Comparison between Solidworks and Ansys CFX Flow Simulation on Aerodynamic Studies

Imadduddin Ramlan[1], Nofrizalidris Darlis[1*], Izuan Amin Ishak[1], Amir Khalid[1], Mohd Aziq Asyraf Zailani[2]

[1]Automotive and Combustion Synergies Technology Group,
 Faculty of Engineering Technology, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, 84600 Pagoh, Johor, MALAYSIA
[2]CTRM Aero Composite Sdn Bhd. MALAYSIA

Abstract: Nowadays, with increase in competition in automobile sector, the Computational Fluid Dynamic (CFD) simulation has become one of important tool in the process of vehicle manufacturing. It is because the CFD simulation able to shorten the lead time in the research and development process. The idea of this project is to analyse the aerodynamic behaviour of a local sedan car, Perodua Bezza by using different software which are SolidWorks Flow Simulation and ANSYS CFX. Both of the software used the same boundary condition and setup except for the type of flow used in the simulation in order to obtain a fair result. The velocity inlet used for this project is 30.56 m/s and the turbulence model selected is standard k-ε. The coefficient of drag for the model obtained for SolidWorks 2018 and ANSYS CFX is 0.396 and 0.413 respectively. The percentage different of the drag coefficient between both software is about 4%, and this probably due to different type of flow used in this simulation. Compared to 0.286 drag coefficient value provided by the manufacturer, the percentage different between the SolidWorks 2018 and ANSYS CFX with the manufacturer data is about 38% and 44% respectively. The different is might be due to simplified version of the car model, the parameters set is different with the manufacturer settings and also the type of flow used in the simulation. Overall, both software can be used for aerodynamic behaviours study but ANSYS CFX 18.2 is better choice because it provides multiple parameters settings which can be used to study more complex flow simulation

Keywords: CFD, aerodynamic, SolidWorks, ANSYS CFX, coefficient of drag, Perodua Bezza

1. Introduction

As the technology is developed, more software engineers have produced much simulation software in order to reduce the time taken for the research and development process and can save up more money. In addition, time is very crucial things in the most manufacturing company because they need to compete with others company to produce faster and quality product thus Computational Fluid Dynamic (CFD) software is very important in the automobile industry. There are two types of CFD simulation software which are open source type and commercial type. Most researchers are preferred to use a commercial type software such as SolidWorks and ANSYS to study the aerodynamic behaviours of a vehicle but the problem is which one is the best software to study the aerodynamic behaviours is still debateable.

The purpose of this technical paper is to compare the results of aerodynamic behaviour between two different CFD software which are SolidWorks 2018 and ANSYS. CFD is a branch of fluid mechanics that uses numerical methods with the help of computer to solve and analyse problems involving fluid flows [1]. CFD simulation technology helps engineers to understand the physical phenomena taking place around the design and provides an environment to optimize the performance with respect to certain criteria [2]. In automobile manufactures, CFD helps study the aerodynamics behaviour without having to create a physical model and thus it helps to reduce research and development costs while simultaneously saving time [1]. The use of CFD to predict aerodynamic flow around vehicles has been on the incline over the last few years due to the increase in computing power available, making it a viable tool for simulating aerodynamic effects [3].Aerodynamics is the dynamic associated with studying the motion of air especially when it interacts with moving objects. Aerodynamics is a subfield of fluid dynamics and gas dynamics, with much theory shared between them [4]. Aerodynamics study in the automotive industry is very important in order to improve the performance, handling, safety, and comfort. Traditionally, wind tunnel tests are one of the processes in vehicles design. In order to do the process, the vehicles or car body model should be made thus it will cost much money and time to complete the tests.

