

---

# ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORKS TRAINED THROUGH DEEP REINFORCEMENT LEARNING DISCOVER CONTROL STRATEGIES FOR ACTIVE FLOW CONTROL

---

**Jean Rabault**  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Oslo  
jean.rblt@gmail.com

**Miroslav Kuchta**  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Oslo  
mirok@math.uio.no

**Atle Jensen**  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Oslo  
atlej@math.uio.no

December 28, 2022

## ABSTRACT

We present the first application of an Artificial Neural Network trained through a Deep Reinforcement Learning agent to perform active flow control. We show that, in a 2D simulation environment, our Artificial Neural Network is able to learn an active control strategy from experimenting with the mass flow rates of two jets on the sides of a cylinder, and by interacting with the unsteady wake successfully reduces drag by about 7%. This opens the way to a new class of methods for performing active flow control.

**Keywords** Active Flow Control · Artificial Neural Network · Deep Reinforcement Learning

## 1 Introduction

Drag reduction and flow control are techniques of critical interest for the industry. For example, 20% of all energy losses on modern heavy duty vehicles are due to aerodynamic drag (of which a large part is due to flow separation on the tractor pillars, see Vernet *et al.* (2014)), and drag is naturally the main source of energy losses for an airplane. Drag is also a phenomenon that penalizes animals, and Nature shows examples of drag mitigation techniques. It is for example thought that structures of the skin of fast-swimming sharks interact with the turbulent boundary layer around the animal, and reduce drag by as much as 9% (Dean & Bhushan, 2010). This is therefore a proof-of-existence that flow control can be achieved with benefits, and is worth aiming for.

In the past, much research has been carried towards so-called passive drag reduction methods, for example using Micro Vortex Generators for passive control of transition to turbulence (Fransson *et al.*, 2006; Shahinfar *et al.*, 2012). While it should be underlined that this technique is very different from the one used by sharks (preventing transition to turbulence by energizing the linear boundary layer, contra reducing the drag of a fully turbulent boundary layer), benefits in terms of reduced drag can also be achieved. Another way to obtain drag reduction is by applying an active control to the flow. A number of techniques can be used in active drag control and have been proven effective in several experiments, a typical example being to use small jets (Schoppa & Hussain, 1998; Glezer, 2011). Interestingly, it has been shown that effective separation control can be achieved with even quite weak actuation, as long as it is used in an efficient way (Schoppa & Hussain, 1998). This underlines the need to develop techniques that could effectively control a complex actuation input into a flow, in order to reduce drag.

Unfortunately, designing active flow control strategies is a complex endeavor. Given a set of point measurements of the flow pressure or velocity around an object, there is no easy way to find a strategy to use this information in order to perform active control and reduce drag. The high dimensionality and computational cost of the solution domain (set by the complexity and non linearity inherent to Fluid Mechanics) mean that analytical solutions, and real-time predictive simulations (that would decide which control to use by simulating several control scenarios in real time) seem out of reach. Despite the considerable efforts put into the theory of flow control, and the use of a variety of analytical and semi-analytical techniques (Barbagallo *et al.*, 2009, 2012; Sipp & Schmid, 2016), bottom-up

approaches based on an analysis of the flow equations face considerable difficulties when attempting to design flow control techniques. A consequence of these challenges is the simplicity of the control strategies used in most published works about active flow control, which traditionally focus on either harmonic or constant control input (Schoppa & Hussain, 1998). Therefore, there is a need to develop efficient control methods, that perform complex active control and take full advantage of actuation possibilities. Indeed, it seems that, as of today, the actuation possibilities are large, but only simplistic (and probably suboptimal) control strategies are implemented. To the knowledge of the authors, the only published example of a complex active control strategy is the one of Gautier *et al.* (2015). In the corresponding work, a genetic programming technique was used to control the separation on a backward-facing step using a spanwise slotted jet. Significant reduction in the extent of the recirculation bubble was reported.

