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ABSTRACT

TREATMENT OF PHYSICAL AND NUMERICAL DIFFUSION
IN FLUID DYNAMIC SIMULATIONS

by
Kang Y. Huh and Michael W. Golay

A computer code is developed to predict the behavior of the hydrogen gas in the containment after a loss-of-coolant accident. The conservation equations for the four components, i.e., air, hydrogen, steam and water, are set up and solved numerically by decoupling the continuity and momentum equations from the energy, mass diffusion and turbulence equations. The homogeneous mixture form is used for the momentum and energy equations and the steam and liquid droplets are assumed to be in the saturation state.

There are two diffusion processes, molecular and turbulent, which should be modelled in different ways. Molecular diffusion is modelled by Wilke's formula for the multi-component gas diffusion, where the diffusion constants are dependent on the relative concentrations. Turbulent diffusion is basically modelled by the $k$-$\varepsilon$ model with modifications for low Reynolds number flow effects. Numerical diffusion is eliminated by a corrective scheme which is based on accurate prediction of cross-flow diffusion. The corrective scheme in a fully explicit treatment is both conservative and stable, therefore can be used in long transient calculations. The corrective scheme allows relatively large mesh sizes without introducing the false diffusion and the time step size of the same order of magnitude as the Courant limit may be used.
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<table>
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<tr>
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<td>Specific heat at constant volume</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Re</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt</td>
<td>Turbulence Reynolds number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rx</td>
<td>Reynolds number in x direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Schmidt number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t (1)</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Parameter of a quadratic equation in Von Neumann analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δt</td>
<td>Time step size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>x-direction velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>y-direction velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Velocity vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>z-direction velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δx</td>
<td>x-direction mesh spacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>Mole fraction in multicomponent gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δy</td>
<td>y-direction mesh spacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δz</td>
<td>z-direction mesh spacing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α_1, α_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ_ijkl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Any general conserved quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6_l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Amplification factor in Von Neumann analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cell</td>
<td>Cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf</td>
<td>Cross-flow diffusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>De Vahl Davis and Mallinson's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i=1</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Hydrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Steam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Liquid Droplets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Left hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Liquid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Molecular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mix</td>
<td>Multicomponent gas mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>New time step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ob</td>
<td>Obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>Old time step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Right hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Turbulent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>Total calculation domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>Upstream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

One of the major concerns in the Three Mile Island (TMI) accident was hydrogen gas accumulation in the containment. Some remedies have been proposed to deal with such problems. However, it is necessary to understand the fluid dynamic phenomena in the containment in order to justify those remedies.

From the hydrogen transport point of view, the response of the containment during an accident can be divided into two stages, the fast blowdown stage and the slow mixing stage. The distinct feature of the second stage is a much longer time scale in comparison with the first blowdown stage. The research work reported here is primarily concerned with the formulation and validation of the physical models and numerical schemes in the second slow mixing stage.

Some simplifying assumptions are made concerning the thermodynamic state in the slow mixing stage. The four components, hydrogen, air, steam and liquid droplets are assumed to be in thermodynamic equilibrium and the relative humidity is assumed to be 100%, although it may be less than 100% when there is no liquid component present.

The governing conservation equations are decoupled in order to simplify the solution procedure. The error due to decoupling is negligible in a slow transient where the
state change over one time step is small. In the first step the continuity and momentum equations are decoupled from the energy and other scalar transport equations and solved by the Simplified Marker and Cell (SMAC) method in order to obtain the flow field. In the second step the energy and mass diffusion equations without phase change and turbulence equations are solved using the flow field obtained in the first step. Finally, the phase change is taken into consideration to maintain 100% relative humidity.

Convection and diffusion are the central issues in physical modelling efforts of hydrogen transport. Convection is assumed to occur as a homogeneous mixture, resulting in the same convection velocity for the four components. Diffusion occurs by two independent mechanisms, molecular and turbulent, and the total diffusion constant is the sum of the diffusion constants of those two mechanisms.


The turbulent diffusion constant is predicted by the k-ε model [45]. The turbulent kinetic energy, $k$, and turbulent dissipation rate, $ε$, are determined by their own transport equations. The turbulent kinematic viscosity,
which is the diffusion constant for momentum transport can be calculated directly from \( k \) and \( \varepsilon \). The turbulent Prandtl and Schmidt numbers are assumed to be equal to one.

The leading issue in numerical modelling of convection and diffusion is to minimize the error that occurs in the numerical solution procedures. Since the error usually appears as an additional diffusion, the term, numerical diffusion, has been used to describe the numerical error in general. The numerical diffusion has two different sources, truncation error diffusion and cross-flow diffusion. Truncation error diffusion is a one dimensional profile error and cross-flow diffusion is a multi-dimensional operator error \([68]\) of the finite difference equation. Truncation error diffusion occurs in the flow direction while cross-flow diffusion occurs primarily in the direction normal to the flow. The effective diffusion constants of the two errors are of the same order of magnitude, however the latter turns out to be the dominant error source in most convection dominant problems. This is because the gradient of the scalar quantity under consideration is small in the flow direction in comparison with that in the direction normal to the flow. Therefore, the major obstacle in accurate numerical modelling of convection and diffusion has been the cross-flow diffusion error which arises in donor cell treatment of the convection term in multi-dimensional problems.

There has been much debate on the numerical diffusion and many schemes have been suggested for the past two
decades. However, a recent review paper on this topic [65] shows that there is no scheme universally acceptable consistent with using reasonable mesh spacings and computation times. This situation is partly due to misunderstanding of the sources of numerical diffusion and also partly due to use of inappropriate approaches for its elimination.

The schemes presently being used can be divided into two categories, skew differencing and corrective schemes. Raithby's [53] and S. Chang's methods [16] are examples of skew differencing schemes and Huh's corrective scheme and tensor viscosity method [25] are examples of corrective schemes. The corrective scheme is inherently better than the skew differencing scheme in that it is conservative and does not affect the simple solution procedure. The conservative property is essential in a long transient problem like the hydrogen transport in the containment. The corrective scheme can be implemented with any of the explicit, ADI and implicit schemes, although with different stability conditions. The stability conditions for each of the aforementioned schemes can be obtained by a Von Neumann analysis and turns out to be consistent with numerical experiments.

Two implementation strategies for the corrective scheme, mesh point and mesh interface implementations, have been tested for recirculating flow problems. The mesh interface
implementation has always given physically reasonable solutions and may be used extensively for all diffusion-convection problems.

The suggested physical models and numerical schemes have been used to simulate the LOCA experiments performed in Battelle-Frankfurt [44] and HEDL (Hanford Engineering Development Laboratory) [6]. Ref. [49] includes all the simulation results compared with experimental data.
CHAPTER 2

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND SOLUTION SCHEME

2.1 Problem Statement

Once a loss-of-coolant accident (LOCA) occurs in a Light Water Reactor (LWR), a large amount of steam and water will come into the containment in the fast blowdown stage increasing the containment pressure. After a while the slow mixing stage follows the initial blowdown stage and continues for an extended period of time. The major safety concern is that of keeping the containment pressure below a certain level to prevent a large scale leakage of radioactive materials.

In addition to the pressure increase due to the primary coolant, hydrogen generation gave a serious concern about the integrity of the containment in the TMI-2 accident. The hydrogen is generated by radiolysis and chemical reaction between water and zirconium in the cladding and may react explosively with oxygen in the air. Thereafter, the hydrogen has received much attention in the safety analysis of nuclear power plants. There have been some mitigation procedures suggested, e.g., containment inerting, installation of ignition devices, use of flame suppressants and enhanced venting capability, for dealing with this problem. In order to justify the design of any mitigation system, it is essential to understand the fluid dynamic phenomena in the containment.
Since a numerical method is suitable for this purpose, a good computational tool has been required to predict the hydrogen concentration distribution. The most difficult aspects of this analysis are the complicated geometry and chaotic post-LOCA conditions, e.g., thermal nonequilibrium, laminar and turbulent flows, phase change and heat transfer between the gas components and wall, etc. Therefore, some simplifying assumptions should be made to use the numerical procedure without impairing the acceptable solution accuracy.
2.2 Governing Equations

The governing conservation equations are set up to describe the post-LOCA fluid dynamics in the containment. The physical implications of the conservation equations will be given with their basic assumptions and limitations.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Continuity:} & \quad \nabla \cdot \vec{v} = 0 \\
\text{Momentum:} & \quad \rho \left[ \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \vec{v} \vec{v} \right] = -\nabla p + \rho g \vec{z} + \vec{f}_d + \nabla \cdot \vec{\sigma} \\
\text{Energy:} & \quad \rho \left[ \frac{\partial e}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \vec{v} h \right] = \nabla \cdot k \nabla T + e_f g \phi_k \\
\text{Mass diffusion:} & \quad \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \rho_i \vec{v} = \nabla \cdot \rho_i \vec{D} + \rho_i \vec{f}_i + \phi_i \\
\text{Turbulence kinetic energy:} & \quad \frac{Dk}{Dt} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_k} \frac{\partial k}{\partial x_k} \right) + \frac{\mu_t}{\rho} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} \\
& \quad - \epsilon + \beta g_k \frac{\nu_T}{\nu_T} \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_k} \\
\text{Turbulence dissipation rate:} & \quad \frac{De}{Dt} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left( \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_k} \frac{\partial e}{\partial x_k} \right) + \frac{C_2}{2} \frac{\mu_t}{\rho} \frac{e}{k} \left( \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_k} \right) \\
& \quad - C_2 \frac{e^2}{k} + \epsilon \beta g_k \frac{\nu_T}{\nu_T} \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_k} \\
\text{Equation of state:} & \quad p = f_p \rho_i T 
\end{align*}
\]
Constitutive equations:  

\[ \dot{\psi}_i = f_\psi(\rho_i, T) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)  

\[ \dot{\sigma} = f_\sigma(\dot{\nu}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.9)  

\[ D_i = D_{im} + D_{it} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.10)  

\[ \nu = \nu_m + \nu_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.11)  

\[ k = k_m + k_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)  

\[ D_{im} = f_D(\rho_i, T) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)  

\[ \nu_m = f_\nu(\rho_i, T) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.14)  

\[ k_m = f_k(\rho_i, T) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)  

\[ D_t = \nu_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.16)  

\[ k_t = \nu_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.17)  

\[ \nu_t = C_\mu k^2 / \varepsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.18)  

\[ \rho = \Sigma \rho_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.19)  

Note that

1. The subscript \( i \) denotes the four components as
follows:

\[ \begin{align*}
  i=1 & \quad \text{air}, \\
  i=2 & \quad H_2, \\
  i=3 & \quad \text{steam}, \\
  i=4 & \quad \text{liquid droplet}.
\end{align*} \]

2. The turbulence equations are written in terms of the Cartesian components in tensor notation.

3. The phase change occurs between steam and liquid droplets and the diffusion constant of liquid droplets is equal to zero.

\[ \begin{align*}
  \phi_1 &= \phi_2 = 0 \\
  \phi_3 + \phi_4 &= 0 \\
  D_4 &= 0
\end{align*} \] (2.20) (2.21) (2.22)

There are eleven conservation equations, one continuity, three momentum, one energy, four mass diffusion and two turbulence equations with ten primary unknowns, \(u, v, w, \rho_i (4), T, k, \epsilon\) for a three dimensional case. Therefore, there is one more equation than is required.

2.2.1 Continuity and Mass Diffusion Equations

The continuity equation is redundant with the four mass diffusion equations and there is an inconsistency between them. The mass diffusion equations are summed up for the four components, \(i=1-4\).
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\Sigma \rho_i) + \nabla \cdot \vec{v}(\Sigma \rho_i) = \Sigma (\nabla \cdot D_i \nabla \rho_i) + \Sigma \Phi_i \quad (2.23)
\]

The sum of the phase change terms is equal to zero.

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \vec{v} = \Sigma (\nabla \cdot D_i \nabla \rho_i) \quad (2.24)
\]

Now it can be seen that the continuity equation is valid if and only if the following Eq. 2.25 and Eq. 2.26 are satisfied.

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = 0 \quad (2.25)
\]

\[
\nabla \rho_i = 0 \quad (2.26)
\]

It is a reasonable assumption in a turbulent flow regime that the four components have the same diffusion constant. Therefore, Eq. 2.26 can be reduced to the following Eq. 2.27.

\[
\nabla \rho = 0 \quad (2.27)
\]

Consequently Eq. 2.1 and Eq. 2.4 are consistent only if the temporal and spatial variations of the total density are very small. Since the concern is only for the slow mixing stage after a LOCA, it is reasonable to assume that Eq. 2.25 and Eq. 2.27 remain valid throughout the transient.
2.2.2 Energy Equation

The energy conservation equation, Eq. 2.3, is also of an approximate nature and the exact form is given in the following.

