

Lecture 13

Monday, May 16, 2005

Supplementary Reading: Osher and Fedkiw, §18.3, §23.1

1 Projection Method (cont.)

From the previous lectures, we have the following steps in updating the velocity field for incompressible flow using the projection method:

1. Compute the intermediate velocity field \vec{V}^* (at cell faces)

$$\frac{\vec{V}^* - \vec{V}^n}{\Delta t} + \vec{V} \cdot \nabla \vec{V} = \vec{g} \quad (1)$$

2. Solve an elliptic equation for the pressure (at cell centers)

$$\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla p \right) = \frac{\nabla \cdot \vec{V}^*}{\Delta t} \quad (2)$$

3. Compute the divergence free velocity field \vec{V}^{n+1} (at cell faces)

$$\frac{\vec{V}^{n+1} - \vec{V}^*}{\Delta t} + \frac{\nabla p}{\rho} = 0 \quad (3)$$

We can multiply p by Δt , to get $p^* = p\Delta t$, and rewrite steps 2 and 3 as

2a.

$$\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \nabla p^* \right) = \nabla \cdot \vec{V}^* \quad (4)$$

3a.

$$\vec{V}^{n+1} - \vec{V}^* + \frac{\nabla p^*}{\rho} = 0 \quad (5)$$

If ρ is constant, then we can move it under the ∇ operator and defining $\hat{p} = \frac{p^* \Delta t}{\rho}$, we can rewrite steps 2 and 3 as

2b.

$$\Delta \hat{p} = \nabla \cdot \vec{V}^* \quad (6)$$

3b.

$$\vec{V}^{n+1} - \vec{V}^* + \nabla \hat{p} = 0 \quad (7)$$

Here we discuss the discretization in step 2 of the term $\nabla \cdot \vec{V}^*$. Since we are solving for the pressure, which on the MAC grid lives at the cell centers, we need to discretize the term at the cell centers. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\nabla \cdot \vec{V}^* \right)_{i,j} &= (u_x^* + v_y^*)_{i,j} \\ &= \frac{u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}^* - u_{i-\frac{1}{2},j}^*}{\Delta x} + \frac{v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^* - v_{i,j-\frac{1}{2}}^*}{\Delta y} + O(\Delta x^2) + O(\Delta y^2) \end{aligned}$$

So we have used the intermediate velocity stored at the cell faces to get a second order accurate approximation to $\nabla \cdot \vec{V}^*$ at the cell centers.

Next, we look at computing \vec{V}^{n+1} in step 3b (constant ρ). In 2D, the equation is

$$(u^{n+1}, v^{n+1}) - (u^*, v^*) + (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y) = 0$$

where we have written the vectors as row vectors. Therefore we have the two equations

$$\begin{cases} u^{n+1} - u^* + \hat{p}_x = 0 \\ v^{n+1} - v^* + \hat{p}_y = 0 \end{cases}$$

We need a discretization of (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y) at the appropriate cell faces.

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}^{n+1} - u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}^* + (\hat{p}_x)_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} &= 0 \\ v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+1} - v_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^* + (\hat{p}_y)_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{p}_x)_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} &= \frac{\hat{p}_{i+1,j} - \hat{p}_{i,j}}{\Delta x} + O(\Delta x^2) \\ (\hat{p}_x)_{i-\frac{1}{2},j} &= \frac{\hat{p}_{i,j} - \hat{p}_{i-1,j}}{\Delta x} + O(\Delta x^2) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the discretization

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta \hat{p})_{i,j} = (\nabla \cdot (\nabla \hat{p}))_{i,j} &= \frac{(\hat{p}_x)_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} - (\hat{p}_x)_{i-\frac{1}{2},j}}{\Delta x} + \frac{(\hat{p}_y)_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} - (\hat{p}_y)_{i,j-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta y} + O(\Delta x^2) + O(\Delta y^2) \\ &= \frac{\hat{p}_{i+1,j} - 2\hat{p}_{i,j} + \hat{p}_{i-1,j}}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{\hat{p}_{i,j+1} - 2\hat{p}_{i,j} + \hat{p}_{i,j-1}}{\Delta y^2} + O(\Delta x^2) + O(\Delta y^2). \end{aligned}$$

We have now discussed the details of the discretizations for steps 1, 2, and 3 of the projection method for incompressible flow.