In the present work, we aim at introducing Deep Neural Networks and Reinforcement Learning to the field of flow control and drag reduction. Deep Neural Networks are revolutionizing large fields of research, such as image analysis (Krizhevsky *et al.*, 2012), speech recognition (Schmidhuber, 2015a), and optimal control (Mnih *et al.*, 2015; Duan *et al.*, 2016). Those methods have largely surpassed all previous algorithms, including previously state-of-the-art methods such as genetic programming, in terms of complexity of the tasks learned and learning speed. It has been speculated that Deep Neural Networks will bring advances also to fluid mechanics (Kutz, 2017), but until this day those have been limited to a few applications, such as the definition of reduced order models (Wang *et al.*, 2018), or performing Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) (Rabault *et al.*, 2017). As Deep Neural Networks, together with the Reinforcement Learning framework, have allowed recent breakthroughs in the optimal control of complex dynamic systems (Lillicrap *et al.*, 2015; Schulman *et al.*, 2017), it is natural to attempt to use them for optimal flow control.

Artificial Neural networks (ANNs) are the attempt to reproduce in machines some of the features that are believed to be at the origin of the intelligent thinking of the brain (LeCun *et al.*, 2015). The key idea consists in performing computations using a network of simple processing units, called neurons. The output value of each neuron is obtained by applying a transfer function on the weighted sum of its inputs (Goodfellow *et al.*, 2016). When performing supervised learning an algorithm, such as stochastic gradient descent, is then used for tuning the neurons weights so as to minimize a cost function on a training set (Goodfellow *et al.*, 2016). The strength of ANNs comes from their property of being universal approximators: a large enough feed-forward neural network using a non linear activation function can fit arbitrarily well any function (Hornik *et al.*, 1989), and the Recurrent Neural Network paradigm is even Turing complete (Siegelmann & Sontag, 1995). Therefore, virtually any problem or phenomenon that can be represented by a function could be a field of experimentation with ANNs. However, the problem of designing the ANNs, and designing the algorithms that train and use them, is still the object of active research.

While the case of supervised learning (i.e., when the solution is known and the ANN should simply be trained at reproducing it, such as image labeling or PIV) is now mostly solved owing to the advance of Deep Neural Networks and Deep Convolutional Networks (He *et al.*, 2016), the case of reinforcement learning (when an agent tries to learn through the feedback of a reward function) is still the focus of much attention (Mnih *et al.*, 2013; Gu *et al.*, 2016; Schulman *et al.*, 2017). We should also note, for the sake of completeness, that the framework of unsupervised learning (i.e., clustering of data without help from either labels or a reward function) has not lead to significant breakthroughs, and is not yet of any practical interest outside of the Machine Learning community. In the case of reinforcement learning, an agent (controlled by the ANN) interacts with an environment through 3 channels of exchange of information. First, the agent is given access at each time step to an observation  $o_t$  of the state  $s_t$  of the environment. The environment can be any stochastic process, and the observation is only a noisy, partial description of the environment. Second, the agent performs an action,  $a_t$ , that influences the time evolution of the environment. Finally, the agent receives a reward  $r_t$  depending on the state of the environment following the action. The reinforcement learning framework consists in finding strategies to learn from experimenting with the environment, in order to discover control sequences  $a(t = 1, \dots, T)$  that maximize the reward. The environment can be any system that provides the interface  $(o_t, a_t, s_t)$ , either it is an Atari game emulator (Mnih *et al.*, 2013), a robot acting in the physical world that should perform a specific task (Kober *et al.*, 2013), or a fluid mechanics system whose drag should be minimized in our case.

In the present work, we apply for the first time the Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL, i.e. Reinforcement Learning performed on a deep ANN) paradigm to a flow control problem. We use a Proximal Policy Optimisation (PPO, Schulman *et al.* (2017)) method together with a Fully Connected Artificial Neural Network (FCANN) to control two synthetic jets located on the sides of a cylinder immersed in a constant flow in a 2D simulation. The geometry is chosen owing to its simplicity, and the low computational cost associated with resolving a 2D unsteady wake at moderate Reynolds number. The PPO agent manages to control the jets and to interact with the unsteady wake to reduce the drag. This work is, to our knowledge, the first time DRL is used in Fluid Mechanics, and it opens the way to a new class of methods for optimization of flow control. We choose to release all our code as Open Source, to help trigger interest in those methods and facilitate further developments. In the following, we first present the simulation environment, before giving details about the network and reinforcement framework, and finally we offer an overview of the results obtained.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Simulation environment