1.1 Automotive Design

Automotive design is not only focusing on the physical appearance only, but in the aerodynamics of the vehicles too. The main concerns of automotive aerodynamics are reducing

drag, reducing wind noise, minimizing noise emission and preventing undesired lift forces at high speeds [5]. There are several theories that really important in the aerodynamics theory such as the Bernoulli's theorem, the aerodynamic parameters, and the process of aerodynamics design. In this section, all the theory will be discussed. The improvement on the characteristic related through the drag force which is ruled by Bernoulli Equation. It is one of the best-known and widely-used equations in fluid mechanics.

$$p + \frac{1}{2} pv^2 = constant \tag{1}$$

From equation (1) shows the increasing of velocity will case the decrease in static pressure and vice versa. The Bernoulli's Equation from equation (1) gives the important result which is:

Static pressure + Dynamic Pressure = Stagnation Pressure

The drag coefficient for a vehicle body can define as [6]:

$$C_D = \frac{D}{\frac{1}{2}pv_\infty^2 A} \tag{2}$$

where D is the drag and A is the frontal area. Since, the C_D was defined as shown in equation (1). Thus, the drag force can derive as:

$$D = \frac{1}{2} pv_\infty^2 C_D . A \tag{3}$$

Besides that, the drag coefficient, C_{df} can derive from friction drag, D_f, on a flat plate as:

$$C_{df} = \frac{D_f}{\frac{1}{2}pv^2 bl} \tag{4}$$

where D_f is friction drag, b and l are width and length of flat plate. The lift force can be determined if the distribution of dynamic pressure and shear force on the entire body are known. Therefore, the lift coefficient (C_L) can indicate as:

$$C_L = \frac{L}{\frac{1}{2}pv_\infty^2 A} \tag{5}$$

where L is lift force and A is the frontal area.

Pressure and shear stress distribution is difficult to obtain along a surface for non-geometry body either experimentally or theoretically but these to value can be obtained by Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) [6].

2. Method for Aerodynamic Design

Automotive aerodynamics is studied using both computer modelling and wind tunnel testing. In traditional ways, it requires more than one wind tunnel in the process of designing the car as shown in the Fig. 1. Currently, almost all car manufacturers using the computational fluid dynamic simulation in the process of designing the car and use the wind tunnel for experimental purpose. In addition, the numerical simulation could provide enough data to the aerodynamic shape design of car [7].


Fig. 1 - The process of car design [7].

3. SolidWorks simulation vs ANSYS simulation

Computational fluid dynamics (CFD) is concerned with numerical solution of differential equations governing transport of mass, momentum, and energy in moving fluids [8]. Today, CFD has become a very vital tool to predict flow movement and these techniques are found in almost all fields ranging from engineering to medical research [9]. The detail of advantages and disadvantages of CFD are shown clearly in Table 1 and Table 2. The basic procedure of CFD can be divided into three which are pre-processing, processing, and a postprocessor. The geometry modelling, grid generation, define model, set properties, set boundary and inlet conditions is a process in pre-processing. Then, simulation can be run and the equations are solved iteratively as a transient or steady-state. Finally, a post-processing is used to analyse the results and visualize the results.

Today, there are many commercial CFD programs available that use numerical analysis and algorithms to solve and analyse problems that involve fluid dynamics such as SolidWorks Flow Simulation, ANSYS Fluent, ANSYS CFX, Star-CD, FLOW-3D, COMSOL, Acusolve CFD, ADINA and ABAQUS [9, 10]. In this project, SolidWorks 2018 Flow Simulation and ANSYS 18.2 CFX will be focused on to study the aerodynamics of the car model.

SolidWorks flow simulation solves the governing equations with a discrete numerical technique based on the finite volume (FV) method. Cartesian rectangular coordinate system is used. To obtain space discretization, the axis-oriented rectangular grid is used far from a geometry boundary. Thus, the control volumes as example mesh cells are rectangular parallelepipeds. Near the geometry boundary Cartesian cut cells approach is used. According to this approach, the near-boundary mesh is obtained from the original background Cartesian mesh by cutting original parallelepipeds cells that intersect the geometry. Consequently, the near-boundary cells are polyhedrons with both axis-oriented and arbitrary oriented plane faces in this case. Thus, SolidWorks flow simulation combines advantages of approach based on regular grids and ones with highly accurate representation of geometry boundaries [11].

The advantages of SolidWork simulation included easy modelling software for making parts and assembly, faster results after analysis and integrated to different other software's like SOLID CAM, ANSYS. Flow simulation is integrated inside SolidWorks [12-15]. However, it is not the best software for analysis and the results not quite accurate.