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\Sigma \rho_i e_i) + \nabla \cdot (\Sigma \rho_i h_i) = \nabla \cdot \kappa \nabla T \tag{2.28}
\]

The temporal term can be divided as follows.

\[
\frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial t} + \Sigma \frac{\partial e_i}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\Sigma \rho_i h_i) = \nabla \cdot \kappa \nabla T \tag{2.29}
\]

The second term on the left hand side of Eq. 2.29 denotes the energy change due to the concentration change in a given control volume. It is clear that the major contribution to this term will come from the latent heat of the phase change.

\[
\Sigma \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial t} = \Sigma \phi_i \tag{2.30}
\]

Eq. 2.30 is substituted in Eq. 2.29 to give the following.

\[
\frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial t} + \Sigma \phi_i + \nabla \cdot (\Sigma \rho_i h_i) = \nabla \cdot \kappa \nabla T \tag{2.31}
\]

The thermal equilibrium assumption is incorporated in Eq. 2.31 so that the internal energy and enthalpy can be written in terms of the temperature.
\[
(\Sigma \rho_i c_{vi}) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \left[ \nabla T \rho_i c_{pi} \right] + e_{fg} \phi = \nabla \cdot k \nabla T \quad (2.32)
\]

where \( \Sigma e_i \phi_i = e_g \phi_g + e_l \phi_l \)

\[
= e_{fg} \phi_g
\]

\[e_i = c_{vi} T\]

\[h_i = c_{pi} T\]

Eq. 2.3 and Eq. 2.32 become identical by defining average internal energy and enthalpy as follows.

\[
e = \frac{\rho_i e_i}{\rho} = \frac{\rho_i c_{vi} T}{\rho} \quad (2.33)
\]

\[
h = \frac{\rho_i h_i}{\rho} = \frac{\rho_i c_{pi} T}{\rho} \quad (2.34)
\]

2.3 Basic Assumptions and Limitations

The governing equations are based on some simplifying assumptions about the physical phenomena in the containment after a LOCA. It is necessary to clarify these assumptions and their limitations for a safe use of the given physical models and solution scheme.
2.3.1 Assumptions

1. The four components all have the same convection velocity. The liquid droplets move with the gas components with no slip.

2. The four components are treated as being nearly incompressible and the phase change rate is moderately small.

3. The turbulent Prandtl and Schmidt numbers are equal to one.

4. The four components are in a state of thermodynamic equilibrium.

5. The relative humidity in the containment is 100%. The relative humidity may be less than 100% when there is no liquid component left.

2.3.2 Limitations

1. The temporal and spatial variations of the total density should be negligibly small because of the incompressibility assumption.

2. The phase change rate should be moderately small because the solution scheme decouples the phase change term from the energy conservation equation.

3. The change of the diffusion constants, $v_t$, $D_t$ and $k_t$ over one time step should be small because the turbulence equations are decoupled from the velocity field calculations.
2.4 Solution Scheme

Eq. 2.1-Eq. 2.7 are a coupled set of equations with primary unknowns, $u$, $v$, $w$, $p$, $\rho_i(4)$, $k$, $\varepsilon$, $T$, $\phi_i$. Since it is too difficult to solve the whole system of the equations and obtain a consistent solution for all the unknowns, the conservation equations are decoupled into two sets, continuity/momentum equations set and other scalar transport equations set. In the first step the SMAC scheme is used to get the convergent velocity field with zero divergence for every mesh. The SMAC scheme is explained in detail in section 2.5. In the second step, the obtained velocity field is substituted in the scalar transport equations, which are the four mass diffusion equations, energy equation and two turbulence equations. The phase change is assumed to be zero in this step. In the third step phase change is taken into consideration to maintain 100% relative humidity. When there is no liquid component left, the relative humidity may be less than 100%.

The equation of state, Eq. 2.7, is used to update the reference pressure and reference density which is important in calculating the buoyancy force.

2.5 SMAC Scheme and Compressibility

The SMAC (Simplified Marker And Cell) scheme [21] has been used for the incompressible fluid flow with Boussinesq approximation for the buoyancy force. It solves the
continuity and momentum equations to get the velocity and pressure field in an iterative way. Since the continuity equation used in the SMAC is an incompressible form, i.e., the divergence of the velocity field vanishes everywhere, the SMAC scheme can be used only for incompressible flow calculations. However, it is possible to modify the SMAC scheme to accommodate a slight compressibility effect, which can arise with net inflow or outflow boundary conditions. The continuity and momentum equations are given in two dimensional Cartesian coordinates in the following.

Continuity: \[ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = 0 \] (2.35)

**x-direction momentum:** \[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + \nu \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} \right) + \rho g_x
\] (2.36)

**y-direction momentum:** \[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} + \nu \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} \right) + \rho g_y
\] (2.37)

The vorticity conservation equation is derived from Eq. 2.36 and Eq. 2.37 as follows.

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\text{Eq. 2.36}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\text{Eq. 2.37}):
\]
\[
\frac{\partial r}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial r}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial r}{\partial y} = v \left( \frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 r}{\partial y^2} \right)
\]

(2.38)

where

\[\zeta = \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}\]

The Poisson equation for the pressure field is also derived from Eq. 2.36 and Eq. 2.37 as follows.

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \text{ (Eq. 2.36)} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \text{ (Eq. 2.37)}:
\]

\[
v^2 p = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (u^2) - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} (uv) - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} (v^2) - \frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{Re} \left( \frac{\partial^2 D}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 D}{\partial y^2} \right)
\]

(2.39)

where

\[D = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}\]

The basic idea of the SMAC scheme is to separate each calculational cycle into two parts, the so-called tilde phase and pressure iteration. In the tilde phase the approximate velocity field at time step \((n+1)\) is obtained from Eq. 2.36 and Eq. 2.37 as follows.

\[
\frac{u^{n+1} - u^n}{\Delta t} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\Delta p^{n+1}}{\Delta x} + f^n
\]

(2.40)

\[
\frac{v^{n+1} - v^n}{\Delta t} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\Delta p^{n+1}}{\Delta y} + g^n
\]

(2.41)

where \(f^n\) and \(g^n\) are the explicit quantities at time step \(n\).
Since the pressure field in Eq. 2.40 and Eq. 2.41 are still unknown, a guessed pressure field or the pressure field at time step $n$ is used to start the iteration. The important point is that $u^{n+1}$ and $v^{n+1}$ calculated from Eq. 2.40 and Eq. 2.41 have the right vorticity. The equation of vorticity transport, Eq. 2.38, shows that the vorticity is independent of the pressure field. Therefore, the following relations hold after the tilde phase.

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} = \zeta \tag{2.42}$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} = D 
eq 0 \tag{2.43}$$

It can be seen from Eq. 2.39 that the pressure field is not right due to the fact that the divergence of the velocity field is not equal to zero. Eq. 2.39 may be rewritten as follows.

$$\nabla^2 p = f(u,v) - \frac{\partial D}{\partial t} \tag{2.44}$$

A finite difference form of Eq. 2.44 is given in the following.

$$\frac{P_{i+1,j} - 2P_{ij} + P_{i-1,j}}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{P_{ij+1} - 2P_{ij} + P_{ij-1}}{\Delta y^2} = f(u,v) - \frac{D_{ij}^{n+1} - D_{ij}^n}{\Delta t} \tag{2.45}$$
The pressure correction formula is obtained by considering the cell \((i,j)\) only and putting \(D^{n+1}_{ij}\) equal to zero.

\[
-2\delta p \left( \frac{1}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta y^2} \right) = \frac{D}{\Delta t} \tag{2.46}
\]

\[
\delta p = -\kappa \frac{D}{\Delta t \left( \frac{1}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta y^2} \right)} \tag{2.47}
\]

The pressure correction is given in terms of the residual divergence for every mesh. Once the zero divergence velocity field is obtained, no more correction will be made. The velocity correction formula is derived from Eq. 2.36 and Eq. 2.37 so that it does not change the vorticity implemented in the tilde phase.

\[
(\delta u)_L = -\frac{\Delta t \delta p}{\rho \Delta x} 
\]

\[
(\delta u)_R = \frac{\Delta t \delta p}{\rho \Delta x} \tag{2.48}
\]

The SMAC scheme can be extended to a slightly compressible fluid flow. The slight compressibility means that the Navier-Stokes equations may be solved safely with the incompressibility assumption, while the continuity equation has the following compressible form.

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0 \tag{2.49}
\]
From Eq. 2.49 the nonzero divergence may be derived as follows.

\[
D = \nabla \cdot \dot{\nabla}
= - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} - \frac{\dot{v} \cdot \nabla \rho}{\rho}
\] (2.50)

The two terms on the right hand side of Eq. 2.50 may be given from the previous time information and boundary conditions.

\[
\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{m_{\text{in}}}{\Delta t}
\] (2.51)

\[
\frac{\dot{v} \cdot \nabla \rho}{\rho} = \frac{v^n \cdot \nabla \rho^n}{\rho^n}
\] (2.52)

where

\[m_{\text{in}}: \text{total net inflow of mass at the boundary during the time } \Delta t.\]

\[v: \text{total volume of the containment.}\]

The associated physical assumption in Eq. 2.51 and Eq. 2.52 is that the pressure perturbation due to the inflow at the boundary propagates throughout the containment instantaneously and the pressure and density increase is uniform over the whole containment.

Now the problem is how to converge to a predetermined nonzero divergence field. This can be done with the following modification of the pressure correction formula of the SMAC scheme.
\[ \delta p = \frac{-(D-D_0)}{2 \Delta t \left( \frac{1}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta y^2} \right)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.53)

where \( D_0 \) is given by Eq. 2.50. The velocity correction formula remains the same as Eq. 2.48.
CHAPTER 3
DIFFUSION MODELLING

The hydrogen, air, steam and liquid components are transported by convection and diffusion in the containment. Convection occurs as a homogeneous mixture resulting in the same convection velocity for the four components. Diffusion occurs by two different mechanisms, molecular and turbulent, which should be modelled independently. The thermal conductivity and viscosity are also diffusion constants in a broader sense for momentum and energy transport. Although turbulent diffusion is greater than molecular diffusion by a few orders of magnitude, proper modelling of the latter is important because the molecular diffusion of hydrogen is significantly greater than those of other gases and also because there may be a laminar flow region in the containment.

3.1 Molecular Diffusion

Molecular diffusion occurs by the collisions of gas molecules. As collisions occur more frequently, the process of diffusion is also increased. Since there may be three gas components, hydrogen, air and steam, in the containment after a LOCA, the diffusion constant of each component is calculated separately by Wilke's formula [73] in Eq. 3.1. It gives the diffusion constant of each component in terms of
the binary mixture diffusion constants and mole fraction of that component. The property of air will be replaced with that of nitrogen gas. The resulting diffusion constants are given as follows,

\[
D_A = \frac{1-y_C}{y_B + y_C} \frac{y_B}{D_{AB}} \frac{y_C}{D_{CB}}
\]

\[
D_B = \frac{1-y_B}{y_A + y_B} \frac{y_A}{D_{BA}} \frac{y_B}{D_{BC}}
\]

\[
D_C = \frac{1-y_C}{y_A + y_C} \frac{y_A}{D_{CA}} \frac{y_C}{D_{CB}}
\]

(3.1)

where \( D_i \): Diffusion constant of the \( i \)-th component

\( y_i \): Mole fraction of the \( i \)-th component

\( D_{ij} \): Binary mixture diffusion constant between the \( i \)-th and \( j \)-th components.

The binary mixture diffusion constants are calculated by the Chapman-Enskog formula, Eq. 3.2.

\[
D_{AB} = 0.0018583 \sqrt{T \left( \frac{1}{M_A} + \frac{1}{M_B} \right)} \frac{p_0^{\gamma_D,AB}}{D_{AB}}
\]

(3.2)

where

\( D_{AB} \): Binary mixture diffusion constant in \([\text{cm}^2/\text{sec}]\)
T: Temperature in [°K]
p: Total pressure in [atm]
\(\sigma_{AB}\): Lennard-Jones parameter in [Å]
\(M_A, M_B\): Molecular weight

\(\Omega_{D,AB}\): Dimensionless function of the temperature and intermolecular potential field for one molecule of A and one of B.

