

# *OpenCMISS-iron examples and tests used by OpenCMISS developers at University of Stuttgart, Germany*

Christian Bleiler\*, Dr.-Ing. Nehzat Emamy<sup>†</sup>  
Andreas Hessenthaler\*, Thomas Klotz\*,  
Aaron Krämer<sup>‡</sup>, Benjamin Maier<sup>†</sup>, Sergio Morales\*,  
Mylena Mordhorst\*, Harry Saini\*

March 15, 2018  
09:58

## CONTENTS

1	Test summary	7
1.1	Details	7
2	Introduction	9
2.1	Cogui files for cmgui-2.9	9
2.2	Variations to consider	9
2.3	Folder structure	10
3	Progress	11
3.1	Equations to test	11
3.2	Setting up a new test	11
3.3	Long-term goals	12
4	Diffusion equation	13
4.1	Equation in general form	13
4.2	Example-0001 [VALIDATED]	14
4.2.1	Mathematical model - 2D	14
4.2.2	Mathematical model - 3D	14
4.2.3	Computational model	14
4.2.4	Result summary	15
4.3	Example-0001-u [PLAUSIBLE]	18
4.3.1	Mathematical model - 2D	18
4.3.2	Mathematical model - 3D	18
4.3.3	Computational model	18

\* Institute of Applied Mechanics (CE), University of Stuttgart, Pfaffenwaldring 7, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany

† Institute for Parallel and Distributed Systems, University of Stuttgart, Universitätsstraße 38, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany

‡ Lehrstuhl Mathematische Methoden für komplexe Simulation der Naturwissenschaft und Technik, University of Stuttgart, Allmandring 5b, 70569 Stuttgart, Germany

4.3.4	Result summary . . . . .	19
4.4	Example-0002 [VALIDATED] . . . . .	22
4.4.1	Mathematical model - 2D . . . . .	22
4.4.2	Mathematical model - 3D . . . . .	22
4.4.3	Computational model . . . . .	22
4.4.4	Result summary . . . . .	23
4.5	Example-0003 [COMPILES] . . . . .	26
4.5.1	Mathematical model - 2D . . . . .	26
4.5.2	Mathematical model - 3D . . . . .	26
4.5.3	Computational model . . . . .	26
4.5.4	Result summary . . . . .	27
4.6	Example-0004 [VALIDATED] . . . . .	30
4.6.1	Mathematical model - 2D . . . . .	30
4.6.2	Computational model . . . . .	30
4.6.3	Result summary . . . . .	30
4.7	Example-0005 [VALIDATED] . . . . .	32
4.7.1	Mathematical model - 2D . . . . .	32
4.7.2	Mathematical model - 3D . . . . .	32
4.7.3	Computational model . . . . .	32
4.7.4	Result summary . . . . .	33
4.8	Example-0011 [VALIDATED] . . . . .	36
4.8.1	Mathematical model - 2D . . . . .	36
4.8.2	Mathematical model - 3D . . . . .	36
4.8.3	Computational model . . . . .	36
4.8.4	Result summary . . . . .	37
4.9	Example-0012 [VALIDATED] . . . . .	40
4.9.1	Mathematical model - 2D . . . . .	40
4.9.2	Mathematical model - 3D . . . . .	40
4.9.3	Computational model . . . . .	40
4.9.4	Result summary . . . . .	41
4.10	Example-0013 [VALIDATED] . . . . .	44
4.10.1	Mathematical model - 2D . . . . .	44
4.10.2	Mathematical model - 3D . . . . .	44
4.10.3	Computational model . . . . .	44
4.10.4	Result summary . . . . .	46
	4.10.5 Misc . . . . .	46
5	Linear elasticity	49
5.1	Equation in general form . . . . .	49
5.2	Example-0101 [PLAUSIBLE] . . . . .	50
5.2.1	Mathematical model . . . . .	50
5.2.2	Computational model . . . . .	50
5.2.3	Validation . . . . .	51
5.3	Example-0102 [PLAUSIBLE] . . . . .	54
5.3.1	Mathematical model . . . . .	54
5.3.2	Computational model . . . . .	54
5.3.3	Validation . . . . .	55
5.4	Example-0111 [PLAUSIBLE] . . . . .	58
5.4.1	Mathematical model . . . . .	58
5.4.2	Computational model . . . . .	58
5.4.3	Validation . . . . .	59
5.5	Example-0112 [PLAUSIBLE] . . . . .	61
5.5.1	Mathematical model . . . . .	61
5.5.2	Computational model . . . . .	61

5.5.3	Validation	62
6	Finite elasticity	64
6.1	Example-0201-u [PLAUSIBLE]	65
6.1.1	Mathematical model - 3D	65
6.1.2	Computational model	65
6.1.3	Result summary	66
6.2	Example-0204-u [PLAUSIBLE]	67
6.2.1	Mathematical model - 3D	67
6.2.2	Computational model	67
6.2.3	Result summary	68
7	Navier-Stokes flow	71
7.1	Equation in general form	71
7.2	Example-0302-u [COMPILES]	72
7.2.1	Mathematical model - 2D	72
7.2.2	Mathematical model - 3D	73
7.2.3	Computational model	73
7.2.4	Result summary	74
8	Monodomain	75
8.1	Example-0401 [PLAUSIBLE]	76
8.1.1	Mathematical model	76
8.1.2	Computational model	76
8.1.3	Results	77
8.1.4	Validation	77
8.2	Example-0402 [PLAUSIBLE]	81
8.2.1	Mathematical model	81
8.2.2	Computational model	81
8.2.3	Results	82
8.2.4	Validation	82
8.3	Example-0404-c [PLAUSIBLE]	86
8.3.1	Mathematical model	86
8.3.2	Computational model	86
8.3.3	Results	87
8.3.4	Validation	87
9	CellML model	88

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].	15
Figure 2	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].	16
Figure 3	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].	16
Figure 4	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].	17
Figure 5	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].	20
Figure 6	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].	20
Figure 7	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].	21

Figure 8	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0]. . . . .	21
Figure 9	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0]. . . . .	23
Figure 10	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0]. . . . .	24
Figure 11	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0]. . . . .	24
Figure 12	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0]. . . . .	25
Figure 13	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0]. . . . .	28
Figure 14	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0]. . . . .	28
Figure 15	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0]. . . . .	29
Figure 16	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0]. . . . .	29
Figure 17	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [8 4 0 2 0]. . . . .	31
Figure 18	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [8 4 0 2 0]. . . . .	31
Figure 19	2D geometry and mesh. . . . .	33
Figure 20	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2 2 0]. . . . .	33
Figure 21	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2 2 0]. . . . .	34
Figure 22	3D geometry (unit cube) and mesh. . . . .	34
Figure 23	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [3 2 0]. . . . .	35
Figure 24	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [3 2 0]. . . . .	35
Figure 25	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 1 1]. . . . .	38
Figure 26	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 1 1]. . . . .	38
Figure 27	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 1 1 1]. . . . .	39
Figure 28	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 1 1 1]. . . . .	39
Figure 29	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0 0 0]. . . . .	42
Figure 30	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0 0 0]. . . . .	42
Figure 31	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0 0 0]. . . . .	43
Figure 32	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0 0 0]. . . . .	43
Figure 33	2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0]. . . . .	46
Figure 34	2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0]. . . . .	47

