\( \Pi_{xxy} \)).

In current boundary condition scheme, to simulate the zero velocity on the wall, a bounce-back type of boundary condition on the non-equilibrium part of the distribution function is implemented. Figure (1) is presented to explain the boundary condition used in the current study. The south wall is coinciding with the x-axis and is shown by the dotted line in Figure (1). Accordingly, the equations are set as below to obtain the unknown variables in the current scheme.

\[
\Pi_x = 0 \quad \Pi_y = -F_y / 2 \quad \Pi_{xxy} = -F_y / 2
\]

By considering the southern boundary and using the above system of equations, we can calculate the unknown distribution function at the south wall. Finally, the equations above are employed to determine \( f_2, f_5, \) and \( f_6 \) as follows.

\[
f_2 = f_4 - 2 \rho u_y / 3
\]
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\[
f_5 = f_7 + \left(f_1 - f_3\right)/2 + F_y/4 \\
f_6 = f_8 - \left(f_1 - f_3\right)/2 + F_y/4
\]

3 Results and Discussion

To illustrate the capabilities of the present model, two examples are numerically simulated. At first case, the three schemes of body forces are applied in a Poiseuille flow with modified boundary condition which have been studied and the errors of all results are compared. In the next case, a Rayleigh-Benard convection problem is simulated. Stability analysis in various conditions as well as the accuracy of solution in each simulation are investigated. In this case study, thermal diffusivity is considered varied with temperature.

3.1. Poiseuille Flow Case Study

One of the best case studies could be selected for the assessment of the present model was a Poiseuille flow driven, due to its known analytical solution. From the Navier-Stokes equations for incompressible Poiseuille flow, the velocity profile could be extracted as follows.

\[
u_y = u_0 \left(1 - \frac{2y}{L_y}\right)^2
\]

where in \(u_0 = F_d L_y^2/(4 \rho \nu)\), \(F_d\) is the driving force and \(L_y\) is the channel width. The effect of channel width on error variations is studied. Various grid resolutions from \(L_y = 8\) to \(L_y = 64\) have been tried. The constant Reynolds number \(Re = u_0 L_y / \nu\) has been considered. The product \(u_0 L_y\) remained constant because the kinematic viscosity depends only on \(\tau\). The no-slip boundary condition on the top and bottom boundaries is used. Also periodic boundary condition along flow direction is assigned to inlet and outlet boundaries. The error function is defined as Equation (29).

\[
er = \sqrt{\sum_i \left(UN_i - UE_i\right)^2 / N_n}
\]

Where \(N_n\) is the number of points, \(UE_i\) and \(UN_i\) are correspond to the analytical and numerical normalized velocity for the \(i^{th}\) node, respectively. The velocity is normalized with the velocity in the center of channel. Figure (2) shows that the numerical error decreases by increasing the channel width. However, the values of resulted error of the present model are approximately same as the results obtained in [17] and too smaller in comparison with the errors obtained by Chen et al [18].

![Figure 1 Distribution function for D2Q9 configuration on the upper wall](image-url)
3.2. Rayleigh-Benard Convection Case Study

A two-dimensional simulation of steady Rayleigh-Benard natural convection has been considered to assess the present models. The diagram of the flow between two parallel plates and the macroscopic boundary conditions are illustrated as a schematic in Figure (3). The walls at $y = 0$ and $y = L_y$ are heated and cooled respectively. Other walls are in periodic conditions. The fluid is initially at rest. Thermodynamic equilibrium at constant temperature $T_0$ is maintained. $T_0$ is the average of the heated and cooled wall temperatures. The variation of the thermal diffusivity has been estimated by a linear equation as stated below.

$$ \alpha_0 + D(T) = \frac{k_0 + k(T)}{\rho c_p} = \alpha_0 \left[ 1 + \gamma(T - T_{\text{bottom}}) \right] $$  \hspace{1cm} (30)

**Figure 2** Error respected to channel width for Poiseuille flow

**Figure 3** Distribution function for D2Q9 configuration on the upper wall
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In the Equation (30), $k(T)$, $\rho$ and $c_p$ are the thermal conductivity, the density and the specific heat capacity respectively. To calculate the temperature distribution and velocity profiles, the D2Q9 is used. To investigate the independency of the numerical solution from the number of grids, different lattice sizes from $31 \times 61$ to $151 \times 301$ are examined. It was observed that there is no significant difference in the results with the number of grids larger than $111 \times 221$. Calculations at different Rayleigh numbers are accomplished on a $111 \times 221$ lattice with a Prandtl number of 0.71.

