

AD-A035 443

NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER WHITE OAK LAB SILVER SP--ETC F/G 12/1
A NOTE ON THE OPERATOR COYFACT IMPLICIT METHOD FOR THE WAVE EQU--ETC(U)
NOV 76 M CIMENT, S H LEVENTHAL

UNCLASSIFIED

NSWC/WOL/TR-76-153


NL

1 of 1
AD
A035443



END

DATE
FILMED
3-77



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1963-A

P
NW

NSWC/WOL/TR 76-153

NSWC/WOL/TR 76-153

NSWC

**TECHNICAL
REPORT**

WHITE OAK LABORATORY

A 035443

A NOTE ON THE OPERATOR COMPACT IMPLICIT METHOD FOR THE WAVE EQUATION

**BY
Melvyn Ciment
Stephen H. Leventhal**

16 NOVEMBER 1976

**NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER
WHITE OAK LABORATORY
SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND 20910**

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

D D C
RECEIVED
FEB 10 1977
Handwritten initials

**NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER
WHITE OAK, SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND 20910**

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 14 NSWC/WOL/TR-76-153 ✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) 6 A Note on the Operator Compact Implicit Method for the Wave Equation		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
7. AUTHOR(s) 10 Melvyn Ciment, Stephen H. Leventhal		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Surface Weapons Center ✓ White Oak Laboratory White Oak, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61152N: ZR0001: ZR0140201: WA0106
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 16 R00001 17 ZR0140201		12. REPORT DATE 11 16 November 1976
18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 8 (2) 11p
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Wave equation, higher order difference method		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) In a previous paper a fourth order compact implicit scheme was presented for the second order wave equation. A very efficient factorization technique was developed when only second order terms were present. In this note we implement the operator compact implicit spatial discretization method for the second order wave equation when first order terms are present. The resulting algorithm is completely analogous to the compact implicit → next page		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

D D C
 DECLASSIFIED
 FEB 10 1977
 RESERVE

391 596

689

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

cont

algorithm when lower order terms were not present. For this more general operator compact implicit spatial approximation the same factorization as in our previous paper is developed.



UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

NSWC/WOL/TR 76-153

16 November 1976

A Note on the Operator Compact Implicit Method for the Wave Equation

The results of this report represent a continuation of an effort to develop high accuracy efficient methods for solving hyperbolic equations. Here an efficient fourth order method for the multi-dimensional wave equation is presented.

These techniques are also being used to solve parabolic equations arising in viscous fluid flow problems for NAVAIR.

This study has been supported by the Naval Surface Weapons Center Independent Research Fund.

C. A. Fisher

C. A. FISHER
By direction

ACCESSION for	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
U C	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNAN DUNGED	<input type="checkbox"/>
STY/ICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
SPECIAL HANDLING	
A	

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	3
SPATIAL DISCRETIZATIONS.	3
OCI APPLIED TO THE WAVE EQUATION	5
REMARKS.	6



INTRODUCTION

In a previous paper [1] a factorization technique which utilized compact implicit spatial and temporal approximations to the second order wave equation was developed. The method proceeded by separately implementing the so called compact implicit fourth order approximations for each of the individual derivative terms. Notwithstanding, the implicit nature of the basic approximation involved, a factorization technique was described which allowed one to resolve higher space dimension problems by requiring merely the solution of tridiagonal equations. In Section VI of [1] we observed a peculiar aspect of our factorization approach. The same approach required twice as much work when mixed order (first and second) spatial derivative terms were present.

Upon further examination of this approach it became apparent that the problem was numerically improperly posed in requiring too much additional data to complete the factorization.

In this note, we observe that by changing the underlying spatial approximation when lower order terms are present it is possible to obtain an algorithm which completely resembles our algorithm for the case when no lower order terms are present.

In a future paper [2] the operator compact implicit method is developed, in much the same way as here, for parabolic problems.

SPATIAL DISCRETIZATIONS

The classical finite difference approach for solving two point boundary value problems of the form

$$(2.1) \quad L(u) = au_{xx} + bu_x = f, \quad x \in [0,1]$$

with $u(0)$, $u(1)$ given is to separately substitute standard approximations for the first and second derivatives in (2.1) and then solve the resulting system of equations. Accordingly, the fourth order compact implicit scheme applied to the solution of (2.1), requires that one solve

$$(2.2) \quad L_h[U_j] = a_j \left(I + \frac{1}{12} \delta_x^2 \right)^{-1} \frac{\delta_x^2}{h^2} U_j + b_j \left(I + \frac{1}{6} \delta_x^2 \right)^{-1} \frac{\delta_x}{2h} U_j = f_j$$

[1] M. Ciment, S. H. Leventhal, "Higher Order Compact Implicit Schemes for the Wave Equation," Math. of Comp. Vol. 29, No. 132, 1975, pp. 985-994.

