

AD-A214 711 ACTION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE 30 Sept 82	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final (1 Oct 81-30 Sep 82)
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE ALGORITHMS FOR COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS			5. FUNDING NUMBERS 61102F 2307-A1
6. AUTHOR(S) Saul Abarbanel			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Massachusetts Institute of Technology Dept of Aeronautics & Astronautics Cambridge, MA 02139			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER 1663
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) AFOSR bldg 410 BAFB DC 20332-6448			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER AFOSR-82-0039
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; Distribution Unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) DTIC ELECTE NOV 29 1989 S B D DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A Approved for public release; Distribution Unlimited			
14. SUBJECT TERMS			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 6
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (890104 Draft)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18
298-101

89

11

3

47

Not to DHC

Final report 1 Oct 81 - 30 Sept 82

SCIENTIFIC REPORT

ALGORITHMS FOR COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS

1 Sept. 1980 - May 31, 1981

1 Sept. 1981 - Sept. 30, 1981

Saul Abarbanel

1663

AFOSR-TR-89-~~1663~~

This research has been sponsored in part by the
Air Force Office of Scientific Research (NAM),
United States Air Force, under Grants AFOSR-80-
0249 and AFOSR-82-0039.

Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

1

During the period covered by the Grants attention has been focused on three areas, all of them of importance in the successful application of implicit algorithms to Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD):

1. The role of boundary conditions for implicit hyperbolic schemes.
2. The stability of hyperbolic Approximate Factorization schemes in three space dimensions, /
3. The rate of convergence to steady state of ADI methods.

This report delineates the progress in each of the above enumerated areas. The details of the research will be found in reports and papers as referenced below for each of the tasks.

1. Role of Boundary Conditions

It is well known that for problems governed by hyperbolic partial differential equations one cannot specify boundary conditions along all the domain. In fact, every point on the boundary which receives information, via the characteristics, from the initial data must be excluded from boundary value specification. On the other hand, in the numerical solution of the approximating difference equations one must often use those "excluded" boundary points in order to advance the integration temporally. (This may be avoided by using upwind differencing; one then, however, may pay a price--e.g. lower spatial accuracy.) The theory of how to treat numerically these "forbidden" hyperbolic boundaries is due to Kriess et al [1,2,3,4,5] and Osher [6,7]. The theory is not easy to apply to systems of equations or in more than one space dimension. In the multidimensional case one must assume periodic solutions in the directions not normal to the boundary being investigated. Application of the G-K-S theory to one-dimensional Beam-Warming type algorithms was carried out by Gustafsson and Olinger [8], and Yee, Beam and Warming [9] for extrapolation-type boundary conditions.

In the present research it was thought interesting to find out whether the conclusions drawn from the one-dimensional analysis carry over to the 2-D case. Some previous work [10] with explicit schemes indicated that this is not always the case. The details of the present investigation were reported at the NASA-Ames workshop on boundary conditions (Oct. 1981), have come out as an ICASE report and were published in the JCP [11]. The major conclusions of this study may be summarized as follows: extrapolation-type boundary



Code	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

conditions which are stable in one dimension will remain so in two dimensions if the indicated extrapolation is carried out in a direction normal to the plane of the boundary. If the extrapolation is done in a non-normal direction (skewed to the boundary plane), then the outcome depends on the nature of the basic internal-points algorithm. If this internal scheme is strictly dissipative (e.g. MacCormack's algorithm), then the 1-D results carry over even if the extrapolation in 2-D be performed in a direction skewed to the boundary plane. If, on the other hand, the internal scheme is not strictly dissipative (e.g. backward Euler), then the 1-D boundary treatment remains stable only if the extrapolation is normal to the boundary plane; otherwise it is unstable (not even conditionally stable).

2. Stability of 3-D Hyperbolic Approximate Factorization Schemes

It has been pointed out by Dwyer and Thames [12] that the Beam-Warming algorithm in 3-D is unstable for the linear wave equation. It was suspected but not demonstrated that this is also true of the system of linearized equations resulting from Euler's equations of gas-dynamics.

As part of the present research effort it was undertaken first to demonstrate the instability of the Approximate Factorization, backward Euler algorithm when applied to the equations of gas-dynamics (Euler equations). The second task was to try and construct an algorithm which will retain the advantages of the Beam-Warming algorithm (approximate factorization of the implicit terms, "delta form" of the unknown vector), or of the LODQ algorithm (see [12]), and yet become stable due to changes introduced into the explicit terms only. Both tasks were completed successfully and are reported in [13].

The new stabilized algorithm has the following features: three LOD (locally one dimensional) fractional steps are followed by an explicit step. The total algorithm is stable in 3 dimensions, is spatially second order accurate for a large range of the Courant number when it converges to steady state. The intermediate steps leading to the steady state are not time consistent and hence do not represent a truly evolving solution. This new algorithm when applied to the 2-dimensional case (which is stable for the standard AF methods) accelerates the convergence to steady state by factors between 2 to 3 depending on the mesh size. The numerical

experiments carried out in connection with this work brought out the little known (or rather little acknowledged) fact that the rate of convergence of hyperbolic AF algorithms to steady state is very sensitive to the time step. In fact, for the linear wave equation, the optimal, Courant number is of order unity. Similar results for the full Euler equations were also reported by Thompkins and Bush [14]. These empirical observations led us to concentrate on the third topic.