The PPO agent performs active flow control in a 2D simulation environment. In the following all quantities are considered non-dimensionalized. The geometry of the simulation, adapted from the 2D test case of well-known benchmarks (Schäfer *et al.*, 1996), consists of a cylinder of radius  $R = 0.05$  immersed in a box of total length  $L = 2.2$  (along X-axis) and height  $H = 0.41$  (along Y-axis). The origin of the coordinate system is in the center of the cylinder. The kinematic viscosity is set as  $\nu = 10^{-3}$ . The inflow profile (on the left wall of the domain) is parabolic, following the formula (cf. 2D-2 test case in Schäfer *et al.* (1996)):

$$U(y) = 4U_m(H/2 - y)(H/2 + y)/H^2,$$

where  $(U(y), V(y) = 0)$  is the velocity vector and we set  $U_m = 1.5$ . A no slip boundary condition is imposed on the top and bottom walls and on the solid walls of the cylinder. An outflow boundary condition is imposed on the right wall of the domain. The configuration of the simulation is visible in Fig. 1. The resulting Reynolds number based on the mean velocity magnitude  $\bar{U} = 2U(0)/3$  is  $Re = 2R\bar{U}/\nu = 100$ . The domain is discretized using Gmsh (Geuzaine & Remacle, 2009). With the mesh refined in the vicinity of the cylinder the computational domain consists of a total number of 7142 triangular elements. A non dimensional, constant numerical time step  $dt = 0.0005$  is used.

In the interest of short solution time (e.g. Valen-Sendstad *et al.* (2012)), the governing Navier-Stokes equations are solved in a segregated manner. More precisely, the Incremental Pressure Correction Scheme (IPCS method, Goda (1979)) with an explicit treatment of the nonlinear term is used. Spatial discretization then relies on the finite element method implemented within the FEniCS framework (Logg *et al.*, 2012).

We remark that both the mesh density and the Reynolds number could easily be increased in a later study, but are kept low here as it allows for fast training on a laptop which is the primary aim of our proof-of-concept demonstration.

In addition, two jets (1 and 2) normal to the cylinder wall are implemented on the sides of the cylinder, at angles  $\theta_1 = 90^\circ$  and  $\theta_2 = 270^\circ$  relatively to the flow direction. The jets are controlled through their mass flow rate,  $Q_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and are set through a parabolic velocity profile going to zero at the edges of the jet. The jet width is set to  $10^\circ$ . Choosing jets normal to the cylinder wall, located at the top and bottom extremities of the cylinder, means that all drag reduction observed will be the result of indirect flow control, rather than direct injection of momentum. In addition, the control is set up in such a way that the total mass flow rate injected by the jets is zero, i.e.  $Q_1 + Q_2 = 0$ , and the maximum mass flow rate of each individual jet is limited to an absolute value of 0.01.

Finally, information is extracted from the simulation and provided to the PPO agent. Both pressure and velocity probes are located in several locations in the vicinity of the cylinder and in its wake (see Fig. 1). The total drag on the cylinder  $C$  is computed following:

$$\int_C (\sigma \cdot n) \cdot e_x dS$$

where  $\sigma$  is the Cauchy stress tensor,  $n$  is the outer unit normal vector of the cylinder surface and  $e_x = (1, 0)$ .

An unsteady wake develops behind the cylinder, which is in good agreement with what is expected at this Reynolds number. A simple benchmark of the simulation was performed by observing the pressure fluctuations and the Strouhal number  $St = fL/U_m$ , where  $f$  is the vortex shedding frequency. Results are in good agreement with previously published data (Schäfer *et al.*, 1996), and a pressure field snapshot of the fully developed unsteady wake is presented in Fig. 1.

### 2.2 Network and reinforcement learning framework

As stated in the introduction, deep reinforcement learning sees the fluid mechanic simulation as yet-another-environment to interact with through 3 simple channels: the observation  $o_t$  (here, an array of point measurements of velocity and pressure obtained from the simulation), the action  $a_t$  (here, the active control of the jets, imposed on the simulation by the learning agent), and the reward  $r_t$  (here, the instantaneous drag value provided by the environment).

