CONSERVATIVE MULTIDIMENSIONAL UPWINDING FOR THE STEADY TWO-DIMENSIONAL SHALLOW WATER EQUATIONS

M.E.Hubbard and M.J.Baines

Tho University of Roading

Dopartmont of Mathomatics

 $P.O.Box\ 220$

Whit~knights

R^ading

 $RG6 \ 6AX$

Unit^d Kingdom

Key words:

shallow wath γ quations, multidimensional upwinding, conservation,

fluctuation distribution, systam dacomposition, sourca tarms

Subject classification:

35L65, 65M99, 76M25

Proposed running head:

Multidim^nsional upwinding for shallow wat^r $% \left({{{\rm{A}}_{\rm{T}}}} \right) = {{\rm{A}}_{\rm{T}}} \left({{{\rm{A}}_{\rm{T}}}} \right) = {{{A}}_{\rm{T}}} \left({{{\rm{A}}_{\rm{T}}}} \right) = {{{A}}_{$

Address for proofs:

Dr. M.E.Hubbard The University of Reading Department of Mathematics P.O.Box 220 Whiteknights Reading RG6 6AX United Kingdom

Phon : +44 (0)118 9875123 x4009

Fax: +44 (0)118 9313423

Email: M.E.Hubbard@r^ading.ac.uk

Abstract

In recent years upwind differencing has gained acceptance as a robust and accurate technique for the numerical approximation of the onedimensional shallow water equations. In two dimensions the benefits have been less marked due to the reliance of the methods on standard operator splitting techniques. Two conservative genuinely multidimensional upwind schemes are presented which have been adapted from flux balance distribution methods recently proposed for the approximation of steady state solutions of the Euler equations on unstructured triangular grids. A method for dealing with source terms, such as those introduced by modelling bed slope and friction, is also suggested and results are presented for two-dimensional steady state channel flows to illustrate the accuracy and robustness of the new algorithms.

1 Introduction

In recent years, many advances have been made in the numerical solution of hyperbolic systems of conservation laws in one and more dimensions [14, 12, 1]. Of particular interest has been the prediction of discontinuous solutions to the equations, which can occur when the system is nonlinear.

In the case of the numerical solution of the shallow water equations traditional methods, such as those of Preissmann, Abbott [5] and McCormack [9] rely on central differencing and are well known to require special treatment before a realistic numerical approximation of discontinuous flows can be obtained. More recently, the concept of upwinding has been adopted from the field of gas dynamics for the modelling of shallow water flows [11, 3]. This has proved to be highly successful, particularly in one dimension, in which high order upwind schemes have been constructed which capture discontinuities sharply and smoothly. This is achieved without the addition of artificial viscosity which is normally required to stabilise central difference schemes in the vicinity of high flow gradients. Furthermore, the upwind discretisation arises naturally from the physical interpretation of hyperbolic systems of equations, also giving a framework in which boundary conditions can be applied easily. The upwinding approach is therefore ideal for the modelling of transcritical and supercritical flows.

The practical advantages of upwind schemes in higher dimensions are less clear. Historically, they have been applied to the two-dimensional shallow water equations via the use of standard operator splitting techniques, *e.g.* [3], which by implication involves the application of one-dimensional methods to a multidimensional system of equations, albeit in two independent directions. Recently

In this paper a conservative formulation is presented, together with two alternative decompositions of the system of shallow water equations and a method of incorporating source terms such as those arising from the consideration of bed slope and friction. Results are presented to illustrate the quality of the numerical solutions obtained for steady state problems.

2 The Governing Equ tions

The shallow water equations can be used to describe the motion of 'shallow' free-

ar
 $\mbox{th}\mbox{cons}\mbox{rvativ}\xi\mbox{variables}$ and the corresponding flux v

and

$$\mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{U}} = \frac{\partial \underline{\mathbf{G}}}{\partial \underline{\mathbf{U}}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -uv & v & u \\ -v^2 + c^2 & 0 & 2v \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (2.9)$$

in which $c = \sqrt{gh}$ is the gravity wave speed or wave colority. Further details about the mathematical aspects of the shallow water equations can be found in [23].

3 A Conserv tive Line ris tion

An appropriate linearisation of the shallow water equations is required so that the decomposition and distribution stages of the algorithm give rise to a conservative scheme. Many different conservative linearisations have been constructed for the Euler equations, see for example [7, 2], but it is the most robust of these, based on Roe's one-dimensional linearisation using a set of parameter vector variables [19], which is generally used for practical calculations. This linearisation is adapted here to give an analogous discrete form of the shallow water equations.