[2] M. Ciment, S. H. Leventhal and B. C. Weinberg, "The Operator Compact Implicit Method for Parabolic Equations," to appear.

The notation here picks up from the notation of [1]. References to an equation in [1] will be superscripted with an asterisk. The appearance of two implicit matrices Q_x, R_x (see (2.2)*, (6.2)*) "trapped inside the a_j, b_j " creates problems in trying to solve the resulting linear system of equations. Several people have tried block methods when these basic terms appear in problems [3]. A suitable tri-diagonal relationship however can be obtained by merely abandoning attempts to represent the separate derivative terms. The approach we adopt is to represent $L(U_j)$ on three adjacent points up to highest order accuracy possible in relation to U_j on the same three points.

A Taylor series analysis shows that for $L(u)$ on a uniform grid fourth order accuracy can be obtained by

$$(2.3a) \quad q_j^+ L(u)_{j+1} + q_j^0 L(u)_j + q_j^- L(u)_{j-1} = \frac{r_j^+ u_{j+1} + r_j^0 u_j + r_j^- u_{j-1}}{h^2}$$

where

$$(2.3b) \quad \begin{cases} q_j^+ = 6a_j a_{j-1} + h(5a_{j-1} b_j - 2a_j b_{j-1}) - h^2 b_j b_{j-1} \\ q_j^0 = 4[15a_{j+1} a_{j-1} - 4h(a_{j+1} b_{j-1} - b_{j+1} a_{j-1}) - h^2 b_{j+1} b_{j-1}] \\ q_j^- = 6a_j a_{j+1} - h(5a_{j+1} b_j - 2a_j b_{j+1}) - h^2 b_j b_{j+1} \end{cases}$$

$$(2.3c) \quad \begin{cases} r_j^+ = \frac{1}{2}[q_j^+(2a_{j+1} + 3h b_{j+1}) + q_j^0(2a_j + h b_j) + q_j^-(2a_{j-1} - h b_{j-1})] \\ r_j^- = \frac{1}{2}[q_j^+(2a_{j+1} + h b_{j+1}) + q_j^0(2a_j - h b_j) + q_j^-(2a_{j-1} - 3h b_{j-1})] \\ r_j = -\frac{1}{2}[r_j^+ + r_j^-] \end{cases}$$

The above relationship can be expressed in an operator form by defining tridiagonal displacement operators Q_x, R_x so that the equation (2.3) is represented by

$$(2.4) \quad Q_x L(U)_j = \frac{1}{h^2} R_x U_j$$

Note well, for conciseness of notation we are using Q_x here to represent a different operator from what Q_x represented in [1]. (Indeed in the case that

[3] R. Hirsh, "Higher Order Accurate Difference Solution of Fluid Mechanics Problems by a Compact Differencing Technique," J. Comp. Physics, 19, 1975, pp. 90-109.

a \equiv 1, b \equiv 0 then both are identical.) Below, however, we will still retain the definition of $Q_t = (I + \frac{1}{12} \delta_t^2)$ from our previous paper. The above relationships (2.3) were first presented by Swartz [4]. The operator compact implicit (OCI) representation $Q_x^{-1} R_x$ for $L(u)$ presents the same formal appearance as $Q_x^{-1} \frac{\delta_x^2}{h^2}$ did for u_{xx} alone. By noting this formal similarity it is clear that the OCI spatial discretization can be fully implemented into our factorization algorithm for the time dependent second order wave equation. This all depends on the underlying invertibility of Q_x . As Swartz observes, for the case that a and b are constants, Q_x is invertible so long as the so called mesh Reynolds number r satisfies

$$(2.5) \quad |r| \equiv \left| \frac{hb}{a} \right| \leq \sqrt{12}$$

OCI APPLIED TO THE WAVE EQUATION

To solve (6.1)*

$$(3.1) \quad u_{tt} = L_x(u) + L_y(u)$$

where initial and boundary data are prescribed and where

$$L_x(u) \equiv au_{xx} + bu_x$$

$$L_y(u) \equiv cu_{yy} + du_y$$

one substitutes the operator compact implicit approximation (2.4) for the respective spatial terms and the same compact implicit scheme as before for the temporal term to obtain

$$(3.2) \quad Q_t^{-1} \frac{\delta_t^2}{k^2} U_{j,m}^n = \frac{(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n}{h^2} U_{j,m}^n + \frac{(Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n}{h^2} U_{j,m}^n$$

where

$$(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n U_{j,m}^n \sim L_x(u)_{j,m}^n$$

$$(Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n U_{j,m}^n \sim L_y(u)_{j,m}^n$$

[4] B. K. Swartz, "The Construction of Finite Difference Analogs of Some Finite Element Schemes," *Mathematical Aspects of Finite Elements in Partial Differential Equations* (C. DeBoer, Ed.) Academic Press, 1974, pp. 279-312.

