

A high order Padé ADI method for unsteady convection-diffusion equations

By D. You

1. Motivation and objectives

The unsteady convection-diffusion equation for a variable ϕ in two-dimensional space can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} &= -c^x \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} - c^y \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \nu^x \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + \nu^y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2}, & (x, y) \in \Omega \times (0, T], \\ \phi(0, x, y) &= \phi_0(x, y), & (x, y) \in \Omega, \\ a(t, x, y)\phi + b(t, x, y) \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} &= f(t, x, y), & (x, y) \in \partial\Omega, t \in (0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathcal{R}^2$ is a rectangular domain, $(0, T]$ is the time interval, and ϕ_0 and f are the initial and boundary conditions. a and b are arbitrary coefficients describing the boundary condition as a Dirichlet, Neumann, or Robin type in the boundary normal direction n . $c^{x(y)}$ and $\nu^{x(y)}$ denote the convection velocity and viscosity in the $x(y)$ -direction, respectively. This equation is commonly encountered in physical sciences governing the transport of a quantity such as mass, momentum, heat, and energy.

Finite difference schemes have been widely used to solve the equation using combinations of various spatial and temporal discretization methods (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959; Karaa & Zhang 2004; Kalita *et al.* 2002; Spitz & Carey 2001; Rigal 1994; Noye & Tan 1988; van der Houwen & de Vries 1983; de Vries 1984; van der Houwen 1984). Among them, the alternating direction implicit (ADI) method proposed by Peaceman & Rachford Jr. (1959) has been popular due to its computational cost-effectiveness. However, like other first and second-order accuracy schemes, the Peaceman-Rachford ADI (PR-ADI) scheme, which is second-order accurate, often produces significant dissipation and phase errors, especially for convection-dominated problems (Karaa & Zhang 2004). In van der Houwen & de Vries (1983), de Vries (1984), and van der Houwen (1984), iterative or non-iterative multistep methods were combined with the ADI method to achieve higher-order temporal accuracy.

To achieve higher spatial accuracy, the high order compact (HOC) scheme (MacKinnon & Carey 1988) has recently been utilized for spatial discretizations. This scheme leads to fourth-order accurate approximations. Furthermore, the HOC scheme produces non-oscillatory solutions for the steady homogeneous convection-diffusion equation (Spitz & Carey 2001). Other classes of high order compact schemes that have different weighting parameters have been derived by Rigal (1994). For solving unsteady convection-diffusion equations, the HOC scheme has been utilized in a number of different ways. Noye & Tan (1988) developed a third-order nine-point HOC scheme for unsteady convection-diffusion equations and later, Kalita *et al.* (2002) increased the order of accuracy to fourth order using the same bandwidth of stencil. The ADI approach was not employed in those methods, and computational costs were therefore significantly higher than that of the PR-ADI method. The computational efficiency of the ADI approach and high-order accuracy of the HOC scheme were combined in the method proposed by Karaa &

Zhang (2004). The high order compact ADI (HOC-ADI) scheme retains the tridiagonal algorithm of the standard ADI (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959) and at the same time, achieves fourth-order accuracy in space.

Although a number of test problems at relatively low cell Reynolds numbers ($Pe = c^{x(y)} h_{x(y)} / \nu^{x(y)}$, where $h_{x(y)}$ is the grid spacing) were considered in the HOC based schemes (Karaa & Zhang 2004; Kalita *et al.* 2002; Noye & Tan 1988), the characteristics of the schemes at high cell Reynolds numbers and the resulting numerical errors in terms of phase and amplitude were not discussed. Many fully-implicit and semi-implicit algorithms for solving Navier-Stokes equations also utilize the computational effectiveness of the ADI-type approach (e.g. Choi *et al.* 1992; Akselvoll & Moin 1995; You *et al.* 2004; Visbal & Gaitonde 1999). Therefore, Navier-Stokes solutions will be one of the most promising applications of ADI methods with high-order spatial accuracy. It is well known that in turbulent flow computations using direct numerical simulation or large eddy simulation, numerical dissipation induced by artificial diffusion or by truncation errors of the numerical scheme significantly degrades the solution quality (Mittal & Moin 1997). As will be shown in the present study, HOC based schemes suffer from excessive numerical dissipation at high cell Reynolds numbers.