Consider the two-dimensional homogeneous system,

$$\underline{\mathbf{U}}_t + \underline{\mathbf{F}}_x + \underline{\mathbf{G}}_y = \underline{\mathbf{0}} , \qquad (3.1)$$

in which the conservative variables \underline{U} and fluxes \underline{F} , \underline{G} are given by (2.2) and (2.3) respectively. For a given cell in a triangular discretisation of the computational domain the flux balance is defined by

$$\underline{\Phi}_{\mathrm{U}} = -\int \int_{\Delta} \left(\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{x} + \underline{\mathbf{G}}_{y} \right) \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y$$

$$= \oint_{\partial \Delta} (\underline{\mathbf{F}}, \underline{\mathbf{G}}) \cdot \mathrm{d}\vec{n} ,$$
(3.2)

in which $\mathrm{d}\vec{n}$ represents the inward pointing normal to the cell boundary. The numerical appro

by assuming that the components of the parameter vector

$$\underline{Z} = \sqrt{h} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$$
(3.5)

vary linearly in space within each cell, cf. Roe's parameter vector for the Euler

(3.4) [7]. The nonlinear terms in (3.7) and (3.8) mean that the linearisation of the shallow water equations cannot be constructed in precisely the same manner. In previous work [10, 17] non-conservative linearisations have been used, in which the flux balance (3.3) is evaluated consistently from an appropriate average state, but in the present work a conservative form is sought.

A conservative linearisation of the shallow water equations is achieved by evaluating the integrals in (3.6) exactly. This does not immediately give rise to linearised flux Jacobians of the form (3.4), so instead a component of (3.6) is isolated which does have this form and which therefore can be decomposed using the second stage of the algorithm, described in Section 4. Hence the numerical flux balance (3.3) is split into two parts, taking the form

$$\widehat{\underline{\Phi}_{U}} = - \underbrace{S_{\triangle}\left(\frac{\overline{\partial \underline{F}}}{\overline{\partial \underline{Z}}} \overline{\underline{Z}_{x}} + \frac{\overline{\partial \underline{G}}}{\overline{\partial \underline{Z}}} \overline{\underline{Z}_{y}}\right)}_{(1)} - \underbrace{S_{\triangle}\left(\mathbf{S}_{Z} \overline{\underline{Z}_{x}} + \mathbf{T}_{Z} \overline{\underline{Z}_{y}}\right)}_{(2)} . \quad (3.9)$$

The overbar indicates the consistent evaluation of a quantity solely from the cell-average state given by

$$\overline{\underline{Z}} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \underline{Z}_i , \qquad (3.10)$$

as well as the corresponding discrete gradient (evaluated under the assumption of linearly varying \underline{Z})

variables since

$$\frac{\partial \underline{U}}{\partial \underline{Z}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{h} & 0 & 0\\ \sqrt{h}u & \sqrt{h} & 0\\ \sqrt{h}v & 0 & \sqrt{h} \end{pmatrix}$$
(3.12)

is linear in the components of \underline{Z} . It then follows that the discrete gradient of the conservative v

ly decoupled. The corresponding analysis of the shallow water equations closely follows that of [18, 16, 25] and the resulting preconditioners are described here.

For the sake of simplifying the algebra, the homogeneous part of the system (2.1) is considered in terms of the streamwise variables, ξ and η , and the symmetrising variables \underline{Q} , defined by

$$\partial \underline{\mathbf{Q}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c}{h} \partial h \\ \partial q \\ q \partial \theta \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (4.1)$$

where $q = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$ is the speed of the flow and $\theta = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{v}{u}\right)$ its direction. The symmetrised form of the shallow water equations are now preconditioned by a matrix **P**, and the resulting system written in the form

$$\underline{\mathbf{Q}}_{t} + \mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{Q}}^{\$} \mathbf{Q} \right)$$



4.1 Decomposition 1 (HELW)

Following the analysis of Mesaros and Roe for the Euler equations [16], the first preconditioning matrix suggested here is given by

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\varepsilon F^2}{\beta \kappa} & -\frac{\varepsilon F}{\beta \kappa} & 0\\ -\frac{\varepsilon F}{\beta \kappa} & \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta \kappa} + \varepsilon & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\beta}{\kappa} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (4.4)$$

where $F = \frac{q}{c}$ is the local Fronde number of the flow,

$$\beta = \sqrt{|F^2 - 1|}, \quad \kappa = \max(F, 1)$$
 (4.5)

and ε is a function of the Fronde number such that $\varepsilon(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\varepsilon(F) = 1$ for $F \ge 1$. These restrictions on ε ensure that the decomposition is not sensitive to the flow angle in the limit as $F \to 0$ [26] and that the transition of the preconditioner through the transcritical region is smooth. Here, as in [26] ε is taken to be the C₁ function

$$\varepsilon(F) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{for} & F \leq \frac{1}{3} \\ -27F^3 + \frac{81}{2}F^2 - 18F + 3 & \text{for} & \frac{1}{3} < F < \frac{2}{3} \\ 1 & \text{for} & F \geq \frac{2}{3} \end{cases}$$
(4.6)

so that the first derivative also varies smoothly. The matrix \mathbf{P} in (4.4) is, in fact, precisely that of [26] with the Mach number replaced by the Froude number and without the involvement of the entropy equation. The variable κ has simply been introduced so that (4.4) is correct for both subcritical and supercritical flow.

