

# Intersection of non-matching grids of different dimensions

Jan Březina<sup>a,\*</sup>, Pavel Exner<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Technical University of Liberec, Studentská 1402/2, 461 17 Liberec 1, Czech Republic*

---

## Abstract

TODO: An abstract.

*Keywords:* non-matching grid, intersections, mixed-dimensional mesh, Plücker coordinates

---

## 1. Introduction

Structure of introduction:

- motivation for computing mesh intersections, other applications - basic overview of existing work, approaches - our contribution - new algorithms for element intersections based on Plücker coordinates - improvement of the front tracking algorithm

- [1] - Use geometric predicates incircle and orientation. Use mesh of bounding boxes to search for intersection candidates. Only use point queries for all vertices of triangle/tetrahedron. Use compatible partitioning of elements by the crack elements.

- [2] - Implementation of the Nitsche method in Fenics. They need 2d-3d intersections, but only for distribution of quadrature points. So they do not store whole intersection data, but only the quad points. The boundary of one domain is partitioned into intersections with elements of the other domain. Use emphasis collision relations (pairs of faces of boundary and elements of the background mesh) and collision maps (map face to all intersections and background element to all intersections, can be constructed from the collision relation). They cite books from computer graphics .. Mention geometric predicates. Present algorithms for: find intersection candidates, compute intersections, integrate over complex domains.

- [3] Claim to provide robust algorithm covering all triangle-triangle degenerate cases. Basic idea is the same as ours: use some tree (Binary Space Tree) structure to find initial point on intersection curve and trace the curve in both

---

\*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: `jan.brezina@tul.cz` (Jan Březina), `pavel.exner@tul.cz` (Pavel Exner)

directions. Quite clever data structure for the mesh. Adaptive precision geometric predicates. Store topological information about the intersection points (point on triangle, edge, vertex). Resolve various degenerate cases, discuss mesh optimization after subdivision.

[4] Full algorithm for 2d=3D called PANG. Implemented in DUNE in 2010 (Bastian). Other software (Hecht, MpCCI). Triangle-Triangle and Tetra-Triangle intersections done similarly as in our approach: set of points including vertices and then sort them counterclockwise. Local intersection algorithm do not provide neighbouring information so the traversal algorithm do not use it.

Review of algorithms: [5]

[6] Robust discretization of porous media. Complete error analysis with mortar non-compatible case. Seems they use normal fluxes across fracture instead of pressure traces. This allows conforming discretization and error results.

[7] Application of mixed-dimensional approach in mechanics. Beam and shell elements ...

[8] Finite volume method, fully implicit two phase flow. Cite usage of FRAC3D generator.

[9] Space-time DG with adaptive mesh, need integration of product of functions on different meshes (in 2D). An algorithm for computing triangle-triangle intersections in 2D.

[10] DFN + MHFEM. Mortar method for intersections. Focused on formulation not on intersections.

[11] (Barbara) Mortad, non=matching, acoustics. Theory, structured grid case. No complex intersections.

[12] Patent for curiosity.

[13] Immersed boundary. ??

[14] ??

[15]

[?] Original algorithm for line-tetrahedra intersections.


[?] Line-convex Polyhedra intersections using generalisation of line-clipping algorithm

The initial problem that occurs when working with incompatible meshes of combined dimensions is the efficient computation of intersections of the mesh subdomains, in particular 1D-2D, 1D-3D, 2D-3D. There is a piece of code in Flow123d at the moment which uses means of analytic geometry. In particular, it computes an intersection of a line and a plane in 3D by solving Gaussian elimination. However it is not efficient and it does not provide barycentric coordinates explicitly. In this section, we present our latest work on this problematics.

The topic is studied in the bachelor and master thesis of Viktor Friš [? ], who was supervised by Jan Březina. They suggested a solution, based on [?] for the two aspects of the problem:

- itemsep=-3pt an efficient identification of the intersecting pairs of elements,
- iiitemsep=-3pt an efficient computation of the actual intersection for the single element pair.