Figure 35	3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732 0.174532925199433]. . . . .	47
Figure 36	3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732 0.174532925199433]. . . . .	48
Figure 37	Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh. . . . .	51
Figure 38	Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh. . . . .	52
Figure 39	Results, iron 2D fine mesh. . . . .	53
Figure 40	Results, iron 3D fine mesh. . . . .	53
Figure 41	Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh. . . . .	55
Figure 42	Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh. . . . .	56
Figure 43	Results, iron 2D fine mesh. . . . .	57
Figure 44	Results, iron 3D fine mesh. . . . .	57
Figure 45	Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh. . . . .	59
Figure 46	Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh. . . . .	60
Figure 47	Results, iron 2D fine mesh. . . . .	60
Figure 48	Results, iron 3D fine mesh. . . . .	60
Figure 49	Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh. . . . .	62
Figure 50	Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh. . . . .	63
Figure 51	Results, iron 2D fine mesh. . . . .	63
Figure 52	Results, iron 3D fine mesh. . . . .	63
Figure 53	3D results, iron reference. . . . .	66
Figure 54	Iron reference run, undeformed geometry and deformed geometry with pressure field. . . . .	68
Figure 55	Iron reference run, top-left to bottom-right: Deformed geometry with displacement field magnitude, x-component, y-component and z-component. . . . .	69
Figure 56	CHearm reference run, top-left to bottom-right: Deformed geometry with displacement field magnitude, x-component, y-component and z-component. . . . .	70
Figure 57	Result of scenario with $10 \times 10$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	77
Figure 58	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	78
Figure 59	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , iterative solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	78
Figure 60	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , iterative solver, $p = 2$ processes . . . . .	79
Figure 61	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , iterative solver, $p = 8$ processes . . . . .	79
Figure 62	Result of scenario with $2 \times 2$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	80
Figure 63	Result of scenario with $2 \times 2$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 2$ processes . . . . .	80
Figure 64	Result of scenario with $10 \times 10$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	82
Figure 65	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	83
Figure 66	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , iterative solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	83
Figure 67	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , iterative solver, $p = 2$ processes . . . . .	84

Figure 68	Result of scenario with $24 \times 24$ elements, $t = 20$ , iterative solver, $p = 8$ processes . . . . .	84
Figure 69	Result of scenario with $2 \times 2$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 1$ process . . . . .	85
Figure 70	Result of scenario with $2 \times 2$ elements, $t = 20$ , direct solver, $p = 2$ processes . . . . .	85
Figure 71	$V_m$ for time $t = 1.0$ , different time step widths $dt \in \{0.01, 0.005, 0.001, 0.0005, 0.00025\}$ . . . . .	87
Figure 72	Error at $t = 1.0$ for different time steps widths. The slope (=experimental order of convergence) should be around 1. . . . .	87
Figure 73	$V_m$ for time $t = 3.0$ , different time step widths $ddt \in \{0.01, 0.005, 0.001, 0.0005, 0.00025\}$ . . . . .	87
Figure 74	Error at $t = 3.0$ for different time steps widths. The slope (=experimental order of convergence) should be around 1. . . . .	87

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic uniaxial extensions . . . . .	52
Table 2	Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic shear . . . . .	56
Table 3	Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic uniaxial extensions . . . . .	60
Table 4	Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic shear . . . . .	63

## 1 TEST SUMMARY

Passed tests: 180 / 206

### 1.1 Details

Content of: example-0001/results/failed.tests

Content of: example-0001-u/results/failed.tests

current\_run/l2x1x0\_n8x4x0\_i8\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n8x4x0\_i8\_s1/Example.part0.exnode

| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 0.05804  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 0.05804

Content of: example-0002/results/failed.tests

Content of: example-0003/results/failed.tests

Failed tests:

current\_run/l2x1x0\_n2x1x0\_i1\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n4x2x0\_i1\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n8x4x0\_i1\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n2x1x0\_i2\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n4x2x0\_i2\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n8x4x0\_i2\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n2x1x0\_i1\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n4x2x0\_i1\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n8x4x0\_i1\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n2x1x0\_i2\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n4x2x0\_i2\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x0\_n8x4x0\_i2\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n2x1x1\_i1\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n4x2x2\_i1\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n8x4x4\_i1\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n2x1x1\_i2\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n4x2x2\_i2\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n8x4x4\_i2\_s0/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n2x1x1\_i1\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n4x2x2\_i1\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n8x4x4\_i1\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n2x1x1\_i2\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n4x2x2\_i2\_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current\_run/l2x1x1\_n8x4x4\_i2\_s1/Example.part0.exnode

| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 44.2627  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 37.2770  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 32.2165  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 27.3358  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 22.1869  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 19.7449  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 44.2627  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 37.2770  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 32.2165  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 27.3358  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 22.1869  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 19.7449  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 124.749  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 128.672  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 143.606  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 94.2619  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 98.7606  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 118.047  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 124.749  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 128.672  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 143.606  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 94.2619  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 98.7606  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 118.047

Content of: example-0004/results/failed.tests

No failed tests.

Content of: example-0005/results/failed.tests

No failed tests.

Content of: example-0011/results/failed.tests

No failed tests.

Content of: example-0012/results/failed.tests

No failed tests.

Content of: example-0013/results/failed.tests

Content of: example-0201-u/results/failed.tests  
No failed tests.

Content of: example-0302-u/results/failed.tests

Content of: example-0401/results/failed.tests  
No failed tests.

Content of: example-0402/results/failed.tests  
No failed tests.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

This document contains information about examples used for testing *OpenCMISS-iron*. Read: How-to<sup>1</sup> and [1].

### 2.1 Cogui files for cmgui-2.9

#### 2.2 Variations to consider

- Geometry and topology
  - 1D, 2D, 3D
  - Length, width, height
  - Number of elements
  - Interpolation order
  - Generated or user meshes
  - quad/hex or tri/tet meshes
- Initial conditions
- Load cases
  - Dirichlet BC
  - Neumann BC
  - Volume force
  - Mix of previous items
- Sources, sinks
- Time dependence
  - Static
  - Quasi-static
  - Dynamic
- Material laws
  - Linear
  - Nonlinear (Mooney-Rivlin, Neo-Hookean, Ogden, etc.)
  - Active (Stress, strain)
- Material parameters, anisotropy
- Solver
  - Direct
  - Iterative
- Test cases
  - Numerical reference data
  - Analytical solution
- A mix of previous items

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://bitbucket.org/hessenthaler/opencmiss-howto>

### 2.3 Folder structure

TBD..

### 3 PROGRESS

People working on setting up tests in alphabetical order (surnames) with initials:

- CB : Christian Bleiler
- NE : Dr.-Ing. Nehzat Emamy
- AH : Andreas Hessenthaler
- TK : Thomas Klotz
- AK : Aaron Krämer
- BM : Benjamin Maier
- SM : Sergio Morales
- MM : Mylena Mordhorst
- HS : Harry Saini

#### 3.1 Equations to test

Test single-physics problems before multi-physics problems!

- Diffusion equation (Laplace, Poisson, Generalized Laplace, ALE Diffusion, etc.)
- Linear elasticity equation (compressible and incompressible)
- Finite elasticity equation (compressible and incompressible Mooney-Rivlin, etc.)
- Navier-Stokes equation (ALE, Stokes, etc.)
- Monodomain equation
- CellML models
- Skeletal muscle models
- Fluid-structure interaction
- etc.