The preconditioned system (4.2) is decomposed by transforming it into a set of characteristic equations,

$$\underline{\mathbf{W}}_t + \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\$} \, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\xi} + \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\$} \, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\eta} = \underline{\mathbf{0}} \,, \tag{4.7}$$

where the characteristic variables \underline{W} are defined by

$$\partial \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathrm{sb}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{g\beta}{q} \partial h \\ q \partial \theta \\ \frac{g}{c} \partial h + F \partial q \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathrm{sp}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{g\beta}{c} \partial h + F q \partial \theta \\ \frac{g\beta}{c} \partial h - F q \partial \theta \\ \frac{g}{c} \partial h + F \partial q \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.8)$$

for subcritical and supercritical flow respectively. The corresponding transformation matrices are given by

$$\frac{\partial \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathbf{sb}}}{\partial \underline{\mathbf{Q}}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\beta}{F} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1\\ 1 & F & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathbf{sp}}}{\partial \underline{\mathbf{Q}}} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta & 0 & F\\ \beta & 0 & -F\\ 1 & F & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4.9}$$

and their inverses, and the resulting characteristic flux Jacobian matrices can be calculated easily using

$$\mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{W}}^{\$} = \frac{\partial \underline{\mathrm{W}}}{\partial \underline{\mathrm{Q}}} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{Q}}^{\$} \frac{\partial \underline{\mathrm{Q}}}{\partial \underline{\mathrm{W}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{W}}^{\$} = \frac{\partial \underline{\mathrm{W}}}{\partial \underline{\mathrm{Q}}} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{Q}}^{\$} \frac{\partial \underline{\mathrm{Q}}}{\partial \underline{\mathrm{W}}}$$
(4.10)

for both subcritical and suprcritical flows.

Note that the choice of variables given by (4.8) changes across the transcritical region. When the flow is supercritical the steady equations are hyperbolic and the choice of variables defined by $\partial \underline{W}_{sp}$ in (4.8) uniquely leads to the system being completely decoupled into scalar components. However, in the subcritical case only one equation can be decoupled, leaving a second component which manifests itself as a 2 × 2 elliptic subsystem, the form of which depends on the choice of characteristic variables, defined here by $\partial \underline{W}_{sb}$ in (4.8). The shallow water equations cannot be decoupled further in subcritical flow.

The complete decoupling of the equations in supercritical flow allows the sys-

tom (4.7) to be written in the form of three scalar advection equations, *i.e.*

$$W_t^k + \vec{\lambda}_{\$}^k \cdot \vec{\nabla}_{\$} W^k = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, 3,$$
 (4.11)

in which the advection velocities in the streamwise coordinate system are

$$\vec{\lambda}_{\$}^{1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\beta}{F} \\ \frac{1}{F} \end{pmatrix}_{\$}, \quad \vec{\lambda}_{\$}^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\beta}{F} \\ -\frac{1}{F} \end{pmatrix}_{\$} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\lambda}_{\$}^{3} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_{\$}. \quad (4.12)$$

Hence the first component of the flux balance in (3.14) takes the form

$$\overline{\underline{\Phi}_{\mathrm{U}}} = -S_{\Delta} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \left(\vec{\lambda}_{\$}^{k} \cdot \vec{\nabla}_{\$} \mathrm{W}^{k} \right) \underline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathrm{U}}^{k} , \qquad (4.13)$$

where every term on the right hand side of (4.13) is evaluated consistently from the cell-average state defined by (3.10) and (3.11), and $\underline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathrm{U}}^{k}$ is the k^{th} column of the matrix

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{U}} = \frac{\partial \underline{\mathrm{U}}}{\partial \underline{\mathrm{Q}}} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \frac{\partial \underline{\mathrm{Q}}}{\partial \underline{\mathrm{W}}} \,. \tag{4.14}$$

This matrix transforms the components of the flux balance corresponding to the characteristic equations back into components of the conservative flux balance. Hence (4.13) represents a consistent decomposition of $\overline{\Phi}_{\rm U}$ of (3.14), the components of which may each be distributed using a simple scalar scheme such as that described in Section 5.1 below.