Following our approach in [1] a factorization of (3.2) can be accomplished by adding the fourth order term

$$-\frac{k^4}{144} Q_t^{-1} \frac{\delta^2}{k^2} [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n$$

The resulting form (analogous to (2.9)*) is

$$(3.3) \quad G_{j,m}^{n+1} \equiv [I - \frac{\lambda^2}{12} (Q_x^{n+1})^{-1} R_x^{n+1}] [I - \frac{\lambda^2}{12} (Q_y^{n+1})^{-1} R_y^{n+1}] U_{j,m}^{n+1} \\ = 2G_{j,m}^n - G_{j,m}^{n-1} + \lambda^2 [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n + (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n$$

The numerical implementation of (3.3) above is completely analogous to the algorithm in [1] for equation (4.3)*. Again with

$$(3.4) \quad [I - \frac{\lambda}{12} (Q_y^{n+1})^{-1} R_y^{n+1}] U_{j,m}^{n+1} \equiv Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$$

solve first for $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$ and then for $U_{j,m}^{n+1}$.

The first two terms on the right hand side are known from previous time steps and need not be computed. The other two terms on the right hand side are obtained in a manner analogous to (4.5)*, (4.6)*. By observing that

$$(3.5) \quad \lambda^2 (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n U_{j,m}^n = 12(U_{j,m}^n - Z_{j,m}^n)$$

the left hand side is obtained without much work. $V_{j,m}^n \equiv \lambda^2 (Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n U_{j,m}^n$ is obtained by solving a tridiagonal system.

REMARKS

1. Here too, the algorithm for (3.3) requires that one generate initial data for $G_{j,m}^1, G_{j,m}^0$. These are obtained by solving tridiagonal systems as in (4.9)*.

2. Boundary Data: The computation of the intermediate boundary conditions may be obtained as in the previous paper. However, the following simplification is possible. As before at the four corner points use the analytic representation of $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$ and one sided differences as an approximation for $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$. Then on $x = \text{constant}$ lines solve (3.4)

$$Q_y^{n+1} Z_{j,m}^{n+1} = [Q_y^{n+1} - \frac{\lambda^2}{12} R_y^{n+1}] U_{j,m}^{n+1}.$$

Observe, that the x-sweep part of the algorithm may also be implemented on $y = \text{constant}$ boundary lines as well as on the interior lines. However, this leads to a problem. Experiments reveal that it is necessary to compute $Z_{j,m}^{n+1}$ on the $y = \text{constant}$ boundaries as accurately as possible. Thus it is necessary to use the exact data for $U_{j,m}^{n+1}$ that is given on these lines. However, the definition of $G_{j,m}^{n+1}$ requires that

$$\lambda^2 [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n + (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n,$$

be evaluated and $\lambda^2 (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n$ must be obtained from (3.5), which includes $Z_{j,m}^n$ which is not exact. However, this problem may be avoided by noting that

$$\lambda^2 [(Q_x^n)^{-1} R_x^n + (Q_y^n)^{-1} R_y^n] U_{j,m}^n = \Delta t^2 [L_x u^n + L_y u^n + O(h^4)] = \Delta t^2 [u_{tt} + O(h^4)].$$

$G_{j,m}^{n+1}$ may then be redefined on $y = \text{constant}$ boundary lines as

$$G_{j,m}^{n+1} = 2G_{j,m}^n - G_{j,m}^{n-1} + \left(1 - \frac{\delta_t^2}{12}\right) \delta_t^2 U_{j,m}^n$$

before implementing the first step of the algorithm.

A Fourier stability analysis of (3.3) reveals, by a perturbation argument, that so long as $r \sim h \sim k$ that again for $C = \max(a,b)$ and

$$\sqrt{C} \lambda \leq \sqrt{3} - 1$$

the amplification factors ρ satisfy

$$|\rho| \leq 1 + O(\Delta t)$$

and so the scheme is stable in the sense of von Neumann.

Numerical Example: In this section a numerical example is presented demonstrating the accuracy, effectiveness and the stability of the method.