The error range of the Chapman-Enskog formula is reported to be about 6-10% [5]. In order to calculate the parameters \(\sigma_{AB}\) and \(\Omega_{D,AB}\) in Eq. 3.2, the following relations are required. For non-polar gases \(\sigma_{AB}\) and \(\Omega_{D,AB}\) are calculated by Eq. 3.3.

\[
\sigma_{AB} = (\sigma_A + \sigma_B)
\]
\[
\varepsilon_{AB} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_A \cdot \varepsilon_B}
\]

(3.3)

For the pair of polar and non-polar gases a correction factor is introduced to account for the polarity.

\[
\sigma_{np} = \kappa (\sigma_n + \sigma_p) \xi^{-\kappa}
\]
\[
\varepsilon_{np} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_n \varepsilon_p} \xi^2
\]

(3.4)

where the correction factor \(\xi\) is given by,

\[
\xi = [1 + \kappa \sigma_n^* \mu_p^* \sqrt{\varepsilon_p / \varepsilon_n}] = [1 + \kappa \sigma_n^* t_p^* \sqrt{\varepsilon_p / \varepsilon_n}].
\]

(3.5)
The parameters in Eq. 3.5 are defined as follows.

\[ \alpha_n^* = \frac{\alpha_n}{\sigma_n^3} \] : Reduced polarizability of the non-polar molecule

\[ \mu_p^* = \frac{\mu_p}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \sigma_p}} \] : Reduced dipole moment of the polar molecule

\[ t_p^* = \frac{\mu_p^*}{\sqrt{8}} \]

For the steam component the following values will be used.

\[ t^* = 1.2 \]

\[ \varepsilon/\kappa = 380^\circ K \]

\[ \sigma = 2.65 \text{ Å} \]

The polarizability is given for the hydrogen and nitrogen (air) components.

\[ H_2: \quad \alpha_n = 7.9 \times 10^{-25} \text{ [cm}^3\text{]} \]

\[ N_2: \quad \alpha_n = 17.6 \times 10^{-25} \text{ [cm}^3\text{]} \]

The fitting functions for the binary mixture diffusion constants are obtained by the least-square-fit method.

The containment pressure is assumed to be 1 atm.

\[ D_{ah} = 4.9492 \times 10^{-5} T^{1.6947} \]

\[ D_{as} = 4.6810 \times 10^{-6} T^{1.9035} \]
\[ D_{hs} = 2.8916 \times 10^{-5} T^{1.8144} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

where

\[ T: \ [\text{[\degree K]}] \]
\[ D: \ [\text{cm}^2/\text{sec}] \]

The viscosity and thermal conductivity can be considered as diffusion constants for momentum and energy transport and calculated similarly as follows [5].

\[ \mu_{\text{mix}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{y_{i\mu}}{y_{i\phi ij}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{j\phi ij}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)

\[ k_{\text{mix}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{y_{i\kappa}}{y_{j\phi ij}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{j\phi ij}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

where

\[ \phi_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} (1 + \frac{M_i}{M_j})^{-\frac{1}{2}} [1 + (\frac{\mu_i}{\mu_j})^{\frac{1}{2}} (\frac{M_j}{M_i})^{\frac{1}{2}}]^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.9)

The viscosity of non-polar gases may be obtained by the following [5].

\[ \mu = 2.67 \times 10^{-5} \frac{\sqrt{MT}}{\sigma^2 \Omega_\mu} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

where

\[ \mu: \ \text{Viscosity in [poise]} \]
\[ T: \ \text{Temperature in [\degree K]} \]
\[ \sigma: \ \text{Lennard-Jones parameter in [\AA]} \]
\[ \Omega_\mu: \ \text{Dimensionless number} \]
The viscosity of steam is,

$$\mu_{\text{steam}} = 0.009 \text{ cp at 1 atm, 20°C}$$

There is another formula suggested for the viscosity of multicomponent gas in the following [5].

$$\mu_{\text{mix}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{y_i^2}{\mu_i} + 1.385 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_i y_k}{\mu_i} \frac{RT}{p_{M} \overline{D_{ik}}}$$

(3.11)

There is a useful relationship for the Prandtl number of non-polar polyatomic gases. [5].

$$Pr = \frac{c_p}{c_p + 1.25R}$$

(3.12)

where $c_p$ is the specific heat per mole at constant pressure.

3.2 Turbulent Diffusion

The diffusion process is greatly enhanced by the turbulence of fluid flow. The effective diffusion constant is therefore the sum of the molecular and turbulent diffusion constants. There are several models suggested for calculating turbulence effects. Presently the best model seems to be the $k-\epsilon$ model originally developed by Launder and Spalding [45]. The $k-\epsilon$ model sets up the transport equations with some empirical constants for the turbulent kinetic energy, $k$, and turbulent dissipation rate, $\epsilon$. The
turbulent viscosity is given directly in terms of $k$ and $\varepsilon$.

3.2.1 Derivation of Turbulence Equations [15, 29, 34, 45]

The transport equations for the turbulent kinetic energy and turbulent dissipation rate are derived from the continuity, momentum and energy equations by decomposing the variables into mean and fluctuating parts and averaging the resulting equations. For example,

$$u_i = \overline{u}_i + u'_i$$

$$\rho_i = \overline{\rho}_i + \rho'_i$$ etc.

The effect of turbulence appears as the additional terms due to the product of fluctuations which do not necessarily cancel out. These terms are treated by the eddy viscosity concept of Boussinesq and eddy diffusivity concept which are given in the following.

$$- \overline{u}_i u_j = v_t \left( \frac{\partial \overline{u}_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial \overline{u}_j}{\partial x_i} \right) - \frac{2}{3} k \delta_{ij}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.13)

$$- \overline{u}_j \rho_i = D_t \frac{\partial \overline{\rho}_i}{\partial x_j}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.14)

$$- \overline{u}_j T' = \alpha_t \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_j}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.15)
The transport equation for \( \overline{u_i u_j} \) is transformed to the turbulent kinetic energy equation by the contraction, \( j=i \). The turbulent dissipation rate equation can also be derived in a similar way and some assumptions should be made in modelling various terms that appear in the derivation.

### 3.2.2 \( k-\varepsilon \) Model

The transport equations for the turbulent kinetic energy and turbulent dissipation rate form the basis of the \( k-\varepsilon \) model. A two dimensional cylindrical coordinate form of the \( k-\varepsilon \) model is introduced in Eq. 3.16.

\[
\frac{\partial k}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (rk) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (wk) = \frac{1}{\rho} \left[ \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \frac{\nu_t}{\sigma_k} \frac{\partial k}{\partial r}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\frac{\nu_t}{\sigma_k} \frac{\partial k}{\partial z}) \right] \\
+ \frac{\mu_t}{\rho} \left[ 2 \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \right)^2 \right] - \varepsilon + \beta g_{Pr} \frac{\nu_t}{Pr} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \varepsilon) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (w \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\rho} \left[ \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r \frac{\nu_t}{\sigma_\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial r}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (\frac{\nu_t}{\sigma_\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial z}) \right] \\
+ C_1 \frac{\mu_t}{\rho} k \left[ 2 \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} \right)^2 \right] \\
+ \left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial r} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} \right)^2 + 2 \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \right)^2 \right] - C_2 \varepsilon \frac{\varepsilon^2}{k} \\
+ \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \beta g_{Pr} \frac{\nu_t}{Pr} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}
\]

(3.16)
The turbulent viscosity $\mu_t$ is given in terms of $k$ and $\varepsilon$ in Eq. 3.17.

$$\mu_t = C_p \rho k^2 / \varepsilon$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.17)

The suggested values of the constants are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$C_p$</th>
<th>$C_1$</th>
<th>$C_2$</th>
<th>$\sigma_k$</th>
<th>$\sigma_\varepsilon$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The molecular effects can be included in Eq. 3.16 as follows.

$$\frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_k} + \frac{\mu_m}{\sigma_k} + \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_k}$$

$$\frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_\varepsilon} + \frac{\mu_m}{\sigma_\varepsilon} + \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_\varepsilon}$$

The turbulent Prandtl and Schmidt numbers are usually assumed to be equal to one.

3.3 **Low Reynolds Number Flow**

While both turbulent and laminar flows are possible in the containment after a LOCA depending on the hydrogen generation rate and geometry, it is difficult to determine whether a region under consideration is in a turbulent or laminar flow. Since the $k-\varepsilon$ model is applicable to fully
turbulent flow, it is required to extend the model to laminar flow regime or to switch to laminar models according to some criterion. The model presently being used is just to use the sum of the molecular and turbulent contributions for every region in the containment. A more refined model is introduced in this section because consistent treatment of laminar and turbulent flows and transition between them may be required in the future modelling efforts.

The following k-ε model is a modified form by Jones and Launder [40, 41].

\[
\frac{D \bar{i}}{D t} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left[ \left( \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_i} + \mu \right) \frac{\partial \bar{e}}{\partial x_k} \right] + C_1 \frac{\mu_t}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_k} - C_2 \frac{\bar{e}}{k} - 2.0 \frac{\nu \mu_t}{\rho} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_i \partial x_k} \right) ^2
\]

\[
\frac{D k}{D t} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left[ \left( \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_k} + \mu \right) \frac{\partial k}{\partial x_k} \right] + \frac{\mu_t}{\rho} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_k} + \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_k} - \bar{e} - 2\nu \left( \frac{\partial \bar{k}}{\partial x_k} \right) ^2
\]

\[ (3.18) \]

In the above equations $C_1$, $\sigma_k$ and $\sigma_i$ retain the values assigned in the ordinary k-ε model, Eq. 3.16, while $C_\mu$ and $C_2$ are to vary with turbulence Reynolds number, $R_t$.

\[
C_\mu = C_{\mu 0} \exp \left[ -2.5/(1 + R_t / 50) \right]
\]

\[
C_2 = C_{2 0} \left[ 1.0 - 0.3 \exp (-R_t^2) \right]
\]

\[ (3.19) \]

where $R_t = \rho k^2 / \mu \bar{c}$
The $C_{\mu 0}$ and $C_{2 0}$ are fully turbulent values of $C_\mu$ and $C_2$. This modified form of the $k-\epsilon$ model was developed to cover all the laminar, transitional and fully turbulent regions. The constants were fitted to the data of a low Re flow in a round pipe to include the effect of laminar wall boundary layer. Although its applicability to a low Reynolds number flow in general is questionable, the model may be used with some confidence if it has the proper limit of laminar regime with the decay of turbulence. It may also be used in the transitional regime by assuming an adequate interpolation between the two extremes. Equation 3.18 shows that $k$ and $\epsilon$ have the same order of magnitude with the decay of turbulence. In other words, both $k^2/\epsilon$ and $\epsilon^2/k$ will go to zero as $k$ and $\epsilon$ go to zero separately. Therefore, the turbulent viscosity $\mu_t$, which is proportional to $k^2/\epsilon$ will vanish with the decay of turbulence. In order to have the proper laminar limit, the total diffusion constant should be expressed as the sum of the turbulent and laminar diffusion constants. It may also be reasonable to assume that the turbulent Prandtl and Schmidt numbers are equal to one.
CHAPTER 4
NUMERICAL DIFFUSION

The final numerical solution involves two types of errors which come from physical modelling and numerical solution procedure. The error in physical modelling is an intrinsic error which cannot be eliminated by the solution procedure. The error in numerical solution procedure is the difference between exact and numerical solutions of the governing equation, which usually appears as additional diffusion. It is clarified that there are two sources of numerical diffusion, truncation error diffusion and cross-flow diffusion. This chapter is primarily concerned with how to predict and eliminate these additional false diffusions to get an accurate solution.

4.1 Truncation Error Diffusion

Truncation error diffusion occurs due to the approximate nature of the finite difference formulations. The name of the truncation error originates from the Taylor series expansion where the second and higher order terms are truncated. Although the Taylor series expansion is not a proper way of interpreting a finite difference equation, the name of the truncation error will be retained here. Since the truncation error exists in multidimensional problems in the same way as it exists in one dimensional problems, it can be analyzed in the following one dimensional
conservation equation without any loss of generality.

