Tinite Différence Methods for HYPERBOLIC PDES A. DONEY, COUPANT the "right way" to solve hyperbolic conservation laws such as the advection equation or the wave eq. methods. is to use finite volume However, for periodic domains, and up to only 2nd order in space/time, there is no practical difference between FD and FV, so we proceed

We will focus on the advection eq: $U_{t} + (\alpha(x)U)_{x} = 0$ written in conservation form as: $u_{t} = -\frac{2}{2} f(u, x, t)$ f lu xwhere the absective flux f = an
gives the amount of conserved
quantity transported through the
point/plane at x per unit time

a(x) has the advective velocity units of length/time. Conservation $\frac{1}{dt} \left(\int_{dX}^{x+h/2} u(x,t) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{dX}^{x+h/2} u(x$ $=-+(u(x+\frac{1}{2}),x+\frac{1}{2},t)$ + + (n(x-h/2), x-h/2, +)

flux in => flux out if a>0 X_{1-1/2} X_{1+1/2} This is the basis of the FV method but we will not cover it. Neverthess, understanding concept of advective flux is crucial to understanding hyperbolic laws & solveng them.
The other hey concept (see PDE class) are space-time characteristics. (4)

These notes only conser 1D periodic (ring) Lomains. But, important for future - see class Computational Methods for PDES, Fall 2023, A. Donere (FV) 1 G. Stabler (FE) - wave equation $u_{tt} = c^2(x) u_{xx}$ - 2D/3D adreetion: $u_{t}=-\overrightarrow{r}\cdot(\overrightarrow{f}(u,\overrightarrow{x},t))=-\overrightarrow{r}\cdot(\overrightarrow{a}u)$ where $a(\overrightarrow{x},t)$ is a velocity field

Aside: Wave equation as 1st order system

Jensit of sound

Jensit of sound

Jensit of sound

Speed of sound

Ox(80) = -7 (802) = momentum

conservation 2tS = - V.(SD) pressure mass conservation 2++5 = -7. 2+ (8) = -7. 7(8c2) => $\partial_{t+} S = -\nabla^2 \left[S \left(C(S, x, t) \right)^2 \right]$ is a more general wave equation for acoustic waves/sound in air

Second aside: Light waves Maxwell equations in empty vacuum: $\begin{cases}
\nabla \cdot E = 0 & (\text{electric field}) \\
\nabla \cdot B = 0 & (\text{magnetic field})
\end{cases}$ $\begin{cases}
\nabla \times E = -\frac{\partial B}{\partial t} \\
\nabla \times B = \frac{1}{C^2} \frac{\partial E}{\partial t}
\end{cases}$ Speed of light $= -\left(\nabla(\nabla \cdot t) - \nabla^2 t\right) = \nabla^2 t = 0$ $= -\left(\nabla(\nabla \cdot t) - \nabla^2 t\right) = C^2 \nabla^2 t = 0$ $= C^2 \nabla^2 t = 0$ =

For now focus on seeningly (!) trivial equation XE [O, L)
periodic domain \mathbb{N_t+an_x=0} $\int u(x,0) = \eta(x)$ Aside: In higher Limensions,
if $\nabla \cdot \vec{a} = 0$ (incompressible velocity field), then $u_t + \vec{a} \cdot \vec{\nabla} u = 0$ Solution $u(x,t) = \eta(x-at)$ simply translates with speed a to the right if a >0, or to the left if a <0. Surprisingly, very few numerical methods can obtain the exact solution. And those that do, do not work for non-constant a! So we should not try to rely on the fact a is constant in our numerical methods at all. Why is advection harder than Lithisian for numerical methods Class discussion of properties of heat us. advertion eq. [8] Go to Fourier Space: $u_{+} = -iak \hat{u}$ =) eigenvalues $\lambda_k = -iak$ 04 PDE are purely maginary:
No dissipation (smoothing), only
transport. Shochs can form for nonlinear PDEs. $\|u\|_2 = \|\tilde{u}\|_2 = \text{const}$ But numerical methods will have a hard time with that 9

physical constraint, especially for non-smooth solutions. Numerical methods introduce artificial -dissipation: $Re(\lambda_k) < 0$ for most kfrequencies/wavelengths travel at different speeds - solution is distorted This is covered in detail in Comp. methods for PDE class. Here we will do a demo in Matlab in class...

