

DTIC FILE COPY



NUSC Reprint Report 8313
31 May 1988

AD-A227 769

A Finite-Difference Solution to a Mixed-Type Partial Differential Equation: An Ocean Dynamic Motion Model

Robert M. Kennedy
Test and Evaluation Department

Ding Lee
Environmental and Tactical
Support Systems Department

DTIC
ELECTE
OCT 22 1990
S E D



Naval Underwater Systems Center
Newport, Rhode Island / New London, Connecticut

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Reprint of a paper published in Mathematical and Computer Modelling,
vol. 10, no. 2, 1988.

90 10 10 104

A

R. K. KENNEDY and D. LEE

(Received May 1987)

Communicated by E. Y. Rodin

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525

1. INTRODUCTION

A partial differential equation (PDE) describing the transverse dynamics of a long cylinder in axial flow was first obtained by Paidoussis [1]. This dynamic motion equation is a fourth-order PDE. In many problems of interest the aspect (length-to-diameter) ratio is quite large and the excitation forces are much larger than the diameter. In these cases the flexural stiffness of the cable is negligible relative to the tension stiffness term. Neglecting this term results in a mainstream equation which is a mixed type; varying from a hyperbolic equation to a parabolic equation elliptic equation. Over a decade ago, a solution to this problem was proposed by Ortloff and Ives [2] using the method of separation of variables. Their solution contained Bessel functions whose order and argument are complex and of a magnitude not well approximated by asymptotic solutions. Moreover, the treatment of the free-end boundary condition was through a "bounded" criteria which is not applicable to numerical solutions. The Ortloff and Ives solution [2] is also quite inefficient for arbitrary excitation time services because the solution must be repeated for each frequency present in the Fourier services of the excitation term. Recently, Lee and Kennedy [3] made the problem numerically well-posed by introducing an appropriate treatment to the free-end boundary condition. Then, a combination of the method of lines and a numerical ordinary differential equation (ODE) method (generalized Adams methods) were applied to solve the well-posed problem. Details of the theoretical and numerical developments can be found in Ref. [3]. The efficiency of the above solution can be further improved by a finite-difference scheme. The main theme of this paper is an improved solution using a basic explicit finite-difference scheme. Further, this development is proved theoretically convergent. Prior to the convergence proof, the theory with regard to stability is fully discussed. The consistency condition is examined. The validity of the finite-difference solution is demonstrated by an exact solution test which is used to examine the accuracy of the mathematical formulation as well as computational procedures.

2. PROBLEM AND SOLUTION SUMMARY

75

$$EI \frac{\partial^4 y}{\partial x^4} + (M + m) \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t^2} + MU^2 \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} + 2MU \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial t \partial x} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[\frac{c_T}{2} \left(\frac{M}{D} \right) U^2 (L - x) \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \right] + \frac{1}{2} c_N \frac{M}{D} U \left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} \right) + U \left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \right) = 0. \quad (1)$$

The parameters appearing in equation (1) have the following definitions:

EI = bending rigidity.

M = the effective mass of fluid "pushed" by the cylinder per unit length of cylinder,

m = mass of the cylinder per unit length,

U = fluid velocity,

c_T = longitudinal drag coefficient due to hydrodynamic forces acting along the cylinder,

L = total length of the cylinder

and

c_N = normal drag coefficient due to hydrodynamic forces acting normal to the cylinder.