#### 3.2 Setting up a new test

Use the following guideline to set up a new test:

1. Check if it is already there
2. Talk to other developers
3. Create a new subfolder examples/example-xxxx
4. Document the setup (computational domain, etc.) in examples/example-xxxx/doc/example.tex
5. Set up example with all parameters as command line arguments, see Section [2.2](#)

6. Set up reference results (CHeart, Abaqus, analytical solution, etc.)
7. Set up script to run all tests in your example directory
8. Set up script to perform comparison between iron results and reference results
9. Set up visualization scripts
10. Compile, run, test, visualize your example
11. Compile, run, test, visualize all examples

For each example, progress is documented in the respective section titles with the following **TAG**:

- **DOCUMENTED**: finish the documentation of the example (spatial domain, number of time steps, boundary conditions, etc.)
- **COMPILES**: example compiles (for default parameters)
- **RUNS**: example runs (for default parameters)
- **CONVERGES**: no convergence issues (for default parameters, results not plausible)
- **PLAUSIBLE**: results look sensible (for default parameters)
- **VALIDATED**: for all parameter sets it gives the correct results as compared to CHeart/Abaqus/analytical solution (includes visualization scripts, run scripts, comparison scripts, documentation!, ...)

Move all tags **CONVERGE**, **PLAUSIBLE** to **VALIDATED**.

Next steps include:

- Everybody runs everything!
- Meeting with Oliver
- Meeting with Auckland

### 3.3 Long-term goals

- Different testing targets
  - SMALL : small, fast tests
  - BIG : same as before; further, bigger and more complex geometries, convergence analysis
  - PARALLEL : same as before but in parallel
- Add more examples/those which were on the agenda but not started
- Jenkins continuous testing, integration and deployment
  - test SMALL/BIG/PARALLEL targets
  - integrate with GitHub (pull-requests triggers Jenkins, merge on success)

## 4 DIFFUSION EQUATION

### 4.1 Equation in general form

The governing equation is,

$$\partial_t u + \nabla \cdot [\sigma \nabla u] = f, \quad (1)$$

with conductivity tensor  $\sigma$ . The conductivity tensor is,

- defined in material coordinates (fibre direction),
- diagonal,
- defined per element.

## 4.2 Example-0001 [VALIDATED]

Example uses generated regular meshes and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

### 4.2.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (2)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = 1. \quad (4)$$

No material parameters to specify.

### 4.2.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (5)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = z = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = z = 1. \quad (7)$$

No material parameters to specify.

### 4.2.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 1

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 1

```


2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 1

```

#### 4.2.4 Result summary

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

Passed tests: 24 / 24



**Figure 1:** 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].





Figure 2: 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].



**Figure 3:** 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].




Figure 4: 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].

### 4.3 Example-0001-u [PLAUSIBLE]

Example uses user-defined regular meshes in CHearm mesh format and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

Issues: Interpolation type 8 (quadratic simplex) gives significantly different results compared to CHearm whereas all other simplex mesh results correspond rather well..

#### 4.3.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (8)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = 1. \quad (10)$$

No material parameters to specify.

#### 4.3.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (11)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = z = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = z = 1. \quad (13)$$

No material parameters to specify.

#### 4.3.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 0

```

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 7 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 8 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 7 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 8 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 7 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 8 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 7 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 8 1

```

- Note: Binary uses command line arguments to search for the relevant mesh files.

#### 4.3.4 Result summary

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

Passed tests: 30 / 32

current_run/l2x1x0_n8x4x0_i8_s0/Example.part0.exnode	CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 0.05804
current_run/l2x1x0_n8x4x0_i8_s1/Example.part0.exnode	CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 0.05804




Figure 5: 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].




Figure 6: 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].




Figure 7: 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].




Figure 8: 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].

#### 4.4 Example-0002 [VALIDATED]

Example uses generated regular meshes and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

##### 4.4.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (14)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 15y \quad x = 0, \quad (15)$$

$$u = 25 - 18y \quad x = 2. \quad (16)$$

No material parameters to specify.

##### 4.4.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (17)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 15y \quad x = 0, \quad (18)$$

$$u = 25 - 18y \quad x = 2. \quad (19)$$

No material parameters to specify.

##### 4.4.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 1


2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 1

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 1  
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 1  
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 1  
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 1  
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 0  
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 0  
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0  
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 0  
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 0  
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 0  
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 1  
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 1  
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1  
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 1  
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 1  
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 1


#### 4.4.4 *Result summary*

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.


Passed tests: 24 / 24




**Figure 9:** 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].



**Figure 10:** 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].



**Figure 11:** 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].



**Figure 12:** 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].

#### 4.5 Example-0003 [COMPILES]

Example uses generated regular meshes and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

Issues: Not clear how to prescribe Neumann BC. Results seem weird. Reference results are set up.

##### 4.5.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (20)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 15y \quad x = 0, \quad (21)$$

$$\partial_n u = 25 - 18y \quad x = 2. \quad (22)$$

No material parameters to specify.

##### 4.5.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (23)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 15y \quad x = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\partial_n u = 25 - 18y \quad x = 2. \quad (25)$$

No material parameters to specify.

##### 4.5.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 0

2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 0

```

2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 1

```

#### 4.5.4 Result summary

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

Passed tests: 0 / 24

Failed tests:

```

current_run/l2x1x0_n2x1x0_i1_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n4x2x0_i1_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n8x4x0_i1_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n2x1x0_i2_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n4x2x0_i2_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n8x4x0_i2_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n2x1x0_i1_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n4x2x0_i1_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n8x4x0_i1_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n2x1x0_i2_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n4x2x0_i2_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n8x4x0_i2_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x0_n2x1x0_i1_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n2x1x1_i1_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n4x2x2_i1_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i1_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n2x1x1_i2_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n4x2x2_i2_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s0/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n2x1x1_i1_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n4x2x2_i1_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i1_s1/Example.part0.exnode
current_run/l2x1x1_n2x1x1_i2_s1/Example.part0.exnode


```

CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 44.2627
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 37.2770
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 32.2165
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 27.3358
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 22.1869
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 19.7449
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 44.2627
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 37.2770
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 32.2165
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 27.3358
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 22.1869
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 19.7449
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 124.749
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 128.672
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 143.606
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 94.2619
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 98.7606
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 118.047
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 124.749
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 128.672
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 143.606
CHeart	- Iron	_2 = 94.2619

```
current_run/l2x1x1_n4x2x2_i2_s1/Example.part0.exnode  
current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s1/Example.part0.exnode
```


| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 98.7606  
| CHeart - Iron |<sub>2</sub> = 118.047

**Figure 13:** 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].



**Figure 14:** 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0].

Figure 15: 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 1 0].



**Figure 16:** 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0].

## 4.6 Example-0004 [VALIDATED]

Example uses generated regular meshes and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

### 4.6.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (26)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 2.0e^x \cdot \cos(y) \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \quad (27)$$

No material parameters to specify.

### 4.6.2 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

integer: number of elements in x-direction  
 integer: number of elements in y-direction  
 integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)  
 integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)  
 integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

```
4 2 0 1 0
8 4 0 1 0
2 1 0 2 0
4 2 0 2 0
8 4 0 2 0
4 2 0 1 1
8 4 0 1 1
2 1 0 2 1
4 2 0 2 1
8 4 0 2 1
100 50 0 1 0 (not tested yet..)
100 50 0 2 0 (not tested yet..)
100 50 0 1 1 (not tested yet..)
100 50 0 2 1 (not tested yet..)
```

### 4.6.3 Result summary

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

Passed tests: 10 / 10

No failed tests.




Figure 17: 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [8 4 0 2 0].




Figure 18: 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [8 4 0 2 0].