3. Convergence Rate to Steady State of ADI Method

ADI methods for elliptic partial differential equations were proposed already in the 1950's. Particularly well known were the algorithms due to Peaceman and Rachford [15] and Douglass and Gunn [16]. In recent years ADI methods were advocated to solve parabolic and hyperbolic partial differential equations, see Beam and Warming [17], and Briley and McDonald [18]. The motivation for this extension of ADI schemes was to combine the convenience of one-dimensional easily invertible operators and the unconditional stability of implicit methods. As pointed out above, the large expected gains over direct explicit solvers have not been realized fully. This is so because the rate of convergence to steady state is very sensitive to the Courant number and it decreases rapidly, i.e. the iteration count grows rapidly, when the calculation is carried out away from an optimal time step. At the optimal Courant number the convergence rate is comparable to those of explicit methods.

The work carried out under the present Grants concentrated so far on the parabolic case which is easier to analyze. The results obtained so far may be summarized as follows (see [19]):

3.1 The convergence to steady state of parabolic ADI solvers, such as the Douglass-Gunn or the Peaceman-Rachford algorithms, is analyzed in terms of the L_2 norm of the residual. This approach, which assumes the presence of many frequencies and averages over their spectrum, turns out to be successful in predicting how the number of iterations needed to converge to steady state depends on the Courant number.

3.2 A new corrected ADI algorithm has been devised which has the following properties:

- a) Its construction necessitates only the addition of the same explicit term to all existing Approximate Factorization codes.

b) It is robust in the sense that it need not be fine-tuned for different mesh sizes, different grid stretchings, mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions, etc.

c) The rate of convergence to steady state is substantially improved and is insensitive to the Courant number over a large range.

d) Its method of derivation is easily extended to the three-dimensional case.

REFERENCES

1. Kreiss, H.O., "Difference Approximations for the Initial-Boundary Value Problem for Hyperbolic Differential Equations," Numerical Solutions of Nonlinear Differential Equations, Proc. Adv. Symposium, Madison, Wis., Wiley, New York, pp 141-146 (1966).
2. Kreiss, H.O., "Stability Theory for Difference Approximations of Mixed Initial Boundary Value Problems," Math.Comp., Vol. 22, pp 703-714 (1968).
3. Kreiss, H.O., "Initial Boundary Value Problems for Hyperbolic Systems," Comm. Pure and Appl. Math., Vol. 23, pp 277-298 (1970).
4. Gustafsson, B., Kreiss, H.O. and Sundstrom, A., "Stability Theory of Difference Equations for Mixed Initial Boundary Value Problems. II," Math. Comp., Vol. 26, pp 649-686 (1972).
5. Gustafsson, B. and Kreiss, H.O., "Boundary Conditions for Time Dependent Problems with An Artificial Boundary," J.Comp.Phys., Vol. 30, pp 333-351 (1979).
6. Osher, S., "Stability of Difference Approximations of Dissipative Type for Mixed Initial-Boundary Value Problems, I." Math.Comp., Vol. 23, pp 335-340 (1969).
7. Osher, S., "Systems of Difference Equations with General Homogeneous Boundary Conditions," Trans.Am.Math.Soc., Vol. 137, pp 177-201 (1969).
8. Gustafsson, B. and Olinger, J., "Stable Boundary Approximations for a Class of Time Discretizations of $U_t = AD U$," Report No. 87, Dept. of Computer Science, Uppsala U., Sweden (1980).
9. Yee, H.C., Beam, R.M. and Warming, R.F., "Stable Boundary Approximations for a Class of Implicit Schemes for the One-Dimensional Inviscid Equations of Gas-Dynamics," AIAA paper 81-1009, CP, AIAA 5th Comp. Fluid Dyn. Conf., Palo Alto, CA (1981).
10. Abarbanel, S.S. and Gottlieb, D., "Stability of Two-Dimensional Initial Boundary Value Problems Using Leap-Frog Type Schemes," Math.Comp., Vol. 33, pp 1145-1155 (1979).

11. Abarbanel, S.S. and Murman, E.M., "Stability of Two-Dimensional Hyperbolic Initial-Boundary Value Problems for Explicit and Implicit Schemes," J.Comp.Phys., Vol. 48, pp 160-167 (1982) (Also ICASE report No. 81-29)
12. Dwoyer, D.L. and Thames, F.C., "Temporal and Spatial Inconsistencies of Time-Split Finite Difference Schemes," NASA Tech. Paper 1790, Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA (1981).
13. Abarbanel, S.S., Dwoyer, D.L. and Gottlieb, D., "Stable Implicit Finite Differences Methods for Three Dimensional Hyperbolic Systems," ICASE Report No. 82-39 (1982).
14. Thompkins, W.T., Jr., and Bush, R.H., "Boundary Treatments for Implicit Solutions to Euler and Navier-Stokes Equations," Symp. on Numerical Boundary Conditions, Oct. 1981, Moffett Field, CA, NASA Conference Publication 2201, pp 353-366 (1982).
15. Peaceman, D.W. and Rachford, H.H., "The Numerical Solution of Parabolic and Elliptic Differential Equations," J.Soc.Ind.Appl.Math., Vol. 3, pp 28-41 (1955).
16. Douglas, J. and Gunn, J.E., "A General Formulation of Alternating Direction Methods," Numer.Math., Vol. 6, pp 428-453 (1964).
17. Beam, R.M. and Warming, R.F., "An Implicit Factored Scheme for the Compressible Navier Stokes Equations," AIAA Journal, Vol. 16, pp 393-402 (1978).
18. Briely, W.R. and McDonald, H., "Solution of the Three Dimensional Compressible Navier-Stokes Equations by an Implicit Technique," Proc. of 4th Int. Conf. on Numerical Methods in Fluid Dynamics, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 35, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1975).
19. Abarbanel, S.S., Dwoyer, D.L. and Gottlieb, D., "On Improving the Convergence Rate of Parabolic ADI Methods," ICASE Report No. 82-28 (1982).