3.1 Simulation Set-Up

The detail of the research methodology will discuss in this section. All the geometry of the car model was generated by using SolidWorks 2018 then the numerical solution was run by SolidWorks 2018 and also ANSYS CFX. The details of Perodua Bezza geometry are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Perodua Bezza dimension [13]

Overall length	: 4150 mm
Width	: 1620 mm
Height	: 1510 mm
Wheelbase	: 2455 mm

Fig. 2 shows the shape of the car from the front, side and rear view. From the figure below, the sketch from picture method have been applied in order to design the car in SolidWorks followed by dimension stated in the Table 1. Fig. 3 shows the drawing of Perodua Bezza after have been design in SolidWorks.

Fig. 2 - Perodua Bezza side, front and rear view.

Fig. 3 - Geometrical model of Perodua Bezza

In order to stimulate the air flow around the vehicle, a fluid volume needs to be created. This was done by creating a fluid enclosure around the model and subtracting the model. This fluid enclosure will act as the wind tunnel for the simulation. This fluid enclosure is created only for ANSYS CFX simulation, the fluid enclosure is created in the SolidWorks 2018 as shown in Fig. 4. For SolidWorks simulation, the fluid enclosure does not need to be create because the analysis for SolidWorks is external flow, thus it only needs to adjust the computational domain size as same as fluid enclosure for ANSYS CFX simulation. The size of the enclosure L x W x H, Length equal to 7 car length, Width equal to 1 car length and Height equal to 2 car length.


Fig. 4 - Fluid enclosure

3.2 Meshing and Boundary Condition

For SolidWorks 2018, the mesh is generated by using automated mesh with highest level of initial mesh which is 7. For ANSYS CFX 18.2, the mesh is also generated automatically by choosing curvature-based mesh with angle of 10°. Fig. 5 shows the mesh generated for SolidWorks and ANSYS CFX.


Fig. 5 - Mesh generated for SolidWorks (upper) and ANSYS CFX (lower)

All the details of boundary condition are shown in the Table 2.

Table 2 - Boundary condition.

Boundary types	Value
Inlet	30.56 m/s
Outlet	0 Pa
Wall	No slip wall
Fluid	Air at 25°C
Analysis type	Steady state solver
Turbulence model	k-epsilon model

4. Results and Discussion

The results presented in this technical paper are in table form or in figure form in order to make the readers to understand easily. In this section, the author will show the results and discuss about the comparison between SolidWorks and ANSYS in term of simulation, the validation for the simulation, the pre-processing, the solver and the post processing.

The results for both CFD software was validated by comparing both CFD software results with the manufacturer data, as example the value of the coefficient of drag for both software was compared with the Perodua Bezza coefficient of drag which is 0.286. The results also validated by comparing both software results such as drag force, and the coefficient of drag and lift, the difference between both software results must be small in order to assume that simulation for both software is running with the same setup in order to make sure the results is valid to be compared.

4.1 Comparison between SolidWorks and ANSYS

4.1.1 Pre-processing

In this pre-processing, the meshing is one of the significant different the software. The meshing element detail for the software is shown in the Table 3. The number of elements for both software is different because the SolidWorks does not have a wall to act as a wind tunnel, it only uses computational domain compare to ANSYS which

use solid box with a specific dimension to act as wind tunnel and also a computational domain for the simulation, thus the same accurate and exact size for the computational cannot be done. Besides, ANSYS 18.2 managed to produce high number of elements and nodes because it can easily use the manual mesh setup for the simulation compared to the SolidWorks manual mesh setup, thus the author used the automatic setup with the highest level of the initial mesh to match with the ANSYS mesh setup.

Table 3 - Details of meshing for both software

Software	No. of elements	No. of nodes
SolidWorks	512164	-
ANSYS CFX	662833	123916

4.1.2 The solver

Solver is where solution for the simulation takes place. The iterations for the SolidWorks as the analysis run converged is 162 iterations, the iterations for the ANSYS as the analysis run converged is only 102 iterations. The higher the numbers of iterations, the longer the time needed for the analysis to be done. SolidWorks takes a lot of time to complete the analysis compared to ANSYS. The results for the post-processing will be discussed in the next sub-topic.