## 4.7 Example-0005 [VALIDATED]

Example uses two user-defined (2d and 3d) unregular meshes and solves a patch test in form of a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step. Here, a Laplace problem with two Dirichlet boundary conditions is solved. The analytical solution for this setting is known and results in a linear distribution of the scalar Laplace parameter  $u$ . The numerical solution has to recover this the linear distribution in order to pass the Patch test. 2d and 3d meshes are according to MacNeil and Harder (1985).

### 4.7.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 0.24] \times [0, 0.12], \quad (28)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (29)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 0.24. \quad (30)$$

No material parameters to specify.

### 4.7.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla u = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (31)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (32)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 1. \quad (33)$$

No material parameters to specify.

### 4.7.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

integer: dimension (2: 2d; 3: 3d)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

2 1 0

2 2 0

2 1 1

2 2 1

3 1 0

3 2 0

3 1 1

3 2 1

#### 4.7.4 Result summary

Since the analytical result is known and the numerical results have to recover the linear distribution of  $u$ , the comparisons are done with the analytical solution.

Passed tests: 8 / 8

No failed tests.




Figure 19: 2D geometry and mesh.




Figure 20: 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2 2 0].




Figure 21: 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2 2 0].




Figure 22: 3D geometry (unit cube) and mesh.




Figure 23: 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [3 2 0].




Figure 24: 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [3 2 0].

#### 4.8 Example-0011 [VALIDATED]

Example uses generated regular meshes and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

##### 4.8.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot [\sigma \nabla u] = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (34)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = 0, \quad (35)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = 1. \quad (36)$$

The conductivity tensor is defined as,

$$\sigma(x, t) = \sigma = I. \quad (37)$$

##### 4.8.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot [\sigma \nabla u] = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (38)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = z = 0, \quad (39)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = z = 1. \quad (40)$$

The conductivity tensor is defined as,

$$\sigma(x, t) = \sigma = I. \quad (41)$$

##### 4.8.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

float:  $\sigma_{11}$

float:  $\sigma_{22}$

float:  $\sigma_{33}$  (ignored for 2D)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

```

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 0 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 0 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 0 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 0 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 0 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 0 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 1 1 1 1
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 1 1 1 1

```

#### 4.8.4 *Result summary*

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

Passed tests: 24 / 24

No failed tests.




Figure 25: 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 1].




Figure 26: 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 1 1].




Figure 27: 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 1 1].




Figure 28: 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 1 1].

#### 4.9 Example-0012 [VALIDATED]

Example uses generated regular meshes and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

##### 4.9.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot [\sigma \nabla u] = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (42)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = 0, \quad (43)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = 1. \quad (44)$$

The conductivity tensor is defined as,

$$\sigma(x, t) = \sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

##### 4.9.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot [\sigma \nabla u] = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (46)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = z = 0, \quad (47)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = z = 1. \quad (48)$$

The conductivity tensor is defined as,

$$\sigma(x, t) = \sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 7 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

##### 4.9.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

float:  $\sigma_{11}$

float:  $\sigma_{22}$

float:  $\sigma_{33}$  (ignored for 2D)

float: angle 1

float: angle 2

float: angle 3

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

```

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 0 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 0 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 0 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 0 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 0 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 1 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 1 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 1 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 1 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 1 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 1 2 3 0 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 0 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 0 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 0 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 0 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 0 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 1 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 1 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 1 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 1 2 3 7 0 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 1 2 3 7 0 0 0

```

#### 4.9.4 *Result summary*

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

Passed tests: 24 / 24

No failed tests.




Figure 29: 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0 0 0].






Figure 30: 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0 0 0].



**Figure 31:** 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0 0 0].



**Figure 32:** 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0 0 0].

#### 4.10 Example-0013 [VALIDATED]

Example uses generated regular meshes and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

##### 4.10.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot [\sigma \nabla u] = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1], \quad (50)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = 0, \quad (51)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = 1. \quad (52)$$

The conductivity tensor is defined as,

$$\sigma(x, t) = \sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (53)$$

Rotation of fibres by 30 degrees (first angle).

##### 4.10.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot [\sigma \nabla u] = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 2] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (54)$$

with boundary conditions

$$u = 0 \quad x = y = z = 0, \quad (55)$$

$$u = 1 \quad x = 2, y = z = 1. \quad (56)$$

The conductivity tensor is defined as,

$$\sigma(x, t) = \sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 7 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (57)$$

Rotation of fibres by (30, 40, 10) degrees.

##### 4.10.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

float:  $\sigma_{11}$

```

float:  $\sigma_{22}$ 
float:  $\sigma_{33}$  (ignored for 2D)
float: angle 1
float: angle 2
float: angle 3

```

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

```

2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 1 1 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 1 1 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 1 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 2 1 0 2 1 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 4 2 0 2 1 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 2 1 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 0 2 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 1 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 2 1 1 2 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 4 2 2 2 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433
2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 2 1 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732
0.174532925199433

```

#### 4.10.4 Result summary

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

Passed tests: 24 / 24





Figure 33: 2D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0].

#### 4.10.5 Misc

OpenCMISS-iron assumes the conductivity tensor defined in local element  $\Xi$  coordinates and uses the fibre angles to rotate the conductivity tensor internally. The script `src/matlab/compute_conductivity_tensor.m` can be used to compute the conductivity tensor in world coordinates, since CHeart assumes the conductivity tensor to be defined in world coordinates. Thus, if one sets up a new test, one has to compute the conductivity tensor in world coordinates as input for CHeart to derive numerical reference data.



**Figure 34:** 2D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 0.0 8 4 0 1 0 2 3 0 0.523598775598299 0 0].





Figure 35: 3D results, iron reference w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 1 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732 0.174532925199433].



**Figure 36:** 3D results, current run w/ command line arguments [2.0 1.0 1.0 8 4 4 1 0 2 3 7 0.523598775598299 0.698131700797732 0.174532925199433].

## 5 LINEAR ELASTICITY

### 5.1 Equation in general form

$$\partial_{tt} \mathbf{u} + \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{u}, t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, t) \quad (58)$$

## 5.2 Example-0101 [PLAUSIBLE]

### 5.2.1 Mathematical model

We solve the following equation (both 2D and 3D domains are considered),

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}, t) = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 160] \times [0, 120] \times [0, 120], t \in [0, 5], \quad (59)$$

with time step size  $\Delta t = 1$  and  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y]$  in 2D  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y, u_z]$  in 3D. The boundary conditions in 2D are given by

$$u_x = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (60)$$

$$u_y = 0 \quad y = 0, \quad (61)$$

$$u_x = 8 \quad x = 160, \quad (62)$$

and in 3D by

$$u_x = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (63)$$

$$u_y = 0 \quad y = 0, \quad (64)$$

$$u_z = 0 \quad z = 0, \quad (65)$$

$$u_x = 8 \quad x = 160. \quad (66)$$

The material parameters are

$$E = 10000 \text{ MPa}, \quad (67)$$

$$\nu = 0.3, \quad (68)$$

$$(69)$$

### 5.2.2 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

float: elastic modulus

float: Poisson ratio

float: displacement percentage load

- Command line arguments for tests are:

160 120 0 8 6 0 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 0 16 12 0 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 0 32 24 0 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 120 8 6 6 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 120 16 12 12 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 120 32 24 24 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

```

160 120 0 8 6 0 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 0 16 12 0 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 0 32 24 0 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 120 8 6 6 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 120 16 12 12 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 120 32 24 24 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05

```

### 5.2.3 Validation

The iron results are compared to those from Abaqus (version 2017). The figures below show selected results from the validation simulations carried out in Abaqus and provide a qualitative validation. A quantitative validation was carried out by comparing the horizontal displacement  $u_y$  along the free-edge ( $y = 120$  for 2D and  $y = z = 120$  for 3D) and computing the L<sub>2</sub>-norm according to

$$L_2\text{-norm} = \frac{1}{N} \times \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{\left(u_{y,\text{abaqus}}^i - u_{y,\text{iron}}^i\right)^2}, \quad (70)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of nodes along the free-edge. The results over the mesh refinements are given in Table 1.





