Computational Mechanics '88

Theory and Applications

Proceedings of the International Conference on
Computational Engineering Science
April 10–14, 1988, Atlanta, GA, USA

Volume 2

Editors: S.N. Atluri, G. Yagawa

Springer-Verlag
Berlin Heidelberg New York London Paris Tokyo

New Approach to Advection-Dominated Flows and Comparison with Other Methods

I. Herrera

Geophysics Institute, National Univesity of Mexico, Mexico, D.F.

Summary

Herrera's Optimal Test Function Method is briefly explained. From numerical experiments carried out up to now, it is concluded that the only procedure with a comparable efficiency is the version of Petrov-Galerkin due to Hughes and Brooks. Comparisons of the test functions used in these two methods show that Hughes and Brooks' test functions are a good approximation of the author's optimal test functions in a well defined range of Peclet's numbers. Outside this range, however, Herrera's optimal test functions can be expected to be more efficient.

Introduction

The numerical solution of the advective-diffusive transport equation is a problem of great importance because many problems in science and engineering have mathematical representations characterized by sharp fronts. This happens when the process is advection dominated, in which case its numerical treatment is very difficult. Considerable work has been expended in developing discretization formulae for this kind of problems [1-3]. Most have focused on upstream weighting techniques. A fundamental criticism to these methods is the essentially ad-hoc nature of their development. This is manifested through the presence of an arbitrary parameter, the choice of which has to be decided by the analyst. An alternative and very promising approach has been introduced by the author [4-9]. In the past several researchers [2,3], when developing test functions, have considered them optimal when they yield exact values at the nodes. More generally, the author has proposed to consider a system of weighting functions optimal when they yield exact values at inter-element boundaries for arbitrary excitation terms. When this is done, this criterium of optimality reduces to the notion of T(Trefftz)-completeness which has been introduced by the author

[4]. Herrera's approach consists in using optimal test functions (OTF) systematically.

Numerical comparisons have been carried out between the results obtained using the author's method and other procedures [9]. In general, it was found that the OTF method yields more satisfactory results. The only procedure whose results were very close, is the Petrov-Galerkin method of Hughes and Brooks [3]. In this paper Herrera's OTF method is described. Then, a comparison between the test functions used in these two methods is carried out. They are shown to be quite similar up to fairly large values of the element Peclet number. The optimal test functions used in the author's approach are derived via the solution of the adjoint differential equation. The test functions of Hughes and Brooks are derived in a relatively ad-hoc manner and using very different considerations. However, they turn out to be good approximations of the solutions of the adjoint differential equation (OTF), except for very large values of the element Peclet number. This explains the good preformance of Hughes approach in the corresponding range of Peclet numbers; outside of which the advantages of the author's approach are more clear (Fig. 2).

Herrera's OTF Method

Let us introduce the approximation for one-dimensional steady-state transport equation with sources, given by

$$\mathcal{L}\, u \equiv \frac{d}{dx}\left(D\,\frac{du}{dx}\right) - V\frac{du}{dx} + Ru = f_{\Omega}(x), \quad 0 \le x \le \ell \tag{1}$$

$$u(0) = g_o \tag{2a}$$

$$u(\ell) = g_{\ell} \tag{2b}$$

First type boundary conditions are chosen for convenience of presentation only. The numerical procedure has been implemented for general differential equations and general boundary conditions [6-8].

The domain $[0,\ell]$ is divided into E subintervals, or elements (not necessarily equal), $\{[x_o,x_1],\ [x_1,x_2],\ldots,[x_{E-1},x_E]\}$, where $x_o=0$ and $x_E=\ell$. This yields E+1 nodal points $\{x_o,x_1,\ldots,x_E\}$.

We adopt the representation

$$u(0)= \sum_{j=0}^{E} U_j \Phi_j(x) \tag{3}$$

where U_j are the nodal values of $u(x)$. A test function $w(x)$ will be taken localized in the union of two neighboring subintervals $[x_{j-1},x_j]$ and $[x_j,x_{j+1}]$, where x_j is any interior node (Fig. 1). In addition, the test function w satisfies

$$w(x_{j-1})=0 \tag{4a}$$

$$w(x_{j+1})=0 \tag{4b}$$

$$w(x_j-) = w(x_j+) \tag{4c}$$

Conditon (4c) states that the limits from the right and from the left agree at the node x_j;i.e. w is continuous at node x_j. However, generally, the derivative of the test function w will have a jump discontinuity at x_j (Fig. 1).