After neglecting the flexural rigidity and rearranging terms, equation (1) is reduced to

$$\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} \frac{M + m}{M} + \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} \left[U^2 - \frac{1}{2} c_T \frac{U^2}{D} (L - x) \right] + \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \frac{U^2}{2D} (c_T + c_N) + 2U \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x \partial t} + \frac{1}{2} c_N \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} = 0. \quad (2)$$

Ortloff and Ives [2] used the non-dimensional terms

$$\tau = (t/L)U, \quad \beta = M/(M + m), \quad \xi = x/L, \quad \varepsilon = L/D \quad \text{and} \quad \eta = y/L.$$

Substitution of these terms into equation (2) yields

$$\frac{\partial^2 \eta}{\partial \tau^2} + \beta \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} c_T \varepsilon (1 - \xi) \right] \frac{\partial^2 \eta}{\partial \xi^2} + 2\beta \frac{\partial^2 \eta}{\partial \xi \partial \tau} + \frac{(c_T + c_N)}{2} \varepsilon \beta \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \xi} + \frac{1}{2} c_N \varepsilon \beta \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \tau} = 0. \quad (3a)$$

The dynamic motion equation problem is described by equation (3a). The associated initial and boundary conditions are:

$$\eta(0, \xi) = \eta_1(\xi), \quad \text{describing initial deflection;} \quad (3b)$$

$$\left. \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial \tau} \right|_{\tau=0} = 0, \quad \text{zero initial velocity,} \quad (3c)$$

$$\eta(\tau, 0) = 0, \quad \text{fixed-end condition;} \quad (3d)$$

$$|\eta(\tau, 1)| < \infty, \quad \text{bounded free-end deflection.} \quad (3e)$$

The set of equations (3a-e) poses an initial-boundary problem in the region of interest (Fig. 1).

Using the method of characteristics we may classify the solution types by evaluating the characteristic type. To do this we evaluate the quadratic equation

$$\beta^2 - \beta \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} c_T \varepsilon (1 - \xi) \right] \begin{array}{ll} > 0 & \xi < \xi^* \text{ hyperbolic} \\ = 0 & \xi = \xi^* \text{ parabolic} \\ < 0 & \xi > \xi^* \text{ elliptic,} \end{array}$$

for some $0 \leq \xi^* < 1$. The point to be noted is that over the length of the physical cylinders all three characteristic types are found. The above summarizes the problem background, the region




Fig. 1. Region of interest.

of interest and the change of equation type.

Two solutions exist for equation (3a). One is the Bessel function solution, obtained by means of the separation of variables [2]. This solution is inefficient for arbitrary temporal excitation of the cylinder structure. Lee and Kennedy [3] introduced the numerical solution to remove the above inefficiency. Lee and Kennedy introduced the change of variables

$$t = \tau \quad (4)$$

and

$$x = x(\xi, \tau) = \beta\tau + (1 - \xi), \quad (5)$$

which brings equation (3a) into an equivalent form:

$$\dot{\eta}_{tt} + \hat{a}(x, t)\dot{\eta}_{xx} + \hat{b}\eta_x + \hat{c}\dot{\eta}_t = 0, \quad (6a)$$

where

$$\hat{a}(x, t) = \beta \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} c_T \epsilon (x - \beta t) \right] - \beta^2,$$

$$\hat{b}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \beta [c_N \beta - (c_T + c_N)],$$

$$\hat{c} = \frac{1}{2} c_N \epsilon \beta$$

and

$$\dot{\eta}(x, t) = \eta(\beta\tau + (1 - \xi), \tau).$$

The associated initial and boundary conditions are:

$$\dot{\eta}(x, 0) = \eta_1(1 - x), \quad \text{prescribed initial deflection;} \quad (6b)$$

$$\dot{\eta}_t(x, t)|_{t=0} = \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \eta_1(1 - x), \quad \text{initial velocity;} \quad (6c)$$

$$\dot{\eta}(x, t) = f(t) \text{ at } x = \beta t + 1, \quad \text{prescribed fixed-end condition;} \quad (6d)$$

$$|\dot{\eta}(x, t)| < \infty \text{ at } x = \beta t, \quad \text{bounded free-end condition.} \quad (6e)$$

The set of equations (6a-e) defines an initial-boundary problem counterpart to equation (3a).