Figure 37: Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh.




Figure 38: Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh.

Dimension	Mesh	$L_2$ -norm	Interpolation
2D	Coarse	$5.322 \times 10^{-16}$	Linear
2D	Medium	$1.559 \times 10^{-15}$	Linear
2D	Fine	$2.900 \times 10^{-15}$	Linear
3D	Coarse	$3.071 \times 10^{-17}$	Linear
3D	Medium	$2.125 \times 10^{-17}$	Linear
3D	Fine	$2.924 \times 10^{-17}$	Linear
2D	Coarse	$9.728 \times 10^{-16}$	Quadratic
2D	Medium	$2.039 \times 10^{-15}$	Quadratic
2D	Fine	$2.159 \times 10^{-15}$	Quadratic
3D	Coarse	$6.687 \times 10^{-16}$	Quadratic
3D	Medium	...	Quadratic
3D	Fine	...	Quadratic

Table 1: Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic uniaxial extensions




Figure 39: Results, iron 2D fine mesh.




Figure 40: Results, iron 3D fine mesh.

### 5.3 Example-0102 [PLAUSIBLE]

#### 5.3.1 Mathematical model

We solve the following equation (both 2D and 3D domains are considered),

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}, t) = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, 160] \times [0, 120] \times [0, 120], t \in [0, 5], \quad (71)$$

with time step size  $\Delta t = 1$  and  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y]$  in 2D  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y, u_z]$  in 3D. The boundary conditions in 2D are given by

$$u_x = u_y = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (72)$$

$$u_x = 0 \quad x = 160, \quad (73)$$

$$u_y = 8 \quad x = 160, \quad (74)$$

and in 3D by

$$u_x = u_y = u_z = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (75)$$

$$u_x = u_z = 0 \quad x = 160, \quad (76)$$

$$u_y = 8 \quad x = 160. \quad (77)$$

The material parameters are

$$E = 10000 \text{ MPa}, \quad (78)$$

$$\nu = 0.3, \quad (79)$$

$$(80)$$

#### 5.3.2 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

float: elastic modulus

float: Poisson ratio

float: displacement percentage load

- Command line arguments for tests are:

160 120 0 8 6 0 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 0 16 12 0 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 0 32 24 0 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 120 8 6 6 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 120 16 12 12 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 120 32 24 24 1 0 10000 0.3 0.05

160 120 0 8 6 0 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05

```

160 120 0 16 12 0 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 0 32 24 0 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 120 8 6 6 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 120 16 12 12 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05
160 120 120 32 24 24 2 0 10000 0.3 0.05

```

### 5.3.3 Validation

The iron results are compared to those from Abaqus (version 2017). The figures below show selected results from the validation simulations carried out in Abaqus and provide a qualitative validation. A quantitative validation was carried out by comparing the horizontal displacement  $u_x$  along the free-edge ( $y = 120$  for 2D and  $y = z = 120$  for 3D) and computing the L<sub>2</sub>-norm according to

$$L_2\text{-norm} = \frac{1}{N} \times \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{(u_{y,\text{abaqus}}^i - u_{y,\text{iron}}^i)^2}, \quad (81)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of nodes along the free-edge. The results over the mesh refinements are given in Table 2.




Figure 41: Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh.




Figure 42: Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh.

Dimension	Mesh	$L_2$ -norm	Interpolation
2D	Coarse	$6.696 \times 10^{-3}$	Linear
2D	Medium	$1.273 \times 10^{-3}$	Linear
2D	Fine	$2.489 \times 10^{-4}$	Linear
3D	Coarse	$4.234 \times 10^{-4}$	Linear
3D	Medium	$4.184 \times 10^{-5}$	Linear
3D	Fine	$3.781 \times 10^{-6}$	Linear
2D	Coarse	$3.036 \times 10^{-4}$	Quadratic
2D	Medium	$6.099 \times 10^{-5}$	Quadratic
2D	Fine	$1.089 \times 10^{-5}$	Quadratic
3D	Coarse	...	Quadratic
3D	Medium	...	Quadratic
3D	Fine	...	Quadratic

Table 2: Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic shear




Figure 43: Results, iron 2D fine mesh.




Figure 44: Results, iron 3D fine mesh.

## 5.4 Example-0111 [PLAUSIBLE]

### 5.4.1 Mathematical model

We solve the following equation (both 2D and 3D domains are considered),

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}, t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, t) \quad \Omega = [0, 160] \times [0, 120] \times [0, 120], t \in [0, 5], \quad (82)$$

with time step size  $\Delta t = 1$  (used for load stepping) and  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y]$  in 2D  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y, u_z]$  in 3D. The boundary conditions in 2D are given by

$$u_x = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (83)$$

$$u_y = 0 \quad y = 0, \quad (84)$$

$$f(u_x) = 6.0 \times 10^4 \quad x = 160, \quad (85)$$

and in 3D by

$$u_x = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (86)$$

$$u_y = 0 \quad y = 0, \quad (87)$$

$$u_z = 0 \quad z = 0, \quad (88)$$

$$f(u_x) = 7.2 \times 10^6 \quad x = 160. \quad (89)$$

The material parameters are

$$E = 10000 \text{ MPa}, \quad (90)$$

$$\nu = 0.3, \quad (91)$$

$$(92)$$

### 5.4.2 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction

float: length along y-direction

float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)

integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

float: elastic modulus

float: Poisson ratio

float: XXX

- Command line arguments for tests are:

160 120 0 8 6 0 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX

160 120 0 16 12 0 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX

160 120 0 32 24 0 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX

160 120 120 8 6 6 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX

160 120 120 16 12 12 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX

```

160 120 120 32 24 24 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 8 6 0 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 16 12 0 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 32 24 0 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 8 6 6 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 16 12 12 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 32 24 24 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX

```

### 5.4.3 Validation

The iron results are compared to those from Abaqus (version 2017). The figures below show selected results from the validation simulations carried out in Abaqus and provide a qualitative validation. A quantitative validation was carried out by comparing the horizontal displacement  $u_y$  along the free-edge ( $y = 120$  for 2D and  $y = z = 120$  for 3D) and computing the L<sub>2</sub>-norm according to

$$L_2\text{-norm} = \frac{1}{N} \times \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{(u_{y, \text{abaqus}}^i - u_{y, \text{iron}}^i)^2}, \quad (93)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of nodes along the free-edge. The results over the mesh refinements are given in Table 3.




Figure 45: Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh.




Figure 46: Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh.

Dimension	Mesh	$L_2$ -norm	Interpolation
2D	Coarse	...	Linear
2D	Medium	...	Linear
2D	Fine	...	Linear
3D	Coarse	...	Linear
3D	Medium	...	Linear
3D	Fine	...	Linear
2D	Coarse	...	Quadratic
2D	Medium	...	Quadratic
2D	Fine	...	Quadratic
3D	Coarse	...	Quadratic
3D	Medium	...	Quadratic
3D	Fine	...	Quadratic

Table 3: Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic uniaxial extensions

Figure 47: Results, iron 2D fine mesh.

Figure 48: Results, iron 3D fine mesh.