The simulation is taking place from the static conductive state, starting with $Ra=2,000$. The Nusselt numbers simulated under the steady-state situations and constant diffusion coefficient are illustrated in Table (1). Two flows with different Rayleigh numbers are studied. The results of different schemes for modeling body forces as well as the various models for boundary condition including the one proposed in this study are presented in this Table. The results of a semi-empirical correlation, $Nu=1.56 \times (Ra/Rac)^{0.296}$ with critical Rayleigh number ($Rac$) equal to 1707, are also showed for the sake of comparison. Comparison of the calculated results with the semi-empirical correlation show that applying scheme 3 for the current boundary condition yields the least amount of error.

For a wide range of Rayleigh numbers, the steady-state streamlines and isotherms are shown in Figure (4). As it is observable, increasing the Rayleigh number leads to the smaller thickness of thermal boundary layer. Also, the rising and falling fluid layers become narrower. The Rayleigh number is increased to magnitudes as high as 1,000,000. Unlike the thermal LBE model [32], the present model remains numerically stable.

In the next assessment, the variation of thermal diffusivity has been taken into account. The calculations have been carried out by considering various values of the thermal diffusivity coefficient, $\gamma = 0.2, 0.4$ and 0.6. The Ra and Pr numbers are assumed to be 1,000,000 and 0.71 respectively. The isotherms for various values of $\gamma$ are illustrated in Figure (5). The calculated corresponding Nusselt Numbers for $Ra=500,000$ and $Ra=1,000,000$ are presented in Table (2) with $\gamma = 0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$ and 0.7. As illustrated in the Figure (5), an increment in the thermal diffusivity coefficient leads to the narrower thermal boundary layer. The high nonlinearity in the heat transfer equation causes to the high-temperature region near the cold wall becoming larger. Results show that the present thermal LBM can simulate highly nonlinear energy equations acceptably.

3.3 Primary Instability of Rayleigh Benard Convection

At first, the presented lattice Boltzmann method was validated by considering the case of the primary instability of Rayleigh-Benard convection with constant properties. Using the linear stability theory, the exact values of critical wave number and critical Rayleigh number, for constant property Rayleigh–Benard convection with rigid bodies are obtained to be 3.117 and 1707.8 respectively [33].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme used to model body force</th>
<th>Boundary condition modeling</th>
<th>$Ra=20,000$</th>
<th>$Ra=30,000$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 3</td>
<td>First Order Bounce-Back</td>
<td>3.247</td>
<td>3.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 3</td>
<td>Second Order Bounce-Back</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>3.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 1</td>
<td>Current model</td>
<td>3.228</td>
<td>3.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 2</td>
<td>Current model</td>
<td>3.791</td>
<td>4.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme 3</td>
<td>Current model</td>
<td>3.236</td>
<td>3.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi empirical correlation</td>
<td>$1.56 \times (Ra/Rac)^{0.296}$</td>
<td>3.232</td>
<td>3.644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to this critical wave number, the aspect ratio $\text{AR} = \frac{L_x}{L_y}$ is considered $2\pi / 3.117 \approx 2$. To investigate the grid independency, several different grid sizes, $81 \times 41$, $161 \times 81$, $321 \times 161$ and $641 \times 321$ have been examined. The estimated critical Rayleigh numbers at different grid sizes are calculated. It can be deduced that the increase of the grid size beyond $81 \times 41$ does not have a significance effect on the accuracy of the results and the critical Rayleigh number is obtained 1707. The critical Rayleigh number is calculated by the interpolation between the growth rate and the decay rate of maximum vertical velocity in various Rayleigh numbers. The same grid size has been employed in previous studies [34-36] for 2D channel flow discretized by the square lattice using D2Q9 model. From the results calculated, it also can be seen that the value of critical Rayleigh number is independent of the Prandtl number. Richardson and Straughan [37] employ a nonlinear energy stability theory for the onset of convection for a fluid with kinematic viscosity depending linearly on temperature. They prove that the eigenvalue models which is obtained from the nonlinear theory is exactly the same as the one of linear instability theory arising from the conservation equations and thus the critical Rayleigh numbers that are resulted from the linear instability and the nonlinear energy stability are the same. They solved numerically the eigenvalue problem with the compound matrix method for free surface boundary condition and state that their results have good agreement with the previous experimental data such as Richter et al. [38]. Capone and Gentile [39] repeated Richardson and Straughan study for fluids with viscosity depending exponentially on temperature. They also consider the free surface boundary condition same as Richardson and Straughan study. At first, the rigid body boundary condition has been chosen by Rajagopal et al. [40]. They employ the Galerkin method, which is utilized by Chandrasekhar [41], to study the thermal-convection instability for the fluid with a viscosity that depends exponentially on the temperature and pressure. By neglecting the pressure effect, the viscosity is assumed has an analytic function of the temperature as below:

$$
\nu = \nu_0 \exp \left[ \gamma' (T - T_{\text{cold}}) \right]
$$

(31)