The ODE solution to equation (6a), proposed by Lee and Kennedy [3], uses the method of lines to discretize partial derivatives with respect to x by central and forward differences. This discretization formulates the PDE, equation (6a), into a system of second-order ODEs in the variable t , i.e.

$$(\dot{\eta}_n)_m + \dot{c}(\eta_t)_m + \left[\frac{-2\hat{a}(x_m, t)}{h^2} - \frac{c_T \epsilon \beta + \hat{b}}{h} \right] \dot{\eta}_m + \frac{\hat{a}(x_{m+1}, t)}{h^2} \dot{\eta}_{m+1} + \left[\frac{\hat{a}(x_{m-1}, t)}{h^2} + \frac{c_T \epsilon \beta + \hat{b}}{h} \right] \dot{\eta}_{m-1} = 0, \quad (7)$$

where $h = \Delta x$.

Then, another change of variable, $\frac{\partial \dot{\eta}_m}{\partial t} = W_m$, brings equation (7) into a system of first-order ODEs in the form

$$\dot{\eta}' = A(x, t)\dot{\eta} + g(x, t, \dot{\eta}), \quad (8)$$

where the vector g contains two non-zero components which supply the fixed-end and free-end boundary conditions.

Because the matrix $A(x, t)$ turns out to be independent of t , the numerical solution to equation (8) with associated conditions can be obtained explicitly by means of the generalized Adams method [3]:

$$\dot{\eta}_{n+1} = e^{Ah} \dot{\eta}_n + h(Ah)^{-1}(e^{Ah} - I)g_n, \quad (9)$$

which summarizes the numerical solution to problem (3a).

Note that the computation of equation (9) is straightforward provided that the matrix exponential e^{Ah} can be carried out simply. An accurate and economical computation of e^{Ah} is by means of a second-order diagonal Padé approximation:

$$e^{Ah} \left[I + \frac{1}{2} Ah + \frac{1}{12} (Ah)^2 \right]^{-1} \left[I - \frac{1}{2} Ah + \frac{1}{12} (Ah)^2 \right]. \quad (10)$$

Even though the e^{Ah} need be calculated only once, it is necessary at every time step to multiply the matrix by a vector. For a matrix of order M , it needs at least $2M^3$ operations initially to obtain the approximation for the e^{Ah} , then at every time step there is another M^2 operations needed to produce the result. In view of the cost of the computation, in both speed and computer storage, we propose an explicit finite-difference solution to problem (6a). We discuss the complete finite-difference development in the following sections.

3. A STABLE FINITE-DIFFERENCE MODEL

In this section we describe the complete development of a finite-difference scheme for the solution of problem (6a). It begins with the formulation. Following the formulation, the theory with regard to consistency, stability and convergence is presented for the proposed finite-difference scheme.

3.1. An Explicit Finite-difference Formulation

To maintain generality, let us consider the non-homogeneous equation

$$\dot{\eta}_{tt} + \hat{a}\dot{\eta}_{xx} + \hat{b}\dot{\eta}_x + \dot{c}\dot{\eta}_t = F(x, t). \quad (11)$$

where $F(x, t)$ physically models a FORCING function. Pursuing the finite-difference discretization of equation (11), let us derive a partial differentiation expression for $\hat{\eta}_{xx}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\eta})_{xx} &= (\hat{a}_x \hat{\eta} + \hat{a} \hat{\eta}_x)_x \\ &= \hat{a}_{xx} \hat{\eta} + 2\hat{a}_x \hat{\eta}_x + \hat{a} \hat{\eta}_{xx}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Since

$$\hat{a} = \beta \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} c_T \epsilon (1 + x - \beta t) \right] - \beta^2,$$

then

$$\hat{a}_x = -\frac{1}{2} c_T \epsilon \beta$$

and

$$\hat{a}_{xx} = 0,$$

therefore equation (12) becomes

$$(\hat{\eta})_{xx} = \hat{a} \hat{\eta}_{xx} - c_T \epsilon \beta \hat{\eta}_x,$$

which implies that

$$\hat{a} \hat{\eta}_{xx} = (\hat{\eta})_{xx} + c_T \epsilon \beta \hat{\eta}_x. \quad (13)$$