## 5.5 Example-0112 [PLAUSIBLE]

### 5.5.1 Mathematical model

We solve the following equation (both 2D and 3D domains are considered),

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{u}, t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, t) \quad \Omega = [0, 160] \times [0, 120] \times [0, 120], t \in [0, 5], \quad (94)$$

with time step size  $\Delta t = 1$  and  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y]$  in 2D  $\mathbf{u} = [u_x, u_y, u_z]$  in 3D. The boundary conditions in 2D are given by

$$u_x = u_y = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (95)$$

$$u_x = 0 \quad x = 160, \quad (96)$$

$$f(u_y) = 6.0 \times 10^4 \quad x = 160, \quad (97)$$

and in 3D by

$$u_x = u_y = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (98)$$

$$u_x = 0 \quad x = 160, \quad (99)$$

$$u_z = 0 \quad z = 0, \quad (100)$$

$$f(u_y) = 7.2 \times 10^6 \quad x = 160. \quad (101)$$

The material parameters are

$$E = 10000 \text{ MPa}, \quad (102)$$

$$\nu = 0.3, \quad (103)$$

$$(104)$$

### 5.5.2 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: length along x-direction  
 float: length along y-direction  
 float: length along z-direction (set to zero for 2D)  
 integer: number of elements in x-direction  
 integer: number of elements in y-direction  
 integer: number of elements in z-direction (set to zero for 2D)  
 integer: interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)  
 integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)  
 float: elastic modulus  
 float: Poisson ratio  
 float: XXX

- Command line arguments for tests are:

```
160 120 0 8 6 0 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 16 12 0 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 32 24 0 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 8 6 6 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 16 12 12 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX
```

```

160 120 120 32 24 24 1 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 8 6 0 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 16 12 0 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 0 32 24 0 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 8 6 6 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 16 12 12 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX
160 120 120 32 24 24 2 0 10000 0.3 XXX

```

### 5.5.3 Validation

The iron results are compared to those from Abaqus (version 2017). The figures below show selected results from the validation simulations carried out in Abaqus and provide a qualitative validation. A quantitative validation was carried out by comparing the horizontal displacement  $u_x$  along the free-edge ( $y = 120$  for 2D and  $y = z = 120$  for 3D) and computing the L<sub>2</sub>-norm according to

$$L_2\text{-norm} = \frac{1}{N} \times \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{(u_{y, \text{abaqus}}^i - u_{y, \text{iron}}^i)^2}, \quad (105)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of nodes along the free-edge. The results over the mesh refinements are given in Table 4.




Figure 49: Results, Abaqus 2D fine mesh.




Figure 50: Results, abaqus 3D fine mesh.

Figure 51: Results, iron 2D fine mesh.

Figure 52: Results, iron 3D fine mesh.

Dimension	Mesh	$L_2$ -norm	Interpolation
2D	Coarse	...	Linear
2D	Medium	...	Linear
2D	Fine	...	Linear
3D	Coarse	...	Linear
3D	Medium	...	Linear
3D	Fine	...	Linear
2D	Coarse	...	Quadratic
2D	Medium	...	Quadratic
2D	Fine	...	Quadratic
3D	Coarse	...	Quadratic
3D	Medium	...	Quadratic
3D	Fine	...	Quadratic

Table 4: Quantitative error between Abaqus 2017 and iron simulations for linear elastic shear

6 FINITE ELASTICITY

## 6.1 Example-0201-u [PLAUSIBLE]

Example uses generated or user-defined regular meshes in CHeart mesh format and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

### 6.1.1 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{u}, t) = 0 \quad \Omega = [0, L_X] \times [0, L_Y] \times [0, L_Z], \quad (106)$$

with 1st Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor in  $d$  dimensions,

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{2\mu}{[\det \mathbf{F}]^{2/d}} \left( \mathbf{F} - \frac{\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{F}}{d} \mathbf{F}^{-T} \right) + p \mathbf{F}^{-T} \quad (107)$$

corresponding to a Neo-Hookean constitutive law (Neo-Hooke parameter  $\mu$ ) with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$u_x = 0 \quad X = 0, \quad (108)$$

$$u_x = u_y = u_z = 0 \quad X = Y = Z = 0, \quad (109)$$

$$u_x = \lambda * L_X \quad X = L_X. \quad (110)$$

or Dirichlet/Neumann boundary conditions

$$u_x = 0 \quad X = 0, \quad (111)$$

$$u_x = u_y = u_z = 0 \quad X = Y = Z = 0, \quad (112)$$

$$\mathbf{t} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu(\lambda - \frac{\mu}{\lambda^2}) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad X = L_X. \quad (113)$$

with stretch  $\lambda$  and traction  $\mathbf{t}$ .

Note: The pressure has an opposite sign compared to CHeart and Ker-MOR.

### 6.1.2 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

float: initial length along x-direction

float: initial length along y-direction

float: initial length along z-direction

integer: number of elements in x-direction

integer: number of elements in y-direction

integer: number of elements in z-direction

integer: solver type (0 - iterative, 1 - direct)

integer: Jacobian type (0 - analytic, 1 - finite-difference)

float: 1st Mooney-Rivlin parameter

float: 2nd Mooney-Rivlin parameter (set to zero)

integer: mesh type (0 - user-defined, 1 - generated)

- float: maximum stretch at right surface
- integer: number of load increments
- integer: BC type at right surface (0 - Dirichlet, 1 - Neumann\_integrated, 2 - Neumann\_point)
- Commandline arguments for tests are:
  - see file run\_example.sh
- Note: Binary uses command line arguments to search for the relevant mesh files if user-defined meshes are selected.
- Note: BC type has not been implemented yet. Thus, it is not being tested.

#### 6.1.3 Result summary

We compare the solution vector (contains all displacement components and pressure values) against an analytical solution with a tolerance of  $10^{-11}$  on the normalized RMSE.

Passed tests: 42 / 48

Failed tests:

```
Folder current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s0_fd0_gm0_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s0_fd1_gm0_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s1_fd0_gm0_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s0_fd0_gm1_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s0_fd1_gm1_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder current_run/l2x1x1_n8x4x4_i2_s1_fd0_gm1_bc0/ does not exist.
```




Figure 53: 3D results, iron reference.

## 6.2 Example-0204-u [PLAUSIBLE]

Example uses user-defined hexahedral mesh (tibialis anterior with skin) in CHeart mesh format and solves a static problem, i.e., applies the boundary conditions in one step.

### 6.2.1 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the following scalar equation,

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{u}, t) = 0 \quad \Omega, \quad (114)$$

with 1st Piola-Kirchhoff stress tensor in d dimensions,

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{2\mu}{[\det \mathbf{F}]^{2/d}} \left( \mathbf{F} - \frac{\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{F}}{d} \mathbf{F}^{-T} \right) + p \mathbf{F}^{-T} \quad (115)$$

corresponding to a Neo-Hookean constitutive law (Neo-Hooke parameter  $\mu$ ) with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$u_x = u_y = u_z = 0 \quad \text{BOTTOM}, \quad (116)$$

$$u_x = u_y = u_z = 2 \quad \text{TOP}. \quad (117)$$

Undeformed geometry and deformed geometry with pressure field in Figure 54 (left). Deformed geometry with displacement field in Figure 55.

Note: The pressure has an opposite sign compared to CHeart and Ker-MOR.

### 6.2.2 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

string: Mesh input file

integer: solver type (0 - iterative, 1 - direct)

integer: Jacobian type (0 - analytic, 1 - finite difference)

float: 1st Mooney-Rivlin parameter

float: 2nd Mooney-Rivlin parameter (set to zero)

float: absolute displacement at top surface in each coordinate direction

integer: number of load increments

integer: BC type at top surface (0 - Dirichlet BC, 1 - Neumann\_integrated, 2 - Neumann\_point)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

TBD

- Note: Binary uses command line arguments to search for the relevant mesh files if user-defined meshes are selected.