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} = \alpha \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + S
\]  

(4.1)

where

\[\begin{align*}
\phi & : \text{any general conserved quantity} \\
S & : \text{source term}
\end{align*}\]

The velocity \( u \) and diffusion constant \( \alpha \) will be assumed constant. Equation 4.1 is integrated in the domain \([x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}]\) and \([t_n, t_{n+1}]\).

\[
\int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} \, dt \, dx + \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \, dt \, dx
\]

\[
= \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \alpha \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \, dt \, dx + S \Delta x \Delta t
\]  

(4.2)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta t & = t_{n+1} - t_n \\
\Delta x & = x_{i+\frac{1}{2}} - x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{align*}
\]

When a function \( f(x) \) is continuous, there exists a point \( x = c \) in \([a, b]\) such that,

\[
\frac{1}{b-a} \int_{a}^{b} f(x) \, dx = f(c)
\]  

(4.3)

Using Eq. 4.3, we may transform Eq. 4.2 as follows.
\[
\frac{1}{\Delta t} [ \phi_{i+1}^{n+1} - \phi_i^{n+1} ] + \frac{u}{\Delta x} [ \phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+1} - \phi_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+1} ]
\]

\[= \frac{\alpha}{\Delta x} \left[ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right]_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+1} - \left[ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right]_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+1} + S \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

where

\[-\frac{1}{2} < f < \frac{1}{2}\]

\[0 < g < 1\]

Equation 4.1 may also be reduced to Eq. 4.5. It is fully explicit and the convection term is finitely differenced by the donor scheme.

\[
\frac{\phi_{i}^{n+1} - \phi_i^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{u}{\Delta x} (\phi_i^n - \phi_{i-1}^n)
\]

\[= \frac{\alpha}{\Delta x^2} (\phi_{i+1} - 2\phi_i + \phi_{i-1}) + S \] \hspace{1cm} (4.5)

From Eq. 4.4 and 4.5, \((\phi_{i+1}^{n+1})_{\text{EXACT}}\) and \((\phi_{i+1}^{n+1})_{\text{FD}}\) can be obtained as follows.

\[(\phi_{i+1}^{n+1})_{\text{FD}} = \phi_i^n + \Delta t \left[ -u \frac{\phi_i^n - \phi_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x} + \frac{\alpha}{\Delta x^2} (\phi_{i+1} - 2\phi_i + \phi_{i-1}) + S \right] \hspace{1cm} (4.6)\]

\[(\phi_{i+1}^{n+1})_{\text{EXACT}} = \phi_{i+1}^n + \Delta t \left[ -u \frac{\phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g} - \phi_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g}}{\Delta x}
\right.

\[+ \frac{\alpha}{\Delta x} \left[ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right]_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g} - \left[ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right]_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g} + S \right] \hspace{1cm} (4.7)\]
Subtracting Eq. 4.6 from Eq. 4.7, we obtain the error at time step (n+1).

\[
(\phi_{i+f}^{n+1})_{\text{EXACT}} - (\phi_{i+f}^{n+1})_{\text{FD}} = \phi_i^{n} - \phi_i^{n+1} + \Delta t \left[ -u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i+a}} + u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_{i+b}} + a \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2_{i+c}} - a \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2_{i+d}} \right]
\]  

(4.8)

where the following relations have already been used.

\[
\frac{\phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g} - \phi_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g}}{\Delta x} = \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_{i+a} - \frac{1}{2} < a < \frac{1}{2}
\]

\[
\frac{\phi_{i}^{n} - \phi_{i-1}^{n}}{\Delta x} = \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_{i+b} - 1 < b < 0
\]

\[
\frac{1}{\Delta x} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g} - \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{n+g} \right] = \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \right)_{i+c} - \frac{1}{2} < c < \frac{1}{2}
\]

\[
\frac{\phi_{i+1}^{n} - 2\phi_{i}^{n} + \phi_{i-1}^{n}}{\Delta x^2} = \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \right)_{i+d} - 1 < d < 1
\]

The mean value theorem, Eq. 4.3, is for a one dimensional case. It can be extended to a two dimensional form as follows.

\[
f(x+a,y+b) = f(x,y) + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right)_A a + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right)_B b
\]

(4.9)

where A and B denote some interior points in the domain bounded by [x,x+a] and [y,y+b].
Now Eq. 4.9 reduces Eq. 4.8 to the following form.

\[ (\phi_{i}^{n+1})_{\text{EXACT}} - (\phi_{i}^{n+1})_{\text{FD}} = -f\Delta x^2 (f_1 - f_2) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \]  

--- A

\[ -f\Delta x\Delta t \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x \partial t} \]  

--- B

\[ -u\Delta t\Delta x (a+b) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \]  

--- C

\[ +\Delta t^2 g \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t \partial x} \]  

--- D

\[ +\Delta x(c-d) \frac{\partial^3 \phi}{\partial x^3} \]  

--- E

\[ +\alpha\Delta t^2 \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t \partial x} \]  

--- F (4.10)

The derivatives with respect to time and space in Eq. 4.10 are at some appropriate points in the domain \([x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}]\) and \([t_n, t_{n+1}]\). The terms A, C and E are truncation error diffusion terms while the terms B, D and F are time derivative terms which become negligible for slow transients.

In a stable scheme the error introduced at a certain step decreases in its absolute magnitude in the following steps and most of the error occurs between neighboring time steps. Although the error terms in Eq. 4.10 are based on the assumption of perfect information at time step n, they may represent the errors over many time steps in a stable scheme.
4.1.1 Truncation Error Diffusion in a One Dimensional Problem

The truncation error diffusion in a one dimensional problem is analyzed for a steady-state case with no source. The results may be extended to a general one dimensional problem if the effects of the transient and source terms are not dominant in determining the profile of $\phi$.

$$u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} = a \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \quad (4.11)$$

Consider a case in which the domain is divided into $N$ equal meshes and the mesh size is $\Delta x$.

$$\phi(x=0) = \phi_0 \quad \phi(x=L) = \phi_N \quad N\Delta x = L$$

Two boundary values $\phi_0$ and $\phi_N$ are given as constant. The analytical solution of Eq. 4.11 is given as,

$$\phi = C_1 e^{cx} + C_2 \quad (4.12)$$

where $c = u/a$ ,

and $C_1 = \frac{\phi_N - \phi_0}{e^{cL} - 1}$ , $C_2 = \frac{\phi_0 e^{cL} - \phi_N}{e^{cL} - 1}$ .
Equation 4.11 is finitely differenced using donor cell scheme for the convection term in the following.

\[
\frac{\phi_i - \phi_{i-1}}{\Delta x} = u \frac{\phi_{i+1} - 2\phi_i + \phi_{i-1}}{2\Delta x}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.13)

where the velocity \( u \) is positive.

Equation 4.13 can also be solved with the given boundary conditions by reducing it to the following form.

\[
P(\phi_i - \phi_{i-1}) = \phi_{i+1} - 2\phi_i + \phi_{i-1}
\]

where \( P = \frac{u\Delta x}{\alpha} \)  \hspace{1cm} (4.14)

The parameter \( P \) in Eq. 4.14 is the cell Reynolds number or cell Peclet number according to whether the diffusion constant \( \alpha \) is the kinematic viscosity or thermal diffusivity. Equation 4.14 may be recast to Eq. 4.15 and solved for \( \phi_i \) in subsequent procedures.

\[
\phi_{i+1} - \phi_i = (P+1)(\phi_i - \phi_{i-1})
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.15)

Equation 4.16 is easily obtained from Eq. 4.15.

\[
\phi_{i+1} - \phi_i = (P+1)^i(\phi_1 - \phi_0)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.16)
Then,

$$\phi_2 - \phi_1 = (1+P)(\phi_1 - \phi_0)$$

$$\phi_3 - \phi_2 = (1+P)^2(\phi_1 - \phi_0)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\phi_N - \phi_{N-1} = (1+P)^{N-1}(\phi_1 - \phi_0)$$

\[
\phi_N - \phi_1 = (\phi_1 - \phi_0) \frac{(1+P)(1+P)^{N-1} - 1}{P} \tag{4.17}
\]

$$\phi_1$$ can be expressed in terms of $$\phi_0$$ and $$\phi_N$$ by Eq. 4.17.

\[
\phi_1 = \frac{(1+P)^N - (1+P)\phi_0 + \phi_N}{(1+P)^N - (1+P) + 1} \tag{4.18}
\]

Therefore, $$(\phi_1 - \phi_0)$$ is given as follows.

\[
\phi_1 - \phi_0 = \frac{P(\phi_N - \phi_0)}{(1+P)^N - 1} \tag{4.19}
\]

Inserting Eq. 4.19 into Eq. 4.16, we obtain the solution for $$\phi_i$$ as,

\[
\phi_i = \phi_0 + \frac{(1+P)^i - 1}{(1+P)^N - 1} (\phi_N - \phi_0) \tag{4.20}
\]

Now the analytical solution Eq. 4.12 and numerical solution Eq. 4.20 have been obtained without any approximation for Eq. 4.11 and Eq. 4.13. Both the analytical and numerical
solutions will be reinserted to the finite difference equation, Eq. 4.13, and the effective diffusion constant for the numerical solution will be obtained. The analytical solution Eq. 4.12 is substituted for $\phi_i$ in Eq. 4.13.

$$\phi_{i+1} - 2\phi_i + \phi_{i-1} = \frac{e^{(i-1)P}}{e^{NP} - 1}(e^P - 1)^2(\phi_N - \phi_0)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.21)

The finite difference solution Eq. 4.20 is also substituted for $\phi_i$ in Eq. 4.13.

$$\phi_{i+1} - 2\phi_i + \phi_{i-1} = \frac{(1+P)^2}{(1+P)^N - 1}(\phi_N - \phi_0)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.22)

Comparing Eq. 4.21 and Eq. 4.22 we can obtain the effective Peclet number $Pe$ of the finite difference solution in terms of the real Peclet number $P$ as follows.

$$\frac{e^{(i-1)Pe}}{e^{NPe} - 1}(e^{Pe} - 1)^2 = \frac{(1+P)^2}{(1+P)^N - 1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.23)

Therefore,

$$Pe = \ln (1+P)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.24)

It is also possible to go through the similar procedures with a central differencing form of the convection term in Eq. 4.25.

$$\frac{\phi_{i+1} - \phi_{i-1}}{2\Delta x} = \frac{\phi_{i+1} - 2\phi_i + \phi_{i-1}}{2\Delta x}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.25)
The effective Peclet number for the finite difference solution of Eq. 4.25 can be derived as follows.

\[ Pe = \ln \left( \frac{2 + P}{2 - P} \right) \]  
(4.26)

where \(-2 < P < 2\)

The effective diffusion constant \(D_e\) can be readily obtained from the following relation.

\[ Pe = \frac{u \Delta x}{D_e} \]  
(4.27)

In general, the transient and source terms and the mixed type of boundary conditions will not affect the numerical diffusion appreciably if they are not dominant terms in determining the profile of \(\phi\). Therefore, Eq. 4.24 and Eq. 4.26 may be a good indication of the truncation error diffusion occurring in a general one dimensional problem.

4.1.2 Another Approach For a One Dimensional Truncation Error Diffusion

The truncation error diffusion in a one dimensional problem can be evaluated in a different approach. Although this approach is approximate and overpredicts the truncation error diffusion, it helps understanding the origin of the truncation error diffusion.

As in the previous section the velocity \(u\) is assumed to be positive and constant. The convection terms in
Eq. 4.4 and Eq. 4.5 may be approximated as follows.

\[
\phi_i - \frac{\phi_{i-1}}{\Delta x} \approx -u_i \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_i
\] (4.28)

\[
\phi_{i+\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\phi_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta x} \approx -u_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_{i+\frac{1}{2}}
\] (4.29)

The truncation error diffusion can be quantified by subtracting Eq. 4.29 from Eq. 4.28.

\[
-u_i \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_i + u_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \right)_{i+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{u \Delta x}{2} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} \right)_{i+f}
\] (4.30)

where

\[0 \leq f \leq \frac{1}{2}\]

Both Eq. 4.28 and Eq. 4.29 hold only when the Peclet number is large, i.e., the convection is dominant over the diffusion. If the Peclet number is small, i.e., the diffusion is dominant over the convection, the profile of \( \phi \) will be linear and the truncation error will be reduced to zero. It can be shown that as \( P \) goes to zero, \( Pe \) also goes to zero resulting in no diffusion error in Eq. 4.24 and Eq. 4.26. Therefore, the truncation error diffusion constant for a convection dominant problem may be given approximately as follows.

\[
D_{ND} \approx \frac{u \Delta x}{2}
\] (4.31)
4.1.3 Truncation Error Diffusion in a Two Dimensional Problem

There are two sources of numerical diffusion in a two dimensional problem, one is the truncation error diffusion and the other is the cross-flow diffusion. The formulas for the truncation error and cross-flow diffusion constants derived in this chapter reveal that they are approximately of the same order of magnitude. It will be shown that the truncation error diffusion in the direction normal to the flow cancels out and there is only a flow direction component left. Since the gradient of \( \phi \) in the flow direction is negligible in a convection dominant problem, the total diffusion quantity of \( \phi \) due to the truncation error is not significant in comparison with that due to the cross-flow diffusion.

A steady-state, two dimensional, conservation equation with no source term is given in the following.