Now, apply the conventional finite-difference discretization to equation (11), making use of equation (13), using the central difference for the second derivative and the backward difference for the first derivative, we obtain a different equation for equation (11), viz.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{\eta}_m^{n+1} - 2\hat{\eta}_m^n + \hat{\eta}_m^{n-1}}{k^2} + \frac{\hat{a}_{m+1}^n \hat{\eta}_{m+1}^n - 2\hat{a}_m^n \hat{\eta}_m^n + \hat{a}_{m-1}^n \hat{\eta}_{m-1}^n}{h^2} \\ - c_T \epsilon \beta \frac{\hat{\eta}_m^n - \hat{\eta}_{m-1}^n}{h} + \delta \frac{\hat{\eta}_m^n - \hat{\eta}_{m-1}^n}{h} + \epsilon \frac{\hat{\eta}_m^{n+1} - \hat{\eta}_m^n}{k} = F(x_m, t^n), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $k = \Delta t$, $h = \Delta x$.

A rearrangement of equation (14) will result in the simple expression

$$\hat{\eta}_m^{n+1} + P \hat{\eta}_m^n + Q \hat{\eta}_{m-1}^n + R \hat{\eta}_{m+1}^n + \hat{\eta}_m^{n-1} = S F(x_m, t^n), \quad (15)$$

where

$$P = \left[-2 - 2\hat{a}_m^n \left(\frac{k}{h} \right)^2 - c_T \epsilon \beta \frac{k^2}{h} - \delta \frac{k^2}{h} - k\epsilon \right] (1 + k\epsilon), \quad (16)$$

$$Q = \left[\hat{a}_{m-1}^n \left(\frac{k}{h} \right)^2 + c_T \epsilon \beta \frac{k^2}{h} + \delta \frac{k^2}{h} \right] (1 + k\epsilon), \quad (17)$$

$$R = \left[\left(\frac{k}{h} \right)^2 \hat{a}_{m+1}^n \right] (1 + k\epsilon) \quad (18)$$

and

$$S = k^2/(1 + k\hat{c}). \quad (19)$$

Then

$$\dot{\eta}_m^{n+1} = SF(x_m, t^n) - P\dot{\eta}_m^n - Q\dot{\eta}_{m-1}^n - R\dot{\eta}_{m+1}^n - \dot{\eta}_m^{n-1}. \quad (20a)$$

Equation (20a) is the explicit finite-difference scheme for the solution of equation (11). Initially, to compute the $\dot{\eta}_m^{n+1}$, the associated initial and boundary conditions (6b-e) must be fulfilled:

$$\dot{\eta}_m^{n-1} = \eta_1(1 - x_m), \quad \text{the prescribed initial deflection;} \quad (20b)$$

$\dot{\eta}_m^n$ is obtained making use of the initial velocity information, such that

$$\dot{\eta}_m^n = \dot{\eta}_m^{n-1} + \Delta t \beta \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \eta_1(1 - x) \right|_m; \quad (20c)$$

$$\dot{\eta}_{m-1}^n = f(t) \text{ at } x = \beta t + 1, \quad \text{the prescribed fixed-end condition;} \quad (20d)$$

$$\left| \dot{\eta}_{m+1}^n \right| < \infty \text{ at } x_{m+1} = \beta t, \quad \text{the bounded free-end condition.} \quad (20e)$$

Problem (20a) with associated conditions (20b-e) constitutes a counterpart initial-boundary problem to problem (6a).

3.2. Consistency

In examining whether the difference equation (15) is consistent with the differential equation (11), we expand $\dot{\eta}_m^{n+1}$ and $\dot{\eta}_m^{n-1}$ in powers of k upon $\dot{\eta}_m^n$, and expand $\dot{\eta}_{m+1}^n$, $\dot{\eta}_{m-1}^n$ in powers of h upon $\dot{\eta}_m^n$.