 $U_{+} = -\alpha U_{X}$ Let's try method-of-lines (MOL) Emite-Difference (FD): $\frac{d}{dt}u_{j} = -\frac{\alpha}{2h}\left(u_{j+1} - u_{j-1}\right)$ Lu Centered Itherence

Ju An (livear ODEs) $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(t) = \exp(At)\overline{\mathcal{U}}(0)$

ÎN)

$$A = -\frac{2}{2h}$$

$$\frac{1}{1}$$

A = Diag { - ia sin(211 kh)} K = wave index $\lambda_k = -\frac{i\alpha}{h} \sin(kh) = -i\alpha k + O(h\gamma)$ purely magnary second order this means we <u>cannot</u> use explicit RK1 (Euler) or RK2, need at beast RK3 for centered advection (explicit)

it we want strong stability. If we only want Lax-Richtmyer stability, for forward Euler $= \left| 1 + \overline{z} \right|^{2} \leq 1 + \overline{z}^{2} \left| \lambda_{\text{max}} \right|^{2}$ $= 1 + \sqrt{7}$

$$|\lambda_{max}| = |\overline{\lambda}_{n}| = \frac{(a)}{h}$$

$$= 1 + \sqrt{2} |a|^{2} = 1 + \sqrt{2}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{h^{2}}{h^{2}}} = 1 + \sqrt{2}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{h^{2}}{|a|}} = 1 + \sqrt{2}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{h^{2}}{|a|}} = 1 + \sqrt{2}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{h^{2}}{|a|}} = 1 + \sqrt{2}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{h^{2}}{h^{2}}} = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{h^{2}}{h^{2}}} =$$

Instead, it we use RK3+

Runge-Kutta orders 1,2,3,4

2

RK2

RR1

-1

-2

-3

-5

-4

-3

-3

-3

-3

-5

-4

-3

-2

-1

-2

-3

-3

-5

-4

-3

-2

-1

-1

-2

-3

-5

-4

-3

-2

-1

-1

-2

-3

-5

-4

-3

-2

-1

0

1

2

absolute stability region neludes [-ic]+ic]

then we get $\frac{1}{2} \leq c \frac{1}{|\alpha|}$ c = 0(1)

et strong stability if

La = Advective

CFL/courant

condition

 $v = \frac{\tau_{lal}}{h} \leq c \in \frac{\text{Courant}}{\text{advective}}$ Now this makes sense physically in terms of Lourain of dependence of PDE (see 10.7 in Le Vegue), and units make sense too time = length space Information must not propagate than (about) one grid
per time step (17) by further cell

But, RK3 is expensive! Temporal error = $O(\overline{z}^3) = O(h^3)$ but spatial error = $O(h^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, and recall we want Spatial error & temporal error & O(h) How can we accomplish that? RK2 is not absolutely stable for magnary eigs. = We must switch sto a non-mot scheme
to so I st or 2 nd order! (B)

RK4 : We could use 4th order centered discretization with a first desirative: of the $-\alpha \cdot \frac{|u_{j-2}(t) - 8u_{j-1}(t) + 8u_{j+1}(t) - u_{j+2}(t)}{12h}$ uo V;(t)! DEMO milass How good is this? We could also use RK3 with a 3rd order left-biased Lifterence $W_{i} = -a \cdot \left[\frac{u_{j-2} - 6u_{j-1} + 3u_{j} + 2u_{j+1}}{6h} \right]$ Is this good? We will see (1)

For the 4th order centered, in Fourier space (von-Neumann analysis) $\hat{u}_{k}' = -i a k \left(1 - \frac{1}{30} (k l) + 0 (k l)^{5}\right)$ purely magnay For the 3 order left-biased, $u_{k} = -i \alpha k \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{30} (k l)^{4} + 0 (k l)^{5} \right)$ $-\alpha \left(\frac{k^{4} l^{3}}{12} + 0 (l^{5}) \right) \delta^{r2} \circ r^{der}$ if a > 0 then real part < 0 for | k | < 11 \\ 20 h