

Boundary Conditions

for advection-diffusion eqs.

A. Donov, Spring 2021

Consider now solving ad-diff

$$u_t + (\alpha u)_x = (\delta u_x)_x$$

on $[0, L]$ with BCs.

One of the first challenges we need to deal with is that the allowed BCs are different if $\delta > 0$ vs. $\delta = 0$

This means that in general we expect **boundary layers** for advection-dominated problems

①

To make this explicit, consider

$$u_t + \alpha u_x = \frac{1}{d} u_{xx}, \quad \alpha > 0 \\ 0 < x < L = 1$$

$$u(0, t) = 1 \quad (\text{inflow boundary})$$

and either

$$\begin{cases} u(1, t) = 0 & (\text{Dirichlet}) \\ u_x(1, t) = 0 & (\text{Flux or} \\ & \text{Neumann}) \end{cases}$$


on the outflow boundary

For Dirichlet BC, the
steady state solution

$$u_t = 0 = -\alpha u_x + \frac{1}{d} u_{xx}$$

$$\text{is } u(x, t) = \frac{e^{\alpha x/d} - e^{-\alpha x/d}}{e^{\alpha L/d} - 1}$$

(2)



Boundary layer of width

$$l_B \sim d/a \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } d \rightarrow 0$$

If the problem is advection-dominated, i.e.,

Peclet number $P_e = \frac{aL}{d} \gg 1$,

then $\frac{l_B}{L} \approx \frac{d}{aL} \ll 1$

so the boundary layer is very thin.

(3)

This means that even a fine grid is unlikely to resolve the solution near the boundary.

Does this matter?

Depends!

For flow over the wing of an airplane, we can compute the lift without worrying about the boundary layer. But the (viscous) drag is dominated by the boundary layer.

At an outflow boundary, we mostly care that "stuff" leaves the domain without reflection, so we don't want a boundary layer. ④

In fact, often a boundary is an open boundary, meaning there is not an actual physical boundary there and so the BC is fake anyway.

At such "boundaries" we better choose a Neumann BC $u_x = 0$, since this makes the steady solution be


$$u(x, t \rightarrow \infty) = 1$$

with no boundary layer.

It is important to know what kind of boundary one has physically before solving PDE! (5)

Let's first consider
advection (-dominated) problems

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_t + (au)_x = 0, \quad x \in (0, L) \\ u(0, t) = g_0(t) \quad (\text{Inflow}) \\ \text{No BC at outflow!} \end{array} \right.$$



$$x_j = (j - 1/2) h, \quad h = \frac{L}{N}$$

Remember that for FV
schemes the faces of the grid
overlap the boundaries:

$$x_{1/2} = 0 \quad x_{N+1/2} = L \quad (6)$$

The inflow boundary flux is trivial. We need the flux

$$F_{1/2}(t) = a_{1/2} u(x_{1/2}, t)$$

$$= a_{1/2} \varphi_0(t)$$

For example, to second order

$$F_{1/2}^{n+1/2} \approx a_{1/2} \varphi_0\left(t + \frac{\frac{n}{2}}{2}\right)$$


↑
Don't forget
the half step!

But what about $F_{3/2}^{n+1/2}$?

For first order upwinding,
there would be no issue

(7)

$$f^n_{3/2} = a_{3/2} u_1$$



We may worry that this will only lead to first-order schemes, but in fact, as we show later, it is OK to use first-order schemes right on the boundary & still get 2nd order, sometimes!
 Harder issue is stability & hard to analyze & prove

Another option is to use a centered flux on this face,

$$F_{3/2}^n = a_{3/2} \left(\frac{u_1 + u_2}{2} \right)$$

but we may worry about stability.

Yet a third option is "ghost cells", as we discuss shortly.


In practice : We try things out & see stability / accuracy / robustness

The harder part is the outflow boundary, where there is no BC

⑨

Options:

- a) In the last one or two cells, switch to a fully one-sided method such as upwind or beam-warming
- b) Use "ghost cells" and continue to use the same formulas as in the interior. This is good also for computational performance (no branching in code), is simple, and often works well.
Let's illustrate this approach for the outflow boundary for $a = \text{const.}$



The idea is to set the values in the ghost cell using **extrapolation from the interior** using the **BC** if there is one. For example :

a) Piecewise constant extrapolation:

$$u_{N+1} = u_N$$

b) Linear extrapolation:

$$u_{N+1} = 2u_N - u_{N-1}$$

(11)