The algorithm is based on the methods used in the computer graphics, in particular for the task (b) Plücker coordinates are employed to efficiently compute 1D-2D intersection in three-dimensional space.



For the 1D-3D and 2D-3D cases, the basic algorithm is applied on sides and edges of the simplices and all the topological information coming from the performed Plücker products is carefully collected to obtain final intersecting object. Further in 2D-3D case, an optimized tracing algorithm is suggested to directly obtain the correct order and orientation of the edges of the intersection polygon.

## 2. Element Intersections

In this section, we present algorithms for computing intersection of a pair of simplicial elements of a different dimension in the 3D ambient space. In particular we are interested in the intersections in 1D-2D, 1D-3D, 2D-2D, 2D-3D cases. It will be suitable to denote  $S_i$  a simplicial element with  $i$  vertices (of dimension  $i - 1$ ). In general, an intersection can be a point, a line segment or a polygon. All these three objects are represented as a vector of vertices called *intersection points* (later denoted IP, or IPs in plural).

The fundamental idea is to compute intersection of 1D-2D simplices using the Plücker coordinates and reduce all other cases to this one.

### 2.1. Plücker Coordinates

Plücker coordinates represent a line in 3D space. Considering a line  $p$ , given by a point  $\mathbf{A}$  and its directional vector  $\mathbf{u}$ , the Plücker coordinates of  $p$  are defined as

$$\pi_p = (\mathbf{u}_p, \mathbf{v}_p) = (\mathbf{u}_p, \mathbf{u}_p \times \mathbf{A}).$$

Further we use a permuted inner product

$$\pi_p \odot \pi_q = \mathbf{u}_p \cdot \mathbf{v}_q + \mathbf{u}_q \cdot \mathbf{v}_p.$$

The sign of the permuted inner product gives us the relative position of the two lines, see [Figure 1](#).




Figure 1: Sign of the permuted inner product is related to the relative position of the two oriented lines. Dashed line symbolizes that the line is in the back, the lines intersect in the middle case. **PE:** *circle dot permuted inner product*

## 2.2. Intersection Line-Triangle (1D-2D)

**PE:** *In this paragraph we investigate real lines. Trimming comes later when tolerance is denoted, see next PE note.* Let us consider a line  $p$  with parametric equation  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{A} + t\mathbf{u}$ ,  $t \in \mathbf{R}$  and a triangle given by vertices  $(\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$  with oriented sides  $s_i = (V_j, V_k)$ ,  $j = (i + 1) \bmod 3$ ,  $k = (i + 2) \bmod 3$ . The permuted inner products  $\pi_p \odot \pi_{s_i}$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2$  have the same sign if and only if there is an intersection point with the line  $p$  inside the triangle. In such a case, the inner products provides scaled barycentric coordinates of the intersection on the triangle. In particular for the barycentric coordinate  $w_i$  related to the vertex  $V_i$  we have

$$w_i = \frac{\pi_p \odot \pi_{s_i}}{\sum_{j=0}^2 \pi_p \odot \pi_{s_j}}$$

Indeed, using the barycentric coordinates the intersection point can be expressed as  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}_0 + w_1\mathbf{s}_2 - w_2\mathbf{s}_1$ . The line  $p$  have Plücker coordinates  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{X})$  (Plücker coordinates are invariant to change of initial point). Combining these two expressions we get

$$\pi_p \odot \pi_{s_1} = \mathbf{u} \cdot (\mathbf{s}_1 \times V_2) + \mathbf{s}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{u} \times [\mathbf{V}_0 + w_1\mathbf{s}_2 - w_2\mathbf{s}_1]) = -w_1\mathbf{u} \cdot (\mathbf{s}_1 \times \mathbf{s}_2).$$

Since  $\mathbf{s}_0 + \mathbf{s}_1 + \mathbf{s}_2 = 0$  we have  $\mathbf{s}_1 \times \mathbf{s}_2 = \mathbf{s}_2 \times \mathbf{s}_0 = \mathbf{s}_0 \times \mathbf{s}_1$  and thus

$$\pi_p \odot \pi_{s_i} = -w_i\mathbf{u} \cdot (\mathbf{v}_1 \times \mathbf{v}_2).$$

Having the barycentric coordinates of the intersection on the triangle we can compute also its local coordinate on  $p$  from its parametric form:

$$X_i = A_i + tu_i, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3$$

We use  $i$  with maximal  $|u_i|$  for practical computation.