For rotational economy we drop the indices n and m , so that $\dot{\eta} = \dot{\eta}_m^n$. Then

$$\dot{\eta}_m^{n+1} = \dot{\eta} + k\dot{\eta}_t + \frac{k^2}{2!} \dot{\eta}_{tt} + \dots, \quad (21)$$

$$\dot{\eta}_m^{n-1} = \dot{\eta} - k\dot{\eta}_t + \frac{k^2}{2!} \dot{\eta}_{tt} - \dots, \quad (22)$$

$$\dot{\eta}_{m+1}^n = \dot{\eta} + h\dot{\eta}_x + \frac{h^2}{2!} \dot{\eta}_{xx} + \dots \quad (23)$$

and

$$\dot{\eta}_{m-1}^n = \dot{\eta} - h\dot{\eta}_x + \frac{h^2}{2!} \dot{\eta}_{xx} + \dots \quad (24)$$

To examine the consistency, we localize the coefficients $\hat{a}_j$ in the closed interval $[t, t + \Delta t]$ using $\bar{a}$ to represent the average $\hat{a}_j$. We rearrange equation (14) and put all terms on the l.h.s. of the equation to give

$$\begin{aligned} & h^2(\dot{\eta}_m^{n+1} - 2\dot{\eta}_m^n + \dot{\eta}_m^{n-1}) + k^2\bar{a}(\dot{\eta}_{m+1}^n - 2\dot{\eta}_m^n + \dot{\eta}_{m-1}^n) \\ & - (c_T\epsilon\beta - \hat{b})(\dot{\eta}_m^n - \dot{\eta}_{m-1}^n)k^2h + \hat{c}kh^2(\dot{\eta}_m^{n+1} - \dot{\eta}_m^n) - k^2h^2F(x_m, t) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Substituting equations (21)–(24) into equation (25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & k^2 h^2 \dot{\eta}_{tt} + k^2 h^2 \bar{a} \dot{\eta}_{xx} - (c_T \varepsilon \beta - \hat{b}) k^2 h^2 \dot{\eta}_x \\ & + \frac{1}{12} k h^2 \dot{\eta}_{ttt} + k^2 h^4 \bar{a} \dot{\eta}_{xxxx} + (c_T \varepsilon \beta - \hat{b}) k^2 h^3 \dot{\eta}_x \\ & + \hat{c} k^2 h^2 \dot{\eta}_y + \frac{1}{2} k^3 h^2 \dot{\eta}_{tt} - k^2 h^2 F(x_m, t) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & k^2 h^2 [\dot{\eta}_{tt} + (\bar{a} \dot{\eta}_{xx} - c_T \varepsilon \beta \dot{\eta}_x) + \hat{b} \dot{\eta}_x + \hat{c} \dot{\eta}_y - F(x_m, t)] \\ & = -\frac{\hat{c}}{2} k^3 h^2 \dot{\eta}_{tt} - (c_T \varepsilon \beta - \hat{b}) k^2 h^3 \dot{\eta}_{xx} + \frac{k^4}{12} h^2 \dot{\eta}_{ttt} - \frac{k^2 h^4}{12} \bar{a} \dot{\eta}_{xxxx}; \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

the truncation error E is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= -\frac{\hat{c}}{2} k \dot{\eta}_{tt} - (c_T \varepsilon \beta - \hat{b}) h \dot{\eta}_{xx} + \frac{k^2}{12} \dot{\eta}_{ttt} - \frac{h^2}{12} \bar{a} \dot{\eta}_{xxxx} + \text{high-order terms} \\ &= O(k, h). \end{aligned}$$

In the $\lim_{h, k \rightarrow 0} E = 0$, which establishes the consistency.