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} = \alpha \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} \right) \tag{4.32}
\]

Equation 4.32 is finitely differenced using donor cell scheme for the convection term.

\[
\frac{\phi_{ij} - \phi_{i-1j}}{\Delta x} + \frac{\phi_{ij} - \phi_{ij-1}}{\Delta y} = \alpha \left( \frac{\phi_{i+1j} - 2\phi_{ij} + \phi_{i-1j}}{\Delta x^2} \right. \\
\left. + \frac{\phi_{ij+1} - 2\phi_{ij} + \phi_{ij-1}}{\Delta y^2} \right) \tag{4.33}
\]
The approach in section 4.1.2 is applied to Eq. 4.33, then the truncation error of the convection term is given as follows.

\[
-u \frac{\phi_{ij} - \phi_{i-1,j}}{\Delta x} - v \frac{\phi_{ij} - \phi_{i,j-1}}{\Delta y} + \frac{1}{\Delta x \Delta y} \int_{y_{j-\frac{1}{2}}}^{y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} (u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}) \, dx \, dy \\
+ \frac{1}{\Delta x \Delta y} \int_{y_{j-\frac{1}{2}}}^{y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}^{x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}} (v \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y}) \, dx \, dy
\]

\[
= -u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x}_{ij} - v \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y}_{ij} + u \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} i+1,j+1 + v \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} i+1,j+1
\]

\[
= \frac{\Delta x}{2} u \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\Delta y}{2} v \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\Delta x}{2} u \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x \partial y} + \frac{\Delta y}{2} v \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y \partial x}
\]

\[
= k [u \Delta x \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + (u \Delta y + v \Delta x) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x \partial y} + v \Delta y \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2}]
\]

\[
= \frac{u \Delta x}{2} [\cos^2 \theta \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + (\cos \theta \tan \theta + \sin \theta) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x \partial y} + \sin \theta \tan \theta \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2}]
\]

(4.34)

where

\[
U = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}
\]

\[
\tan \theta = \frac{\Delta y}{\Delta x}
\]

\[
\tan \theta_1 = \frac{v}{u}
\]

The coordinate (x, y) is transformed to the coordinate (ξ, η) by rotation.

\[
\xi = x \cos \theta + y \sin \theta
\]

\[
\eta = -x \sin \theta + y \cos \theta
\]

(4.35)
where \( \xi \) is the coordinate in the flow direction.

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta & \quad \xi \\
\theta & \quad \psi
\end{align*}
\]

Then Eq. 4.32 is reduced to the following form.

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \xi^2} = \alpha \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \eta^2} \right)
\]

(4.36)

where \( U = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2} \)

Now Eq. 4.34 will be transformed to the coordinate system \((\xi, \eta)\) given by Eq. 4.35.

\[
(\Delta \phi) \sim \left[ \left( \sin \theta \tan \theta_1 + \cos \theta \right) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \xi^2} + \left( -\sin \theta + \cos \theta \tan \theta_1 \right) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \xi \partial \eta} \right]
+ \left( 0 \right) \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial \eta^2} \frac{U \Delta x}{2}
\]

(4.37)

Equation 4.37 shows that the diffusion component in the \( \eta \) direction (normal to the flow direction) is zero and the cross differential term also vanishes when \( \theta \) is equal to \( \theta_1 \). Therefore, dominant truncation error diffusion occurs only in the flow direction. When \( \theta \) is equal to 0 or \( \pi/2 \), the problem is basically one dimensional and the truncation
error diffusion occurs in the flow direction as in a one dimensional problem.

4.2 Cross-flow Diffusion

Most of the confusion about the nature of numerical diffusion comes from the fact that there exists an additional source of false diffusion, that will be named here as the cross-flow diffusion. It is entirely different from the truncation error diffusion. Recently this additional false diffusion was explained by Patankar [52] and Stubley et al. [67,68] and it was clarified that this is the dominant source of the error in most multi-dimensional problems. In this section the origin of the cross-flow diffusion will be illustrated and the corresponding diffusion constant will be quantified so that they can be used in the corrective scheme of section 4.3.4.

The cross-flow diffusion comes from the multi-dimensionality of the problem, therefore it exists only in two or three dimensional problems when the flow direction is not aligned with the mesh configuration. The origin of the cross-flow diffusion is illustrated in Fig. 4.1, which shows a single mesh with pure convection. In Fig. 4.1(A), the hot and cold fluid enters the mesh from the left and bottom surfaces at 45° angle. The hot fluid will come out of the top surface and the cold fluid out of the right surface. In the donor cell scheme Fig. 4.1(A) is transformed into
Fig. 4.1. Illustration of the cross-flow diffusion in a single mesh with pure convection
Fig. 4.1(B) where the velocity components normal to the surface are considered. Then homogeneous mixing occurs in the mesh, and intermediate temperature fluid will come out of the top and right surfaces. The numerical results in Fig. 4.1(B) are again interpreted as Fig. 4.1(C) by a program user. Therefore, an appreciable amount of false diffusion occurs in multidimensional donor cell differencing of the convection term.

Another illustration of the cross-flow diffusion is given in Fig. 4.2 which shows a row of meshes aligned in the x-direction. The value of $\phi$ at the point A should reappear at the point X because there is no physical diffusion. In the donor cell scheme it is distributed all along the points $A_1, A_2, A_3 \ldots$ and the sum of the values at those points is exactly equal to $\phi$. This distribution of the value of $\phi$ causes the cross-flow diffusion.

$$(1-p)\phi[1+p+p^2+\ldots] = (1-p)\phi \frac{1}{1-p} = \phi$$

where

$$p = \frac{u}{\Delta x} \frac{v}{\Delta y}$$

The effective diffusion constant for the cross-flow diffusion will be calculated in the two dimensional Cartesian coordinate in Fig. 4.3. This is a pure convection problem with no physical diffusion. Consider the fluid element CAB which looks like a long one-dimensional rod. The fluid
Fig. 4.2. Illustration of the cross-flow diffusion in a row of meshes aligned in the $x$-direction with pure convection.
where $t_1 - t_0 = \Delta t = \ell_3 / U$

$\tan \theta_1 = \Delta y / \Delta x$

$\tan \theta = v / u$

$p = \frac{u / \Delta x}{u / \Delta x + v / \Delta y}$

Fig. 4.3. Geometry for explanation of the cross-flow diffusion in a two dimensional Cartesian coordinate
element was on the line CAB at time $t_0$ and is translated in the velocity direction, $\vec{v}$.

The value $\phi_A$ at the point $A$ should reappear at the Point $A'$. In the donor cell scheme it is divided into two portions, $p\phi_A$ and $(1-p)\phi_A$ and appears at the points $A_1$ and $A_2$. The travel of the fluid element is analyzed in Fig. 4.4, which shows that the value $\phi_A$ diffuses out along the fluid element. The diffusion occurs both to the right and left hand sides. The diffusion to the right hand side is considered first in the following.

\[
\frac{\text{(Gradient)}_{\phi}}{\phi_A} = \phi_A / \ell_1
\]

\[
\frac{\text{(Current)}_{\phi}}{\phi_A} = p\phi_A \frac{\ell_2}{t_1 - t_0} = p\phi_A \frac{\ell_2 U}{\ell_3}
\]

Therefore,

\[
\frac{\text{(Diffusion constant)}}{\text{(Gradient)}} = \frac{(\text{Current})_{\phi}}{(\text{Gradient})_{\phi}} = \frac{\ell_2 \ell_1}{\ell_3}
\]

where

\[
\ell_1 = \Delta x / \cos \theta_1
\]

\[
\ell_2 = \Delta x \sin \theta / \sin (\theta_1 + \theta)
\]

\[
\ell_3 = \Delta x \sin \theta_1 / \sin (\theta_1 + \theta)
\]

After substituting appropriate expression for each term, the following right hand side diffusion constant results.

\[
D_{RHS} = U \Delta x \frac{\sin \theta \cos \theta}{\cos \theta_1 \sin (\theta + \theta_1)}
\]
Fig. 4.4. Geometry for explanation of the cross-flow diffusion in a rotated two dimensional Cartesian coordinate.
Repeating the same procedure for the left hand side we can find that the right and left hand side diffusion constants are equal to the following.

\[
D_{\text{RHS}} = D_{\text{LHS}} = U\Delta x \frac{\sin \theta \cos \theta}{\cos \theta_1 \sin(\theta + \theta_1)} \tag{4.38}
\]

Equation 4.38 is the effective diffusion constant when the diffusion is confined to the one dimensional fluid element. There are two diffusion components in a two dimensional problem as follows.

\[
\nabla^2 \phi = \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2}
\]

The current on the one dimensional fluid element can be factored into the x and y components. The cross-flow diffusion constants are the ratios of the current and gradient of \( \phi \) in the x and y directions.

\[
D_x = U\Delta x \frac{\sin \theta \cos \theta \cos \theta_1}{\sin(\theta + \theta_1)}
\]

\[
D_y = U\Delta x \frac{\sin \theta \cos \theta \sin^2 \theta_1}{\sin(\theta + \theta_1) \cos \theta_1} \tag{4.39}
\]

Equation 4.39 is identical to the following simple expressions.

\[
D_x = u\Delta x (1-p)
\]

\[
D_y = v\Delta y p \tag{4.40}
\]
where
\[ p = \frac{u}{\Delta x} + \frac{v}{\Delta y} \]

Equation 4.38 should be differentiated with respect to \( \theta \) in order to find out the velocity direction with maximum cross-flow diffusion. It can be shown that,

\[ \frac{D_{RHS}}{\theta} = 0 \text{ when } \tan^2 \theta = \tan \theta_1 . \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.41)

Equation 4.41 shows that \( D_{RHS} \) (or \( D_{LHS} \)) is maximum at an angle of \( \theta \) between \( \frac{\pi}{4} \) and \( \theta_1 \), that is to say, \( \frac{\pi}{4} \leq \theta \leq \theta_1 \) or \( \theta_1 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{4} \). De Vahl Davis and Mallinson [24] also derived the effective cross-flow diffusion constant and their result is given in Eq. 4.42.

\[ D_{DM} = \frac{U \Delta x \Delta y \sin 2 \theta}{4(\Delta y \sin^3 \theta + \Delta x \cos^3 \theta)} = \frac{U \Delta x \tan \theta_1 \sin 2 \theta}{4(\tan \theta_1 \sin^3 \theta + \cos^3 \theta)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.42)

Equation 4.42 underestimates the cross-flow diffusion as shown in Fig. 4.5. When both \( \theta \) and \( \theta_1 \) are equal to \( \frac{\pi}{4} \), Eq. 4.40 and Eq. 4.42 give the same result.

Now the analysis will be extended to a three dimensional case in Fig. 4.6. In Fig. 4.6 the value at the point \( O \) is \( \phi \) and that value should reappear at the point \( X \) where the velocity vector meets the plane ABC. In the donor cell scheme the value \( \phi \) is divided into three portions \( p_x \phi, p_y \phi, \)
Fig. 4.5. Comparison of the prediction formulas for cross-flow diffusion constant by De Vahl Davis and Mallinson and Huh
Fig. 4.6. Geometry for explanation of the cross-flow diffusion in a three-dimensional Cartesian coordinate system.
occurs at the points A, B, and C instead of at the point X. This is the so-called cross-flow diffusion phenomenon. The currents due to the cross-flow diffusion are along the directions $\vec{X}A$, $\vec{X}B$, $\vec{X}C$, and $\vec{n}_A$, $\vec{n}_B$, $\vec{n}_C$ denote unit vectors along those directions. The coordinate of the point X is given as follows.

$$X(l_4 \cos \alpha, l_4 \cos \beta, l_4 \cos \gamma)$$

Any point on the plane ABC should satisfy the following Eq. 4.43.

$$\frac{x}{\Delta x} + \frac{y}{\Delta y} + \frac{z}{\Delta z} = 1 : \text{plane ABC} \quad (4.43)$$

Since the point X is on the plane ABC, the following relation holds.

$$l_4 (\frac{\cos \alpha}{\Delta x} + \frac{\cos \beta}{\Delta y} + \frac{\cos \gamma}{\Delta z}) = 1 \quad (4.44)$$

Therefore,

$$l_4 = \frac{1}{\frac{\cos \alpha}{\Delta x} + \frac{\cos \beta}{\Delta y} + \frac{\cos \gamma}{\Delta z}} \quad (4.45)$$

The lengths of AX, BX, CX which are denoted as $l_1$, $l_2$, $l_3$ can be obtained as follows.

$$l_1 = AX = \sqrt{(\Delta x - l_4 \cos \alpha)^2 + (l_4 \cos \beta)^2 + (l_4 \cos \gamma)^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{\Delta x^2 + l_4^2 - 2 \Delta x l_4 \cos \alpha}$$
\[ k_2 = \sqrt{(l_4 \cos \alpha)^2 + (\Delta y - l_4 \cos \beta)^2 + (l_4 \cos \gamma)^2} \]
\[ = \sqrt{\Delta y^2 + l_4^2 - 2\Delta y l_4 \cos \beta} \]

\[ k_3 = \sqrt{(l_4 \cos \alpha)^2 + (l_4 \cos \beta)^2 + (\Delta z - l_4 \cos \gamma)^2} \]
\[ = \sqrt{\Delta z^2 + l_4^2 - 2\Delta z l_4 \cos \gamma} \quad (4.46) \]

The unit vectors \( \hat{n}_A, \hat{n}_B, \hat{n}_C \) can be obtained in terms of their components in x, y, z directions.

\[ \hat{n}_A = \frac{\hat{X}_A}{|\hat{X}_A|} = \frac{\hat{O}_A - \hat{O}_X}{l_1} \quad (4.47) \]

etc.