Next, we shall discuss the case when some of the permuted inner products are zero. In fact, we test if any barycentric coordinate is under given tolerance ( $|w_i| \leq \epsilon$ ). Various *pathological* cases are detected and further topological information is attached to the intersection data. In the case of one zero coordinate

(non-coplanar intersection on the edge) or two zero coordinates (intersection in the vertex), we add the local edge index or the local vertex index to the intersection, respectively. When all coordinates are (close to) zero, the line and the triangle are (nearly) coplanar. For every edge  $s_i$  we compute its intersection with the line segment  $p$  in terms of the local coordinates  $t_i$  and  $t_p$ . Only intersections with  $t_i \in (-\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)$  are accepted, for  $t_i$  close to 0 and 1 we append the vertex index to the intersection. Edges parallel to  $p$  or lying on the  $p$  are skipped.

Finally, we obtain zero, one, or two intersection points with additional topological information. The intersection point data structure keeps for each of the two intersecting elements:

- Barycentric coordinate of the intersection.
- Dimension of the most specific subelement (face, edge, vertex) where the point lies.
- Local index of the most specific subelement.

Further, we store the sign of the permuted inner product in order to detect various special and degenerate cases higher dimensional cases.

TODO: We should distinguish "special" case and "degenerate" case. The later one is the case when line lies in the plane of the triangle. The first case should be treated as usual only set additional topology info about vertex or edge. The degenerate case is not necessary to investigate in the case of auxiliary intersection only in the case of final intersection. Need to verify it since it is not the case in current code.

We distinguish two variants of the desired result: the auxiliary intersection used as subprocedure of the other intersections and the final intersection. In the first case we just return the array of the intersection points with the line.  
**PE:** *In the first case, we do not trim the line (We need both IPs (if there are two), for 1D-3D). In the final case, we need to check that also  $t_p \in (-\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon)$ . That is the current state.* Degenerated case of  $p$  laying on the triangle edge is also detected....

Intersection with line segment ... (final 1D-2D intersection)

### 2.3. Intersection Line-Tetraherdon (1D-3D)

We consider a line  $p$  and a tetraherdon... Tetrahedron has six edges, so six Plücker coordinates and inner products are computed at most. These data are passed to the 1D-2D algorithm described above, which is applied to the every face of the tetrahedron face.

There might be two intersection points maximally, which are finally checked that they belong o abscissas. If the line has its boundary point inside the tetrahedron, the intersection line must be cut and coordinates of intersection point are interpolated. Pathologic cases are again carefully processed so we obtain the most extensive topology information we can. See [?] for detailed description of all possible cases.

#### 2.4. Intersection Triangle-Tetrahedron (2D-3D)

The intersection of a triangle  $S_3$  and a tetrahedron  $S_4$  is a polygon with 7 vertices at maximum. The sides of the polygon are coincident with either sides of  $S_3$  or with faces of the  $S_4$ . So a vertex of the polygon can arise from intersection of a side with a face or an edge with  $S_3$  or from a vertex of  $S_3$ . So we have to compute at most 12 side-face intersections and at most 6 edge-triangle intersections. However, to this end we only need to compute 9 Plücker coordinates (3 sides, 6 edges) and 18 permuted inner products, one for every side-edge pair.