### 6.2.3 Result summary

We use CHeart revision 6411 to compare all displacement components and the pressure field (reference value: RSE of normalized RMSE of components is 0.00484848482722).


Passed tests: 1 / 12

Failed tests:


```
Folder reference/iron/s0_fd0_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s0_fd0_bc1/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s0_fd0_bc2/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s0_fd1_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s0_fd1_bc1/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s0_fd1_bc2/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s1_fd0_bc0/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s1_fd0_bc1/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s1_fd0_bc2/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s1_fd1_bc1/ does not exist.
Folder reference/iron/s1_fd1_bc2/ does not exist.
```



**Figure 54:** Iron reference run, undeformed geometry and deformed geometry with pressure field.



**Figure 55:** Iron reference run, top-left to bottom-right: Deformed geometry with displacement field magnitude, x-component, y-component and z-component.



**Figure 56:** CHeart reference run, top-left to bottom-right: Deformed geometry with displacement field magnitude, x-component, y-component and z-component.

## 7 NAVIER-STOKES FLOW

### 7.1 Equation in general form

$$\partial_t(\rho \mathbf{v}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v} + p \mathbf{I}) = \rho \mathbf{f} \quad (118)$$

## 7.2 Example-0302-u [COMPILES]

Example uses user-defined simplex meshes in CHart mesh format with quadratic/linear interpolation for velocity/pressure and solves a dynamic problem.

Setup is the well-known lid-driven cavity problem on the unit square or unit cube in two and three dimensions.

Current issue: does not converge after 30 some time iterations (2D and 3D).

Visualization issue: In exelem-file, replace

1. constant(2)\*constant, no modify, grid based.  
#xi1=0, #xi2=0
2. constant(2)\*constant, no modify, grid based.

with

1. constant\*constant, no modify, grid based.  
#xi1=0, #xi2=0
2. constant\*constant, no modify, grid based.

and likewise for 3D, replace

1. constant(2;3)\*constant\*constant, no modify, grid based.  
#xi1=0, #xi2=0, #xi3=0
2. constant(2;3)\*constant\*constant, no modify, grid based.

with

1. constant\*constant\*constant, no modify, grid based.  
#xi1=0, #xi2=0, #xi3=0
2. constant\*constant\*constant, no modify, grid based.

### 7.2.1 Mathematical model - 2D

We solve the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation,

$$\partial_t(\rho \mathbf{v}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v}) - \nabla \cdot (\mu \nabla \mathbf{v} - p \mathbf{I}) = \rho \mathbf{f} \quad \Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (119)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad (120)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (121)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad x = 1, \quad (122)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad y = 0, \quad (123)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = [1, 0]^T \quad y = 1. \quad (124)$$

Viscosity  $\mu = 0.0025$ , density  $\rho = 1$ . Thus, Reynolds number  $Re = 400$ .

### 7.2.2 Mathematical model - 3D

We solve the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation,

$$\partial_t(\rho \mathbf{v}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v}) - \nabla \cdot (\mu \nabla \mathbf{v} - p \mathbf{I}) = \rho \mathbf{f} \quad \Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad (125)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad (126)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (127)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad x = 1, \quad (128)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad y = 0, \quad (129)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = [1, 0]^T \quad y = 1, \quad (130)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad z = 0, \quad (131)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad z = 1. \quad (132)$$

Viscosity  $\mu = 0.01$ , density  $\rho = 1$ . Thus, Reynolds number  $Re = 100$ .

### 7.2.3 Computational model

- Commandline arguments are:

integer: number of dimensions (2: 2D, 3: 3D)

integer: mesh refinement level (1, 2, 3, ...)

float: start time

float: stop time

float: time step size

float: density

float: viscosity

integer: solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

2 1 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.0025 1.0 0

2 2 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.0025 1.0 0

2 3 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.0025 1.0 0

2 1 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.0025 1.0 1

2 2 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.0025 1.0 1

2 3 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.0025 1.0 1

3 1 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.01 1.0 0

3 2 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.01 1.0 0

3 3 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.01 1.0 0

3 1 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.01 1.0 1

3 2 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.01 1.0 1

3 3 0.0 1.0 0.001 0.01 1.0 1

- Note: Binary uses command line arguments to search for the relevant mesh files.

#### 7.2.4 *Result summary*

We use CHeart rev. 6292 to produce numerical reference solutions.

## 8 MONODOMAIN

## 8.1 Example-0401 [PLAUSIBLE]

### 8.1.1 Mathematical model

We solve the Monodomain Equation

$$\sigma \Delta V_m(t) = A_m \left( C_m \frac{\partial V_m}{\partial t} + I_{\text{ionic}}(V_m) \right) \quad \Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad t \in [0, 3.0] \quad (133)$$

where  $V_m(t)$  is given by the Hodgkin-Huxley system of ODEs [2]  
with boundary conditions

$$V_m = 0 \quad x = y = 0, \quad (134)$$

$$V_m = 0 \quad x = y = 1. \quad (135)$$

and initial values

$$V_m(t = 0) = -75$$

Additionally a stimulation current  $I_{\text{stim}}$  is applied for  $t_{\text{stim}} = [0, 0.1]$  at the center node of the domain (i.e. at  $(x, y) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, )$ ).

Material parameters:

$$\sigma = 3.828$$

$$A_m = 500$$

$$C_m = 0.58 \quad \text{for the slow-twitch case}, \quad C_m = 1.0 \quad \text{for the fast-twitch case}$$

$$I_{\text{stim}} = 1200 \quad \text{for the slow-twitch case}, \quad I_{\text{stim}} = 2000.0 \quad \text{for the fast-twitch case}$$

### 8.1.2 Computational model

- This example uses generated meshes

- Commandline arguments are:

number elements X

number elements Y

interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

PDE step size

stop time

output frequency

CellML Model URL

slow-twitch

ODE time-step

- Commands for tests are:

```
./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F 0.0001
./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F 0.005
./folder/src/example 10 10 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F 0.0001
mpirun -n 2 ./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml
```


```
mpirun -n 8 ./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml
./folder/src/example 2 2 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F 0.0001
mpirun -n 2 ./folder/src/example 2 2 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F
```

- This is a dynamic problem.

### 8.1.3 Results

Passed tests: 0 / 0

No failed tests.



**Figure 57:** Result of scenario with  $10 \times 10$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 1$  process


With the 'big' target there will be animations created. You get a better understanding of the solutions by looking at them in `iron-tests/examples/example-0401/doc/figures`.

### 8.1.4 Validation


We compare with a Matlab implementation as well as with reference iron files.

The matlab scripts use finite difference discretization instead of finite elements. The results are qualitatively the same but exactly. The compare script also tests for matlab reference data which is only included for the 2 examples with  $24 \times 24$  elements. There is a big  $L_2$ -error. The tolerance is set to a high value to allow for the tests to succeed. With this the comparing mechanism is tested. Maybe in the future someone succeeds to generate suitable matlab data that then can just be exchanged without having to rewrite the compare script.


The iron files to compare with are the output of the simulation as of Aug. 2017. In that way we can check if the simulation brakes with respect to the current state. In order to keep file sizes minimal the comparision is only conducted for time steps  $t = 0.01, 0.1, 0.2, 1, 2, 3$  for the 'big' target and  $t = 0.1, 0.2, 1$  for the 'fast' target.