In the case of subcritical flow the choice of characteristic variables defined by $\partial \underline{W}_{sb}$ in (4.8) leads to Jacobian matrices in the system (4.7) given by

$$\mathbf{A}_{W}^{\xi} = \begin{pmatrix} -\varepsilon\beta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_{W}^{\xi} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varepsilon & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.15)$$

Hence the characteristic equations take the form of a single scalar advection equation, which is precisely the same as the k = 3 equation defined by (4.11) and (4.12), together with a 2 × 2 elliptic subsystem, so $\overline{\Phi_{\rm U}}$ of (3.14) is written

$$\underline{\overline{\Phi}_{\mathrm{U}}} = -S_{\Delta} \left(\underline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathrm{U}}^{1}, \underline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathrm{U}}^{2} \right) \left[\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\varepsilon\beta & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{W}^{1} \\ \mathrm{W}^{2} \end{array} \right)_{\xi} + \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 & \varepsilon \\ 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{W}^{1} \\ \mathrm{W}^{2} \end{array} \right)_{\eta} \right] \\ -S_{\Delta} \left(\vec{\lambda}_{\$}^{3} \cdot \vec{\nabla}_{\$} \mathrm{W}^{3} \right) \underline{\mathbf{r}}$$

Ν

[18] and takes the form

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\chi F^2}{\beta_{\epsilon}^2} & -\frac{\chi F}{\beta_{\epsilon}^2} & 0\\ -\frac{\chi F}{\beta_{\epsilon}^2} & \frac{\chi}{\beta_{\epsilon}^2} + 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \chi \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (4.17)$$

whoro

$$\beta_{\epsilon} = \sqrt{\max\left(\epsilon^{2}, |F^{2} - 1|\right)}, \quad \chi = \frac{\beta_{\epsilon}}{\max\left(F, 1\right)}$$
(4.18)

and ϵ is a nonzoro constant which typically takes a value of 0.05. This matrix is again derived by following the analysis of the Euler equations [25], the result being that the Mach number is replaced by the Froude number and the entropy equation disappears.

The decoupling of the system proceeds as in the previous decomposition, leading to a set of characteristic equations (4.7) in new variables \underline{W} , now defined by

$$\partial \underline{\mathbf{W}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{g\beta_{\epsilon}}{c} \partial h + Fq \, \partial \theta \\ \frac{g\beta_{\epsilon}}{c} \partial h - Fq \, \partial \theta \\ \frac{g}{c} \partial h + F \, \partial q \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (4.19)$$

ind product of the flow speed, *cf.* (4.8). The corresponding transformation matrix is given by $\frac{\partial W_{sp}}{\partial \underline{Q}}$ in (4.9).

The difference between the two decompositions lies in the treatment of the system for subcritical and transcritical flows $(F^2 \leq 1 + \epsilon^2)$. The decision to keep the same characteristic variables in both subcritical and supercritical flow leads to Jacobian matrices in the transformed system (4.7) which are given by

$$\mathbf{A}_{W}^{\$} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi \nu^{+} \ \chi \nu^{-} \ 0 \\ \chi \nu^{-} \ \chi \nu^{+} \ 0 \\ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_{W}^{\$} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\chi}{\beta_{\epsilon}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{\chi}{\beta_{\epsilon}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.20)$$

whoro

$$\nu^{+} = \frac{F^{2} - 1 + \beta_{\epsilon}^{2}}{2\beta_{\epsilon}^{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu^{-} = \frac{F^{2} - 1 - \beta_{\epsilon}^{2}}{2\beta_{\epsilon}^{2}}.$$
(4.21)

It is easy to see that in the supercritical region $\nu^- = 0$, the system is completely decoupled, and the decomposition (and subsequent distribution) reduces to precisely that given for supercritical flow in Section 4.1.

In the subcritical case the system is again decomposed into a single, independent scalar component and a pair of coupled equations, but rather than regarding the latter as a 2 × 2 subsystem it is instead treated as in [18], as two separate scalar equations with source terms. As a consequence, the decomposition of $\overline{\Phi}_{\rm U}$ of (3.14) takes the form

$$\overline{\underline{\Phi}_{\mathrm{U}}} = -S_{\triangle} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \left(\vec{\lambda}_{\$}^{k} \cdot \vec{\nabla}_{\$} \mathrm{W}^{k} + q_{\$}^{k} \right) \underline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathrm{U}}^{k} , \qquad (4.22)$$

in which $\underline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathrm{U}}^{k}$ is the k^{th} column of the matrix \mathbf{R}_{U} (4.14), newly defined from the \mathbf{P} of (4.17) and the \underline{W} of (4.19),

$$\vec{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{1} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi \nu^{+} \\ \frac{\chi}{\beta_{\epsilon}} \end{pmatrix}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \quad \vec{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} \chi \nu^{+} \\ -\frac{\chi}{\beta_{\epsilon}} \end{pmatrix}_{\mathfrak{F}} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{F}}^{3} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_{\mathfrak{F}}, \quad (4.23)$$

and

$$q_{\mathfrak{F}}^{1} = \chi \nu^{-} W_{\xi}^{2}, \quad q_{\mathfrak{F}}^{2} = \chi \nu^{-} W_{\xi}^{1} \quad \text{and} \quad q_{\mathfrak{F}}^{3} = 0.$$
 (4.24)