In this report, a Padé scheme-based ADI (PDE-ADI) method is proposed. The present scheme employs the standard fourth-order accurate approximations for first and second derivatives in the convection-diffusion equation and simultaneously retains second-order accuracy in time utilizing the efficiency of tridiagonal algorithms. Furthermore, in contrast to the HOC based schemes in which the phase and amplitude characteristics of a solution are altered by the variation of cell Reynolds number, the present method retains the characteristics of the modified wavenumbers for spatial derivatives, regardless of the variation of cell Reynolds number.

The superiority of the proposed scheme compared to other ADI schemes (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959; Karaa & Zhang 2004) for solving unsteady convection-diffusion equations is discussed in detail.

2. High order Padé ADI scheme

Applying the Crank-Nicolson scheme and the ADI factorization for time integration of (1.1) results in

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ 1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(c^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \nu^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \right\} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(c^y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \nu^y \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) \right\} \phi^{n+1} \\ &= \left\{ 1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(c^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \nu^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \right\} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(c^y \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \nu^y \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) \right\} \phi^n \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

In the HOC based schemes (Karaa & Zhang 2004; Kalita *et al.* 2002; Spatz & Carey 2001; Noye & Tan 1988), the convection-diffusion terms in each direction are approximated with fourth-order accuracy as follows:

$$\left(c^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \nu^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \phi = f^x, \quad (2.2)$$

$$c^x \delta_x \phi_i - \nu^x \left(1 + \frac{Pe_x^2}{12} \right) \delta_x^2 \phi_i = f_i^x + \frac{h_x^2}{12} \delta_x^2 f_i^x - \frac{Pe_x h_x}{12} \delta_x f_i^x, \quad (2.3)$$

where δ_x and δ_x^2 are the second-order central difference operators for first and second derivatives, respectively. HOC approximations as given in (2.3) are incorporated into the ADI factored equation (2.1) in order to complete the HOC-ADI scheme proposed by Karaa & Zhang (2004). This method is unconditionally stable and retains fourth-order accuracy in space and second-order accuracy in time. Also, the HOC-ADI scheme equipped with tridiagonal algorithms results in a significant computational cost saving compared to other non-ADI based iterative HOC schemes (Kalita *et al.* 2002; Noye & Tan 1988). See Karaa & Zhang (2004) for more details.

Two important observations can be made about (2.3). First, the cell Reynolds number is present in the stencil coefficients. This feature results in a non-oscillatory solution by adding numerical dissipation depending on the cell Reynolds number for the steady homogeneous convection-diffusion equation (Spotz & Carey 2001). However, the non-oscillatory feature is not guaranteed in unsteady problems (Spotz & Carey 2001), and as will be shown in this note, the scheme produces significantly enhanced dissipation in cases of high cell Reynolds numbers. The other point is that the approximation becomes singular for pure convection problems ($\nu^x = 0$), whereas for pure diffusion problems ($c^x = 0$), the HOC approximation becomes the standard fourth-order Padé scheme.

To examine the characteristics of the HOC scheme in more detail, a modified wavenumber analysis of (2.2) is performed. The modified wavenumber analysis allows one to assess how well different frequency components of a harmonic function in a periodic domain are represented by a finite-difference scheme (Moin 2001). Replacing the difference operators in (2.3) with modified wavenumbers for second-order central differences results in

$$\lambda_{\text{HOC}} = \left(ic^x k^1 + \nu^x \left(1 + \frac{\text{Pe}_x^2}{12} \right) k^2 \right) / \left(-i \frac{\text{Pe}_x h_x}{12} k^1 + 1 - \frac{h_x^2}{12} k^2 \right). \quad (2.4)$$