Computation of the intersection polygon consists of three parts. In the first part (Algorithm 1), we compute intersection points on the boundary of  $S_3$  using the line-tetrahedron intersection algorithm for every of its sides. There are 0,1, or 2 intersection points on every side and the points are already sorted according to the side orientation, which match orientation of the intersection polygon. So, passing through all the sides and appending the points into  $I$  provides us with incomplete intersection polygon but in the correct order. **PE:** *Comment on process point (Algorithm 2), face relation indicator, I would move description of face table here, since I looked at algorithm1 here, from it skipped to process point and I got lost..*

**PE:** *If IP lies on an edge(s) of  $S_4$ , we create a mark so we exclude the edges from further computation in Algorithm 3.*

**PE:** *In process point, we set for all the face of the vertex, if we coming through the vertex in or out the  $S_4$ . I understand that the condition on line 10 means, that we do not overwrite info if there is another IP on that face..*

**PE:** *I corrected the algorithm references. Please check, it is ok now..*

Then we proceed to the second part (Algorithm 3). Using the line-triangle intersection algorithm for edges of  $S_4$  we obtain points from interior of  $S_3$  and need to insert them into  $I$  to correct place. To this end we exploit additional information about coincidence of points with faces of  $S_4$ . Every point  $p$  from the first part of the algorithm **PE:** *I would use proper references instead, I got confused, what 'part of algorithm' is..* that is not a vertex of  $S_3$  belongs to a face  $f$  of  $S_4$ ; we know from the order of the points whether the face comes before or after the point in the intersection polygon; in the first case we set  $F[0, f] = p$ , in the second case we set  $F[1, f] = p$ . Every point  $p$  from the second part of the algorithm lies on an edge  $e$  which is between two faces  $f_0, f_1$ . The correct order of the faces on the intersection polygon is determined by the sign of the edge-triangle intersection. So, having the faces in the correct order we set  $F[0, f_0] = p$  and  $F[1, f_1] = p$ .

Finally in the third part (Algorithm 4), the table  $F$  than allows us to modify array of successors  $P$  and get  $I$  in correct order as the list  $K$ .

List  $in[f]$  contains index of the intersection point that follows after  $f$  on the boundary of traced polygon, similarly  $out[f]$  stores index of the intersection point that preeceeds the face  $f$ .

Possible cases for processing  $L$ :

---

**Algorithm 1:** 2d-3d intersection, points on triangle boundary

---

**Input:** input data

**Output:** List of IPs sorted output data

```
1  $I = \emptyset$  // Intersection polygon.
2  $F(:, :) = -1$  // Unset entries of the face connection table.
3 for side  $s$  of  $S_3$  do
4    $L = \text{intersection}(s, S_4)$  // List of max. two points.
5   process point( $L[0]$ , 0)
6   process point( $L[-1]$ , 1) PE: Isn't it clearer to write the two process
   point lines into cycle over  $L$ ?
7 if  $I[0] == I[-1]$  then remove  $I[-1]$ 
8 PE: I am not sure if I understand the notation ' $[-1]$ ', can be
   explained? The last line then checks if first and last IPs, if they are not
   duplicates...??
```

---

---

**Algorithm 2:** process point(  $p, i$  )

---

**Input:** intersection point  $p$ , face relation indicator  $i$

**Output:** update of  $I$  and  $F$

```
1 if  $p \neq I[-1]$  then append  $p$  to  $I$ 
2 PE: I am missing the check whether IP is vertex of  $S_3$  as referred in
   text. So what if it is a vertex?
3 set  $j$  to index of  $p$  in  $I$ 
4 if  $p$  is on face  $f$  then  $F[i, f] = j$ 
5 else if  $p$  is on edge  $e$  then
6   compute sign of intersection( $e, S_3$ )
7   sort faces  $f_0, f_1$  coincident with  $e$ 
8    $F[i, f_i] = j$ 
9 else if  $p$  is on vertex  $v$  of  $S_4$  then
10  for face  $f$  coincident with  $v$  do
11    if  $F[i, f] == -1$  then  $F[i, f] = j$ 
12 mark all edges of  $S_4$  the  $p$  lies on
```