The distribution of the decoupled component of this second decomposition is once again carried out using the scalar upwind scheme of Section 5.1 below. It is possible to use the same method for the coupled components, with an appropriate modification (described in Section 5.2) to ensure that the scheme remains linearity preserving [18] in the presence of source terms. However positivity is lost as a consequence, so when the Froude number is close to unity and the advection velocities associated with each componenty very closely aligned, the distribution provides very little cross-stream diffusion and as a result lacks robustness. The actual scalar scheme used here is the SUPG scheme suggested in [18] and described at the end of Section 5.2. As in Section $4.1 \text{ed}\Delta\Delta\text{TD5}$ ion state solutions of (5.1) are calculated by repeating this update iteratively in order to approximate the solution in the limit as $t \to \infty$.

The vector $\vec{\lambda}$ in (5.2) may not be constant, in which case a conservative linearisation of the scalar advection equation (5.1) can often be constructed by treating it as a special case of the system linearisation discussed in Section 3 [8]. to a nodal updat[^] of th[^] form

$$u_i^{n+1} = u_i^n + \frac{\Delta t}{S_i} \sum_{\bigcup \Delta_i} \alpha_i^j \phi_j , \qquad (5.6)$$

where S_i is the area of the median dual cell for node i (one third of the total area of the triangles with a vertex at i), α_i^j is the distribution coefficient which indicates the proportion of the fluctuation ϕ_j to be sent from cell j to node i, and $\bigcup \Delta_i$ represents the set of cells with vertices at node i. It can be seen from the second expression for ϕ

- Linearity preservation the exact steady state solution is preserved when this varies linearly in space, so no update is sent to the nodes when a cell fluctuation is zero and the scheme is second order accurate at the steady state on a regular mesh with a uniform choice of diagonals [8].
- Continuity the contributions to the nodes, $\alpha_i^j \phi_j$ (5.6), depend continuously on the data, avoiding limit cycling as convergence is approached and improving the robustness of the scheme.

Linearity preservation should also be satisfied by the decomposition, so that no update is sent to the vertices of a cell when its flux balance is zero and the higher order accuracy possessed by the linearity preserving scalar scheme is retained by the overall algorithm. The property is obviously satisfied by the two decompositions described here because the columns of the matrix $\mathbf{R}_{\rm U}$ (4.14) are linearly independent.

A simple distribution scheme with all of the above properties is the so-called PSI scheme [8]. It is most easily described by considering a single triangular cell in isolation. If, according to the linearised advection velocity, $\hat{\vec{\lambda}}$ of (5.5), the triangle has a single downstream vertex, at node *i* say, then that node receives the whole fluctuation, so

$$u_i^{n+1} = u_i^n + \frac{\Delta t}{S_i} \hat{\phi} , \qquad (5.8)$$

while the values of u at the other two vertices remain unchanged. In the case of a triangle with two downstream vertices, at nodes i and j for example, the fluibutation is divided bet fluctuation can therefore be written

$$u_{i}^{n+1} = u_{i}^{n} + \frac{\Delta t}{S_{i}}\phi_{i}^{*},$$

$$u_{j}^{n+1} = u_{j}^{n} + \frac{\Delta t}{S_{j}}\phi_{j}^{*},$$
(5.9)

where $\phi_i^* + \phi_j^* = \hat{\phi}$ for conservation. In the PSI scheme [22]

$$\phi_{i}^{*} = \phi_{i} - L(\phi_{i}, -\phi_{j})$$

$$\phi_{j}^{*} = \phi_{j} - L(\phi_{j}, -\phi_{i}) , \qquad (5.10)$$

whare

$$\phi_i = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\vec{\lambda}} \cdot \vec{n}_i \left(u_i^n - u_k^n \right), \quad \phi_j = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\vec{\lambda}} \cdot \vec{n}_j \left(u_j^n - u_k^n \right), \quad (5.11)$$

and L donotos the minmod limiter function,

$$L(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \operatorname{sgn}(xy))\frac{1}{2}(\operatorname{sgn}(x) + \operatorname{sgn}(y))\min(|x|, |y|).$$
(5.12)

The PSI scheme is positive for a restriction on the time-step at a node i given by

$$\Delta t \leq \frac{S_i}{\sum_{\bigcup \Delta_i} \max(0, \frac{1}{2} \hat{\lambda}^j \cdot \vec{n}_i^j)}, \qquad (5.13)$$

and is used in the overall algorithm for the distribution of the homogeneous scalar components which arise from the decompositions of Section 4.