Our deep reinforcement learning agent uses the Proximal Policy Optimisation (PPO, Schulman *et al.* (2017)) method for performing learning. PPO is a reinforcement learning algorithm that belongs to the policy gradient methods family. This method was chosen for several reasons. In particular, it is less complex mathematically and faster than concurring Trust Region Policy Optimization methods (TRPO, Schulman *et al.* (2015)), and requires little to no metaparameter tuning. It is also better adapted to continuous control problems than Deep Q Learning (DQN, Mnih *et al.* (2015)) and its




Figure 1: Unsteady pressure wake behind the cylinder after flow initialization without active control (colormap). The location of the velocity probes is indicated by the black dots. The location of the control jets is indicated by the red dots.

variations (Gu *et al.*, 2016). From the point of view of the fluid mechanicist, the PPO agent acts as a black box (though details about its internals are available in Schulman *et al.* (2017) and the referred literature).

The PPO method is episode-based, which means that it learns from performing active control for a limited amount of time before analyzing the results obtained and resuming learning with a new episode. Therefore, the simulation is first performed with no active control until a well developed unsteady wake is obtained, and the corresponding state is saved and used as a start for each subsequent learning episode.

The ANN used is relatively simple, being composed of two dense layers of 512 fully connected neurons, plus the layers required to acquire data from the probes, and generate data for the 2 jets. In total, this amounts to slightly over 300000 weights. For more details, readers are referred to the implementation (see the Appendix). At first, no learning could be obtained from the PPO agent interacting with the simulation environment. The reason for this was the difficulty for the PPO agent to learn the necessity to set time-correlated, continuous control signals, as the PPO first tries purely random control and must observe some improvement on the drag before it can perform any learning. Therefore, we implemented two tricks to help the PPO agent learn control strategies:

- The control value provided by the network is kept constant for a duration of 50 numerical time steps, corresponding to around 10 percent of the vortex shedding period. This means, in practice, that the PPO agent is allowed to interact with the simulation and update its control only each 50 time step.
- The control is made continuous in time to avoid jumps in the pressure and velocity due to the use of an incompressible solver. For this, the control at each time step in the simulation is obtained for each jet as  $c_{s+1} = c_s + \alpha(a - c_s)$ , where  $c_s$  is the control of the jet considered at the previous numerical time step,  $c_{s+1}$  is the new control,  $a$  is the action set by the PPO agent for the current 50 time steps, and  $\alpha = 0.1$  is a numerical parameter.

Using those technical tricks, and choosing an episode duration of 4000 numerical time steps (i.e. 80 actions by the network), the PPO agent is able to learn a control strategy after about 24 hours of training on a modern laptop (on our laptop, we performed learning using a single thread on a 3.2GHz CPU; only a couple of GBs of RAM are used, and no GPU acceleration is needed). Most of the computation time is spent in the flow simulation. This setup with simple, quick simulations makes experimentation and reproduction of our results easy, while being enough for a proof-of-concept in the context of a first application of Reinforcement Learning to active flow control.

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Drag reduction

After training through DRL, the ANN is able to reduce drag significantly by applying jet control. Illustrative results after training, compared with the baseline simulation (no forcing), and the effect of random control (i.e., at the first episode of training), are presented in Fig. 2. The left column of Fig. 2 presents results without active control (both jets equal to zero). In this case, one can observe that the simulation is well converged, and a regular vortex shedding is taking place and visible in the instantaneous drag. The middle column of Fig. 2 shows the results obtained with a randomly initialized network, at its first training episode. As could be expected, the network is doing no good to the flow by randomly switching on and off the control jets, and drag is actually increased. Finally, the last column of Fig. 2 shows typical output obtained using a network that has undergone training for around one day. While the control signal looks very similar to the case before training, the control is actually carefully designed by the network to follow the evolution of the probes measuring flow characteristics, and significant drag reduction is obtained.




Figure 2: Illustration of the effect of the active control on the drag affecting the cylinder. Left column: baseline without any jet action. Middle column: Results at the beginning of network training. Right column: results after successful learning. Top line: control signal applied to the jets. Bottom line: instantaneous drag on the cylinder. The drag reduction effect of the flow control is clearly visible.

While the drag reduction takes some time to be fully effective, and the result obtained is stochastic in nature (i.e., there are random variations in the results obtained from experiment to experiment), a typical drag value of around 0.148 is observed when successful, effective actuation is taking place. This represents a drag reduction of slightly over 6.9 % when comparing with the baseline drag, 0.159.