3.3. Stability

From equation (14), if one compares the terms, in equation (14), between $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$ and $O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$, it is easily seen that as $k \rightarrow 0$, the dominant term is $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right)$. Similarly, the dominant term between $O\left(\frac{1}{h^2}\right)$ and $O\left(\frac{1}{h}\right)$ belongs to the $O\left(\frac{1}{h^2}\right)$ term. This analysis suggests that for the stability analysis, one can use

$$\dot{\eta}_{tt} + \hat{a}(x) \dot{\eta}_{xx} = 0 \quad (27)$$

to derive the sufficient condition of stability.

Theorem

The finite-difference scheme (14) used to solve the dynamic motion equation (11) is stable if

$$\frac{k}{h} \leq \frac{1}{|\hat{a}|}.$$

Proof. For brevity, write $\lambda = e^{ak}$. Since $\hat{a}(x)$ is not rapidly varying in the variable x , we adopt the “frozen variable” approximation to localize $\hat{a}(x)$ as a constant in x between the interval $[t, t + \Delta t]$ and also for brevity, write $\hat{a}(x) = \bar{a} = \text{const}$. We look for the solution $\dot{\eta}(x, t)$ in the form $e^{at} e^{i\omega x}$, using the Von Neumann approach. Substituting $\dot{\eta} = e^{at} e^{i\omega x}$ into equation (27), using the approximation $\bar{a} = \hat{a}(x)$, one finds

$$\frac{e^{a(n+1)k} - 2e^{an k} + e^{a(n-1)k}}{k^2} \cdot e^{i\omega m h} + \bar{a} \frac{e^{i\omega(m+1)h} - 2e^{i\omega m h} + e^{i\omega(m-1)h}}{h^2} \cdot e^{an k} = 0.$$

A simplification of the above equation gives

$$\lambda^2 + K\lambda + 1 = 0, \quad (28)$$

where

$$K = 2 \left\{ \bar{a} \frac{k^2}{h^2} [\cos(\omega h) - 1] - 1 \right\}.$$

Then

$$\lambda = \frac{-K \pm \sqrt{K^2 - 4}}{2}. \quad (29)$$

The stability condition requires that $|\lambda| \leq 1$, which implies that both of the following conditions must be satisfied:

$$|\lambda_1| = \left| \frac{-K + \sqrt{K^2 - 4}}{2} \right| \leq 1 \quad (30)$$

and

$$|\lambda_2| = \left| \frac{-K - \sqrt{K^2 - 4}}{2} \right| \leq 1. \quad (31)$$

Both conditions (30) and (31) have the term $\sqrt{K^2 - 4}$ in common. This is the term that needs to be analyzed in order to derive the stability condition. Condition (30) is equivalent to

$$-1 \leq -\frac{K}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K^2 - 4} \leq 1. \quad (32)$$

There are two cases to examine:

$$(i) \quad K^2 - 4 > 0 \quad (33)$$

and

$$(ii) \quad K^2 - 4 \leq 0. \quad (34)$$

Case (i):

$$K^2 - 4 > 0 \rightarrow K^2 > 4 \rightarrow \left[2 \left\{ \bar{a} \frac{k^2}{h^2} [\cos(\omega h) - 1] \right\} \right]^2 > 4.$$

In order that the above condition is satisfied, it is necessary that $[\cos(\omega h) - 1] \neq 0$. Since $\bar{a} < 0$ in the hyperbolic region and $[\cos(\omega h) - 1] < 0$, together they require that

$$\bar{a} \frac{k^2}{h^2} [\cos(\omega h) - 1] > 1,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{k^2}{h^2} > \{\bar{a}[\cos(\omega h) - 1]\}^{-1}. \quad (35)$$

Returning to condition (32), we examine

$$-\frac{K}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K^2 - 4} \leq 1 \rightarrow K \geq -8, \quad (36)$$

which always exists.