Let's see what these do
 if we use Lax-Wendroff
NOT in flux form:

$$\bar{u}_N^{n+1} = \bar{u}_N^n - \gamma h \left(\underbrace{\frac{\bar{u}_{N-1} - \bar{u}_{N+1}}{2h}}_{\text{centered advection}} \right) + \frac{(\gamma h)^2}{2} \left(\underbrace{\frac{\bar{u}_{N-1} - 2\bar{u}_N + \bar{u}_{N+1}}{h^2}}_{\text{ }} \right)$$

Piecewise constant

$$\bar{u}_N^{n+1} = \bar{u}_N^n - \gamma h \left(\underbrace{\frac{\bar{u}_{N-1} - \bar{u}_N}{2h}}_{\text{ }} \right) + \frac{(\gamma h)^2}{2} \left(\underbrace{\frac{\bar{u}_{N-1} - 2\bar{u}_N + \bar{u}_N}{h^2}}_{\text{ }} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{(\gamma h)^2}{2} \left(\underbrace{\frac{\bar{u}_{N-1} - 2\bar{u}_N + \bar{u}_N}{h^2}}_{\text{ }} \right)$$

(12)

$$\bar{u}_N^{n+1} = \bar{u}_N^n - \frac{\nu(1-\nu)}{2} h \left(\frac{\bar{u}_{N-1} - \bar{u}_N}{h} \right)$$

which is not consistent with
the PDE and so is a
bad idea.

If we used linear extrapolation

$$\bar{u}_{N+1} = 2\bar{u}_N - \bar{u}_{N-1} \Rightarrow$$

$$\bar{u}_N^{n+1} = \bar{u}_N^n - 2h \left(\frac{\bar{u}_{N-1} - \bar{u}_N}{h} \right)$$

which means we are using upwind in the outflow cell,
so this makes sense.

Is it second order?
(return to this later)

(13)

Now, imagine we wrote

LW or Fromm or Beam Warming
in flux form. The problem
would be on the **outflow face**

$$F_{N+1/2} = a \left(\bar{u}_N + \frac{h}{2} s_N^{(\text{slope estimate})} (1-\gamma) \right)$$

But what is s_N ?

For LW, we used downwind

slopes,

$$s_N = \frac{\bar{u}_{N+1} - \bar{u}_N}{h}, \quad a > 0$$

So if we use constant

extrapolation for the ghost

cell ($\bar{u}_{N+1} = \bar{u}_N$) then $s_N = 0$

$$\Rightarrow \text{upwind flux } F_{N+1/2} = a \bar{u}_N \quad (14)$$

which is consistent with the ODE though looks only first order (to be checked!). So now constant extrapolation is OK.

If we used linear extrapolation then

$$S_N = \frac{U_N - U_{N-1}}{h}$$


which is the same as the Beam Warming scheme for the last face (NOT the same as switching to BW in last cell)

We see that depending on what the code does ghost cells do different things!

(15)

Ghost cells are NOT
real cells !

They are just a (computational)
tool to implement **one-sided**
stencils (finite differences) at
the boundaries.



(16)

$$F_{3/2} = \alpha \left(\bar{u}_1 + \frac{h}{2} S_1 (1-\gamma) \right)$$

If we use downwind slopes as in LW, there is no issue,

$$S_1 = \frac{\bar{u}_2 - \bar{u}_1}{h}$$

But what if we are doing

Froum's method

$$S_1 = \frac{\bar{u}_2 - \bar{u}_0}{2h}$$

Linear extrapolation

$$\bar{u}_0^n = \underbrace{2\vartheta_0(t)} - \bar{u}_1$$

uses BC!

$$\Rightarrow S_1 = \frac{(\bar{u}_2 + \bar{u}_1) - 2\vartheta_0(t)}{2h} \quad (17)$$

$$S_1 = \frac{\bar{u}_2 + \bar{u}_1}{2} - g_0(t)$$

which is a consistent slope estimate, so looks like a good choice. But this also makes sense:

$$S_1 = \frac{u_1 - g_0(t)}{h/2}$$

To get this using ghost cells we would have needed

$$u_0 = u_2 - 4u_1 + 4g_0$$

which is weird & is not quadratic extrapolation,

which would be

$$u_0 = \frac{8g_0}{3} - 2u_1 + u_2/3$$

Which choice is "good"?

(18)

Demo in class

Getting clear second-order convergence up to the boundary is difficult when both advection & diffusion compete.