By considering the $\text{Ra}<\text{Ra}_{\text{c}}$, above equation will convert to the following equation

$$
\nu = \nu_0 \exp \left[ \Gamma \left( \frac{\gamma}{L_y} - 1 \right) \right]
$$

(32)

Where $\Gamma$ is equal to the $\gamma' (T_{\text{hot}} - T_{\text{cold}})$. They obtained that the critical wave number is about 3.117 to 3.072 for $|\Gamma|$ which is equal from 0 to 2.

| Table 2 Nusselt number values calculated by numerical scheme with variation of thermal diffusivity |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Nusselt Number                                   | Ra=500,000     | Ra=1,000,000   |
| $\gamma = 0.0$                                   | 7.641          | 8.719          |
| $\gamma = 0.1$                                   | 7.726          | 9.139          |
| $\gamma = 0.3$                                   | 8.168          | 9.694          |
| $\gamma = 0.5$                                   | 8.614          | 10.173         |
| $\gamma = 0.7$                                   | 9.103          | 10.787         |
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Figure 4 Two-dimensional simulation streamlines and isotherms at steady states for wide range of Rayleigh numbers
\[ \gamma = 0.2 \]

\[ \gamma = 0.4 \]

\[ \gamma = 0.6 \]

**Figure 5** Two-dimensional simulation Isotherms at steady states for Ra=1,000,000 with variation of thermal diffusivity

**Table 3** Critical Rayleigh number versus different \( \Gamma \) reported by Rajagopal et al. [40] compared with current calculated results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Rayleigh number</th>
<th>Rajagopal et al. [40]</th>
<th>current results (Pr=0.7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = -2.0 )</td>
<td>5026.42</td>
<td>5015\pm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = -1.5 )</td>
<td>3790.86</td>
<td>3781\pm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = -1.0 )</td>
<td>2885.93</td>
<td>2877\pm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = -0.5 )</td>
<td>2217.33</td>
<td>2213\pm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = +0.5 )</td>
<td>1344.88</td>
<td>1349\pm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = +1.0 )</td>
<td>1061.67</td>
<td>1069\pm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = +1.5 )</td>
<td>845.855</td>
<td>854\pm1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma = +2.0 )</td>
<td>680.252</td>
<td>696\pm1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Therefore, the aspect ratio about 2.0 is until true. They used the linear as well as the non-linear stability theorem to obtain the approximations to the critical Rayleigh number for different values of the dimensionless parameter $\Gamma$. By considering the aspect ratio equal to 2, the calculated results of the lattice Boltzmann method can be comparable with the Rajagopal et al. [40] results. The critical number which is obtained from lattice Boltzmann method is divided by the Rajagopal et al. [40] results and is shown in Table (3). In Rajagopal et al. study, the fluid diffusion properties in Rayleigh number are calculated at the $\Gamma = 0$.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, a modified no-slip wall condition model has been proposed to reduce the error initiated by applying regular boundary condition method. For this purpose, a body force term near the wall has been taken into account. As demonstrated in results, the presented boundary condition method, same as the model is suggested in [17], is more accurate than previous methods in the literature.

A wide range of Rayleigh numbers has been examined in the simulation of steady-state Rayleigh-Benard convection problem by the current method. Furthermore, the effect of high nonlinearity is considered in the conservative equation by simulations applying the proposed model. To assess the current schemes, the Rayleigh-Benard convection problem simulated by considering the variable thermal diffusivity. The stability conditions obtained for flows with a large variation of thermal conductivity ($\gamma = 0.7$) and Rayleigh numbers up to 1,000,000. At the last assessment, the variable kinematic viscosity has been applied to investigate the primary instability of Rayleigh-Benard convection. The calculated results demonstrated that the current method is capable to estimate the critical Rayleigh number with high accuracy within the variation of the diffusion coefficient.
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Nomenclature