Also,

$$-1 \leq -\frac{K}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K^2 - 4} \rightarrow K \geq 2, \quad (37)$$

since condition (36) is always satisfied; which also implies that $-\frac{K}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K^2 - 4} \leq 1$ is obviously true.

Next,

$$-1 \leq -\frac{K}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K^2 - 4} \rightarrow K \leq 2. \quad (38)$$

On close examination of conditions (35)–(38), it is clearly seen that the case $K^2 - 4 > 0$ will not lead to a condition of stability.

Case (ii):

$$\begin{aligned} K^2 - 4 \leq 0 &\rightarrow \left| -\frac{K}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K^2 - 4} \right| \leq 1 \\ &\rightarrow \left(-\frac{K}{2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{4 - K^2} \right)^2 \leq 1 \\ &\rightarrow \left| -\frac{K}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{K^2 - 4} \right| = 1 \quad \text{identically.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $K^2 \leq 4$ gives

$$\bar{a} \frac{k^2}{h^2} [\cos(\omega h) - 1] \leq 2 \rightarrow \frac{k^2}{h^2} \leq 2(\bar{a})^{-1} [\cos(\omega h) - 1]^{-1}, \quad (39)$$

$\max [\cos(\omega h) - 1] = 2$ gives [equation (39)]

$$\frac{k^2}{h^2} \leq \frac{1}{\bar{a}} \rightarrow \frac{k}{h} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{a}}}, \quad (40)$$

establishing the condition of stability.

Q.E.D.

3.4. Convergence

The consistency condition, established in Section 3.2, states that the finite-difference solution approaches the true solutions as $k, h \rightarrow 0$. Additionally, the stability condition, proved in Section

3.3, states that the numerical solution approaches the finite-difference solution because at every time step the numerical error remains bounded. Both the stability and consistency imply that the numerical solution approaches the true solution as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k, h \rightarrow 0$; this is the concept of convergence.

4. NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS

This section presents an exact solution test [3] which is used to examine the theoretical and computational accuracy of the finite-difference model. All computations were performed on the VAX 11/780 computer using double-precision complex arithmetic.

Consider the function

$$\eta(\xi, \tau) = e^{i\omega\tau} \sin(\omega\xi). \quad (41)$$

If we perform the partial derivations $\eta_{\xi\xi}$, $\eta_{\tau\tau}$, $\eta_{\xi\tau}$ and η_{τ} , and substitute them into the original dynamic motion equation (3a), we obtain an inhomogeneous equation of the form

$$\eta_{\tau\tau} + a(\xi)\eta_{\xi\xi} + b_{\eta\xi} + 2\beta\eta_{\xi\tau} + c\eta_{\tau} = F(\xi, \tau), \quad (42)$$

where

$$F(\xi, \tau) = [-\omega^2[a(\xi) + 1] + i\omega c] \sin(\omega\xi) + (b\omega + 2\beta i\omega^2) \cos(\omega\xi) e^{i\omega\tau}. \quad (43)$$

We regard $F(\xi, \tau)$ as simulating a forcing function and select input parameter values close to those of realistic physical parameters.

The associated initial and boundary conditions are taken as follows:

$$e^{i\omega\tau} \sin(\omega\xi)|_{\tau=0} = \sin(\omega\xi), \quad \text{initial condition;} \quad (44)$$

$$e^{i\omega\tau} \sin(\omega\xi)|_{\xi=0} = 0, \quad \text{fixed-end condition;} \quad (45)$$

$$e^{i\omega\tau} \sin(\omega\xi)|_{\xi=\xi_B} = e^{i\omega\tau} \sin(\omega\xi_B), \text{ such that } |e^{i\omega\tau} \sin(\omega\xi_B)| \leq 1 < \infty, \text{ free-end condition.} \quad (46)$$

We purposely select $\omega = i$ so that as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, $\eta(\xi, \tau) \rightarrow 0$. In selecting a practical $\varepsilon = 5E + 4$, we find:

<i>Problem</i>	<i>Region</i>
Hyperbolic	$0 \leq \xi < 0.998$
Parabolic	$\xi = 0.998$
Elliptic	$0.998 < \xi \leq 1$

Note that the elliptic region is extremely small and considered negligible. This is usually true in many problems of interest.