4.1.3 The coefficient of drag and lift

There are several things that need to be determine in order to calculate the coefficient of drag and lift such as the drag force that act on the car body on the front direction of the car and upper direction of the car, the frontal area of the car, the density of the fluid, and the velocity. Table 8 shows the value that is vital in calculates the coefficient of drag and lift. After determine all the value, just calculate the coefficient of drag and lift by using the equation stated in the literature review section. For SolidWorks, the user can set the equation goal to automatically calculate the coefficient of drag in which ANSYS CFX does not have the ability to do that. The results of the coefficient of drag and lift between the software are different. The coefficient of drag is really depending on the design of the shape of the model. The results of the coefficient of drag and lift are shown in the Table 4 while the coefficient of drag and lift are shown in the Table 5 below.

Table 4 - Coefficient of drag and lift of the model

	SolidWorks	ANSYS CFX
Drag force (z direction)	497.89 N	519.17 N
Drag force (y direction)	565.32 N	243.96 N
Frontal area of model (m^2)	2.196	2.196
The density of fluid (kg/m^3)	1.225	1.225
The inlet velocity (m/s)	30.56	30.56

Table 5 - Coefficient of drag and lift for SolidWorks and ANSYS.

Software	Drag coefficient	Lift coefficient
SolidWorks	0.396	0.450
ANSYS CFX	0.413	0.194
Percentage difference	4.29%	131.95%

The percentage different for the value of the coefficient of drag between SolidWorks and ANSYS with the manufacturer data are 38.46% and 44.41% respectively. SolidWorks has lower percentage different compared to ANSYS CFX. The reasons why the value the software is far from the manufacturer data is due to simplified geometrical modelling of the car and also the different parameters used for the simulation compared to the manufacturer settings. The shape of the model is too simple due to lack of dimension details on that particular model and also to reduce computational time for the simulation thus it will affect the

value of the drag force acting on the body of the car for all direction and also the value of the frontal area of the car. The different between the software for lift coefficient is due to the different type of flow used for the simulation.


**Fig. 5 – Drag coefficient vs number of iterations for SolidWorks**

Another different between SolidWorks simulation and ANSYS CFX simulation is the ability to show the graph for coefficient of drag. Figure 8 show the graph of coefficient of drag vs number of iterations for SolidWorks. SolidWorks can easily set the equation goal (coefficient of drag equation) and shows the chart for the equation goal but for ANSYS CFX, the user need to manually calculate the value of the coefficient of drag and manually produces the chart of coefficient of drag if needed.

4.1.4 The pressure contours

Results of static pressure contours for the software will be shown in the Fig. 6. Based on the results of simulation, it shows that the software have same higher-pressure concentration on the frontal area of the car. The pressure will drop when the air flows over the hood of the car and then increasing when the air flows reach the windshield. Then the pressure drops as the air flow travels over the windshield. The high pressure recorded for ANSYS CFX is 0.58 kPa and 101.94 kPa for SolidWorks. The minimum pressure recorded for ANSYS CFX is -1.34 kPa and 100.61 kPa for SolidWorks. Based on figure, the value is far. However, the location of the highest pressure at the body of the car is still the same. Based on previous studies, mostly the value of pressure (Pa) is in range between -3000 Pa to 2000 Pa, thus it can be concluded that ANSYS CFX produce a better result in term of pressure value because the value is in range of the previous studies compared to SolidWorks which tend to produce high value of pressure.

Pressure contour for ANSYS CFX

Pressure contour for SolidWorks

Fig. 6 - Comparison of pressure contour between ANSYS CFX and SolidWorks

4.1.5 Velocity streamline

Fig. 7 shows the velocity streamline for both SolidWorks and ANSYS CFX. For both velocity streamline, it shows that the air velocity decreasing as it approaches the front section of the car and the air velocity is higher at the hood section of the car. The highest air velocity recorded for ANSYS CFX is 50.14 m/s and 37.57 m/s for SolidWorks. The minimum velocity recorded for ANSYS CFX is 0.07 m/s and 0 m/s for SolidWorks. Both results show a different for its highest value of air velocity but the location of the highest air velocity is still the same. Both results is in range of the previous study, thus it shows that both software is relevant for this type of study.