More important is to avoid spurious reflections from artificial boundaries, since these pollute the solution in the domain we care about.

In 2D/3D, corners are even harder & sometimes singular & not even well-posed in the PDE itself.

BCs for diffusion

It is useful here to consider first elliptic PDE

$$\mathcal{L}u = f \quad \begin{matrix} \text{elliptic} \\ \text{operator WITH} \\ \text{BCs} \end{matrix}$$

with BCs. General rule:

Discretize elliptic operator

with BCs to (say) 2nd order

to get linear system:

$$LU + F^{(BC)} = F \quad \begin{matrix} \text{(elliptic)} \\ \text{From inhomogeneous} \\ \text{BCs} \end{matrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow U_t = LU + F^{(BC)} \quad \begin{matrix} \text{(parabolic)} \\ \text{MOL} \end{matrix}$$

and you will get 2nd order for the parabolic eq. as well

(20)


Let us consider both FD & FV schemes, i.e., grids where the boundary is either a grid point or a face

[Both appear in FV in 2D


sometimes, say incompressible

Navier-Stokes on staggered grid]

$$u_{xx} = f, \quad x \in (0, L)$$



$$x_0 = 0, \quad x_1 = h, \quad x_2 = 2h$$



(21)

For FD, Dirichlet BC is easy, just set "ghost" cell:


$$u_0 = u(0)$$

$$\Rightarrow \left(u_{xx} \right)_{x=h} \approx \frac{u_2 - 2u_1 + u_0}{h^2} \quad u_0 = u(0)$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} (Lu)_1 = \frac{u_2 - 2u_1}{h^2} \\ F_1^{(BC)} = \frac{u(0)}{h^2} \end{cases} \quad (\text{FD - Dirichlet})$$

For FV, homogeneous Neumann is easy since it really means no flux through boundary.

For inhomogeneous BCs, set



$$\frac{u_1 - u_0}{h} \approx u_x(x=0)$$

$$\Rightarrow u_0 = u_1 - h u_x(x=0)$$

$$(u_{xx})_{x=h/2} \approx \frac{u_2 - 2u_1 + u_0}{h^2}$$

$$= \frac{u_2 - u_1}{h^2} - \frac{u_x(x=0)}{h} \Rightarrow$$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} (Lu)_1 &= \frac{u_2 - u_1}{h^2} && (\text{FV-Neumann}) \\ F_1^{BC} &= - \frac{u_x(x=0)}{h} \end{aligned} \right.$$

(23)

Is this second order?
The easiest way to check
is to check if exact for
quadratic functions. That is,
take

$$u(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$$

$$u_1 = u(h/2)$$

$$u_2 = u(3h/2)$$

& confirm that

$$\frac{u_2 - u_1}{h^2} - \frac{u_x(x=0)}{h} = u_{xx}(0) = 2a$$

which shows 2nd order

(24)

For FD, however, Neumann BC is less obvious.

One option (Section 2.12 in FD book of LeVeque):

$$\frac{u_1 - u_0}{h} = u_x(x=0)$$

and use this equation instead of the PDE & the first point (u_0). This makes it harder to do parabolic for which we need PDE at $x=0$.

Instead, let's put a ghost point u_{-1} & use BC to fill it in:

E.g.

$$\frac{u_1 - u_{-1}}{2h} = u_x(x=0) \Rightarrow$$

$$u_{-1} = u_1 - 2h u_x(0)$$

$$(u_{xx})_{x=0} = \frac{1}{h^2} (u_{-1} - 2u_0 + u_1)$$

$$= \frac{2}{h^2} (u_1 - u_0 - h u_x(0)) \Rightarrow$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (Lu)_0 = \frac{2}{h^2} (u_1 - u_0) \\ F_0^{BC} = - \frac{2}{h} u_x(0) \end{array} \right. \quad \begin{array}{l} FD \\ Neumann \end{array}$$

(26)

This makes sense for the elliptic PDE since

$$\left. (\mathcal{L}u)_0 + F_0 \right|_{\text{BC}} \rightarrow \left. (\mathcal{L}u)(x=0) \right|_{\text{BC}}$$

$$\frac{2}{h^2} (u_1 - u_0 - h u_x(0)) = f(0)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{u_1 - u_0}{h} = u_x(0) + \frac{h}{2} f(0)$$


$$\frac{u(h) - u(0)}{h} = u_x(0) + \frac{h}{2} u_{xx}(0)$$

which is a one-sided Taylor series, one order more accurate than the previous attempt

$$\frac{u_1 - u_0}{h} = f(0)$$

(27)