The following inputs are selected for the computation:

$$\beta = 1/2, \quad c_T = 0.01, \quad c_N = 0.09, \quad \eta = 5E + 4, \quad \omega = 0.1i, \quad \Delta\tau = 1E - 5.$$

This problem is chosen such that the real part is zero and calculated up to 10,000 steps. The results are presented in Table 1, and show very good agreement with the exact solution.

If these computations had been carried out using the numerical ODE solution, they would have required calculation of a matrix exponential, a matrix inversion, two matrix-matrix multiplications and two matrix-vector multiplications. The total operation would be $O(N^3)$. The improved finite-difference scheme only requires the calculation of four scalar-vector multiplications, four vector-

Table 1 An exact solution test^a

τ	0.3052E - 04	0.3052E - 01	0.1114E + 00
0.1	0.1000E - 01 0.1000E - 01	0.9967E - 02 0.9969E - 02	0.9886E - 02 0.9889E - 02
0.2	0.2000E - 01 0.2000E - 01	0.1994E - 01 0.1994E - 01	0.1978E - 01 0.1977E - 01
0.3	0.3000E - 01 0.3000E - 01	0.2992E - 01 0.2991E - 01	0.2970E - 01 0.2967E - 01
0.4	0.4000E - 01 0.4001E - 01	0.3988E - 01 0.3988E - 01	0.3957E - 01 0.3956E - 01
0.5	0.5002E - 01 0.5002E - 01	0.4986E - 01 0.4986E - 01	0.4946E - 01 0.4946E - 01
0.6	0.6003E - 01 0.6003E - 01	0.5985E - 01 0.5985E - 01	0.5937E - 01 0.5937E - 01
0.7	0.7005E - 01 0.7005E - 01	0.6984E - 01 0.6984E - 01	0.6928E - 01 0.6928E - 01
0.8	0.8008E - 01 0.8008E - 01	0.7984E - 01 0.7984E - 01	0.7920E - 01 0.7919E - 01
0.9	0.9012E - 01 0.9012E - 01	0.8990E - 01 0.8984E - 01	0.8925E - 01 0.8912E - 01

^aThe table entries show both the exact (upper value) and the numerical (lower value) solution.

vector additions and a few scalar-scalar operations. The total operation is $O(N^2)$. It is evident that the improved finite-difference solution is much faster.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The previous solution [3] to a well-posed dynamic motion equation was made available using an efficient numerical ODE solution to a vibration problem of practical interest. This numerical solution improved the generality and computational efficiency of the previous special function solution. This efficient solution is now further improved by a stable explicit finite-difference scheme which increased the computation speed while maintaining the same accuracy. The theoretical development assures the stability, consistency and convergence of the solution. One test example was calculated and the answers compared very favorably with the exact solution, demonstrating the accuracy. This improved model, thus far, appears to give a more efficient numerical treatment of the transverse dynamics of a long thin cylinder in viscous axial fluid flow.

Acknowledgements--This research was supported by Naval Underwater Systems Center Independent Research Projects A65020 and A68055.

REFERENCES

1. M. P. Paidoussis, Dynamics of flexible slender cylinders in axial flow. *J. Fluid Mech.* **26**(4), 717-751 (1966).
2. C. R. Ortloff and J. Ives, On the dynamic motion of a thin flexible cylinder in a viscous stream. *J. Fluid Mech.* **38**(4), 713-720 (1969).
3. D. Lee and R. M. Kennedy, A numerical treatment of a mixed type dynamic motion equation arising from a towed acoustic antenna in the ocean. *J. Comput. Math. Applic.* **11**(7-8), 807-816 (1985).