- $\vec{c}_i$: lattice velocity vector in the direction $i$, m/s
- $c_p$: specific heat capacity, kJ/kg.K
- $c_s$: the speed of sound, m/s
- $D$: the variable part of the thermal diffusivity, m$^2$/s
- $err$: numerical error
- $f_i(\vec{r},t)$: particle distribution function traveling with velocity $\vec{c}_i$, kg
- $f_i^{eq}(\vec{r},t)$: equilibrium distribution function traveling with velocity $\vec{c}_i$, kg
- $\vec{f}(\vec{r},t)$, $\vec{f}^{eq}(\vec{r},t)$: vectors of moment corresponding to $f_i(\vec{r},t)$ and $f_i^{eq}(\vec{r},t)$ respectively
- $F_d$: driving force, kg/m.s$^2$
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\[ \tilde{F}_i \] effect of the body force \( (F) \) in the collision term, kg/s

\[ g_i(\tilde{r},t) \] particle distribution function in the \( i^{th} \) direction, K

\[ g_{eq}^i(\tilde{r},t) \] equilibrium distribution function in the \( i^{th} \) direction, K

\[ G \] gravity acceleration, m/s²

\[ k(T) \] the variable part of thermal conductivity, W/m.K

\[ k_0 \] the constant part of thermal conductivity, W/m.K

\[ L_x, L_y \] rectangular geometry dimensions, m

\[ m \] hydrodynamic moments

\[ M, M' \] transformation matrix

\[ N_n \] number of nodes

\[ Pr \] Prandtl number \( (= \frac{\nu}{\alpha_0}) \)

\[ \tilde{r} \] location vector \((x,y)\), m

\[ Ra \] Rayleigh number

\[ Re \] Reynolds number

\[ t \] time, s

\[ T \] temperature, K

\[ T_0 \] an average of the heated and cooled wall temperature, K

\[ T_m \] average fluid temperature, K

\[ T_w \] wall temperature, K

\[ \tilde{u} \] fluid velocity vector with \( u_x \) and \( u_y \) components, m/s

\[ \tilde{u}^' \] microscopic velocity, m/s

\[ \tilde{u}^{eq} \] equilibrium velocity, m/s

\[ U_{E_i} \] analytical normalized velocity for \( i^{th} \) direction node

\[ U_{N_i} \] numerical normalized velocity for \( i^{th} \) direction node

\[ w_i \] lattice constant in the direction \( i \)

\[ x, y \] coordinate axis directions

**Greek symbols**

\[ \alpha_0 \] the constant part of the thermal diffusivity, m²/s

\[ \beta \] Volumetric thermal expansion coefficient, 1/K

\[ \gamma \] variable thermal conductivity parameter, 1/K

\[ \lambda \] relaxation time in the energy equation, s

\[ \mu \] dynamic viscosity, m²/s

\[ \rho \] density, kg/m³

\[ \rho_m \] average fluid density, kg/m³

\[ \tau \] relaxation time in the momentum equation, s

\[ \nu \] kinematic viscosity, m²/s

\[ \Lambda \] relaxation matrix

\[ \Pi \] components of hydrodynamic moments

\[ \Omega \] collision operator
چکیده
تاکنون اسکیم‌های متعددی در روش شبکه بولتزمن برای مدل سازی شرط عدم لغزش بر روی دیواره معرفی شده است. مطالعه حاضر به معرفی یک مدل جدید جهت اعمال شرط عدم لغزش بر روی دیواره بر اساس روش بنت در حضور نیروی حجمی می‌پردازد. نشان داده شد که خطای شرط معرفی شده کمتر از خطای شرط مرزی معرفی شده در مطالعات گذشته می‌باشد.
تاثیر اسکیم‌های اعمال نیروی حجمی نیز در روش شبکه بولتزمن با حفاظت شرط مرزی مذکور بررسی قرار گرفت و اسکیم دارای کمترین خطای معرفی گردید. نهایتاً به بررسی اثر ضریب پخش متغیر بر روی جریان راولی بنارد با استفاده از اسکیم‌های مذکور پرداخته شد. عدد راولی بحل نهایی محاسبه شده در توافق خوبی با نتایج محاسبه شده به کمک تئوری پایداری خطی است. لذا می‌توان گفت این اسکیم قابلیت مدلسازی اثرات غیرخطی از جمله تغییرات شدید ضریب پخش را دارا می‌باشد.