SMAI 2021

A posteriori Finite-Volume local subcell correction of high-order discontinuous Galerkin schemes for the nonlinear shallow-water equations

Ali HAIDAR Université de Montpellier 2, institut Montpelliérain Alexander Grotheindieck (IMAG)

21 juin 2021





Introduction

The nonliear Shallow-Water (NSW) equations

$$\partial_t \eta + \partial_x q = 0, \tag{1a}$$

$$\partial_t q + \partial_x \left(uq + \frac{1}{2}g(\eta^2 - 2\eta b) \right) = -g\eta \partial_x b.$$
 (1b)



Introduction

- Great efforts have been made since the sixties in order to produce accurate approximations of weak solutions of the NSW equations.
- large variety of numerical methods have been developed :
 - Finite-Volumes (FV) methods
 - Finite-Elements (FE) methods
 - Discontinuous Galerkin (DG)
 - spectral methods
 - residual distribution methods

Introduction : DG methods (advantages)

High-order discontinuous Galerkin (**DG**) methods have become very popular to approximate the solutions of various linear and nonlinear partial differential equations.

- Combines the background of FE and FV methods
- Successfully validated in many domain of applications.
- Reach any Arbitrary high-order of accuracy in space.
- Handle complex geometries.
- Local conservation; robustness; strong stability properties.

Introduction : DG methods (disadvantages)

- DG still suffer from the lack of nonlinear stability. In particular, high-order DG methods may produce spurious oscillations in the presence of discontinuities or steeply varying gradients.
- DG may fails near wet/dry zones, negative water height in NSW.

Introduction : FV methods

- **FV advantages** : (1) Low computational cost, (2) their shock-capturing ability, which allows to preserve the discontinuous or steeply varying gradients, (3) and positivity preserving.
- **FV disadvantages** : Low accuracy, low order of convergence, solution dispersion.

Motivation : FV a very good choice for a local correction.

Plan du travail

1 Discrete formulation

- DG formulation
- DG formulation as a FV scheme on subcells

2 A posteriori local subcell correction

- Admissibility criteria
- Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes
- Well-balancing property
- Preservation of the water height positivity

3 Numerical validation

- Time marching algorithm
- Test cases

Discrete formulation

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ denote the domain (a segment), such that $\Omega = \bigcup \omega_i$, where :

$$\bullet \omega_i = \left[x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \right].$$

• h_{ω_i} is the length of element ω_i .

P^{*k*}(ω_i) the space of polynomials in ω_i .

DG formulation

Well-balanced DG scheme

$$\int_{\omega_{i}} \partial_{t} \mathbf{v}_{h,i} \psi \mathrm{d} \mathbf{x} = \int_{\omega_{i}} \mathbf{F} \left(\mathbf{v}_{h,i}, \mathbf{b}_{h,i} \right) \partial_{\mathbf{x}} \psi \mathrm{d} \mathbf{x} - [\mathbf{F} \psi]_{i-1/2}^{i+1/2} + \int_{\omega_{i}} \mathbf{B} \left(\mathbf{v}_{h,i}, \mathbf{b}_{h,i} \right) \psi \mathrm{d} \mathbf{x}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathbb{P}^{k} \left(\omega_{i} \right).$$
(2)

$$F_{i+1/2} = F\left(v_{i+1/2}^{-}, v_{i+1/2}^{+}, b_{i+1/2}\right)$$
(3)

where $v_{i+1/2}^{\pm}$ and $b_{i+1/2} = b_{i+1/2}^{\pm}$ are the interpolated left and right values of ω_i interface $x_{i+1/2}$ and *F* is a consistent numerical flux.

posteriori local subcell correction

DG formulation as a FV scheme on subcells

DG formulation as a FV scheme on subcells

$$\partial_t \overline{v}_m^{\omega} = -\frac{1}{|S_m^{\omega}|} \left(\widehat{F}_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{\omega} - \widehat{F}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}^{\omega} \right) + \overline{B}_m^{\omega}. \tag{4}$$

$$\widehat{F}_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{\omega_{i}} = \mathsf{F}_{\omega_{i}}\left(\widetilde{x}_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{\omega_{i}}\right) - \mathcal{C}_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{i-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathsf{F}_{\omega_{i}}\left(x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}\right) - \mathcal{F}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}\right) - \mathcal{C}_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{i+\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathsf{F}_{\omega_{i}}\left(x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}\right) - \mathcal{F}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}\right)$$

we refer to [Haidar et al(2021)] and [Vilar(2019)] for more details.

(5)

Admissibility criteria

Physical Admissibility Detection (PAD)

We define a sensor function that :

• Check if the sub-mean values \overline{v}_m^{n+1} belongs to Θ .

$$\Theta = \left\{ (H, q) \in^2; \ H \ge 0 \right\}.$$
(6)

Check if there is any NaN values.

