INVERSE METHODS FOR SOLVING SHALLOW WATER EQUATIONS

Project Proposal

Name: Brian KYANJO Supervisor: Prof. Jodi Mead

Course: Inverse Methods Date: March 31, 2022

Motivation

The shallow water equations (SWE) are a system of hyperbolic partial differential equations (PDEs) describing the flow below a pressure surface in a fluid. They have been frequently used to model several real-life problems i.e. the propagation of tsunamis waves in the ocean (Dias and Dutykh, 2007) and modeling of atmospheric turbulence. Deep knowledge is required to handle such events, therefore first, robust, and computationally efficient methods like inverse methods are required to solve the shallow water equations.

You real to explain in what way inverse me those were view.

Problem description and methods used

Inverse methods have been frequently used to handle shallow water problems; see for instance Monnier et al. (2016), Gessese and Sellier (2012), and Voronina (2013). Consider small-amplitude waves in a one-dimensional fluid channel that is shallow relative to its wavelength. The conservation of mass and momentum equations are written in terms of height h(t) (m) and momentum hu (m^2/s) as shown in system (1)

$$h_t + (hu)_x = 0,$$

$$(hu)_t + \left(hu^2 + \frac{1}{2}gh^2\right)_x = 0,$$
(1)

where $q(m/s^2)$ is acceleration due to gravity, hu measures the flow rate of water past a point and u(x,t) (m/s) is the horizontal velocity (LeVeque et al., 2002; Toro, 2001). The conservation laws in system (1) can be solved by developing numerical methods based on an eigendecomposition of the Jacobian matrix. And this can be achieved by expressing system (1) in quasi linaer form as shown in equation (2)

$$m_t + f'(m)m_x = 0, (2)$$

where m(x,t) = (h(x,t), hu(x,t)) and $f'(m) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is a flux Jacobian matrix given by;

 $f'(m) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -u^2 + gh & 2u \end{bmatrix}.$ (3)

Consider a simple set of initial conditions to equation (2) with a single discontinuity at the middle of the channel. Setting h and hu equal to constants on either side of the interface, and assuming the discontinuity is at x = 0 yields a Riemann problem with initial conditions given by equation (4).

This 1set Riemann Problem $m(x,0) = \begin{cases} m_l, & \text{if } x \leq 0, \\ m_r, & \text{if } x > 0, \end{cases} \text{ (4)}$

where m_l and m_r are two piece-wise constant states separated by a discontinuity. Suppose that we know the nature of the solution (i.e. consits of two shocks or a single shock) to equation (2), then we can solve the Riemann problem (equation (4)) by finding the intermediate state $m_m(x,t) = (h_m(x,t), hu_m(x,t))$ that can be connected to m_l by a left going shock or to m_r by a right going shock and vise varsa. Through the points m_l and m_r there is a curve of points that connects m_l to m_m or m_m to m_r via a left going shock or right going shock. For shallow water equations, these points must satisfy the non linear equation (5) (LeVeque et al., 2002).

$$F(h_m) = u_r - u_l + (h_m - h_r)\sqrt{\frac{g}{2}\left(\frac{1}{h_m} + \frac{1}{h_r}\right)} + (h_m - h_l)\sqrt{\frac{g}{2}\left(\frac{1}{h_m} + \frac{1}{h_l}\right)}$$

The Methods that will be used in this study are the forward and Riemann problem. The idea behind the forward approach (based on Forestclary) is to find Roe-averaged parameters: height field (h), velocity field (u), and root mean square speed (c) for a Riemann problem at every interface. These are used to obtain the corresponding eigenvalues and eigenvectors for the Jacobian matrix (3) that yield the waves and speeds used in obtaining fluctuations at each interface. These fluctuations as shown in equation (6) are used to obtain the forestclaw output M.

$$M_i^{n+1} = M_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x} (\mathcal{A}^+ \Delta M_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^n + \mathcal{A}^- M_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^n) M^n = \int_{h(t, t_i)}^{h(t, t_i)} h(t, t_i) dt$$
(6)

where the fluctuations $\mathcal{A}^-\Delta M^n_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathcal{A}^+\Delta M^n_{i-\frac{1}{2}}$ are the net updating contributions from the leftward and rightward moving waves into the grid cell from the right and left interfaces respectively, Δt and Δx are the temporal and spatial step size respectively. Then the simulated data d_s is generated at each interface by adding noise to the forestclaw output as shown in equation (7).