**Figure 58:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 1$  process



**Figure 59:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , iterative solver,  $p = 1$  process



**Figure 60:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , iterative solver,  $p = 2$  processes



**Figure 61:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , iterative solver,  $p = 8$  processes




Figure 62: Result of scenario with  $2 \times 2$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 1$  process




Figure 63: Result of scenario with  $2 \times 2$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 2$  processes

## 8.2 Example-0402 [PLAUSIBLE]

### 8.2.1 Mathematical model

We solve the Monodomain Equation

$$\sigma \Delta V_m(t) = A_m \left( C_m \frac{\partial V_m}{\partial t} + I_{ionic}(V_m) \right) \quad \Omega = [0, 1] \times [0, 1], \quad t \in [0, 3.0] \quad (136)$$

where  $V_m(t)$  is given by the CellML description of Noble's 1998 improved guinea-pig ventricular cell model system of ODEs [3]

with boundary conditions

$$V_m = 0 \quad x = y = 0, \quad (137)$$

$$V_m = 0 \quad x = y = 1. \quad (138)$$

and initial values

$$V_m(t = 0) = -75$$

Additionally a stimulation current  $I_{stim}$  is applied for  $t_{stim} = [0, 0.1]$  at the center node of the domain (i.e. at  $(x, y) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ ).

Material parameters:

$$\sigma = 3.828$$

$$A_m = 500$$

$$C_m = 0.58 \quad \text{for the slow-twitch case,} \quad C_m = 1.0 \quad \text{for the fast-twitch case}$$

$$I_{stim} = 1200 \quad \text{for the slow-twitch case,} \quad I_{stim} = 2000.0 \quad \text{for the fast-twitch case}$$

### 8.2.2 Computational model

- This example uses generated meshes

- Commandline arguments are:

number elements X

number elements Y

interpolation order (1: linear; 2: quadratic)

solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)

PDE step size

stop time

output frequency

CellML Model URL

slow-twitch

ODE time-step

- Commands for tests are:

`./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 n98.xml F 0.0001`

`./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 n98.xml F 0.005`

`./folder/src/example 10 10 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 n98.xml F 0.0001`

```

mpirun -n 2 ./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 n98.xml F 0.0001
mpirun -n 8 ./folder/src/example 24 24 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 n98.xml F 0.0001
./folder/src/example 2 2 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 n98.xml F 0.0001
mpirun -n 2 ./folder/src/example 2 2 1 0 0.005 3.0 1 n98.xml F 0.0001


```

- This is a dynamic problem.

### 8.2.3 Results

Passed tests: 0 / 0

No failed tests.




**Figure 64:** Result of scenario with  $10 \times 10$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 1$  process


With the 'big' target there will be animations created. You get a better understanding of the solutions by looking at them in `iron-tests/examples/example-0402/doc/figures`.

### 8.2.4 Validation


We compare with reference iron files of Aug. 2017. See also the notes on `example-0401`.




**Figure 65:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 1$  process



**Figure 66:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , iterative solver,  $p = 1$  process



**Figure 67:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , iterative solver,  $p = 2$  processes



**Figure 68:** Result of scenario with  $24 \times 24$  elements,  $t = 20$ , iterative solver,  $p = 8$  processes




Figure 69: Result of scenario with  $2 \times 2$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 1$  process




Figure 70: Result of scenario with  $2 \times 2$  elements,  $t = 20$ , direct solver,  $p = 2$  processes

### 8.3 Example-0404-c [PLAUSIBLE]

#### 8.3.1 Mathematical model

We solve the Monodomain Equation

$$\sigma \Delta V_m(t) = A_m \left( C_m \frac{\partial V_m}{\partial t} + I_{ionic}(V_m) \right) \quad \Omega = [0, 1], \quad t \in [0, 10.0] \quad (139)$$

where  $V_m(t)$  is given by the Hodgkin-Huxley system of ODEs [2]  
with Neumann boundary conditions

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \quad x = 0, \quad (140)$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} = 0 \quad x = 1. \quad (141)$$

and initial values

$$V_m(t = 0) = -75$$

Additionally a stimulation current  $I_{stim}$  is applied for  $t_{stim} = [0, 0.5]$  at the center node of the domain (i.e. at  $(x, y) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2},)$ ).

Material parameters:

$$\sigma = 3.828$$

$$A_m = 500$$

$$C_m = 0.58 \quad \text{for the slow-twitch case,} \quad C_m = 1.0 \quad \text{for the fast-twitch case}$$

$$I_{stim} = \begin{cases} 75/10 \cdot (2X) & \text{for } X \geq 10 \text{ reference elements} \\ 75 & \text{for } < 10 \text{ reference elements} \end{cases} \quad \text{for the slow-twitch case,}$$

$$I_{stim} = \begin{cases} 75/12 \cdot (2X) & \text{for } X \geq 12 \text{ reference elements} \\ 75 & \text{for } < 12 \text{ reference elements} \end{cases} \quad \text{for the fast-twitch case}$$

#### 8.3.2 Computational model

- This example uses generated meshes
- Commandline arguments are:
  - number of elements
  - order of interpolation
  - solver type (0: direct; 1: iterative)
  - time step PDE
  - end time
  - output file stride
  - cellml model file
  - if slow-twitch (T: slow-twitch, F: fast-twitch)
  - time step ODE

- Commandline arguments for tests are:

64 2 0 0.01 10 5 hodgkin\_huxley\_1952.cellml F 0.01

64 2 0 0.005 10 10 hodgkin\_huxley\_1952.cellml F 0.005

```

64 2 0 0.001 10 50 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F 0.001
64 2 0 0.0005 10 100 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F 0.0005
64 2 0 0.00025 10 200 hodgkin_huxley_1952.cellml F 0.00025

```

- This is a dynamic problem.
- More test cases for 2nd order should be constructed.

### 8.3.3 Results

We run the scenario for different time step widths and examine the experimental order of convergence.

**Figure 71:**  $V_m$  for time  $t = 1.0$ , different time step widths  $dt \in \{0.01, 0.005, 0.001, 0.0005, 0.00025\}$

**Figure 72:** Error at  $t = 1.0$  for different time steps widths. The slope (=experimental order of convergence) should be around 1.

**Figure 73:**  $V_m$  for time  $t = 3.0$ , different time step widths  $dt \in \{0.01, 0.005, 0.001, 0.0005, 0.00025\}$

**Figure 74:** Error at  $t = 3.0$  for different time steps widths. The slope (=experimental order of convergence) should be around 1.

### 8.3.4 Validation

The purpose of this test case is to see if convergence orders are as expected, no actual validation of the output takes place.

## 9 CELLML MODEL

## REFERENCES

- [1] Chris Bradley, Andy Bowery, Randall Britten, Vincent Budelmann, Oscar Camara, Richard Christie, Andrew Cookson, Alejandro F Frangi, Thiranja Babarenda Gamage, Thomas Heidlauf, et al. OpenCMISS: a multi-physics & multi-scale computational infrastructure for the vph-/physiome project. *Progress in biophysics and molecular biology*, 107(1):32–47, 2011.
- [2] Alan L Hodgkin and Andrew F Huxley. Propagation of electrical signals along giant nerve fibres. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, pages 177–183, 1952.
- [3] Denis Noble, Anthony Varghese, Peter Kohl, and Penelope Noble. Improved guinea-pig ventricular cell model incorporating a diadic space, ikr and iks, and length-and tension-dependent processes. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, 14(1):123–134, 1998.