Yet another approach is to use a 2nd order one-sided difference instead of ghost cells:



$$u(x \text{ near } 0) = ax^2 + bx + c$$

$$u_x(0) = b$$

$$u(0) = u_0 = c$$

$$u(1) = ah^2 + bh + c = u_1$$

$$u_{xx}(0) = 2a = \frac{2}{h^2} (u_1 - u_0)$$


Same as what we got before

$$\boxed{-\frac{2}{h} u_x(0)}$$

Since this is exact for quadratic functions, expect 2nd order

(28)

For FV, Dirichlet is less obvious. Let's try using a ghost cell



$$\frac{u_0 + u_1}{2} \underset{\substack{\leftarrow \\ BC}}{=} u(x=0)$$

$$\Rightarrow u_0 = 2u(0) - u_1$$

(linear extrapolation)

$$(u_{xx})(x=h/2) = \frac{1}{2} (u_0 - 2u_1 + u_2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{h^2} (-3u_1 + u_2 + 2u(0))$$

(29)

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} (Lu)_1 = \frac{1}{h^2} (u_2 - 3u_1) & FV \\ F_{1,BC} = \frac{2u(0)}{h^2} & \text{Dirichlet} \\ & \#1 \end{cases}$$

The matrix L looks like

$$L = \frac{1}{h^2} \begin{bmatrix} -3 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & -2 & \frac{1}{2} & & \\ & 1 & -2 & \ddots & \\ & & 1 & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}$$

which is symmetric negative definite, just like the Laplacian operator with Dirichlet BCs. So this is a good discretization in terms of robustness & physical fidelity? Is it 2nd order accurate?

If we plug in a quadratic function like before, we would get

$$\frac{1}{h^2} (-3u_1 + u_2 + 2u(0)) = \frac{3\alpha}{2} \neq 2\alpha = u_{xx}(h/2)$$

so this is not consistent with PDE at boundary.

Yet numerically this is 2nd order for diffusion equation.

But, if we also have advection, the error introduced into the domain is advected into the domain & we loose 2nd order (demo code)

Can we get 2nd order accuracy at boundary?

We want

$$U_{xx}(x=h/2) = \alpha u(h/2) + \beta(3h/2) + \gamma u(0)$$

to be exact for all quadratic functions

$$u(x) = ax^2 + bx + c \Rightarrow$$

(simple 3x3 linear solve)

$$\alpha = -\frac{4}{h^2} \quad \beta = \frac{4}{3h^2} \quad \gamma = \frac{8}{3h^2}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (Lu)_1 = \frac{4}{3h^2} (3u_1 - u_0) \\ F_1^{BC} = \frac{8u(0)}{3h^2} \end{array} \right.$$

FV
Dirichlet
#2
(32)

Note that the matrix L is no longer symmetric! Eigenvalues may not all be real ... so we could be sacrificing stability for accuracy.

An easier & more flexible way to derive the same BC & put it in codes (including non-constant diffusion!) is to use quadratic extrapolation to ghost cell

$$u_0 \approx u(-h/2) = -2u_1 + \frac{u_2}{3} + \frac{8u(0)}{3}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{u_0 - 2u_1 + u_2}{h^2} = \frac{4}{3h^2} (3u_1 - u_0) + \frac{8u(0)}{3h^2}$$

as before (33)

With non-constant diffusion:

$$F_{1/2} = -d_{1/2} \left(\frac{u_1 - u_0}{h} \right)$$

$$F_{3/2} = -d_{3/2} \left(\frac{u_2 - u_1}{h} \right)$$

$$\left((du_x)_x \right) (x = h/2) = - \frac{F_{3/2} - F_{1/2}}{h}$$

$$= - \frac{(3d_{1/2} + d_{3/2})}{h^2} u_1$$

$$+ \left(\frac{\frac{1}{3}d_{1/2} + d_{3/2}}{h^2} \right) u_2$$

$$+ \frac{8d_{1/2} u(0)}{3h^2}$$

matrix L

We will not have time to discuss theory in any detail here, and the general theory is called **GKSO theory** (Gustafsson, Kreiss, Oliger, Osher) and is complicated.

An important point to realize is that the error follows the same (discretized) PDE as the solution, (This follows from linearity) with the **local truncation error** as a source term on the r.h.s.