5.2 Distribution of Coupled Components/Subsystems

The elliptic nature of the 2×2 subsystem which results from the decomposition of the shallow water equations in subcritical flow suggests that an upwind distribution strategy is less appropriate than for the scalar components. Two schemes are described here for the distribution of this component, one for each decomposition, following the different distributions suggested for the corresponding decompositions of the Euler equations [16, 18]. In the first decomposition (HELW) the two coupled equations are modelled by the system The second approach (HESUPG) equates the coupled subsystem with a pair of scalar advection equations with source terms of the form

$$u_t + \vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{\nabla} u = q , \qquad (5.20)$$

in which $u, \vec{\lambda}$ and q are defined by the first two entries in (4.19), (4.23) and (4.24) respectively. In [18] the quantity

$$\widehat{\phi_q} = -S_{\Delta} \left(\widehat{\vec{\lambda}} \cdot \widehat{\vec{\nabla u}} - \widehat{q} \right) , \qquad (5.21)$$

is distributed for each of the two equations using a scheme which is equivalent to a mass-lumped streamline upwind Petrov-Galerkin (SUPG) finite element scheme with additional artificial viscosity [4].

The distribution coefficients for this linearity preserving and continuous but non-positive scheme are given by

$$\alpha_i^j = \frac{1}{3} + \tau \frac{\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{n}_i}{2S_{\Delta_j}} + \kappa \frac{\vec{\nabla} u \cdot \vec{n}_i}{2S_{\Delta_j}} , \qquad (5.22)$$

in which

$$\tau = C_1 \frac{h}{|\vec{\lambda}|}, \quad \kappa = C_2 \frac{h \operatorname{sgn}(\hat{\phi})}{|\vec{\nabla}u| + h}.$$
(5.23)

The constants C_1 and C_2 are both taken to be 0.5 [13], h is a typical local length scale, *e.g.* the length of the longest edge of the cell, and $\hat{\phi}$ is defined in (5.3). This scheme is used here for the distribution of the coupled equations which result from the subcritical HESUPG decomposition.

6 Source Terms

Source terms appear in the linearised shallow water equations both as a result of modelling bed slope and friction (2.1) and from the linearisation (3.14), and

these terms must be included in the updating of the solution.

The simplest method of treating the momentum sources, \underline{q} in (2.1), is to calculate them pointwise at each node and then add them to the conservative variables once the flux balance distribution has been completed, so

$$\underline{\mathbf{U}}_{i}^{n+1} = \underline{\mathbf{U}}_{i}^{n} + \delta \underline{\mathbf{U}}_{i} + \Delta t \,\underline{\mathbf{q}}_{i} , \qquad (6.1)$$

in which $\delta \underline{U}_i^n$ is the update indicated by the distribution of the decomposed flux balance. However, it is more appropriate to the schemes presented here for all of the sources to be incorporated within the flux balance distribution itself. This is the obvious way to treat the linearisation source terms since they are inherently cell-based quantities.

One way of achieving this is to include the source terms within the decomposition, so the characteristic equations of (4.7) become

$$\underline{\mathbf{W}}_{t} + \mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} + \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \underline{\mathbf{W}}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}^{-1} \underline{\mathbf{q}}_{\mathrm{tot}} , \qquad (6.2)$$

where \underline{q}_{tot} is the sum of the momentum and linearisation source terms consistently evaluated from the cell-average state \overline{Z} . The two types of source term can be considered separately but are combined here for simplicity.

The effect of \underline{q}_{tot} on the flux balance distribution can be illustrated simply by considering a scalar component of the decomposition. A characteristic equation taken from (4.11) now has the form

A positive distribution scheme does not remain positive under this modification but the linearity preservation property is retained by calculating the distribution coefficients precisely as in the homogeneous case but then using them to distribute the quantity $\widehat{\phi}_q$. The modified updates are then transformed into increments of the conservative variables using the matrix \mathbf{R}_{U} (4.14) as before. The source terms which now appear in the elliptic subsystem can also be treated in this manner for both the matrix and scalar distributions.

A third method of treating the source term \underline{q}_{tot} is to distribute it separately from $\underline{\Phi}_{U}$, and the simplest way to do this is via a symmetric distribution in which one third of \underline{q}_{tot} within a cell is sent to each of its vertices. All three ways of incorporating the source terms are considered in the following section.