For comparison, the standard second-order central difference (CD) and fourth-order Padé (PDE) approximations of (2.2) are also considered, for which

$$\lambda_{\text{CD}} = ic^x k^1 + \nu^x k^2, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\lambda_{\text{PDE}} = ic^x \hat{k}^1 + \nu^x \hat{k}^2, \quad (2.6)$$

where $k^1 = \sin kh_x/h_x$, $k^2 = (2 - 2 \cos kh_x)/h_x^2$, $\hat{k}^1 = 3 \sin kh_x/h_x(2 + \cos kh_x)$ and $\hat{k}^2 = 12(1 - \cos kh_x)/h_x^2(5 + \cos kh_x)$.

Figure 1 shows the real and imaginary parts of λ s as functions of kh_x for two different cell Reynolds numbers. In the case of $\text{Pe} = 0.1$, shown in Fig. 1(a), the real parts for both the HOC and Padé schemes are almost indistinguishable, while the Padé scheme shows better resolution than the HOC scheme in the imaginary parts of λ . Both schemes show better resolution properties than does the second-order central difference scheme. However, if the cell Reynolds number is increased to 10, the HOC scheme dramatically increases dissipation error ($\text{Real}(\lambda)$) and produces a significant overshoot in the imaginary part of λ (see Fig. 1(b)). This suggests that the solution quality of the HOC scheme is highly dependent on the cell Reynolds number. Especially, at a high Reynolds number, significant numerical dissipation is expected, which is undesirable in turbulent flow computations using direct numerical simulation or large-eddy simulation (Mittal & Moin 1997).

In contrast to the HOC scheme, the Padé scheme-based algorithm does not alter its non-dissipative characteristics with the cell Reynolds number. However, the tridiagonal matrix algorithms are not retained if we apply the Padé approximations directly to (2.1).




FIGURE 1. Real and imaginary parts of λ for three numerical schemes: (a) $Pe = 0.1$ and (b) $Pe = 10$. —, PDE; ----, HOC; ·····, CD; -·-·-, exact.

To overcome this deficiency, further factorizations are made without loss of temporal accuracy:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^y \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^y \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\right) \phi^{n+1} \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^y \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^y \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\right) \phi^n \\
&+ \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where the spatial derivative terms are approximated with the standard fourth-order Padé schemes. For instance, the first and second derivatives in x -direction are approximated as

$$\phi'_{i-1,j} + 4\phi'_{i,j} + \phi'_{i+1,j} = -\frac{3}{h} (\phi_{i-1,j} - \phi_{i+1,j}), \tag{2.8}$$

$$\phi''_{i-1,j} + 10\phi''_{i,j} + \phi''_{i+1,j} = \frac{12}{h^2} (\phi_{i-1,j} - 2\phi_{i,j} + \phi_{i+1,j}), \tag{2.9}$$

or in matrix-vector notations,

$$\begin{aligned}
L_x \Phi_{,x} &= A_x \Phi, \\
L_{xx} \Phi_{,xx} &= B_{xx} \Phi.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

The same approximations are also applied to the spatial derivative terms in y -direction.

In matrix-vector notation, (2.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_x^{-1} T_x^+ L_{xx}^{-1} T_{xx}^- L_y^{-1} T_y^+ L_{yy}^{-1} T_{yy}^- \Phi^{n+1} \\
&= L_x^{-1} T_x^- L_{xx}^{-1} T_{xx}^+ L_y^{-1} T_y^- L_{yy}^{-1} T_{yy}^+ \Phi^n,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_x^\pm &= \left(L_x \pm \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^x A_x \right), \quad T_{xx}^\pm = \left(L_{xx} \pm \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^x B_{xx} \right), \\ T_y^\pm &= \left(L_y \pm \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^y A_y \right), \quad T_{yy}^\pm = \left(L_{yy} \pm \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^y B_{yy} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

The solution procedure only consists of a number of multiplications and inversions of tridiagonal matrices, which makes the computation more efficient than other non-ADI based schemes (Kalita *et al.* 2002; Noye & Tan 1988) that require iterative methods for solving banded sparse matrices (also see Ref. Karaa & Zhang (2004) for the comparison of computational costs for ADI and non-ADI based schemes). From (2.8)-(2.10) and (2.12), it can easily be shown that $T_{x(y)}^+$ and $T_{xx(yy)}^-$ are nonsingular tridiagonal matrices.