Admissibility criteria

Subcell Numerical Admissibility Detection (SubNAD)

In order to tackle the issue of spurious oscillations, we enforce a local *Discrete Maximum Principle*, at the subcell level, as follows :

Check if, for m = 1, ..., k + 1, the following inequalities hold :

$$\min\left(\overline{\eta}_{m-1}^{n},\overline{\eta}_{m}^{n},\overline{\eta}_{m+1}^{n}\right) \leq \overline{\eta}_{m}^{n+1} \leq \max\left(\overline{\eta}_{m-1}^{n},\overline{\eta}_{m}^{n},\overline{\eta}_{m+1}^{n}\right).$$

The SubNAD criterion relies on a DMP based on subcell mean values, and not the whole polynomial set of values.

Admissibility criteria

Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes

Replace the subcell mean value \overline{v}_m^{h+1} by a new corrected one $\overline{v}_m^{\star,n+1}$, which is computed using a subcell first-order FV scheme of the form :

$$\overline{v}_{m}^{\star,n+1} = \overline{v}_{m}^{n} - \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{|S_{m}|} \left(F_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{l} - F_{m-\frac{1}{2}}^{r} \right) + \Delta t^{n} \overline{B}_{m}, \tag{7}$$

where $F_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{l}$, $F_{m-\frac{1}{2}}^{r}$ are some new subcell *first-order corrected* FV numerical fluxes .

Discrete formulation

A posteriori local subcell correction

Numerical validation

Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes

Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes



FIGURE - Sketch of the correction of the reconstructed fluxes at subcell boundaries

A posteriori Finite-Volume local subcell correction of hig

Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes

Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes

$$\overline{v}_{m-1}^{\star,n+1} = \overline{v}_{m-1}^{n} - \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{|S_{m-1}|} \left(F_{m-\frac{1}{2}}^{\prime} - \widehat{\mathsf{F}}_{m-3/2} \right) + \Delta t^{n} \overline{B}_{m-1}, \tag{8}$$

$$\overline{v}_{m+1}^{\star,n+1} = \overline{v}_{m+1}^{n} - \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{|S_{m+1}|} \left(\widehat{\mathsf{F}}_{m+3/2} - F_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{r}\right) + \Delta t^{n}\overline{B}_{m+1}.$$
(9)



Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes

Subcell low-order corrected FV fluxes



Well-balancing property

Well-balancing property (DG numerical flux)

We define the numerical flux function F on interface x as follows :

$$F = F(v_{i+1/2}^{-}, v_{i+1/2}^{+}, b_{i+1/2}),$$
(10)

where the numerical flux function is the global Lax-Friedrichs flux :

$$F(v^{-}, v^{+}, b) = \frac{1}{2} \left(F(v^{-}, b) + F(v^{+}, b) - \sigma(v^{+} - v^{-}) \right),$$
(11)

with $\sigma = \max_{\omega \in} \sigma_{\omega}$ and

$$\sigma_{\omega} = \max_{m} \left(\left| \overline{u}_{m}^{\omega} \right| + \sqrt{g \overline{H}_{m}^{\omega}} \right).$$

Well-balancing property

Well-balancing property (FV numerical flux)

We introduce some new Finite-Volume numerical fluxes on subcell's S_m left and right interfaces, denoted by $F_{m-\frac{1}{2}}^r$ and $F_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^l$, as follows :

$$F_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{\prime} = F\left(\overline{v}_{m}^{+}, \overline{v}_{m+1}^{-}, \overline{b}_{m}^{+}\right) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g\overline{\eta}_{m}^{+}\left(\overline{b}_{m}^{+} - b_{\widetilde{x}_{m+\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \end{pmatrix},$$
(12)

$$\mathbf{F}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}^{r} = \mathbf{F}\left(\overline{\mathbf{v}}_{m-1}^{+}, \overline{\mathbf{v}}_{m}^{-}, \overline{\mathbf{b}}_{m}^{-}\right) + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ g\overline{\eta}_{m}^{-} \left(\overline{\mathbf{b}}_{m}^{-} - \mathbf{b}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \end{pmatrix}.$$
(13)

Preservation of the water height positivity

Preservation of the water height positivity

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{v}}_{m}^{\star,n+1} = \overline{\boldsymbol{v}}_{m}^{n} - \frac{\Delta t^{n}}{|S_{m}|} \left(\boldsymbol{F}_{m+\frac{1}{2}}^{l} - \boldsymbol{F}_{m-\frac{1}{2}}^{r} \right) + \Delta t^{n} \overline{\boldsymbol{B}}_{m}, \tag{14}$$

This scheme preserve positivity (on a sub-cell scale).