7 Results

Both algorithms described in the previous sections (HELW and HESUPG) have been used to solve numerically a wide variety of steady state test cases for the twodimensional shallow water equations. In all cases the linearisation source terms are distributed separately from the rest of the flux balance by a simple central scheme since this strategy proves to be more robust than an upwind distribution and there is negligible difference between the results. The momentum sources, when they appear, are distributed in an upwind manner as part of the flux balance for the purposes of accuracy, except when robustness becomes an issue in which case they are considered separately and evaluated on a pointwise basis.

The boundary conditions are applied very simply by referring to the theory of characteristics. This determines the num

which should be imposed at a chosen point on the boundary. One condition must be applied for each positive eigenvalue of the matrix

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{U}} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{U}} n_x + \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{U}} n_y , \qquad (7.1)$$

where $\vec{n} = (n_x, n_y)^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the inward pointing normal to the boundary of the computational domain. In the case of the shallow water equations these eigenvalues are given by

$$\lambda_1 = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{n}$$
, $\lambda_2 = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{n} + c$ and $\lambda_3 = \vec{u} \cdot \vec{n} - c$. (7.2)

Thus, when the component of the flow normal to the boundary is supercritical either the whole solution is specified (at inflow) or none of it (outflow). For subcritical inflow two conditions are specified (total head and tangential velocity component) while for subcritical outflow a single piece of information, the depth of the flow, is set to a prespecified freestream value. At a solid wall only λ_2 is positive and this is accommodated by setting the normal velocity component to zero.

7.1 Oblique Hydraulic Jump

Fow standard stoady state test cases exist for the homogeneous two-dimensional shallow water equations, but there are some simple problems for which exact solutions have been calculated. One such example [3] is supercritical flow through a frictionless channel with a flat bed containing a wedge inclined at an angle θ to the direction of the flow at which an oblique hydraulic jump is induced by the interaction of the flow with the front of the wedge. The angle β which this 

Figure 7.2: Convergence history for the oblique hydraulic jump test case.

walls. This figure also shows the local Froude number contours of the steady state solution calculated for this test case (both the HELW and the HESUPG schemes are the same for supercritical flow). The hydraulic jump can be seen to be captured sharply at the correct angle and a discontinuous water surface devoid of oscillations is obtained. The values of the flow variables downstream of the jump (sampled on the outflow boundary at the point indicated by the asterisk in Figure 7.1) are $h_d = 1.5001$ m and $|\vec{u}_d| = 7.9506$ ms⁻¹ ($F_d = 2.073$), very close to the exact v Euler equations. Neither technique is used here but it is expected that both could be used to similar advantage.

Note that a CFL number of 0.7 has been used here but in the subsequent test cases, all of which have regions of subcritical flow, the CFL number is taken to be 0.2 which proved to be the highest value which could be taken which was stable for all of these cases. This seems to be because of the discontinuity in the distribution at the critical line and the nonorthogonality of the eigenvectors of the preconditioned system at low Froude numbers (described in more detail in [6]).

7.2 Symmetric Constricted Channel Flows

The domain for these test cases represents a channel of length 4 metres and width 1 metre with bumps of the same shape and size in the centre of either wall of the channel. The bumps are one metre in length and are defined such that the breadth of the channel is given by

$$B = B_0 - 2B_h \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi (x - x_c)}{x_l}\right)$$
 for $|x - x_c| \le \frac{x_l}{2}$,

Swwww

is completely subcritical and therefore symmetric about the centre of the con-

. . . ¹

the subcritical elliptic subsystem would reduce the oscillations, but not without smearing the discontinuity as well. Although the HESUPG scheme, with its greater inherent numerical diffusion, does this automatically, neither treatment is ideal and the modelling of transcritical flows requires further consideration.

The results shown in Figure 7.6 illustrate the effect of the linearisation source terms on the solution. The values of the breadth-averaged local Froude number are plotted along the length of the channel for the HELW scheme. The small oscillations downstream of the jump are rendered almost invisible by the averaging procedure and the solutions are very close to those produced by the HESUPG scheme (not plotted here) although the latter predicts the one-dimensional discontinuity to be very slightly further upstream.