The present factorization retains the wavenumber characteristics discussed in Fig. 1 with $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)$ accuracy. Consider subsets of the factored equations (2.1) and (2.7):

$$\left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(c^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - \nu^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \right) \phi = g \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$\left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right) \phi = g. \quad (2.14)$$

It can easily be shown that modified wavenumber spectrums for (2.13) and (2.14) are equivalent by second-order temporal accuracy:

$$\left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} i c^x \hat{k}^1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^x \hat{k}^2 \right) = \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} i c^x \hat{k}^1 \right) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^x \hat{k}^2 \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2). \quad (2.15)$$

The von Neumann stability analysis is performed to examine the stability of the scheme. By assuming $\phi_{ij}^n = \phi_0^n e^{ik^x h_x} e^{ik^y h_y}$, we obtain the amplification factor σ in the following form

$$\sigma = \frac{(1 - i\alpha^x)(1 - \beta^x)(1 - i\alpha^y)(1 - \beta^y)}{(1 + i\alpha^x)(1 + \beta^x)(1 + i\alpha^y)(1 + \beta^y)}, \quad (2.16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{x(y)} &= \frac{\Delta t}{2} c^{x(y)} \frac{3 \sin(k^{x(y)} h_{x(y)})}{h_{x(y)} (2 + \cos(k^{x(y)} h_{x(y)}))}, \\ \beta^{x(y)} &= \frac{\Delta t}{2} \nu^{x(y)} \frac{12(1 - \cos(k^{x(y)} h_{x(y)}))}{h_{x(y)}^2 (\cos(k^{x(y)} h_{x(y)}) + 5)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

It can easily be shown that the criterion $|\sigma| \leq 1$ is satisfied for all $\alpha^{x(y)}, \beta^{x(y)}$. Therefore, the new scheme is unconditionally stable.

Extension of the present ADI method to a three-dimensional problem and a system of equations can be made in the same way for PR-ADI (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959) or for HOC-ADI (Karaa & Zhang 2004) methods, except for the additional factorization in the advection and diffusion steps. Stability and convergence of the present ADI method for linear and nonlinear systems of equations can be proved by applying the same approach used for the PR-ADI method (Hundsdoerfer & Verwer 1989). To demonstrate the potential of the present Padé-ADI method for three-dimensional nonlinear systems, a formulation for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations is presented in the Appendix.

Forward or backward differences can be employed to impose Dirichlet, Neumann, or

Robin type boundary conditions while retaining the bandwidth and the strict diagonal dominance of the matrices (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959; Karaa & Zhang 2004; Spatz & Carey 2001). Mattsson & Nordström (2004) showed that two and one orders less accurate boundary closures for the second and first derivatives terms, respectively, can maintain the internal order of accuracy. It is also worth noting that a strong stability of the present ADI scheme for non-periodic boundary conditions can be achieved by employing the simultaneous approximation term (SAT) procedure (Carpenter *et al.* 1994; Mattsson 2005). The SAT procedure is a penalty method in which the penalty parameters are determined by stability considerations (see Refs. Mattsson & Nordström (2004); Carpenter *et al.* (1994); Mattsson (2005); Strand (1994); Carpenter *et al.* (1999) for details).