### 3.2 Analysis of the control strategy

The ANN trained through DRL learns a control strategy by using a trial-and-error method. Understanding which strategy an ANN decides to use is known to be challenging, even on simple image analysis tasks. Indeed, the strategy of the network is encoded in the complex combination of the weights of all its neurons and a number of properties of each individual network, such as the variations in architecture, make systematic analysis challenging (Raubert *et al.*, 2017; Schmidhuber, 2015b). Through the combination of the neuron weights, the network builds its own internal representation of how the flow in a given state will be affected by actuation. This is a sort of private, 'encrypted' reduced order model obtained through experience and interaction with the flow. Therefore, it appears challenging to directly analyze the control strategy from the knowledge of a trained network, which should be considered rather as a black box.


Instead, we can look at macroscopic flow features, that pinpoint the effect that the actuation has on the flow and the separation happening in the wake. For this, we look at the mean and the Root Mean Square (RMS) of the flow velocity magnitude and pressure, averaged over a large number of vortex shedding periods. Results are presented in Fig. 3. Several interesting points are visible from both the velocity and pressure data. Most strikingly, the area of the separated wake is larger in the case with active control, than in the baseline. This is clearly visible from the mean value plots of both velocity magnitude and pressure. This somewhat counterintuitive feature results in a lower mean pressure drop in the wake of the cylinder in the case with active control, which is the cause for the reduced drag. The RMS figures also clearly show a decreased level of fluctuations of both the velocity magnitude and the pressure in the wake, as well as a displacement downstream of the cylinder of the regions where highest flow variations are recorded.

## 4 Conclusions

We show for the first time that an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) can, through Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL, and more specifically the Proximal Policy Optimisation method, PPO), discover a control strategy for the active control of synthetic jets on a cylinder and achieve active control drag reduction. From the point of view of the ANN and



(a) Velocity magnitude comparisons: mean (double figure top), RMS (double figure bottom).



(b) Pressure comparisons: mean (double figure top), RMS (double figure bottom).

Figure 3: Comparison of the flow morphology without (top of each double figure) and with (bottom of each double figure) actuation. The colorbar is common to both figures of each double plot. A clear increase in size of the recirculation area is observed with actuation, which is associated with a lower pressure drop behind the cylinder.

DRL, this is yet-another-environment to interact with. The discovery of the control strategy takes place through the optimization of a reward function, here defined from the drag on the cylinder. A drag reduction of up to around 7 % is observed. This is remarkable, as no metaparameter tuning was necessary, and training takes place in about one day on a recent laptop. In addition, we have resorted to strong regularization of the DRL agent output through under sampling of the simulation and imposing a continuous control for helping the learning process, and one could therefore expect that relaxing those constraints, i.e. giving more freedom to the network, could lead to even more efficient strategies.

The control strategy is interesting, and one could argue, counterintuitive. The ANN decides to increase the area of the separated region in the case when active control is turned on, which in turn induces a lower pressure drop behind the cylinder, and therefore lower drag. One could argue that, in the present analysis, the ANN is a tool that can be used to discover an unexpected mode of the flow.

These results are potentially of considerable importance for Fluid Mechanics, as they show that DRL can be used to solve the high dimensionality, analytically untractable problem of active flow control. This work opens a number of research directions, including applying the DRL methodology to more complex simulations, for example more realistic 3D LES on large computer clusters, or even applying such an approach directly to a real world experiment. In addition, a number of interesting questions arise from the use of ANNs and DRL: can some form of transfer learning be used between simulations and the real world if the simulations are realistic enough (i.e., can one train an ANN in a simulation, and then use it in the real world)? Or, how robust are the control strategies to a variation in the Reynolds number? One could speculate that, as the Reynolds number is increased, the ANN will to some extent observe the faster flow evolution and adapt to it by also increasing the frequency at which it performs large changes in its control. The use of DRL for active flow control may provide a technique to finally take advantage of advanced, complex flow actuation possibilities, such as those allowed by complex jet actuator arrays.

