CONSERVATIVE MULTIDIMENSIONAL UPWINDING FOR THE SHALLOW WATER EQUATIONS

m-Baines and Miller and Miller

The University of Reading

Department of Mathematics

Whit-knights

R_{ading}

RG6 6AX

United Kingdom

Key words

shallow water equations, multidimensional upwinding, conservation,

fluctuation distribution, system decomposition, source terms

Sub ject classification in the cation of the cation of

 L M M

Proposed running head

Multidimensional upwinding for shallow water

Address for proofs

The University of Reading Department of Mathematics Whit-knights R_{ading} RG6 $6AX$ United Kingdom

Phone

  x

Fax: $+44$ (0)118 9313423

 \mathcal{L}

Abstract

In recent years upwind di-erencing has gained acceptance as a ro bust and accurate technique for the numerical approximation of the one dimensional shallow water equations. In two dimensions the benefits have been less marked due to the reliance of the methods on standard oper ator 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

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 the matrix of Preissmann Abbott as the Preissmann Abbott and McCoremack and McCoremack and McC tral differencing and are well known to require special treatment before a realistic numer recently placements of discontinuous or the discontinuous ows can be obtained- the obtainedthe concept of upwinding has been adopted from the field of gas dynamics for the modelling of shallow water ows \mathbb{R} . This has proved to be highly successful to be highly succes 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 dierence schemes in the vicinity of high ow 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 to upwinding approaches in the upwinding approach is the modelling the modelling and modelling of transcritical and supercritical flows.

The practical advantages of upwind schemes in higher dimensions are less clear-they have they have been also the the two two two distincts waters and the two two two two two two two t equations via the use of standard operators operators, the standard operator splitting techniques eby implication involves the application of one-dimensional methods to a multidimensional system of two independent in two independent of two independent of two independent of the contract

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.

-The Governing Equ tions

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

are the conservative variables and the corresponding flux **v**

and

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

 \blacksquare

in which $c = \sqrt{gh}$ is the gravity wave speed or wave celerity. 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 dierent conservative linearisations have been constructed for the Euler equations, see for example [7, 2], but it is the most robust of these, based on Ro⁻'s one-dimensional linearisation using a set of parameter vector variables [19], which is generally used for practical calculations-calculations-calculations-calculations-calculations-calculationshere to give an analogous discrete form of the shallow water equations.

Consider the two-dimensional homogeneous system,

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

in which the conservative variables used under the conservative π and π are given by π respectively- a group- π and the computation of the computation of the computation of the computation of the computational order of the computational computational computational computation of the computational computat domain the flux balance is defined by

$$
\underline{\Phi}_{\mathbf{U}} = -\iint_{\Delta} \left(\underline{\mathbf{F}}_x + \underline{\mathbf{G}}_y \right) dx dy
$$

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

in which due represents the investigation of the cell boundary to the cell boundarynumerical 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- Roes parameter vector for the Euler

 $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}$ the linearisation of the linearisation the shallow water equations cannot be constructed in precisely the same manner. In provious work [10, 17] non-conservative linearisations have been used, in which the ux balance \mathbf{u} balance \mathbf{u} is evaluated consistently from an appropriate average state 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 - exactly- This does not immediately give rise to linear \mathcal{N} Jacobians of the form \mathcal{N} is the form \mathcal{N} is the form of \mathcal{N} isolated which does have this form and which therefore can be decomposed using the second stage of the algorithm described in Section - \mathcal{H} $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$ balance $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$ is split into two parts taking taking the formulation $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}$

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

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 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 Z- It then follows that the discrete gradient of the $\mbox{conservative}$ v

ly decoupled- The corresponding analysis of the shallow water equations closely follows that of

 and the resulting preconditioners are described here-

For the sake of simplifying the algebra, the homogeneous part of the system is the streamwise of the streamwise variables in the streamwise variables in the streamwise variables in t symmetrising variables Q , defined by

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

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

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

-Decomposition 1 (HELW)

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

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

where $F = \frac{4}{c}$ is the local Froude number of the flow,

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

and ε is a function of the Froude number such that $\varepsilon(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\varepsilon(F) = 1$ for F - These restrictions on ensure that the decomposition is not sensitive to the flow angle in the limit as $F \rightarrow 0$ [26] and that the transition of the p is contained to the transcription in the transcription is p in r in r in r is as in r is a taken to be the C_1 function