3. Numerical examples

To examine the validity and effectiveness of the present high order Padé ADI method, an unsteady problem concerning the convection-diffusion of a Gaussian pulse in the square domain $[0, 2] \times [0, 2]$ is considered with the following initial condition (Karaa & Zhang 2004):

$$\phi(0, x, y) = \exp\left(-\frac{(x - 0.5)^2}{\nu^x} - \frac{(y - 0.5)^2}{\nu^y}\right). \quad (3.1)$$

An analytical solution to this problem is

$$\phi(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{4t + 1} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - c^x t - 0.5)^2}{\nu^x(4t + 1)} - \frac{(y - c^y t - 0.5)^2}{\nu^y(4t + 1)}\right). \quad (3.2)$$

The Dirichlet boundary conditions are taken from the analytical solution.

A uniform grid of $h_x = h_y = 0.025$ is employed to compare the accuracy of the computed solutions from the present Padé-ADI, the HOC-ADI, and the PR-ADI schemes. The viscosity values are fixed at $\nu^x = \nu^y = 0.01$. Two cell Reynolds numbers of $Pe = 2$ and 200 are considered by setting convection velocities $c^x = c^y = 0.8$ and $c^x = c^y = 80$. Constant time step sizes of 2.5×10^{-3} and 2.5×10^{-5} are used for $Pe = 2$ and 200, respectively.

Figure 2 shows L^2 -norm errors of the computed solutions at $Pe = 2$ with respect to the exact solution at each time step. The present ADI scheme produces a significantly more accurate solution than do the other schemes with which it is compared. Less accurate predictions of the HOC-ADI scheme are mainly due to phase errors as expected through the modified wavenumber study (see Fig. 1(a)). The PR-ADI method shows significantly higher magnitudes of L^2 -norm errors. In Karaa & Zhang (2004), in this case, it was shown that the PR-ADI method cannot achieve the same order of L^2 -norm errors of the HOC-ADI scheme, even with twice the grid resolution. Numerical solutions are compared with the exact solution at the final time step ($t = 1.25$) in Fig. 3. Solutions obtained from the present ADI (Fig. 3(b)) and the HOC-ADI (Fig. 3(c)) schemes are visually indistinguishable from the exact solution (Fig. 3(a)). However, noticeable phase differences are observed between the PR-ADI solution (Fig. 3(d)) and the exact solution.

The superiority of the present ADI scheme is more clearly observed in the high cell Reynolds number case ($Pe = 200$). Figure 4 shows contour plots of the numerical and exact solutions at $t = 0.0125$. The present ADI scheme produces a solution that is in good agreement with the exact solution in terms of amplitude and phase (Fig. 4(a) and (b)). However, the HOC-ADI scheme and the PR-ADI scheme lead to significantly dissipated




FIGURE 2. L^2 -norm errors produced by three numerical schemes at each time step: —, present ADI scheme; ----, HOC-ADI scheme (Karaa & Zhang 2004); ·····, PR-ADI scheme (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959). $\Delta t = 0.0025$, $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.025$, $c^x = c^y = 0.8$ and $\nu^x = \nu^y = 0.01$.

Scheme	L^2 -norm error	$\frac{\text{CPU time}}{\text{CPU time for PR-ADI}}$
PR-ADI (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959)	3.29×10^{-4}	1.0
HOC-ADI (Karaa & Zhang 2004)	1.82×10^{-4}	1.4
Present ADI	7.68×10^{-6}	2.2

TABLE 1. L^2 -norm errors at $t = 0.0125$ and CPU times used for numerical integrations. $\Delta t = 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$, $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.025$, $c^x = c^y = 80$ and $\nu^x = \nu^y = 0.01$.

solutions that are also highly distorted and oscillatory (Fig. 4(c) and (d)). In particular, the enhanced numerical dissipation makes the HOC-ADI scheme unattractive for direct numerical simulations or large eddy simulations of turbulent flows. The distortions and oscillations are in opposite-direction in the solution of HOC-ADI and PR-ADI schemes, and this feature is explained by the characteristics of the imaginary parts of the λ s for a high cell Reynolds number case (see Fig. 1(b)).