---

---

**Algorithm 3:** 2d-3d intersection, points in triangle interior

---

**Input:** input data

**Output:** List of IPs sorted output data

```
1 for unmarked edge  $e$  of  $S_4$  do
2    $p = \text{intersection}(e, S_3)$ 
3   append  $p$  to  $I$ 
4   set  $j$  to index of  $p$  in  $I$ 
5   if  $p$  is inside of  $e$  then
6     sort faces  $f_0, f_1$  coincident with  $e$ 
7      $F[0, f_0] = j$ 
8      $F[1, f_1] = j$ 
9   else  $p$  on the vertex  $v$  of  $S_4$ 
10    for face  $f$  coincident with  $v$  do
11      if  $F[i, f] == -1$  then  $F[i, f] = j$ 
12    mark all edges of  $S_4$  coincident with  $v$ 
```

---

---

**Algorithm 4:** 2d-3d intersection, finish sort of points

---

**Input:** all points in  $I$

**Output:** polygon in  $J$  in correct order **PE:**  *$J$  should be  $K$  ?*

```
1  $P = (1, \dots, n-1, 0)$  // array of successors
2 for  $f$  is face of  $S_4$  do
3   if  $F[1, f] \neq F[1, f]$  then  $P[F[1, f]] = F[0, f]$ 
4   PE: condition should be  $F[0, f] \neq F[1, f]$  ? I don't understand:
       successor indices should be switched? This way there would be same
       two indices..
5  $i = 0$ 
6 for  $n = 0$  To  $|I| - 1$  do  $K[n] = I[i]$   $i = P[i]$ 
```

---



1. Regular case,  $L$  consists of two intersections  $p, q$  sorted by orientation of  $s$ , laying inside of  $s$ .  
 If  $p$  is on the edge  $e$  of  $S_4$  compute sign of intersection( $e, S_3$ ), sort the faces  $f_0, f_1$  coincident with  $e$  and set  $in[f_0]$  to index of  $p$  in  $L$ . Similarly if  $q$  is on the edge, set  $out[f_1]$  to index of  $q$  in  $L$ .  
 If  $p$  is in vertex  $v$  of  $S_4$ , for every face  $f$  coincident with  $v$  set  $in[f]$  to index of  $p$  unless there is some index already set. So, we do not over ride entries coming from the edge intersections. Similarly set  $out[f]$  if  $q$  is in vertex of  $S_4$ .  
 If  $p$  is on face  $f_0$  of  $S_4$ , set  $in[f_0]$  to index of  $p$ . Similarly, if  $q$  is on face  $f_1$  of  $S_4$ , set  $out[f_1]$  to index of  $q$ . laying on faces  $f_p, f_q$  of  $S_4$ .
2.  $L$  consists of a single intersection point  $p$  (touching  $S_4$ )  
 If  $p$  is on edge, compute sign of intersection( $e, S_3$ ), sort the faces  $f_0, f_1$ , set  $in[f_0]$  and  $out[f_1]$  to index of  $p$ .  
 If  $p$

How tracing works.

- If there are no intersections in vertex of  $S_4$ .

intersection polygon are found as intersection points of either triangle side and tetrahedron or tetrahedron edge and triangle. Therefore we use both algorithms above for 1D-3D and 1D-2D, respectively. Data are again efficiently passed to lower dimensional problems, so

The array of intersection points is generally not sorted. We use two so called *tracing* algorithms and we intend to orient the edges of the polygon in the same direction as the triangle is oriented. If one of the intersection point is pathologic, a general convex hull method is applied using the Monotone chain<sup>1</sup> algorithm. The points are sorted using only their barycentric coordinates.

An optimized algorithm has been suggested for non-pathologic cases. At this moment all the collected topology data come into play. The algorithm takes advantage by using only the data already computed and also lowers the complexity to  $O(N)$ , compared with the Monotone chain complexity  $O(N \log N)$  ( $N$  being number of intersection points).