E.g. error at an inflow boundary will be adected into the domain (and is important)

For elliptic PDEs:

Let \hat{u} be numerical solution
& u be discretized true solution

Error $E = \hat{u} - u$

$$L\hat{u} = f \quad (\text{Discrete system})$$

Local Truncation error (LTE):

$$\tilde{e} = Lu - f$$

$$L(u - \hat{u}) = LE = \tilde{e}$$

If we make a larger error at a boundary, how it affects the interior depends on solution of

$LE = \tilde{e}$ which approximates

$$\approx \mathcal{L}_e = \tilde{e} \quad (\text{elliptic PDE + source on boundary}) \quad (36)$$

For $\mathcal{L} = \partial_{xx} + \text{periodic}$

$$\bar{\tau} = \frac{h^2}{12} u_{xxxx} + O(h^4)$$

(Taylor series)

$$\mathcal{L}e = \bar{\tau} \Rightarrow$$

$$e_{xx} \approx \frac{h^2}{12} u_{xxxx} \Rightarrow$$

$$e \approx \frac{h^2}{12} u_{xx} = \frac{h^2}{12} f$$

which is an excellent error estimate in the absence of boundaries.

Now imagine we have BCs, say Neumann on right & Dirichlet on left, and we modify L accordingly.

E.g. imagine

$$\bar{v} = \begin{bmatrix} c_L O(h^p) \\ O(h^2) \\ c_R O(h^q) \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{l} \leftarrow \text{Left e.g.} \\ p=0 \text{ (inconsistent)} \end{array}$$

$$c_L O(h^p) \quad \begin{array}{l} \leftarrow \text{Right e.g.} \\ q=1 \text{ (first order)} \end{array}$$

$$L = \frac{1}{h^2} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & -2 & \ddots & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 & -3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{(Discrete Laplacian)} \\ + \text{BCs} \end{array}$$

Solve $L E = \bar{v}$ & you will see that

$$E = O(h^2) \quad \underline{\text{everywhere}}$$

This is because $L^{-1} = h^2 O(1)$
has an h^2 in front which
helps us! Specifically

$$L^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = -\frac{h^2}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$L^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = h^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ \vdots \\ N \end{bmatrix} - \frac{h^2}{2}$$

error grows

S_0

$$E = h^2 \left[C_L O(h^P) + N \cdot C_R O(h^q) \right]$$

$$E = C_L O(h^{P+2}) + \\ L C_R O(h^{q+1})$$

This means we can get a 2nd order scheme even if $P=0$

$$\& q=1 !$$

To see this from the PDE perspective $\mathcal{L}e = \bar{z}$, note that e satisfies:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} e_{xx} = \frac{h^2}{12} u_{xxxx} \text{ (interior)} \\ e(x=0) = \alpha O(h^P) \\ e_x(x=L) = \beta O(h^q) \end{array} \right.$$

$$\Rightarrow e(x) = \frac{h^2}{12} f(x) + \alpha + \beta x$$

↗ constant ↘ grows

which tells us that error introduced at Dirichlet BC will propagate unchanged through interior, but error at Neumann boundary will grow in interior

(40)

For time-dependent PDEs,
consider MOL for simplicity

$$u'(t) = \underbrace{Lu(t)}_{\text{assume constant}} + g(t)$$

LTE $\hat{u}'(t) = \hat{L}\hat{u} + g + \bar{\epsilon}$

$$e'(t) = \hat{u}' - u' = \hat{L}e + \bar{\epsilon}$$

$$e' = \hat{L}e + \bar{\epsilon}$$

$$e_t = 2e + \bar{\epsilon} \quad] \begin{array}{l} \text{error approx.} \\ \text{satisfies same} \\ \text{PDE +} \\ \text{source} \end{array}$$

$$e' = L(e + L^{-1}\bar{\epsilon})$$

$$= L(e + \xi(t))$$

If scheme is stable, then
perturbation/error ξ won't
grow too fast

(41)

So if $\xi = O(h^P)$ then
 $e = O(h^P)$ for finite time.
 This means that we need
 to control / bound / estimate ξ :

$$L\xi = \bar{e}$$

which is the steady-state
 equation $L\xi = \bar{e}$, i.e.,
 elliptic PDE for parabolic eqs.
 this shows that if we
 discretize elliptic PDE + BCs
 to second order, we will get
 second order for the parabolic
 one if time integrator is
 stable & sufficiently accurate.

For advection-diffusion, error
 at inflow boundaries gets
 advected into the domain (42)