The numerical results shown are for a conservative and a non-conservative formulation in which the linearisation sources are simply ignored. Close inspection reveals that the discontinuity is predicted to be about half a cell's width further downstream by the non-conservative scheme. On a grid in which the cell edges are aligned with the discontinuity the discrepancy in jump position between the conservative and non-conservative schemes can be as much as one cell. The non-conservative formulation predicts the jump to be further away from the exact position predicted by one-dimensional theory for an open channel of varying width, the third solution shown in Figure 7.6. Thus it is important to enforce conservation for precise positioning of the discontinuity even though an adequate solution may be obtained in this case without conservation. Note also that the averaged conservative numerical approximation passes from subcritical to supercritical flow at the centre of the channel (its narrowest point) as it should



the breadth-averaged local Froude number predicted by the two upwind schemes is shown in Figure 7.8, together with the exact solution. The three solutions are almost indistinguishable and even the HELW scheme exhibits no small oscillations on the subcritical side of the jump.

Both sets of results presented have been obtained using an upwind distribution of momentum sources evaluated on a cell by cell basis. Close examination of the solutions reveals that this method of treating these source terms leads to the best approximation of the exact solution, although the differences would not be visible in the figure. It should be noted though that convergence to the steady state is slightly better if the sources are incorporated at the nodal update stage, indicating greater robustness. In actual fact none of the schemes converge to machine accuracy in this transcritical case so no convergence histories are shown.

7.4 Spillway Flow

The final problem represents shallow water flow in a spillway and provides a genuinely two-dimensional test case. The flow is through a channel 10m wide with a right angled bend half way along its length. The inner and outer corners of the bend are taken to be area of concentric circles with radii 10m and 20m respectively, and there is 30m of straight channel both upstream and downstream of the bend. The flow is supercritical at both inflow and outflow and the inflow conditions are such that h = 1m, $u = 0ms^{-1}$ and $v = -5ms^{-1}$. The slope of the channel is of magnitude 1 in 5 along the straight sections and varies linearly across the channel around the bend from 1 in 5 on the outer curve to 2 in 5 on the inner curve. Manning's roughness coefficient for the flow takes the value of



8 Conclusions

Two alternative genuinely multidimensional upwind schemes have been presented for the numerical solution of the two-dimensional shallow water equations on unstructured triangular grids. Techniques which were originally developed for the solution of the Euler equations have been adapted for the approximation of the shallow water equations and a conservative formulation of the algorithm has been presented. A method of treating general source terms, appropriate for use with multidimensional upwinding, has also been suggested.

Both schemes presented here have been shown to produce high quality results for both subcritical and supercritical steady state flows and have the ability to capture discontinuities very sharply. Of the two, the HELW scheme is the less diffusive and as a result, slightly less robust. It produces sharper jumps and more accurate subcritical approximations, but at the expense of small oscillations downstream of transcritical discontinuities. These could be smoothed by adjusting the Lax-Wendroff distribution appropriately, with a consequent smearing of the discontinuity, but both schemes require further study to improve the modelling of the transition between supercritical and subcritical flows.

The treatment of the momentum sources also merits attention since it is still unclear which is the best method to use for their distribution. The most robust treatment proved to be to consider the sources on a nodal basis but distributing cell-averaged source terms in an upwind manner appears to be more accurate. It is clear though that the linearisation sources are necessary for the precise positioning of the hydraulic jumps although in many cases adequate numerical solutions can be obtained using a non-conservative formulation. Multidim^nsional up

[5] J.A.Cung^, F.M.Holly and A.V^rw^y

- [14] R.J.L^{ovo}qu^o, Numerical Methods for Conservation Laws, Birkhaus^or, Bas¹, 1992.
- [15] I.MacDonald, M.J.Bainos, N.K.Nichols and P.G.Samuols, 'Stoady Opon Channol Tost Probloms with Analytic Solutions', Numorical Analysis Roport 3/95, The University of Reading, 1995, to appear in J. Hydraulic Eng., A CE.
- [16] L.M.M^saros and P.L.Ro^, 'Multidim^nsional fluctuation sch^m^s bas^d on d^composition m^thods', AIAA Pap^r 95–1699, 1995.
- [17] H.Paillère, 'It is possible to solve dam-break problems using a multidimensional upwinding approach', Thèse annexe, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1995.
- [18] H.Paillòro, E.van dor Woido and H.Doconinck, 'Multidimonsional upwind mothods for in

- [22] D.Sidilkover and P.L.Roe, 'Unification of some advection schemes in two dimensions', ICASE Report 95-10, 1995.
- [23] J.J.Stokar, Water Waves, Intarscianca, Naw York, 1986.
- [24] B.van Leer, 'Progress in multi-dimensional upwind differencing', ICASE Report 92-43, 1992.
- [25] B.van Loor, W.-T.Loo and P.L.Roo, 'Characteristic time-stepping or local preconditioning of the Euler equations', AIAA Paper 91-1552-CP, 1991.
- [26] B.van Loor, E.Turkol, C.H.Tai and L.M.Mosaros, 'Local proconditioning in a stagnation point', AIAA Papor 95-1954, 1995.