## 5 Appendix: Open Source code

The code source of this project is released as open source on the Github of the author: [will be released upon publication]. The simulation environment is based on the open source finite element framework FEniCS Logg *et al.* (2012) v 2017.2.0. The PPO agent is based on the open source implementation provided by Tensorforce Schaarschmidt *et al.* (2017), which builds on top of the Tensorflow framework for building Artificial Neural Networks Abadi *et al.* (2016).

## References

- ABADI, MARTÍN, BARHAM, PAUL, CHEN, JIANMIN, CHEN, ZHIFENG, DAVIS, ANDY, DEAN, JEFFREY, DEVIN, MATTHIEU, GHEMAWAT, SANJAY, IRVING, GEOFFREY, ISARD, MICHAEL & OTHERS 2016 Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In *OSDI*, , vol. 16, pp. 265–283.
- BARBAGALLO, ALEXANDRE, DERGHAM, GREGORY, SIPP, DENIS, SCHMID, PETER J & ROBINET, JEAN-CHRISTOPHE 2012 Closed-loop control of unsteadiness over a rounded backward-facing step. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **703**, 326–362.
- BARBAGALLO, ALEXANDRE, SIPP, DENIS & SCHMID, PETER J 2009 Closed-loop control of an open cavity flow using reduced-order models. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **641**, 1–50.
- DEAN, BRIAN & BHUSHAN, BHARAT 2010 Shark-skin surfaces for fluid-drag reduction in turbulent flow: a review. *Philosophical transactions. Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences* **368** **1929**, 4775–806.
- DUAN, YAN, CHEN, XI, HOUTHOOFT, REIN, SCHULMAN, JOHN & ABBEEL, PIETER 2016 Benchmarking deep reinforcement learning for continuous control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1329–1338.
- FRANSSON, JENS HM, TALAMELLI, ALESSANDRO, BRANDT, LUCA & COSSU, CARLO 2006 Delaying transition to turbulence by a passive mechanism. *Physical review letters* **96** (6), 064501.
- GAUTIER, NICOLAS, AIDER, J-L, DURIEZ, THOMAS, NOACK, BR, SEGOND, MARC & ABEL, MARKUS 2015 Closed-loop separation control using machine learning. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **770**, 442–457.
- GEUZAIN, CHRISTOPHE & REMACLE, JEAN-FRANÇOIS 2009 Gmsh: A 3-d finite element mesh generator with built-in pre-and post-processing facilities. *International journal for numerical methods in engineering* **79** (11), 1309–1331.
- GLEZER, ARI 2011 Some aspects of aerodynamic flow control using synthetic-jet actuation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **369** (1940), 1476–1494.