## 2.5. Tracking boundary of the intersection polygon

**PE:** *It seems to me, that we can really describe the prolongation in general, for 1D and 2D, referring to them as components. I tried to do so..*

**PE:** *We need proper definitions of terms we use:*

*candidates pair is a pair of a component element and a bulk element, that might intersect each other (due to intersection of their bounding boxes or prolongation result) pathologic, special, degenerate case ??*

**PE:** *Do you want to use American 'neighbor' or all other English 'neighbour'? (I prefer non-american.. to be unified at the end..)*

---

<sup>1</sup>Wikibooks, [online 2016-03-01], [http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Algorithm\\_Implementation/Geometry/Convex\\_hull/Monotone\\_chain](http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Algorithm_Implementation/Geometry/Convex_hull/Monotone_chain)

## 2.6. Prolongation algorithm

Consider now a complex mesh of combined dimensions consisting of *components*, which are sets of connected elements of the same lower dimension (1D, 2D), in the space of 3D elements, which we shall call a *bulk*. Obtaining all of the 1D-3D and 2D-3D intersections is based on finding the first two elements intersecting each other. Then we can prolongate the intersection by investigating neighbouring elements.




Figure 2: Prolongation algorithm for 1D-2D and 2D-3D intersections.

The prolongation algorithm is the same for both 1D and 2D components, see Figure 2. It can be seen as a *breadth-first search*<sup>2</sup> algorithm on the graph of component elements.

**breadth first search** algorithm:

1. Get next unprocessed component element  $k$ .
2. Find intersection candidates  $\mathcal{K}$  in bulk mesh (3D elements).
3. For  $K \in \mathcal{K}$  compute intersection  $(k, K)$ .
4. Push the intersection neighbours into queues:  $(k, L) \rightarrow Q_b$ ,  $(l, K) \rightarrow Q_c$ .
5. While  $(l, L) \in Q_b$  check intersection  $(l, L)$ . Append queues.
6. Pop pair from  $Q_c$ . (move to the next component element: go to 3).
7. If  $Q_c$  is empty, go to 1.

Prerequisites:

- need information about element connectivity (mesh preprocessing)
- find the starting intersection – AABB (Axes Aligned Bounding Boxes)
- possibly create Bounding Interval Hierarchy (BIH)

<sup>2</sup>Wiki, [online 2016-03-01], [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Breadth-first\\_search](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Breadth-first_search)

After computing the intersection of a pair of elements (line or triangle vs tetrahedron), we fill two queues with element pairs as candidates for further intersection. If the intersection edge (point of line in 1D, edge of polygon in 2D) is inside the tetrahedron, not on its surface, we get a neighbouring element of the component and push it back together with the current tetrahedron into *component prolongation queue*. If the intersection edge is inside the *slave* element (line or triangle), i.e. is on the surface of tetrahedron, we get a neighbouring element of the tetrahedron and push it back together with the current slave element into *3D prolongation queue*.

Then we empty the prolongation queues – the 3D prolongation queue at first, then the component prolongation queue. When both queues are empty, all intersections of a component have been found and we continue to look for another component.

The algorithm is now unified for 1D and 2D in contrast to [? ], where the component prolongation queue is emptied at first.

A new candidate pair of elements is found during prologantion, based on the topological information of the intersection point. There are 3 possible cases (applies both for 1D-3D and 2D-3D):

- **IP lies on component element side and inside bulk element**  
We find all the sides of component element in which the IP lies (IP can be at node and connect more sides). We find the component neighboring elements over the sides and push a new candidate pair [component neighbor – current bulk element] into component queue.
- **IP lies on component element side and on the surface of bulk element**  
We find all the faces of bulk element in which the IP lies (1 face, or 2 faces (IP on an edge), or 3 faces (IP at a node)). We find the corresponding neighboring bulk elements over the faces and push the following new candidates pairs into the bulk queue: [current component element – bulk neighbor], [component neighbor – bulk neighbor]. If the candidates pair has been investigated already, we skip it.
- **IP lies inside component element (therefore must be on the surface of bulk element)**  
The same as before, but we push only [current component element – bulk neighbor] candidates pairs, since there is no component neighbor.

### 3. Front tracking algorithm

### 4. Benchmarks

### 5. Conclusions

TODO: - line intersection tracking for accelerate 2D-2D intersections - better handling of special cases in paarticular in relation to prolongations - better

calculation reuse (pass with prolongations) - optimisation of element intersection  
 - skip unnecessary calculations

## 6. Acknowledgement

The paper was supported in part by the Project OP VaVpI Centre for Nanomaterials, Advanced Technologies and Innovations CZ.1.05/2.1.00/01.0005.