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

so the the contract derivative also varies some statistics and the matrix party of the matrix \mathbf{r} precisely that of $[26]$ with the Mach number replaced by the Froude number and with the simplest the the simple entropy equations in the entropy is the entropy between $\frac{1}{2}$ introduced so that \mathbf{I} is correct for both subcritical and supercritical output \mathbf{I}

The preconditioned system \mathbf{I} is decomposed by transforming it into a set \mathbf{I} of characteristic equations,

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

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

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

for subcritical and supercritical ow respectively- The corresponding transforma tion matrices are given by

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

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

$$
\mathbf{A}_{\rm W}^{\rm s} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}_{\rm Q}^{\rm s} \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial \mathbf{W}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}_{\rm W}^{\rm s} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{W}}{\partial \mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}_{\rm Q}^{\rm s} \frac{\partial \mathbf{Q}}{\partial \mathbf{W}} \tag{4.10}
$$

for both subcritical and supercritical flows.

 N -choice of variables given by -changes across the transcription by -changes across the transcription ℓN region-the own is supercritical the steady the steady equations are hyperbolic and the steady of the steady of $\frac{1}{2}$ choice of variables density $\frac{1}{2}$ \frac 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, a fine a here by W<u>illigh</u> in $(1,0)$. The shallow water equations cannot be decoupled further in subcritical flow.

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

 \mathbf{f} to be written in the form of three scalar advection equations i-form of three scalar advections i-form of the form o

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

in which the advection velocities in the streamwise coordinate system are

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

Hence the rst component of the ux balance in Λ

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

where every term on the right hand side of - is evaluated consistently from - is evaluated consistently from the cell-average state denined by (3.10) and (3.11) , and $\underline{\dot{r}_U}$ 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 - represents a consistent decomposition of U of - the compo nents of which may each be distributed using a simple scalar scheme such as that

In the case of subcritical flow the choice of characteristic variables defined by \sim $\frac{1}{2}$ in (1.0) I was to sacceral matrices in the system (1.0) σ . If σ

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

Hence the characteristic equations take the form of a single scalar advection equation which is precisely the same as the contract of the contract of the k is the contract of the contract - together with a elliptic subsystem so U of - is written

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

[18] and takes the form

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

 \blacksquare

whore

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

and c is a none to complaint which typically takes a value of the - film matrix is against the result of the analysis of the Euler equations $\mathcal{L} = \{ \mathcal{L} \}$ 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 $\mathbf i$ and $\mathbf i$ now denote $\mathbf i$ now denote $\mathbf i$

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

independent of the case of the case of the case of the corresponding transformation matrix $\mathcal{L}^{(1)}$ is given by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ in 90 - Care y

The difference between the two decompositions lies in the treatment of the system for subcritical and transcritical nows $\Gamma_- \sim 1 \pm \epsilon$). The decision to keep the same characteristic variables in both subcritical and supercritical flow leads to Jacobian matrices in the transformed system Λ . The transformed system Λ

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

where

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

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 own in Section - Section - Section - Section - Section - Section - Sect

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-terms-decomposition of United States \triangle () and \triangle \mathcal{N} -form \mathcal{N} -form \mathcal{N} -form \mathcal{N} -form \mathcal{N}

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

in which $\underline{\mathbf{r}}_U$ is the k^{or} column of the matrix \mathbf{R}_U (4.14), newly defined from the **P** \mathcal{N} and the W of - \mathcal{N} -

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

and

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

The distribution of the decoupled component of this second decomposition is once again carried out using the scheme of Section 2018. In the scheme of Section 2019, which is a section of S is possible to use the same method for the coupled components, with an appro- \mathbf{r} linearity preserving
 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 scheme suggested in
 and described at the end of Section -- As in Section

state solutions of - are calculated by repeating this update iteratively in order to approximate the solution in the limit as $t \to \infty$.