- GODA, KATUHIKO 1979 A multistep technique with implicit difference schemes for calculating two- or three-dimensional cavity flows. *Journal of Computational Physics* **30** (1), 76 – 95.
- GOODFELLOW, IAN, BENGIO, YOSHUA & COURVILLE, AARON 2016 Deep learning. Book in preparation for MIT Press.
- GU, SHIXIANG, LILICRAP, TIMOTHY, SUTSKEVER, ILYA & LEVINE, SERGEY 2016 Continuous deep q-learning with model-based acceleration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2829–2838.
- HE, KAIMING, ZHANG, XIANGYU, REN, SHAOQING & SUN, JIAN 2016 Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778.
- HORNIK, KURT, STINCHCOMBE, MAXWELL & WHITE, HALBERT 1989 Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural Networks* **2** (5), 359 – 366.
- KOBER, JENS, BAGNELL, J. ANDREW & PETERS, JAN 2013 Reinforcement learning in robotics: A survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research* **32** (11), 1238–1274, arXiv: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364913495721>.
- KRIZHEVSKY, ALEX, SUTSKEVER, ILYA & HINTON, GEOFFREY E 2012 Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1097–1105.
- KUTZ, J. NATHAN 2017 Deep learning in fluid dynamics. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **814**, 1–4.
- LECUN, YANN, BENGIO, YOSHUA & HINTON, GEOFFREY 2015 Deep learning. *Nature* **521**, 436–444.
- LILICRAP, TIMOTHY P, HUNT, JONATHAN J, PRITZEL, ALEXANDER, HEESS, NICOLAS, EREZ, TOM, TASSA, YUVAL, SILVER, DAVID & WIERSTRA, DAAN 2015 Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971* .
- LOGG, ANDERS, MARDAL, KENT-ANDRE & WELLS, GARTH 2012 *Automated solution of differential equations by the finite element method: The FEniCS book*, , vol. 84. Springer Science & Business Media.
- MNIH, VOLODYMYR, KAVUKCUOGLU, KORAY, SILVER, DAVID, GRAVES, ALEX, ANTONOGLU, IOANNIS, WIERSTRA, DAAN & RIEDMILLER, MARTIN 2013 Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602* .
- MNIH, VOLODYMYR, KAVUKCUOGLU, KORAY, SILVER, DAVID, RUSU, ANDREI A, VENESS, JOEL, BELLEMARE, MARC G, GRAVES, ALEX, RIEDMILLER, MARTIN, FIDJELAND, ANDREAS K, OSTROVSKI, GEORG & OTHERS 2015 Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature* **518** (7540), 529.
- RABAULT, JEAN, KOLAAS, JOSTEIN & JENSEN, ATLE 2017 Performing particle image velocimetry using artificial neural networks: a proof-of-concept. *Measurement Science and Technology* **28** (12), 125301.
- RAUBER, PAULO E, FADEL, SAMUEL G, FALCAO, ALEXANDRE X & TELEA, ALEXANDRU C 2017 Visualizing the hidden activity of artificial neural networks. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics* **23** (1), 101–110.
- SCHAARSCHMIDT, MICHAEL, KUHNLE, ALEXANDER & FRICKE, KAI 2017 Tensorforce: A tensorflow library for applied reinforcement learning. Web page.
- SCHÄFER, M., TUREK, S., DURST, F., KRAUSE, E. & RANNACHER, R. 1996 *Benchmark Computations of Laminar Flow Around a Cylinder*, pp. 547–566. Wiesbaden: Vieweg+Teubner Verlag.
- SCHMIDHUBER, JÜRGEN 2015a Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural networks* **61**, 85–117.
- SCHMIDHUBER, JÜRGEN 2015b Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural Networks* **61**, 85 – 117.
- SCHOPPA, WADE & HUSSAIN, FAZLE 1998 A large-scale control strategy for drag reduction in turbulent boundary layers. *Physics of Fluids* **10** (5), 1049–1051.
- SCHULMAN, JOHN, LEVINE, SERGEY, MORITZ, PHILIPP, JORDAN, MICHAEL I. & ABBEEL, PIETER 2015 Trust region policy optimization. *CoRR abs/1502.05477*, arXiv: 1502.05477.
- SCHULMAN, JOHN, WOLSKI, FILIP, DHARIWAL, PRAFULLA, RADFORD, ALEC & KLIMOV, OLEG 2017 Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347* .



- SHAHINFAR, SHAHAB, SATTARZADEH, SOHRAB S, FRANSSON, JENS HM & TALAMELLI, ALESSANDRO 2012 Revival of classical vortex generators now for transition delay. *Physical review letters* **109** (7), 074501.
- SIEGELMANN, H.T. & SONTAG, E.D. 1995 On the computational power of neural nets. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **50** (1), 132 – 150.
- SIPP, DENIS & SCHMID, PETER J 2016 Linear closed-loop control of fluid instabilities and noise-induced perturbations: A review of approaches and tools. *Applied Mechanics Reviews* **68** (2), 020801.
- VALEN-SENDSTAD, KRISTIAN, LOGG, ANDERS, MARDAL, KENT-ANDRE, NARAYANAN, HARISH & MORTENSEN, MIKAEL 2012 A comparison of finite element schemes for the incompressible navier–stokes equations. In *Automated Solution of Differential Equations by the Finite Element Method*, pp. 399–420. Springer.
- VERNET, J, ÖRLÜ, R, ALFREDSSON, PH, ELOFSSON, P & SCANIA, AB 2014 Flow separation delay on trucks a-pillars by means of dielectric barrier discharge actuation. In *First international conference in numerical and experimental aerodynamics of road vehicles and trains (Aerovehicles 1)*, Bordeaux, France, pp. 1–2.
- WANG, Z, XIAO, D, FANG, F, GOVINDAN, R, PAIN, CC & GUO, Y 2018 Model identification of reduced order fluid dynamics systems using deep learning. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids* **86** (4), 255–268.