2 Heat Equation

Starting from conservation of mass, momentum and energy one can derive

$$\rho e_t + \rho \vec{V} \cdot \nabla e + p \nabla \cdot \vec{V} = \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) \quad (8)$$

where

- k : thermal conductivity
- T : temperature
- e : internal energy/unit mass
- ρe : internal energy/unit volume

The assumptions that e and T satisfy the relationship

$$de = c_v dT$$

and that $\nabla \cdot \vec{V} = 0$, simplify equation 8 to

$$\rho c_v T_t + \rho c_v \vec{V} \cdot \nabla T = \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) \quad (9)$$

which can be further simplified to the standard heat equation

$$\rho c_v T_t = \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T) \quad (10)$$

ignoring the effects of convection, i.e. setting $\vec{V} = 0$. If k is constant, this can be written as

$$T_t = \frac{k}{\rho c_v} \Delta T. \quad (11)$$

Applying explicit Euler time discretization to equation 10 results in

$$\frac{T^{n+1} - T^n}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{\rho c_v} \nabla \cdot (k \nabla T^n) \quad (12)$$

where either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions can be applied on the boundaries of the computational domain. Assuming that ρ and c_v are constants allows us to rewrite this equation as

$$\frac{T^{n+1} - T^n}{\Delta t} = \nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^n) \quad (13)$$

with $\hat{k} = \frac{k}{\rho c_v}$. Standard central differencing (second order accurate) can be used for the spatial derivatives as in

$$\frac{\hat{k}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} \left(\frac{T_{i+1,j} - T_{i,j}}{\Delta x} \right) - \hat{k}_{i-\frac{1}{2},j} \left(\frac{T_{i,j} - T_{i-1,j}}{\Delta x} \right)}{\Delta x}$$

A time step restriction of

$$\Delta t \hat{k} \left(\frac{2}{(\Delta x)^2} + \frac{2}{(\Delta y)^2} + \frac{2}{(\Delta z)^2} \right) \leq 1 \quad (14)$$

is needed for stability. If we $\Delta x = \Delta y$, then this is

$$4 \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \hat{k} \leq 1$$

In $3D$, the restriction is $6 \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \hat{k} \leq 1$ and in general for nD the restriction is $2n \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \hat{k} \leq 1$.

Implicit Euler time discretization

$$\frac{T^{n+1} - T^n}{\Delta t} = \nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^{n+1}) \quad (15)$$

avoids this time step stability restriction. This equation can be rewritten as

$$T^{n+1} - \Delta t \nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^{n+1}) = T^n \quad (16)$$

discretizing the $\nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^{n+1})$ term using central differencing. For each unknown, T_i^{n+1} , equation 16 is used to fill in one row of a matrix creating a linear system of equations. Since the resulting matrix is symmetric, a number of fast linear solvers can be used (e.g. a PCG method with an incomplete Choleski preconditioner, see Golub and Van Loan [1]). Equation 15 is first order accurate in time and second order accurate in space, and Δt needs to be chosen proportional to Δx^2 in order to obtain an overall asymptotic accuracy of $O(\Delta x^2)$. However, the stability of the implicit Euler method allows one to chose Δt proportional to Δx saving dramatically on CPU time. The Crank-Nicolson scheme

$$\frac{T^{n+1} - T^n}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^{n+1}) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^n) \quad (17)$$

can be used to achieve second order accuracy in both space and time with Δt proportional to Δx . For the Crank-Nicolson scheme,

$$T^{n+1} - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^{n+1}) = T^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nabla \cdot (\hat{k} \nabla T^n) \quad (18)$$

is used to create a symmetric linear system of equations for the unknowns T_i^{n+1} . Again, all spatial derivatives are computed using standard central differencing.

Why not always use Crank-Nicholson, as it gives second order accuracy and no time step restriction? Let us look at the solution as $\Delta t \rightarrow \infty$. Backward Euler gives

$$\Delta T^n = 0,$$

which is the correct steady state solution. Crank-Nicholson gives

$$\Delta T^{n+1} = -\Delta T^n.$$

In $1D$ this is

$$T_{xx}^{n+1} = -T_{xx}^n$$

This shows that the curvature is changing sign at each time step. So the problem with Crank-Nicholson is that as Δt gets very large, you get oscillations, whereas with backward Euler, you get the steady-state solution.

References

- [1] Golub, G. and Van Loan, C., *Matrix Computations*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1989.