Remark

- Scheme (14) conserve height positivity. Actually we don't need more than that
- We have the well balancing for all schemes, on a sub-cell scale.

Time marching algorithm

Time marching algorithm

We advance in time steps using the explicit SSP-RK schemes. For instance, writing the semi-discrete NSW equation in the operator form

$$\partial_t v_h + A_h(v_h) = 0,$$

we advance from time level *n* to (n+1) with the third-order scheme as follows :

$$v_{h}^{n,1} = v_{h}^{n} - \Delta t^{n} A_{h}(v_{h}^{n}),$$

$$v_{h}^{n,2} = \frac{1}{4} (3v_{h}^{n} + v_{h}^{n,1}) - \frac{1}{4} \Delta t^{n} A(v_{h}^{n,1}),$$

$$v_{h}^{n+1} = \frac{1}{3} (v_{h}^{n} + 2v_{h}^{n,2}) - \frac{2}{3} \Delta t^{n} A_{h}(v_{h}^{n,2}).$$

Test cases : Smooth analytic solution

$$u_0(x) = \left\{ egin{array}{ccc} 1 & ext{if } x \leq 0, \\ e^{-x^{N_S+1}} & ext{elsewhere.} \end{array}
ight.$$



FIGURE – Test 1 - A new analytical solution for the NSW equations - Free surface elevation computed at = 0.1 s with the for k = 3 and $n_e = 60$.

Test cases : Smooth analytic solution

| k | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| h | $E_{L_2}^h$ | $q_{L_2}^h$ | $E_{L_2}^h$ | $q_{L_2}^h$ | $E_{L_2}^h$ | $q_{L_2}^h$ |
| <u>1</u> 15 | 5.91E-4 | 1.96 | 2.13E-5 | 3.19 | 3.20E-6 | 4.05 |
| $\frac{1}{30}$ | 1.52E-4 | 2.02 | 2.33E-6 | 2.85 | 1.93E-7 | 4.18 |
| $\frac{1}{60}$ | 3.73E-5 | 2.02 | 2.99E-7 | 2.95 | 1.06E-8 | 3.95 |
| $\frac{1}{120}$ | 9.21E-6 | - | 4.18E-8 | - | 6.91E-10 | - |

TABLE – Test 1 - A new analytical solution for the NSW equations : L^2 -errors between numerical and analytical solutions and convergence rates for η at time t = 0.1s

A posteriori local subcell correction

Numerical validation

Test cases

Test cases : discontinuity $t > t_c$



FIGURE – Test 1 - A new analytical solution for the NSW equations, with k = 3 and $n_e = 100$, with a zoom on the discontinuity and wet/dry interface.

posteriori local subcell correction

Numerical validation

Test cases

Test cases : Dam-break (wet bottom)



FIGURE – Test 2 - Dam break on a wet bottom, with k = 3 and $n_e = 50$ mesh elements.

Discrete formulation

posteriori local subcell correction

Numerical validation

Test cases

Test cases : Dam-break (wet bottom)



A *posteriori* local subcell correction

Test cases

Well-balancing property



FIGURE – Test 3 - Preservation of a motionless steady state - Free surface elevation at = 50s (left), with a zoom on the wet/dry interface (right).

Carrier and Greenspan periodic



FIGURE – Test 5 - Carrier and Greenspan's periodic solution - Free surface elevation computed for different values of time in the range [14.57, 157] for k = 8 and $n_e = 10$.

A posteriori local subcell correction

Numerical validation

Test cases

Carrier and Greenspan transient



FIGURE – Test 4 - Carrier and Greenspan's transient solution - Free surface elevation for different values of time in the range [0.5 s, 23 s] (left) and at t = 200 s (right) for k = 3 and n e = 50.

Carrier and Greenspan transient



FIGURE – Test 4 - Carrier and Greenspan's transient solution, for k = 8 and n = 10

Conclusion

- New subcell DG-FV formulation for nonlinear Shallow water equation
- The resulting algorithm accurately handles strong shocks with no robustness issues
- It ensures the preservation of the water height positivity at the subcell level
- It preserves the class of motionless steady states (well-balancing)
- It retains the highly accurate subcell resolution of DG schemes
- The procedure is furthermore totally parameter free

Future works

- Investigate moving mesh case, based on an Arbitrary-Lagrangian-Eulerian ALE (in progress)
- Coupling with a floating object.
- Extend to a general 2D case

References I



A. Haidar et al.

A posteriori finite-volume local subcell correction of high-order discontinuous galerkin formulations for the nonlinear shallow-water equations.

J. Comput. Phys., 2021.

Article submitted.



F. Vilar.

A posteriori correction of high-order discontinuous galerkin scheme through subcell finite volume formulation and flux reconstruction.

J. Comput. Phys., 387 :245–279, 2019.