 10° vector λ in (0.2) may not be constant, in which case a conservative linearisation of the scalar advection equation - can often be constructed by trating it as a special case of the system linearisation discussed in Section 3 [8].

to a nodal update of the form

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

where S_i is the area of the median dual cell from the theory of the total \sim area of the triangles with a vertex at $i)$, α_i^i is the distribution coefficient which indicates the proportion of the uctuation j to be sent from cell ^j to node i and in represents the set of the vertices with vertices at \mathbf{r}_i . The set of \mathbf{r}_i 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, $\alpha_i^2 \phi_j$ (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 satised by the two decompo sitions described here because the columns of the matrix RU (Russ) for the matrix independent.

A simple distribution scheme with all of the above properties is the so-called PSI scheme - It is most easily described by considering a single triangular coll in isolation. It, according to the linearised advection velocity, λ of (5.5), the triangle has a single downstream vertex, at node i say, then that node receives the whole fluctuation, so

$$
u_i^{n+1} = u_i^n + \frac{\Delta t}{S_i} \widehat{\phi} \tag{5.8}
$$

while the values of up at the other two vertices remains α interactions α at the case of α of a triangle with two downstream vertices, at nodes i and j for example, the

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 $\varphi_i + \varphi_j = \varphi$ for conservation. In the PSI scheme [22]

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}\n\phi_i^* & = & \phi_i - L(\phi_i, -\phi_j) \\
\phi_j^* & = & \phi_j - L(\phi_j, -\phi_i)\n\end{array} \tag{5.10}
$$

 wh ^{-r}

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

and L denotes the minmod limiter function,

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

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

$$
\Delta t \le \frac{S_i}{\sum_{\cup \Delta_i} \max(0, \frac{1}{2} \hat{\vec{\lambda}}^j \cdot \vec{n}_i^j)},
$$
\n(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.

- - -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

$$
u_t + \vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{\nabla} u = q \tag{5.20}
$$

In which u , λ and η are denined by the rist two entries in (4.19) , (4.29) and (4.24) respectively. In the second contract of the quantity of the qu

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

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

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

in which

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

 \mathbf{r} is constant of and \mathcal{C}_2 are both taken to be - sto profit \mathbf{r} , proached some in \mathbf{r} scale, e.g. the length of the longest edge of the cell, and ϕ is denned in (0.0). 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 \mathbf{A} these terms must be included in the updating of the solution.

The simplest method of treating the momentum sources q in - 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

$$
\underline{\mathbf{U}}_i^{n+1} = \underline{\mathbf{U}}_i^n + \delta \underline{\mathbf{U}}_i + \Delta t \, \underline{\mathbf{q}}_i \,, \tag{6.1}
$$

in which $\delta \underline{U}^n_i$ 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 ux balance distribution itself- This is the obvious way to treat the linearisation source terms since they are inherently c⁻ll-bas^{-d} quantities.

One way of achieving this is to include the source terms within the decomposition so the characteristic equations of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} -characteristic equations of -characteris

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

where \mathbf{u} the sum of the momentum and linearisation source terms consistently consisten tot the second contract of the second second contract of the second evaluated from the cellaverage state Z- The two types of source term can be considered separately but are combined here for simplicity.

The effect of q_{tot} on the flux balance distribution can be illustrated simply by considering a scalar component of the decomposition- A characteristic equation taken from - 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 φ_g . The modified updates are then transformed into increments of the conservative variables using the matrix RU - 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 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 \pm tot incorporating the source terms are considered in the following section.

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 dierence 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

which should be imposed at a chosen point on the boundary-boundary-boundary-boundary-boundary-boundary-boundarybe 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 $n = (n_x, n_y)$ 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

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

Thus, when the component of the flow normal to the boundary is supercritical either the whole solution is specied at it output at it out of it output is specied at \mathbf{r} 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 from the set to a prespective free stream value-office solid wall only \mathcal{M}_1 is positive and this is accommodated by setting the normal velocity component to zoro.