Multiplying $\mathcal{L}u$ by w, integrating from x_{j-1} to x_{j+1}, and applying "generalized Gauss Theorem" for functions with jump discontinuities (see, for example [10]), it is obtained.

$$\int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} w\mathcal{L}u\,dx = -\left[uD\frac{dw}{dx}\right]_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} + \left[\!\left[uD\frac{dw}{dx}\right]\!\right]_{x_j} + \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} u\mathcal{L}^{*}w\,dx \tag{5}$$

Here, the "jump" $[\![\ ]\!]$, is defined by

$$\left[\!\left[uD\frac{dw}{dx}\right]\!\right]_{x_j} = u_j(x_j+)D\frac{dw}{dx}(x_j+)-u(x_j-)D\frac{dw}{dx}(x_j-) \tag{6}$$

while the adjoint operator $\mathcal{L}^{*}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^{*}w \equiv \frac{d}{dx}\left(D\frac{dw}{dx}\right) + \frac{d}{dx}(Vw) + Rw \tag{7}$$

In the author's procedure, the optimal test function w satisfies $\mathcal{L}^{*}w=0$. In this case, combining (5) with (1), it is obtained

$$A_{j-}U_{j-1}+A_jU_j+A_{j+}U_{j+1} = \int_{x_{j-1}}^{x_{j+1}} wf_{\Omega}dx \tag{8}$$

where

$$A_{j-} = (D\frac{dw}{dx})_{x_{j-1}} ; \quad A_j = \left\| D\frac{dw}{dx} \right\|_{x_j} ; \quad A_{j+1} = -(D\frac{dw}{dx})_{x_{j+1}} \tag{9}$$

When equation (8) is applied at each one of the interior nodes (i.e., $j=1,\ldots,E-1$), the unknown values $(U_1,\ldots,U_{E-1})$ of the solution there, can be obtained from the resulting system of E-1 equations. Before closing this Section, we observe that the optimal test function w used in (8), may be thought as defined throughout the whole interval $[0,\ell]$, if its value is identically zero outside $[x_{j-1},x_{j+1}]$. In view of equations (4), such test function is continuous on $[0,\mathcal{L}]$ but its derivative has jumped discontinuities at interior nodes.

Comparison with Petrov-Galerkin

The procedure explained before has been applied to advection dominated problems using semi-discretization [9]. The results so obtained are quite satisfactory, being oscillation free, to a large extent. The only method whose results are close for a large range of Peclet numbers is the Petrov-Galerkin version of Hughes and Brooks [3]. After a more careful analysis it was found that this is due to the fact that the weighting functions used in both methods are close to each other.

For the case when $D\equiv 1$, $R\equiv 0$ and V is constant, in equation (1), Hughes' test function is

$$w = \phi + \tfrac{1}{2}[(\coth\alpha) - 1/\alpha]\ V\frac{d\phi}{dx} \tag{10}$$

where ϕ is a basis function and $\alpha = Vh/2$ is the element Peclet number. In Fig. 2, the test functions for both methods are compared for $\alpha=1,3,5,7$ and 10.

Thus, we can conclude that the weighting function used in HB-Petrov-Galerkin method is a good approximation of Herrera's Optimal Test Function, up to Peclet numbers of 1. Beyond this value, they are clearly different and because of their optimality property Herrera's test functions can be expected to be more efficient.

References

1.. Allen, M.B. and Pinder, G.F., Collocation Simulation of Multiphase Porous Medium Flow, Soc. Pet. Eng. J., 23 (1) pp. 135-142, 1983.

2. Christie, I.; Griffiths, D.F. and Mitchell, A.R., Finite Element Methods for Second Order Differential Equations with Significant First Derivatives, Int. J. Num. Method. Engng., 10, 1389-1396 (1976).

3. Hughes, T.J.R. and Brooks, A., A theoretical framework for Petrov-Galerkin methods with discontinuous weighting functions: Applications to the streamline-upwind procedure, in Finite Elements in Fluids, Vol. 4, Gallagher, et al., eds., 47-65, Wiley, N.Y. 1982.

4. Herrera, I.., Boundary Methods: An Algebraic Theory, Pitman Advanced Publishing Program, Boston, London 1984.

5. Herrera, I., Unified approach of numerical methods. Part I, Green's formulas for operators in discontinuous fields Numerical Methods for Partial Differential Equations, 1 (1), 12-37, 1985. Part 2, Finite elements, boundary methods and its coupling Numer. Meths. for Partial Differential Equations 1 (3), 159-186. 1985.

6. Herrera, I., Chargoy, L. and Alduncin, G., Unified approach of numerical methods. Part. 3. Finite differences and ordinary differential equations. Numer. Meths. for Partial Differential Equations, 1, (4), 241-258, 1985.

7. Herrera, I., The algebraic theory approach for ordinary differential equation:Highly accurate finite differences. Numer. Meths. for Partial Differential Equations, 3, (3), 199-218, 1987.

8. Celia, M. and Herrera, I., Solution of general ordinary differential equations using the algebraic theory approach, Numer. Meths. for Partial Differential Equations, 3 (2), 117-129, 1987.

9. Celia, M., Herrera, I. and Kindered, S., A new numerical approach for the advective-diffusive transport equation, Comunicaciones Técnicas del Instituto de Geofísica, (UNAM), No. 7, 1987.

10. Allen, M., Herrera, I. and Pinder, G., Numerical Modelling in Science and Engineering, John Wiley, 1987.