Therefore,

\[ \hat{n}_A = \frac{1}{l_1} [ (\Delta x - l_4 \cos \alpha), -l_4 \cos \beta, -l_4 \cos \gamma ] \]

\[ \hat{n}_B = \frac{1}{l_2} [ -l_4 \cos \alpha, (\Delta y - l_4 \cos \beta), -l_4 \cos \gamma ] \]

\[ \hat{n}_C = \frac{1}{l_3} [ -l_4 \cos \alpha, -l_4 \cos \beta, (\Delta z - l_4 \cos \gamma) ] \quad (4.48) \]

The currents in the directions \( \hat{n}_A, \hat{n}_B, \hat{n}_C \) can simply be given as the products of the transported quantities and velocities.

\[ |(\text{Current})_{XA}| = p_x \Phi \frac{l_1}{\Delta t} \]
\[ \text{(Current)_{XB}} = p_y \phi \frac{\ell_2}{\Delta t} \]

\[ \text{(Current)_{XC}} = p_z \phi \frac{\ell_3}{\Delta t} \quad (4.49) \]

where

\[ \Delta t = \frac{\ell_4}{U} \]

The gradients of \( \phi \) in the \( x, y, z \) directions are given as follows.

\[ (\text{Grad})_x = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \]

\[ (\text{Grad})_y = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} \]

\[ (\text{Grad})_z = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} \quad (4.50) \]

Now the \( x \) direction cross-flow diffusion constant may be given as the ratio of the current to the gradient of \( \phi \) in the \( x \) direction.

\[ (\text{Current})_x = \frac{p_x \phi}{\Delta t} (\Delta x - \ell_4 \cos \alpha) + \frac{p_y \phi}{\Delta t} (-\ell_4 \cos \alpha) \]

\[ + \frac{p_z \phi}{\Delta t} (-\ell_4 \cos \alpha) \]

\[ (\text{Grad})_x = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} \quad (4.51) \]

Therefore,

\[ D_x = \frac{p_x \Delta x}{\Delta t} (\Delta x - \ell_4 \cos \alpha) + \frac{p_y \Delta x}{\Delta t} (-\ell_4 \cos \alpha) + \frac{p_z \Delta x}{\Delta t} (-\ell_4 \cos \alpha) \]
\[ D_x = \frac{p_x \Delta x^2}{\Delta t} - \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} l_4 \cos \alpha (p_x + p_y + p_z) \]

\[ = \frac{p_x \Delta x^2}{\Delta t} - \frac{\Delta x}{\Delta t} l_4 \cos \alpha \]  

(4.52)

Inserting the expression for \( \Delta t \) given by \( \Delta t = \frac{l_4}{U} \), we can simplify the result as follows.

\[ D_x = u \Delta x \left( \frac{p_x \Delta x}{l_4 \cos \alpha} - 1 \right) \]

\[ = u \Delta x (1 - p_x) \]  

(4.53)

The cross-flow diffusion constants in the y and z directions can be obtained in the same way. The rotation of indices will also give the same result.

\[ D_y = v \Delta y (1 - p_y) \]

\[ D_z = w \Delta z (1 - p_z) \]  

(4.54)

4.3 Discussion of Skew Differencing and Corrective Schemes

The origins of the numerical diffusion and their effective diffusion constants have been given in the previous sections. This section is a review of the schemes that have been used to eliminate the numerical diffusion. The most important ones may be the skew differencing, tensor viscosity method, finite element method, etc. although none of them has been successful enough to be accepted widely.
Most of the schemes in Table 4.1 can be categorized into two types, skew differencing and corrective schemes. S. Chang's method [16] and Raithby's scheme [53] are of a skew differencing type while the tensor viscosity method [25] and Huh's corrective scheme that will be introduced in section 4.3.4 fall in the category of a corrective scheme. In the skew differencing type schemes finite differencing of the convection term is done not in terms of the x and y directions, but directly along the velocity direction. Since the upstream point in the velocity direction does not necessarily fall on the mesh point where the quantity under consideration is defined, the interpolation should be done between neighboring points to obtain the value at the upstream point. The donor cell treatment of the convection term results in a 5-point relationship in a two dimensional problem. In the skew differencing scheme the 5-point relationship becomes a 9-point relationship. Basically the inclusion of four additional corner points contributes to more accurate numerical modelling of the convection. However, the interpolation between neighboring points may still give some cross-flow diffusion. The cross-flow diffusion is not eliminated entirely in the skew differencing scheme, but just appreciably lower than that of the donor cell scheme.

The corrective scheme is to reduce the diffusion constants in order to compensate for the additional false
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Contributor/method</th>
<th>Standard mesh?</th>
<th>Best mesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centered finite difference</td>
<td>Lillington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orlandi</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galerkin finite elements</td>
<td>Cliffe</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 x 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dones et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td>41 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandotto</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hickmott et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-order upwind finite difference</td>
<td>Elbahar et al./PATANKAR</td>
<td>Pe = 10&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt; only</td>
<td>41 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orlandi</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priddin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100 x 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wada et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td>81 x 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkes</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 x 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher order upwind finite difference</td>
<td>Elbahar et al./QUICK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elbahar et al./LLUE</td>
<td>Pe = 10&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt; only</td>
<td>41 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huiime/QUICK</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 x 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilkes/LLUE</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector upwind difference</td>
<td>Lillington/SUD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillington/VUD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillington/VUDCC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upwind finite element</td>
<td>Narusawa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of characteristics</td>
<td>Esposito</td>
<td></td>
<td>41 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass and Rodi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hufnus and Khalizky</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite analysis method</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td></td>
<td>81 x 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensor viscosity method</td>
<td>Ruel et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 x 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-adaptive method</td>
<td>Schoenauer</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesh transformation method</td>
<td>Sykes</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lax-Wendroff</td>
<td>Wada et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 x 40&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. List of the schemes for numerical representation of advection presented at the Third Meeting of the International Association for Hydraulic Research, 1981 [65]
diffusion. The corrective scheme is valid only if the effective numerical diffusion constant can be predicted accurately. Since the cross-flow diffusion is dominant over the truncation error diffusion and the effective diffusion constants for the cross-flow diffusion can be predicted theoretically, the corrective scheme can give a numerical solution which is almost free from numerical diffusion. The tensor viscosity method is one example of the corrective scheme, although the validity of its correction formula is not clear. The correction formula used here is Eq. 4.53 and Eq. 4.54. The diffusion constants in x, y and z directions will be reduced by the amounts of $D_x$, $D_y$ and $D_z$ in Eq. 4.53 and Eq. 4.54.

4.3.1 Raithby's Scheme

Raithby's scheme [53] is an Eulerian type of approach, where the balance equation is set up for a given control volume by considering convection and diffusion at the control surface. It is therefore a conservative scheme. The finite difference equation for Raithby's scheme is derived on the assumption of a linear profile of $\phi$ normal to the flow and a uniform profile in the flow direction.

\[ \phi = C_1 + C_2 n = C_1 + C_2 (\frac{y}{U} - \frac{x}{U}) \]  

(4.55)

where $n$ is the distance normal to the flow and $U = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$. 
Fig. 4.7. A segment of the calculation domain showing grid lines, control volume and notations in Raithby's scheme
The convection quantity at the control surface is calculated from the upstream value in the flow direction and the upstream value is obtained by interpolating two neighboring points. This should be repeated for the four control surfaces of every mesh in a two dimensional problem, which may be too complicated and time consuming for a practical purpose. The inclusion of the four additional points also complicates the structure of the coefficient matrix in an implicit scheme.

4.3.2 **Skew Differencing By Huh**

Skew differencing scheme here treats the convection term in a Lagrangian way. The convection term is differenced in the velocity direction between mesh points, not in terms of the convection that occurs at mesh interfaces. Although this scheme is nonconservative, it is much simpler than Raithby's scheme and becomes conservative in a unidirectional flow.

\[
\frac{u}{\partial x} + \frac{v}{\partial y} = U \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} 
\]

where \( \xi \) is the coordinate in the velocity direction and

\[
U = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}.
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} = \frac{\phi_{ij} - \phi_{US}}{\lambda} \]

(4.57)

where the upstream value \( \phi_{US} \) may be calculated by
interpolating two neighboring points. Some of the results of this skew differencing scheme is given in section 5.3.2.

4.3.3 Tensor Viscosity Method

The tensor viscosity method treats the numerical diffusion constant as a tensor quantity. The expression for the tensor viscosity [25] is given in the following.

\[
T = \frac{1}{2} \Delta t \begin{pmatrix} u^2 & uv \\ uv & v^2 \end{pmatrix}
\]  

(4.58)

Eq. 4.58 for the numerical diffusion constant is apparently not consistent with the results in Eq. 4.53 and Eq. 4.54.

4.3.4 Corrective Scheme By Huh

The corrective scheme is to use the reduced diffusion constants, \(D_x, D_y, D_z\) in \(x, y, z\) directions to compensate for the cross-flow diffusion effect. The validity of this scheme is based on the fact that the cross-flow diffusion can be predicted accurately. The expressions for the cross-flow diffusion constants \(D_x, D_y, D_z\) are derived in section 4.2.

\[
D_x = u \Delta x (1 - p_x)
\]

\[
D_y = v \Delta y (1 - p_y)
\]
\[ D_z = w\Delta z(1-p_z) \quad (4.59) \]

where

\[ p_x = \frac{u}{\Delta x} \quad \frac{v}{\Delta y} \quad \frac{w}{\Delta z} \quad \text{etc.} \]

Two implementation strategies have been tested so far, the mesh point implementation and mesh interface implementation. These two become identical when the flow field is uniform or a very fine mesh is used so that the flow change over neighboring meshes is negligible. In a coarse mesh or recirculating flow field the latter implementation strategy is definitely preferred.

4.3.4.1 Mesh Point Implementation

The mesh point implementation is to assign the cross-flow diffusion constants \( D_x, D_y, D_z \) at the center of a mesh where all quantities are defined except the flow field. The velocities at two boundary faces are averaged to get the representative velocity, which is used with the cell dimensions to get the cross-flow diffusion constants.

After the cross-flow diffusion constants are assigned to every mesh point, they should be averaged again between neighboring mesh points to calculate the cross-flow diffusion current at mesh interfaces.
4.3.4.2 Mesh Interface Implementation

The mesh interface implementation is to assign the cross-flow diffusion constants directly to the mesh interfaces where the cross-flow diffusion current should be calculated. The mesh interface implementation is always recommended although it has a more complex program logic than the mesh point implementation.

There are three possible cases that should be treated independently in a two dimensional case, as shown in Fig. 4.8. Note that the cross-flow diffusion constant for the interface with an inward velocity does not have to be considered in that mesh because it will be considered in the neighboring mesh. For the first two cases the cross-flow diffusion constants are zero because the velocity vector is aligned with the mesh configuration. For the second case the two outward velocities, U and V, can be directly used with cell dimensions in Eq. 4.59, and the resulting $D_x$ and $D_y$ will be assigned to each interface. The third case is expected to have a flow split as shown in the figure. The velocity U is split into two components, $U_1$ and $U_2$, so that they are proportional to $V_1$ and $V_2$. The two velocity sets $(U_1,V_1)$ and $(U_2,V_2)$ are used to give $(D_{x_1},D_{y_1})$ and $(D_{x_2},D_{y_2})$. The right interface will have the cross-flow diffusion constant $(D_{x_1}+D_{x_2})$ and the top and bottom interfaces, $D_{y_1}$ and $D_{y_2}$. The same logic can easily be extended to a three dimensional case. Appendix C includes
Fig. 4.8. Three possible flow configurations for mesh interface implementation of the corrective scheme in a two dimensional problem.
the fortran program for calculating cross-flow diffusion constants in an arbitrary flow field.

4.4 Comparison of Explicit, Implicit and ADI Schemes

There are three typical solution schemes, Explicit, Implicit and ADI (Alternate Direction Implicit), for the general conservation equation, Eq. 4.60, which is a parabolic partial differential equation. The pros and cons of the three schemes will be compared in the following four viewpoints.