-Oblique Hydraulic Jump

Fow standard steady state test cases exist for the homogeneous two-dimensional shallow water equations, but there are some simple problems for which exact solutions and calculated-been calculated-been calculated-interesting and contributed or the compani 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 \mathbf{u} interaction of the most with the most of the weight \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} wedge- \mathbf{v} with this \mathbf{v}

NYYYY

Figure - Convergence history for the oblique hydraulic jump test case-

walls-the shows the local from the local Frouder contours of the steady of the steady of the steady of the steady state solution calculated for this test case (both the HELW and the HESUPG schemes are the same for supercritical ow- The hydraulic jump can be seen to be captured sharply at the correct angle and a discontinuous water surface devoid jump (sampled on the outflow boundary at the point indicated by the asterisk in Figure (1.1) are $n_d = 1.5001$ m and $|u_d| = 7.9500$ ms $^{-1}$ ($r_d = 2.073$), very close to

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 - 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 the military proved to be the highest called military which is military which we stable for all of the seems to because of the discontinuity in the discontinuity in the discontinuity in the c distribution at the critical line and the nonorthogonality of the eigenvectors of the preconditioned system at low Froude numbers (described in more detail in $[6]$.

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 dened such that the bradth of the channel is given by

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

 $\,$

BANANA

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

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$, \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{v} , \mathbf{U}

the subcritical elliptic subsystem would reduce the oscillations but not without smearing the discontinuity as well-the HESUPG scheme with its scheme with its scheme with its 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 - illustrate the eect of the linearisation source terms on the solution- The values of the breadthaveraged local Froude number are plotted along the length of the channel for the HELW scheme- The small os cillations 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 inspec tion reveals that the discontinuity is predicted to be about half a cell's width further downstream by the nonconservative 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 nonconservative formulation predicts the jump to be further and \mathbf{r} from the exact position predicted by one-dimensional theory for an open channel of varying width the third solution shown in Figure - the Figure - the solution shown in Figure - 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 breadthaveraged local Froude number predicted by the two upwind schemes is shown in Figure - 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 motion sources examination of the cell by cell by cell basis-basis-basis-basis-basis-basis-basis-basis-basi 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 is in the gure-dimension of the gure-dimension \mathcal{U} that converges 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.

- - -Spillway Flow

The final problem represents shallow water flow in a spillway and provides a genuinely twodimensional test case- The ow is through a channel
m wide with a right angled bend half way along its length- The inner and outer corners of the bend are taken to be arcs of concentric circles with radii 10m and 20m respectively, and there is $30m$ of straight channel both upstream and downstream of the bend- The ow is supercritical at both inow and outow and the inow conditions are such that $n = 1$ m, $u = 0$ ms and $v = -3$ ms . In slope of the channel is of magnitude \mathcal{L} magnitude sections and varies linearly the inner curve- Mannings roughness coecient for the ow takes the value of

Conclusions

Two alternative genuinely multidimensional upwind schemes have been presented for the numerical solution of the two-dimensional shallow water equations on unstructure of the techniques which were originally developed for the structure originally developed for the s 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-treating and the treating general source terms appropriate for use of users and users appropriate for 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-two the HELW scheme is the two the HELW scheme is the less the less the l distinct and as a result slightly less robust-collection and a result of products in the same of the sharper \sim 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 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 γ nsional up

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

- R-J-Leveque Numerical Methods for Conservation Laws Birkhauser Basel 1992.
- I-MacDonald M-J-Baines N-K-Nichols and P-G-Samuels Steady Open Channel Test Problems with Analytic Solutions', Numerical Analysis Report in The University of Property and Property of Reading the Company of Reading the Most and Department of P A $CE.$
- L-M-Mesaros and P-L-Roe Multidimensional uctuation schemes based on decomposition methods AIAA Paper in the AIAA Paper of the AIAA Paper in the AIAA Paper in the AIAA Paper in the
- H-Paillere It is possible to solve dambreak problems using a multidimen sional upwinding approach', Thèse annexe, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
- H-Paillere E-van der Weide and H-Deconinck Multidimensional upwind methods for in
- D-Sidilkover and P-L-Roe Unication of some advection schemes in two dimensions ICASE Report "
 -
- J-J-Stoker Water Waves Interscience New York
-
- B-van Leer Progress in multidimensional upwind dierencing ICASE Re port 92-43, 1992.
- B-van Leer W-T-Lee and P-L-Roe Characteristic timestepping or local preconditioning it is easily quantities are also a precondent of the Paper of the Paper of the Paper of the Pa
- B-van Leer E-Turkel C-H-Tai and L-M-Mesaros Local preconditioning in a stagnation point AIAA Paper I at the AIAA Paper