So your data are highly
$$d_s = G(m) + \epsilon$$
, for $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ $M = M$ where $G(m) = M$ represents the forestclaw output, with $m = (h, ha)$ such that h and ha are chosen values. Then Jacobian matrix is obtained by; $(G(m))^{k+1} = (G(m))^k$.

And then iterate the estimate m^k that satisfy $(G(m))^{k+1} = (G(m))^k$.

$$\min_{m^{k+1}} \left\{ ||J(m^k)m^{k+1} - d_s||_2^2 + \alpha^2 ||m^{k+1} - m^k||_2^2 \right\}$$
 where α is chosen to be any small value for which the solution converges. The value of the parameter

estimate for which the norm of the change in the estimates is less than 10^{-6} , will be the solution that will be validated with results in the next method. To check the nature of the simulated data, the χ^2_{obs} and p-value will be calculated.

In contrast with the above forestclaw procedure, chosen height and momentum initial parameters will be used to determine the unknown height and momentum fields. The only three major differences from the procedure will be:

- Solving the nonlinear equation (5) for h_m using the Gauss-Newton method at every interface using an exact Jacobian matrix.
- Computing fluxes: $f(q_l)$, $f(q_m)$, and $f(q_m)$ at states q_l , q_m , and q_r respectively. Solving a number of
- And then subtracting them from each other to obtain the fluctuations at each interface as shown in equation (10) instead of using waves and speeds.

$$\mathcal{A}^{-}\Delta q_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n} = f(q_m) - f(q_l), \qquad \mathcal{A}^{+}\Delta q_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n} = f(q_r) - f(q_m)$$
(10)

To confirm whether the method is working, the results from the last procedure are plotted against the inverse model to validate and assess the inverse method (Gessese and Sellier, 2012). The wall time is also computed to check the computational cost of each model.

you have not allyned a posser, not a mother to solve the pro

Time Frame

All the stages of this project are planned for the remaining time of the semester and that is the four weeks in the month of April and the first five days of May 2022. During this time the following will be accomplished;

• First week: Accomplishment of the coding part of the project.)

• Second week: simulation of the problem, visualization, and analysis of results.

You will write if the project after • Third Week: Start and finish the write up of the project

• Fourth Week: Project presentation, implementation, and finalizing remarks.

• First five days of May: Submission of the project report.

The accomplishment of all these tasks in the anticipated time frame will prove a high level of success.

mets, produce, uncontainty estimates may define

Take home

At the end of the project, I will have learned how to: write up a project proposal, formulate and implement a shallow-water problem from a forward one, use the Gauss-Newton method to solve nonlinear problems, and think as an inverse method expert. Communication fort

References

F. Dias and D. Dutykh. Dynamics of tsunami waves. In Extreme man-made and natural hazards in dynamics of structures, pages 201–224. Springer, 2007.

A. Gessese and M. Sellier. A direct solution approach to the inverse shallow-water problem. Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2012, 2012.

R. J. LeVeque et al. Finite volume methods for hyperbolic problems, volume 31. Cambridge university press, 2002.

J. Monnier, F. Couderc, D. Dartus, K. Larnier, R. Madec, and J.-P. Vila. Inverse algorithms for 2d shallow water equations in presence of wet dry fronts: Application to flood plain dynamics. Advances in Water Resources, 97:11–24, 2016.

E. F. Toro. Shock-capturing methods for free-surface shallow flows. Wiley-Blackwell, 2001.

T. Voronina. An inverse algorithm for reconstructing an initial tsunami waveform. Tsunami: From Fundamentals to Damage Mitigation, page 37, 2013.

This description doesn't reflect air conversation. Please let me know if you have any give about this feedback.