1. conservation
2. physical constraint
3. accuracy
4. stability

\[
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + w \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = D \left( \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial z^2} \right) + S \quad (4.60)
\]

Explicit (1-D):

\[
\frac{\phi_{i}^{n+1} - \phi_{i}^{n}}{\Delta t} + \frac{u}{\Delta x}(\phi_{i}^{n} - \phi_{i-1}^{n}) = \frac{D}{\Delta x^2}(\phi_{i+1}^{n} - 2\phi_{i}^{n} + \phi_{i-1}^{n}) + S \quad (4.61)
\]

Implicit (1-D):

\[
\frac{\phi_{i}^{n+1} - \phi_{i}^{n}}{\Delta t} + \frac{u}{\Delta x}(\phi_{i}^{n+1} - \phi_{i-1}^{n+1}) = \frac{D}{\Delta x^2}(\phi_{i+1}^{n+1} - 2\phi_{i}^{n+1} + \phi_{i-1}^{n+1}) + S \quad (4.62)
\]
ADI (2-D): (A)

\[
\frac{\phi_{ij}^{n+1} - \phi_{ij}^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{u_{ij}^{n+1/2} - \phi_{i-1,j}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta x} + \frac{v_{ij}^{n+1/2} - \phi_{ij-1}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta y}
\]

\[
= \frac{\phi_{i+1,j}^{n+1/2} - 2\phi_{ij}^{n+1/2} + \phi_{i-1,j}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{\phi_{ij+1}^{n+1} - 2\phi_{ij}^{n+1} + \phi_{ij-1}^{n+1}}{\Delta y^2} + S
\]

\[
\frac{\phi_{ij}^{n+1} - \phi_{ij}^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{u_{ij}^{n+1/2} - \phi_{i-1,j}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta x} + \frac{v_{ij}^{n+1/2} - \phi_{ij-1}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta y}
\]

\[
= \frac{\phi_{i+1,j}^{n+1/2} - 2\phi_{ij}^{n+1/2} + \phi_{i-1,j}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{\phi_{ij+1}^{n+1} - 2\phi_{ij}^{n+1} + \phi_{ij-1}^{n+1}}{\Delta y^2} + S
\]

ADI (2-D): (B)

\[
\frac{\phi_{ij}^{n+1} - \phi_{ij}^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{u_{ij}^{n+1/2} - \phi_{i-1,j}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta x} = \frac{\phi_{i+1,j}^{n+1} - 2\phi_{ij}^{n+1} + \phi_{i-1,j}^{n+1}}{\Delta x^2} + S
\]

\[
\frac{\phi_{ij}^{n+1} - \phi_{ij}^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{v_{ij}^{n+1/2} - \phi_{ij-1}^{n+1/2}}{\Delta y} = \frac{\phi_{ij+1}^{n+1} - 2\phi_{ij}^{n+1} + \phi_{ij-1}^{n+1}}{\Delta y^2} + S
\]

(4.63)

4.4.1 Conservation

The conservation principle is that the total amount of \( \phi \) should be conserved \((S=0)\), or affected only by the source term contribution \((S\neq0)\), when the net inflow or outflow at
the domain boundary is equal to zero. A scheme may be both stable and nonconservative and also both unstable and conservative because the conservative property is independent of the stability. When we are concerned with a steady state solution, the conservative property may not be crucial. For a long time transient, however, the conservative property is as important as the stability because the error from nonconservation may accumulate over many time steps. All the explicit, implicit and ADI schemes can be made conservative by using appropriate differencing forms for the convection term. In order to guarantee conservation, the same exchange term should be used for neighboring meshes. Although a conservative form is preferred to a nonconservative one, there are some nonconservative solution schemes like ICE (Implicit Continuous Eulerian), where the convection terms of momentum equations are linearized in a nonconservative way.

4.4.2 Physical Constraint

The physical constraint is closely related with the stability in a practical sense. Although they usually give
similar constraints on the time step size and mesh spacing, they are from entirely different origins. The laws of physics impose some restrictions on the numerical scheme to get physically reasonable solutions. The Courant condition and Hirt's stability condition [36] that the finite domain of influence should at least include the continuum domain of influence are good examples of the physical constraint condition.

4.4.2.1 Diffusion

There is a maximum net flow that can occur between neighboring meshes by diffusion.

\[
\phi_C' \Delta x \Delta y = \phi_C \Delta x \Delta y + D \frac{\phi_R - \phi_C}{\Delta x} \Delta y \Delta t
\]

\[
\phi_R' \Delta x \Delta y = \phi_R \Delta x \Delta y - D \frac{\phi_R - \phi_C}{\Delta x} \Delta y \Delta t
\]
Since the relationship, $\phi^t_R \geq \phi^t_C$, should still hold, we have the following physical constraint.

$$\Delta x \Delta y (\phi^t_R - \phi^t_C) \geq 2D \frac{(\phi^t_R - \phi^t_C)}{\Delta x \Delta y} \Delta t$$

$$\frac{2D \Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \leq 1 \quad (4.64)$$

eqq

Eq. 4.64 may be extended to a d-dimensional case as follows.

$$d \frac{2D \Delta t}{\Delta x^2} \leq 1 \quad (4.65)$$

Equation 4.65 may be a too conservative criterion in a real problem. When the physical constraint is ignored and the time step size greater than that given by Eq. 4.64 or 4.65 is used, the solution will be unstable or stable with damping oscillations. Both of the oscillation and instability should be avoided in a transient problem. The ADI scheme given in Eq. 4.63 is unconditionally stable; however, there will be a damping oscillation in the solution when the time step size is greater than that given by Eq. 4.64 or 4.65. Therefore the physical constraint should be respected in addition to the stability condition to get a meaningful transient solution.
4.4.2.2 Convection

The explicit and donor cell treatment of the convection term gives the convection quantity at interface $S$ as $u\phi_A \Delta t \Delta y$. It is based on the assumption that $\phi_A$ is the representative value of the control volume $A$. If $\Delta t$ is greater than the Courant limit, a portion of the control volume $C$ will cross the interface $S$. Then $u\phi_A \Delta t \Delta y$ is no more an appropriate expression for the convection quantity during $\Delta t$. Therefore,

$$\Delta t \leq \frac{\Delta x}{u}$$

When a time step size greater than the Courant limit is used, the damping oscillation or instability may occur as in the case of diffusion.

4.4.3 Accuracy

Realistic interpretation of a finite difference equation comes from an integral form of the conservation
Fig. 4.9. Profile assumptions of $\phi$ in space and time for various differencing schemes

where US (Upstream)  
DS (Downstream)
equation. The infinitesimal approximation of differential terms is not appropriate in most problems of our consideration. The accuracy expressed in terms of $O(\Delta t), O(\Delta x^2)$ is also not appropriate for finitely large $\Delta t$ and $\Delta x$. The accuracy depends on how well we can compute the convection and diffusion quantities at control surfaces over the time $\Delta t$. In other words, the accuracy depends on the profiles assumed for $\phi$ in time and space because the exact profiles are not known a priori.

Since the exact profile depends on the Peclet and Strouhal numbers of the governing equation, appropriate schemes should be chosen according to those numbers or weighting should be done between neighboring time steps and mesh points to increase the accuracy of the solution. However, the accuracy is usually the least important among the given four considerations.

4.4.4 Stability

The stability is a mathematical problem, whether the error introduced at a certain step will increase or decrease as the calculation goes over to the following steps. It depends on the maximum eigenvalue of the iteration matrix. If its absolute magnitude is less than one, the error propagation is suppressed and the largest error contribution will be from the previous time step.

The stability can be checked by the theorems about matrix eigenvalues or Von Neumann analysis. The Von Neumann
analysis is to expand the solution of a finite difference equation in Fourier series and check the decay of each mode separately. The stability is not a sufficient condition for an acceptable numerical scheme. In the following sections, stability criteria will be derived for the explicit, implicit and ADI schemes using the Von Neumann analysis.

4.4.4.1 Explicit Scheme

The Von Neumann stability analysis of a finite difference equation is simple in its idea, but its algebra may get complicated.

4.4.4.1.1 One Dimensional Central Differencing of Convection Term

The finite difference equation is given for a one dimensional general conservation equation with central differencing of the convection term.

\[
\frac{\phi_i^{n+1} - \phi_i^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{\phi_{i+1}^n - \phi_{i-1}^n}{2\Delta x} = D\frac{\phi_{i+1}^n - 2\phi_i^n + \phi_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x^2}
\]  

(4.67)

The solution \( \phi_i^n \) is expanded in Fourier series as follows.

\[
\phi_i^n = \sum \zeta_i^n e^{Ii}
\]  

(4.68)

where \( I = \sqrt{-1} \).
The absolute value of $\zeta$ should be less than one for every mode to achieve stability. When Eq. 4.68 is substituted in Eq. 4.67, the following expression for $\zeta$ results.

$$\zeta = 1 - C_x \sin \theta_x I - 2d_x (1 - \cos \theta_x)$$

(4.69)

where

$$C_x = \frac{u \Delta t}{\Delta x},$$

$$d_x = \frac{D \Delta t}{\Delta x^2}.$$  

Therefore,

$$|\zeta|^2 = [1 - 2d_x (1 - \cos \theta_x)]^2 + [C_x \sin \theta_x]^2 < 1$$

(4.70)

Equation 4.70 may be rewritten as follows by defining $\cos \theta_x$ as $t$.

$$[1 - 2d_x (1 - t)]^2 + C_x^2 (1 - t^2) < 1$$

(4.71)

where

$$t = \cos \theta_x,$$

$$-1 \leq t \leq 1.$$  

The function $f(t)$ will be defined as follows.

$$f(t) = |\zeta|^2 - 1$$

$$= (4d_x^2 - C_x^2) t^2 + (-8d_x^2 + 4d_x) t + C_x^2 + 4d_x^2 - 4d_x$$

(4.72)

In order to get the stability of Eq. 4.67, the function
f(t) should be less than or equal to zero for any t in [-1,1].
\[ f(t) \leq 0 \] (4.73)
for any t in [-1,1]

Equation 4.73 can be solved by a graphical method using the characteristics of a quadratic equation. The parabola f(t) always meets the t-axis because the discriminant is always greater than or equal to zero.

\[
D(\text{Discriminant}) = (C_x^2 - 2d_x)^2 > 0
\] (4.74)

One of the two meeting points with the t-axis is the point t=1 because f(1) is equal to zero.

\[ f(1) = 0 \] (4.75)

The parabola f(t) may have three distinct shapes according to the sign of the coefficient of the second order term.

1. \( 4d_x^2 - C_x^2 > 0 \) : concave upward
2. \( 4d_x^2 - C_x^2 = 0 \) : linear
3. \( 4d_x^2 - C_x^2 < 0 \) : concave downward.

In case (1) f(t) is a parabola concave upward and f(-1) should be less than or equal to zero as shown in Fig. 4.10(1). Therefore,
Fig. 4.10. Three distinct shapes of the parabola, \( f(t) \), according to the sign of the coefficient of second order term.
\[ f(-l) = 8d_x(2d_x - 1) \leq 0 \]

\[ 0 \leq d_x \leq \frac{1}{2} \]  

(4.76)

In case (2) \( f(t) \) is a straight line and \( f(-l) \) again should be less than or equal to zero. In case (3) the parabola \( f(t) \) is concave downward and the axis of symmetry should be on the right hand side of the point, \( t=1 \) as shown in Fig. 4.10(3).

Axis of symmetry: \[ t = \frac{4d_x^2 - 2d_x}{4d_x^2 - C_x^2} > l \]

\[ d_x \geq \frac{1}{4} C_x^2 \]  

(4.77)

Summing up the results in Eq. 4.76 and Eq. 4.77, we get the following stability conditions.

\[ 4d_x^2 - C_x^2 \geq 0 : \quad 0 \leq d_x \leq \frac{1}{2} \]

\[ 4d_x^2 - C_x^2 < 0 : \quad d_x \geq \frac{1}{4} C_x^2 \]

The stable region in the coordinate system \((C_x, d_x)\) is shown in Fig. 4.11.

4.4.4.1.2 One Dimensional Donor Cell Differencing of Convection Term

The following Eq. 4.78 is a finite difference equation with donor cell differencing of the convection term.
Fig. 4.11. Stability condition in the plane \((C_x, d_x)\) for an explicit scheme with central differencing of convection term in a one dimensional problem.
\[
\frac{\phi_{i}^{n+1} - \phi_{i}^{n}}{\Delta t} + u \frac{\phi_{i}^{n} - \phi_{i-1}^{n}}{\Delta x} = D \frac{\phi_{i+1}^{n} - 2\phi_{i}^{n} + \phi_{i-1}^{n}}{\Delta x^2}
\]  

(4.78)

where the velocity \( u \) is positive.

The Von Neumann analysis of Eq. 4.78 gives the following stability condition.

\[
|\zeta|^2 = \left[1 - (C_x + 2d_x)(1 - \cos \theta_x)\right]^2 + [C_x \sin \theta_x]^2 \leq 1
\]

(4.79)

It can be shown that the value of \(|\zeta|^2\) in Eq. 4.79 does not change when the velocity \( u \) is less than zero, if the Courant number, \( C_x \), is defined such that it is always positive.