At $Pe = 200$, the three numerical schemes are compared quantitatively in Table 1. The present ADI scheme shows a much smaller L^2 -norm error than do those of other ADI schemes. However, in contrast to the case of $Pe = 2$, the L^2 -norm error of the HOC-ADI scheme is not significantly lower than that of the PR-ADI method. A disadvantage of the present ADI scheme is the higher computational cost due to the increased number of factorizations of the governing equation. However, it is worth noting that at this high cell Reynolds number, the present scheme produces better results than does the HOC-ADI scheme that employs the double mesh size.




FIGURE 3. Contour plots of the pulse in the region $1.2 \leq x, y \leq 1.8$ at $t = 1.25$: (a) exact, (b) present ADI, (c) HOC-ADI (Karaa & Zhang 2004), and (d) PR-ADI (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959). $\Delta t = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$, $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.025$, $c^x = c^y = 0.8$ and $\nu^x = \nu^y = 0.01$. Dotted contour lines in (b)-(d) correspond to the exact solution.

4. Concluding remarks

A high order alternating direction implicit (ADI) method for computation of unsteady convection-diffusion equations has been proposed. The Padé approximations of spatial derivatives lead to fourth-order accuracy with high resolution properties in space, while second-order accuracy is maintained in time. The solution procedure consists of a number of multiplications and inversions of tridiagonal matrices that are computationally cost effective. The present method is unconditionally stable and produces more accurate solutions in terms of phase and amplitude errors than do the standard second-order ADI method (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959) and the fourth order HOC-ADI scheme (Karaa & Zhang 2004). In particular, it does not introduce numerical dissipation, which is significant in the convection dominated case when other previous ADI schemes are employed.




FIGURE 4. Contour plots of the pulse in the region $1.2 \leq x, y \leq 1.8$ at $t = 0.0125$: (a) exact, (b) present ADI, (c) HOC-ADI (Karaa & Zhang 2004), and (d) PR-ADI (Peaceman & Rachford Jr. 1959). $\Delta t = 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$, $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.025$, $c^x = c^y = 80$ and $\nu^x = \nu^y = 0.01$.

Acknowledgments

The helpful comments of Dr. Meng Wang on a draft of this paper are greatly appreciated.

5. Appendix. Padé ADI method for incompressible Navier-Stokes equations

Consider the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in the conservative form:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} u_i u_j + \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_j \partial x_j} u_i - \frac{\partial p}{\partial x_i}, \\ \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_i} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

Applying the Crank-Nicolson scheme and the fractional-step method Kim & Moin (1985) to (5.1) leads to

$$\frac{\hat{u}_i - u_i^n}{\Delta t/2} = - \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_j \delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \right) - \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta x_j} u_i^n u_j^n - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_j \delta x_j} u_i^n \right), \quad (5.2)$$

$$\frac{u_i^{n+1} - \hat{u}_i}{\Delta t} = - \frac{\delta \phi^{n+1}}{\delta x_i}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\frac{\delta u_i^{n+1}}{\delta x_i} = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

where ϕ is referred to as the pseudo-pressure and is different from the original pressure p by

$$\frac{\delta p^{n+1}}{\delta x_i} = \frac{\delta \phi^{n+1}}{\delta x_i} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t). \quad (5.5)$$

(5.2) can be recast as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_i + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_j \delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \right) = \\ u_i^n - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta x_j} u_i^n u_j^n - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_j \delta x_j} u_i^n \right) \equiv R_i^n \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

or

$$F_i = \hat{u}_i + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_j \delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \right) - R_i^n = 0 \quad (5.7)$$

Applying a Newton-iteration method to (5.7) leads to

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \hat{u}_j} \right\}^r \delta \hat{u}_j^{r+1} = -F_i^r, \quad (5.8)$$

where $\delta \hat{u}_j^{r+1} = \hat{u}_j^{r+1} - \hat{u}_j^r$, r is the iteration index, and $j = 1, 2, 3$. Then

$$\left\{ \delta_{ij} + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}_j} \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_j \delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \right) \right\}^r \delta \hat{u}_j^{r+1} = -F_i^r, \quad (5.9)$$

and we introduce a matrix of the form

$$M_{ij} = \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{u}_j} \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_j - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_j \delta x_j} \hat{u}_i \right) \right\}. \quad (5.10)$$