Let Ω be defined by $[0 \leq x, y \leq .5]$ and define the coefficients, initial conditions, and boundary conditions of (3.1) by

$$a(x,y,t) = \frac{(x+1)^2}{4(t+1)^2}$$

$$b(x,y,t) = \frac{(x+1)^2(y+1)}{4(t+1)}$$

$$e(x,y,t) = \frac{(y+1)^2}{4(t+1)^2}$$

$$d(x,y,t) = \frac{(y+1)^2(x+1)}{4(t+1)}$$

$$u(x,y,0) = e^{(x+1)(y+1)}$$

$$u_t(x,y,0) = (x+1)(y+1)e^{(x+1)(y+1)}$$

$$u(x,y,t)|_{\partial\Omega} = e^{(x+1)(y+1)(t+1)}$$

The exact solution is

$$u(x,y,t) = e^{(x+1)(y+1)(t+1)}$$

The method was run for a sequence of spatial meshes and time steps, so that in each subsequent run we halved the mesh size and time step. In table 1 the accuracy of the method is demonstrated for L_2 -error and relative max-error.

# Time Steps	h	k	L_2 -Error	L_2 -Rate	Relative Max-Error	Relative Max-Rate
20	.1	.05	3.847-05		5.049-06	
				3.74		3.91
40	.05	.025	2.886-06		3.341-07	
				3.97		3.98
80	.025	.0125	1.843-07		2.118-08	
				3.87		3.86
160	.0125	.00625	1.264-08		1.455-09	

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION

Copies

Office of Naval Research
Arlington, Virginia 22217
Attn: Dr. Leila Bram, Code 432

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544
Attn: Dr. Joel Dendy
Dr. Blair Swartz

University of Tennessee
Department of Mathematics
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Attn: Prof. Max Gunzburger

ICASE, NASA Langley
MS 132C
Hampton, Virginia 23665
Attn: Dr. James Ortega

Center of Applied Mathematics
275 Olin Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853
Attn: Prof. James H. Bramble

Brookhaven National Laboratory
Upton, New York 11973
Attn: Dr. Ridgway Scott

Courant Institute
New York University
251 Mercer Street
New York, New York 10012
Attn: Prof. Peter Lax
Prof. Heinz O. Kreiss
Prof. E. Isaacson
Dr. Eli Turkel
Dr. Amiram Harten

Department of Mathematics
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Attn: Prof. Todd Dupont

DISTRIBUTION

Copies

Department of Mathematics
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
Attn: Prof. John Osborn
Prof. I. Babuska
Prof. R. B. Kellogg

ONR Branch Office/Pasadena
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, California 91101
Attn: Dr. Richard Lau

Department of Mathematics
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
Attn: Prof. A. Chorin

Numerical Analysis Center
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78731
Attn: Prof. David Young
Prof. J. T. Oden

California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91109
Attn: Prof. Herbert B. Keller

Mathematics Research Center
U. S. Army
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Attn: Prof. Seymour V. Parter

Applied Physics Laboratory
Johns Hopkins University
Johns Hopkins Road
Laurel, Maryland 20810
Attn: Dr. Joel C. W. Rogers

Mathematics Department
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Attn: Prof. G. Birkhoff
Prof. Garth Baker

DISTRIBUTION

Copies

Department of Computer Sciences
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305
Attn: Professor J. Olinger

University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Attn: Dr. G. Fairweather

Department of Mathematics
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131
Attn: Prof. Cleve Moler

Department of Mathematics
University of North Carolina
Charlotte, NC 28223
Attn: I of. David Archer

Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

12

TO AID IN UPDATING THE DISTRIBUTION LIST
FOR NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER, WHITE
OAK LABORATORY TECHNICAL REPORTS PLEASE
COMPLETE THE FORM BELOW:

TO ALL HOLDERS OF NSWC/WOL/TR 76-153
by Melvin Ciment, Code WA-44

DO NOT RETURN THIS FORM IF ALL INFORMATION IS CURRENT

A. FACILITY NAME AND ADDRESS (OLD) (Show Zip Code)

NEW ADDRESS (Show Zip Code)

B. ATTENTION LINE ADDRESSES:

C.

REMOVE THIS FACILITY FROM THE DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR TECHNICAL REPORTS ON THIS SUBJECT.

D.

NUMBER OF COPIES DESIRED _____

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER
WHITE OAK, SILVER SPRING, MD. 20910

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
900 316



COMMANDER
NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER
WHITE OAK, SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND 20910

ATTENTION: CSBWA 44