Velocity streamline for ANSYS CFX

Velocity streamline for SolidWorks

Fig. 7 - Comparison of velocity streamline between ANSYS CFX and SolidWorks

5. Conclusion

A Computational Fluid Dynamic (CFD) analysis was carried out by using SolidWorks and ANSYS CFX on a Perodua Bezza to analyse the aerodynamics behaviour for that car. The results of the simulation such as drag coefficient for both software were found to be very close, the percentage different between the results for drag coefficient is as low as 4.29%. However, the different between the value for both software and the manufacturer data is very high (38.46% and 44.41%). It is due the simplified version of the car model and also the parameters set by the author are nowhere near to the manufacturer settings due to unknown details. In addition, the geometrical modelling of the car needs to be improved in order to get more accurate results for the simulation. Based on the low percentage different between SolidWorks and ANSYS CFX drag coefficient value, it can be concluded that SolidWorks and ANSYS CFX is relevant in CFD simulation to study the aerodynamic behaviours of the car. The software used can provide good results if the details are set specifically. However, based on this study, ANSYS CFX provides a better result to study the aerodynamic behaviours due to its various parameter settings and its flexibility compared to SolidWorks 2018.

Acknowledgement

References

[1] Parab, A., Sakarwala, A., Paste, B., Patil, V., & Mangrulkar, A. (2014). "Aerodynamic Analysis of a Car Model using Fluent-Ansys 14.5." *Int. Journal on Recent Technologies in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering*, 1(4), 7–13.

[2] Dias, G., Tiwari, N. R., Varghese, J. J., & Koyeerath, G. (2016). "Aerodynamic Analysis of a Car for Reducing Drag Force." *IOSR Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering* (IOSR-JMCE, 13(3), 114–118.

[3] M Takagi. (1990) "Application of computers to automobile aerodynamics." *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, 33(1):419–428, 1990.

[4] Senger, S., Bhardwaj, S. D. R., & Bhard, R. (2014). "Aerodynamic Design of F1 and Normal Cars and Their Effect on Performance". *International Review of Applied Engineering Research*. 4(4), 363–370.

[5] Kumar, K. (2016). "A Review on Aerodynamic Study of Vehicle Body using CFD". *The 5th National Conference on Emerging Vistas of Technology*.

[6] Saat, A. F., & Rosly, N. (2019). Aerodynamic Analysis of Vertical Axis Wind Turbine. Journal of Aviation and Aerospace Technology, 1(1)

[7] Zhang, Y., Zhang, Z., Luo, S., & Tian, J. (2009). "Aerodynamic Numerical Simulation in the Process of Car Styling." E-Engineering & Digital Enterprise Technology Vii, Pts 1 and 2, 16–19, 862–865.

[8] Date (2005). "Introduction to Computational Fluid Dynamics". Cambridge University Press, New York: Cambridge University Press.

[9] Ihsak, N., Muhammad E.M.A.S., Mohd Azam, A. A., and Razali M. A., "Experimental Study of Mixing Efficiency in Laminar Flow for Circular Pipe with Perforated Plate Mixer". *Journal of Complex Flow* 1 (1) (2019): 16-20.

[10] Andersson, B., Andersson, R., Hakansson, L., Mortensen, M., & van Wachem, B. G. M. (2012). "Computational fluid dynamics for engineers". Austin, TX: Engineering Education System, 1989.

[11] Lai, Y. (2009). Technical Reference. Imid 2009, (159679), 1069–1072.

[12] Azmi, M. F. M., Marzuki, M. A. B., & Bakar, M. A. A. (2017). "Vehicle aerodynamics analysis of a multi-purpose vehicle using CFD". *ARPN Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 12(7), 2345–2350

[13] Ramya, P., Kumar, A. H., & Ramanaiah, J. M. N. (2015). "Analysis of Flow over Passenger Cars using Computational Fluid Dynamics", 29(4), 170–176.

[14] Taherkhani, A. R., Gilkeson PhD, C., Gaskell PhD, P., Hewson PhD, R., Toropov PhD, V., Rezaienia PhD, A., & Thompson, H. (2017). "Aerodynamic CFD Based Optimization of Police Car Using Bezier Curves." *SAE International Journal of Materials and Manufacturing*, 10(2), 2017-01-9450.

[15] Chaurasiya, V. V, Kushwaha, D. B., & Raees, M. (2017). "Aerodynamic Analysis of Vehicle Using CFD". *International Journal of Recent Trends in Engineering & Research*, 131–137.