Now we split $M_{ij} = (M_{ij}^1 + M_{ij}^2 + M_{ij}^3)$ into three parts, each containing x_1 -, x_2 -, and x_3 -derivatives, respectively. Using an ADI factorization technique, (5.9) becomes

$$\left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{ii}^1 \right)^r \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{ii}^2 \right)^r \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} M_{ii}^3 \right)^r \delta \hat{u}_i^{r+1} = -F_i^r - \kappa \frac{\Delta t}{2} (M_{ij})^r \delta \hat{u}_j^*, \quad (5.11)$$

where $\kappa = 1$ for $j \neq i$ and $\kappa = 0$ for $j = i$ with $j = 1, 2, 3$. No summation rule is repeated on $i (= 1, 2, 3)$. $\delta \hat{u}_j^*$ is updated during the iteration step. The factored terms in the left-hand side of (5.11) become tridiagonal matrices when the spatial derivatives are approximated by the second-order central differences. Inversions of the tridiagonal matrices result in a significant reduction in computing cost and memory. This formulation has been successfully employed in a number of direct- and large-eddy simulations of turbulent flows (Choi *et al.* 1992; Akselvoll & Moin 1995; You *et al.* 2004).

Interestingly, Visbal & Gaitonde (1999) employed second-order central differences and fourth-order Padé schemes for the spatial derivative terms in the left- and right-hand sides of (5.11) to obtain global high-order spatial accuracy. Second-order central differences for the factored terms were necessary to retain the efficiency of tridiagonal matrix operations. The present ADI method allows for the use of fourth-order Padé schemes for the left-hand side factored terms, thereby maintaining the efficiency of tridiagonal matrix operations. Applicability of the present ADI method is considered for the case of $i = 1$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\delta}{\delta x_1} 2\hat{u}_1\right)^r \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_1 \delta x_1}\right)^r \cdot \\ & \quad \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\delta}{\delta x_2} \hat{u}_2\right)^r \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_2 \delta x_2}\right)^r \cdot \\ & \quad \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\delta}{\delta x_3} \hat{u}_3\right)^r \left(1 - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_3 \delta x_3}\right)^r \delta \hat{u}_1^{r+1} \\ & = -F_1^r - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\delta}{\delta x_2} (\hat{u}_1 \delta \hat{u}_2^*) - \frac{\Delta t}{2} \frac{\delta}{\delta x_3} (\hat{u}_1 \delta \hat{u}_3^*), \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_{11}^1 \delta \hat{u}_1 &= \frac{\delta}{\delta x_1} (2\hat{u}_1 \delta \hat{u}_1) - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_1 \delta x_1} \delta \hat{u}_1, \\ M_{11}^2 \delta \hat{u}_1 &= \frac{\delta}{\delta x_2} (\hat{u}_2 \delta \hat{u}_1) - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_2 \delta x_2} \delta \hat{u}_1, \\ M_{11}^3 \delta \hat{u}_1 &= \frac{\delta}{\delta x_3} (\hat{u}_3 \delta \hat{u}_1) - \frac{1}{\text{Re}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta x_3 \delta x_3} \delta \hat{u}_1, \\ M_{12} \delta \hat{u}_2 &= \frac{\delta}{\delta x_2} (\hat{u}_1 \delta \hat{u}_2), \\ M_{13} \delta \hat{u}_3 &= \frac{\delta}{\delta x_3} (\hat{u}_1 \delta \hat{u}_3). \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