- [1] N. Sukumar, N. Mos, B. Moran, T. Belytschko, [Extended finite element method for three-dimensional crack modelling](#) 48 (11) 1549–1570. doi: [10.1002/1097-0207\(20000820\)48:11<1549::AID-NME955>3.0.CO;2-A](#). URL [http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/1097-0207%2820000820%2948%3A11%3C1549%3A%3AAID-NME955%3E3.O.CO%3B2-A](#)
- [2] A. Massing, M. G. Larson, A. Logg, [Efficient implementation of finite element methods on nonmatching and overlapping meshes in three dimensions](#) 35 (1) C23–C47. doi: [10.1137/11085949X](#). URL [http://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/11085949X](#)
- [3] A. H. Elsheikh, M. Elsheikh, [A reliable triangular mesh intersection algorithm and its application in geological modelling](#) 30 (1) 143–157. doi: [10.1007/s00366-012-0297-3](#). URL [http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00366-012-0297-3](#)
- [4] M. J. Gander, C. Japhet, [Algorithm 932: PANG: Software for nonmatching grid projections in 2d and 3d with linear complexity](#) 40 (1) 1–25. doi: [10.1145/2513109.2513115](#). URL [http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2513109.2513115](#)
- [5] M. J. Gander, C. Japhet, [An algorithm for non-matching grid projections with linear complexity](#), in: M. Bercovier, M. J. Gander, R. Kornhuber, O. Widlund (Eds.), Domain Decomposition Methods in Science and Engineering XVIII, no. 70 in Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 185–192, DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-02677-5\\_19](#). URL [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-02677-5\\_19](#)
- [6] W. M. Boon, J. M. Nordbotten, [Robust discretization of flow in fractured porous media](#). URL [http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.06977](#)
- [7] S. Bournival, J.-C. Cuillire, V. Francois, [A mesh-geometry based approach for mixed-dimensional analysis](#), in: Proceedings of the 17th International Meshing Roundtable, Springer, pp. 299–313. URL [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-87921-3\\_18](#)

- [8] V. Reichenberger, H. Jakobs, P. Bastian, R. Helmig, [A mixed-dimensional finite volume method for two-phase flow in fractured porous media](#) 29 (7) 1020–1036.  
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0309170805002150>
- [9] K. Sldkov, V. Dolej, Bakalsk prce: Integration of piecewise polynomial functions on non-matching grids.
- [10] G. Pichot, J. Erhel, J.-R. de Dreuzy, [A generalized mixed hybrid mortar method for solving flow in stochastic discrete fracture networks](#) 34 (1) B86–B105.  
URL <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/100804383>
- [11] B. Flemisch, M. Kaltenbacher, S. Triebenbacher, B. Wohlmuth, [Non-matching grids for a flexible discretization in computational acoustics](#) 11 (2) 472–488. doi:10.4208/cicp.141209.280810s.  
URL [http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S1815240600002292](http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1815240600002292)
- [12] [Hybrid local nonmatching method for multiphase flow simulations in heterogeneous fractured media](#), u.S. Classification 703/2, 703/10; International Classification G06F17/50; Cooperative Classification G01V2210/646, E21B43/26, G01V1/30, E21B41/00, G01V1/301, G06F17/5018.  
URL <http://www.google.com/patents/US20140046636>
- [13] R. Mittal, G. Iaccarino, [IMMERSED BOUNDARY METHODS](#) 37 (1) 239–261. doi:10.1146/annurev.fluid.37.061903.175743.  
URL <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.fluid.37.061903.175743>
- [14] S. J. Owen, [A survey of unstructured mesh generation technology.](#), in: IMR, pp. 239–267.  
URL <http://ima.udg.edu/~sellares/ComGeo/OwenSurv.pdf>
- [15] Y. A. Kuznetsov, [Overlapping domain decomposition with non-matching grids](#) 6 299–308.  
URL <http://emis.ams.org/proceedings/DDM/DD9/Kuznetsov.ps.gz>