REFERENCES

- AKSELVOLL, K. & MOIN, P. 1995 Large eddy simulation of turbulent confined coannular jets and turbulent flow over a backward facing step. *Report TF-63*. Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- CARPENTER, M. H., GOTTLIEB, D. & ABARBANEL, S. 1994 Time-stable boundary conditions for finite-difference schemes solving hyperbolic systems: methodology and application to high-order compact schemes. *J. Comp. Phys.* **111**, 220–236.
- CARPENTER, M. H., NORDSTRÖM, J. & GOTTLIEB, D. 1999 A stable conservative interface treatment of arbitrary spatial accuracy. *J. Comp. Phys.* **148**, 341–365.
- CHOI, H., MOIN, P. & KIM, J. 1992 Turbulent drag reduction: studies of feedback control and flow over riblets. *Report TF-55*. Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- DE VRIES, H. B. 1984 Comparative study of ADI splitting methods for parabolic equations in two space dimensions. *J. Comp. App. Math.* **10**, 179–193.
- HUNSDORFER, W. H. & VERWER, J. G. 1989 Stability and convergence of the Peaceman-Rachford ADI method for initial-boundary value problems. *Math. Comp.* **53**, 81–101.
- KALITA, J. C., DALAL, D. C. & DASS, A. K. 2002 A class of higher order compact

- schemes for the unsteady two-dimensional convection-diffusion equation with variable convection coefficients. *Int. J. Num. Methods Fluids* **38**, 1111–1131.
- KARAA, S. & ZHANG, J. 2004 High order ADI method for solving unsteady convection-diffusion problems. *J. Comp. Phys.* **198**, 1–9.
- KIM, J. & MOIN, P. 1985 Application of a fractional-step method to incompressible Navier-Stokes equations. *J. Comp. Phys.* **59**, 308–323.
- MACKINNON, R. J. & CAREY, G. F. 1988 Analysis of material interface discontinuities and superconvergent fluxes in finite difference theory. *J. Comp. Phys.* **75**, 151–167.
- MATTSSON, K. 2005 Private communication.
- MATTSSON, K. & NORDSTRÖM, J. 2004 Summation by parts operators for finite difference approximations of second derivatives. *J. Comp. Phys.* **199**, 503–540.
- MITTAL, R. & MOIN, P. 1997 Suitability of upwind-biased schemes for large-eddy simulation of turbulent flows. *AIAA J.* **36**, 1415–1417.
- MOIN, P. 2001 *Fundamentals of Engineering Numerical Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- NOYE, B. J. & TAN, H. H. 1988 Finite difference methods for solving the two-dimensional advection-diffusion equation. *Int. J. Num. Methods Fluids* **26**, 1615–1629.
- PEACEMAN, D. W. & RACHFORD JR., H. H. 1959 The numerical solution of parabolic and elliptic differential equations. *J. Soc. Ind. Appl. Math.* **3**, 28–41.
- RIGAL, A. 1994 High order difference schemes for unsteady one-dimensional diffusion-convection problems. *J. Comp. Phys.* **114**, 59–76.
- SPOTZ, W. F. & CAREY, G. F. 2001 Extension of high-order compact schemes to time-dependent problems. *Num. Methods Part. Diff. Eqs.* **17**, 657–672.
- STRAND, B. 1994 Summation by parts for finite difference approximations for d/dx . *J. Comp. Phys.* **110**, 47–67.
- VAN DER HOUWEN, P. J. 1984 Iterated splitting methods of high order for time-dependent partial differential equations. *SIAM J. Num. Anal.* **21**, 635–656.
- VAN DER HOUWEN, P. J. & DE VRIES, H. B. 1983 Fourth order ADI method for semidiscrete parabolic equations. *J. Comp. Appl. Math.* **9**, 41–63.
- VISBAL, M. R. & GAITONDE, D. V. 1999 High-order-accurate methods for complex unsteady subsonic flows. *AIAA J.* **37**, 1231–1239.
- YOU, D., MITTAL, R., WANG, M. & MOIN, P. 2004 Computational methodology for large-eddy simulation of tip-clearance flows. *AIAA J.* **42**, 271–279.