The function \( f(t) \) is defined as follows to make it easier to solve Eq. 4.79.

\[
f(t) = |\zeta|^2 - 1
\]

\[
= \left[(C_x + 2d_x)^2 - C_x^2\right]t^2 + [-2(C_x + 2d_x)^2 + 2(C_x + 2d_x)]t
\]

\[
+ [(C_x + 2d_x)^2 + C_x^2 - 2(C_x + 2d_x)]
\]

(4.80)

The function \( f(t) \) in Eq. 4.80 should be less than or equal to zero for any \( t \) in \([-1,1]\) for the stability of Eq. 4.78.

\[
f(t) \leq 0 \quad \text{for any } t \text{ in } [-1,1]
\]

(4.81)

The parabola \( f(t) \) meets the \( t \)-axis at the point, \( t=1 \).

\[
f(1) = 0
\]

(4.82)
Equation 4.81 can be solved by the graphical method as in the previous section.

\[(c_x + 2d_x)^2 - c_x^2 > 0 : 0 < c_x + 2d_x < 1 \] \hspace{1cm} (4.83)

\[(c_x + 2d_x)^2 - c_x^2 < 0 : d_x > \frac{1}{4}(c_x^2 - c_x) \] \hspace{1cm} (4.84)

The results, Eq. 4.83 and Eq. 4.84, are shown graphically in Fig. 4.12.

4.4.4.1.3 Two and Three Dimensional Donor Cell Differencing of Convection Term

The two dimensional extension of Eq. 4.78 is given in the following.

\[
\phi_{ij}^{n+1} - \phi_{ij}^n + \frac{\phi_{ij}^n - \phi_{i-1j}^n}{\Delta x} + \frac{\phi_{ij}^n - \phi_{ij-1}^n}{\Delta y} = D \frac{\phi_{i+1j}^n - 2\phi_{ij}^n + \phi_{i-1j}^n}{\Delta x^2} + D \frac{\phi_{ij+1}^n - 2\phi_{ij}^n + \phi_{ij-1}^n}{\Delta y^2} \] \hspace{1cm} (4.85)

The Von Neumann analysis is applied to the finite difference equation, Eq. 4.85, yielding the following result.

\[
\zeta - 1 = -c_x(1 - e^{-i\theta_x}) - c_y(1 - e^{-i\theta_y}) - 2d_x(1 - \cos \theta_x) - 2d_y(1 - \cos \theta_y) \] \hspace{1cm} (4.86)
Fig. 4.12. Stability condition in the plane \((C_x, d_x)\) for an explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a one dimensional problem.

\[ d_x = -\frac{1}{2}C_x + \frac{1}{2} \]

\[ d_x = \frac{1}{2}(C_x^2 - C_x) \]
where
\[ C_x = \frac{u \Delta t}{\Delta x}, \quad C_y = \frac{v \Delta t}{\Delta y} \]
\[ d_x = \frac{D \Delta t}{\Delta x^2}, \quad d_y = \frac{D \Delta t}{\Delta y^2} \]

The Courant numbers, \( C_x \) and \( C_y \), are defined so that they are always positive, independent of the directions of the velocities \( u \) and \( v \). Equation 4.86 can be simplified by defining \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) as given in the following Eq. 4.87.

\[ \zeta = 1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \quad (4.87) \]

where

\[ \alpha_1 = -C_x - 2d_x + (C_x + d_x)e^{-i \theta_x} + d_x e^{i \theta_x} \]
\[ \alpha_2 = -C_y - 2d_y + (C_y + d_y)e^{-i \theta_y} + d_y e^{i \theta_y} \]

The stability condition is that the absolute magnitude of \( \zeta \) should be less than or equal to one for any values of \( \theta_x \) and \( \theta_y \). From Fig. 4.13 and Fig. 4.14 it can be seen that \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) should satisfy the following conditions independently.

\[ |\alpha_1^{+\frac{1}{2}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (4.88) \]
\[ |\alpha_2^{+\frac{1}{2}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (4.89) \]
Fig. 4.13. The region in the complex plane where \((a_1 + a_2)\) should exist for the stability of an explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a general two dimensional problem.
Both $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ should be in the shaded circle to ensure that $|\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 1| < 1$.

Fig. 4.14. The region in the complex plane where the amplification factor, $\zeta$, should exist for the stability of an explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a general two dimensional problem.
Both Eq. 4.88 and Eq. 4.89 can be solved by the graphical method as in the previous sections. The results are given in Fig. 4.15, where the points \( (C_x, d_x) \) and \( (C_y, d_y) \) should be in the shaded region for stability. A three dimensional case can also be solved through the same procedures and the results are given in Fig. 4.16. The stable region shrinks on a linear scale with dimensionality.

4.4.4.1.4 Stability Condition in Terms of Cell Reynolds Number

The stability conditions in the previous three sections are in terms of the dimensionless numbers, \( C_x \) and \( d_x' \), which depend on both the mesh spacing, \( \Delta x \), and time step, \( \Delta t \). When \( \Delta x \) and \( \Delta t \) are already given, the stability can be checked directly. However, our usual concern is the stable time step size for a given mesh spacing. Therefore, the stable range of \( C_x \) should be determined in terms of the cell Reynolds number \( C_x/d_x' \), which is independent of the time step size, \( \Delta t \). The stability condition is again given by Eq. 4.88 and 4.89 and \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) may be rewritten as follows.

\[
\alpha_1 = C_x \left[ -1 - \frac{2}{R_x} + (1+\frac{1}{R_x})e^{-i\theta_x} + \frac{1}{R_x} e^{i\theta_x} \right] \tag{4.90}
\]

\[
\alpha_2 = C_y \left[ -1 - \frac{2}{R_y} + (1+\frac{1}{R_y})e^{-i\theta_y} + \frac{1}{R_y} e^{i\theta_y} \right] \tag{4.91}
\]
Fig. 4.15. Stability condition in the planes \((C_x,d_x)\) and \((C_y,d_y)\) for an explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a general two dimensional problem.
Fig. 4.16. Stability condition in the planes \((C_x, d_x)\) etc. for an explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a general three dimensional problem.
The following condition for \( C_x \) and \( R_x \) can be derived from Eq. 4.88 and Eq. 4.90.

\[
\left[ \frac{1}{x} - C_x \left( 1 + \frac{2}{R_x} \right) \left( 1 - \cos \theta_x \right) \right]^2 + [C_x \sin \theta_x]^2 \leq \frac{1}{x} \tag{4.92}
\]

Equation 4.92 can be simplified as follows.

\[
f(t) = C_x (1+K)^2 (1-t)^2 - C_x K (1-t) + C_x^2 (1-t^2)
\]

\[
= (C_x^2 K^2 - C_x^2) t^2 + (2C_x^2 K^2 + C_x K) t + C_x^2 K^2 - C_x K
\]

\[
+ C_x^2 \leq 0 \tag{4.93}
\]

where \( K = 1 + \frac{2}{R_x} \), and

\[
t = \cos \theta_x
\]

The stability condition is now that \( f(t) \) should be less than or equal to zero for any \( t \) in \([-1,1]\).

\[
f(1) = 0 \tag{4.94}
\]

\[
D(\text{Discriminant}) = C_x^2 (K-2C_x)^2 \geq 0 \tag{4.95}
\]

The function \( f(t) \) satisfies Eq. 4.94 and Eq. 4.95, and has distinct shapes for the following three cases.

(1) \( C_x^2 (K^2-1) > 0 \) : concave upward
(2) \( C_x^2(K^2-1) = 0 \) : linear

(3) \( C_x^2(K^2-1) < 0 \) : concave downward

For case (1) and (2), \( f(-1) \) should be less than or equal to zero. For case (3) the axis of symmetry of the parabola should be on the right hand side of the point, \( t=1 \). The solution procedure is similar to those in the previous sections and the results are given in the following as,

\[
R_x > 0 : \ 0 \leq C_x \leq \frac{1}{2(1+\frac{2}{R_x})} 
\]

\[
R_x < -1 : \ 0 \leq C_x \leq \frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{2}{R_x}) 
\]

The results in Eq. 4.96 and Eq. 4.97 are shown in Fig. 4.17. The same result will be obtained for the y-direction, therefore the subscript \( x \) may be replaced with the subscript \( y \) in Fig. 4.17. The stability condition in Fig. 4.17 is applicable to all general 2-D problems, although it can be relaxed if there is a constraint on the velocity direction and mesh spacings such that the following relation is satisfied.

\[
f = \frac{v}{\Delta y} \frac{\Delta y}{u} \leq 1 \]
Fig. 4.17. Stability condition in the plane $(R_x, C_x)$ and $(R_y, C_y)$ for an explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a general two dimensional problem.
where \( f = \frac{v}{u/\Delta x} \)

Fig. 4.18. Stability condition in the plane \((R_x, C_x)\) for an explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a two dimensional problem with \( f = \frac{v}{u/\Delta x} \)
Then the number \( \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} \) on the \( C_x \)-axis in Fig. 4.17 should be replaced with \( \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} \) in Fig. 4.18. Table 4.2 shows the comparison between the analytical result in Fig. 4.17 and numerical experiments.

### 4.4.4.2 Implicit Scheme

The following Eq. 4.99 is a fully implicit finite difference equation for a general one dimensional problem and the Von Neumann analysis will be applied in the same way as in the explicit scheme.

\[
\frac{\phi_{i}^{n+1} - \phi_{i}^{n}}{\Delta t} + \frac{\phi_{i}^{n+1} - \phi_{i}^{n+1}}{\Delta x} = D \frac{\phi_{i+1}^{n+1} - 2\phi_{i}^{n+1} + \phi_{i-1}^{n+1}}{\Delta x^2}
\]

(4.99)

The stability condition is shown in Fig. 4.19 and Fig. 4.20, and it can be seen that the implicit scheme is unconditionally stable if the diffusion constant is greater than \(-\frac{1}{4} u\Delta x\).

\[
d_x \geq -\frac{1}{4} C_x
\]

(4.100)

For a general two dimensional problem, the stability condition is found to be the following.

\[
d_x \geq -\frac{1}{4} C_x
\]

(4.101)

\[
d_y \geq -\frac{1}{4} C_y
\]

(4.102)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_x$</th>
<th>Maximum Stable $C_x$</th>
<th>Von Neumann Analysis</th>
<th>Numerical Experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.333</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.333</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833.3</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8.333</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.167</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.629</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.083</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Comparison of the stability conditions in terms of the cell Reynolds number by Von Neumann analysis and numerical experiments in a two dimensional explicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term
Fig. 4.19. Stability condition in the plane \((C_x, d_x)\) for an implicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a one-dimensional problem.
Fig. 4.20. Stability condition in the plane \((R_x, C_x)\) for an implicit scheme with donor cell differencing of convection term in a one dimensional problem.
4.4.4.3 ADI Scheme

There are two possible formulations of the Alternate Direction Implicit (ADI) scheme given in Eq. 4.63. One of the formulations has both the x and y direction components in each step, treating them implicitly one by one at each fractional step and the other formulation has only the x or y direction component treated implicitly in each step.

The Von Neumann analysis of the first formulation in Eq. 4.63 gives the following stability condition.

\[
|\zeta|^2 = \frac{\{(1-\cos\theta_x)(\frac{C_x+d_x}{2})^2 + \frac{C_x}{2}\sin\theta_x]^2\{(1-\cos\theta_y)(\frac{C_y+d_y}{2})^2\}}{\{(1+(1-\cos\theta_x)(\frac{C_x+d_x}{2})^2 + \frac{C_x}{2}\sin\theta_x]^2\{(1+(1-\cos\theta_y)(\frac{C_y+d_y}{2})^2 + \frac{C_y}{2}\sin\theta_y)^2\}}
\]

(4.103)

\[
|\zeta| \leq 1
\]

In order for \(|\zeta|\) to be less than or equal to one, the following condition should be satisfied.

\[
d_x \geq -\frac{C_x}{2} - \frac{c}{4}
\]

(4.104)
The same condition should hold for the y-direction.

\[
d_y \geq -\frac{C_y}{2} - \frac{1}{4}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.105)

The stability condition of the second formulation in Eq. 4.63 can also be given by the Von Neumann analysis as follows.

\[
d_x \geq -\frac{C_x}{2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.106)

\[
d_y \geq -\frac{C_y}{2}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (4.107)

Therefore the second formulation of the ADI scheme in Eq. 4.63 has the same stability condition as the fully implicit scheme.
Some calculations are performed to validate the physical models and numerical schemes in the previous chapters. The physical models are tested in a natural convection problem and the numerical schemes are tested in a simple geometry to compare numerical solutions with exact solutions. Finally, the ADI scheme is explored to use a time step size larger than the Courant limit to save the overall computational time.

5.1 Natural Convection Results

The containment is modelled as a two dimensional rectangular compartment with an obstacle as a heat sink. Natural convection occurs due to the heat transfer between the obstacle and containment air. Updating of the reference state, energy convection and heat transfer models are considered and the resulting flow fields are given in Fig. 5.1 and Fig. 5.2.

5.1.1 Updating of the Reference State

The state of air is determined by any two independent properties. For example, density is determined by temperature and pressure. Since the natural convection of air occurs as a result of the buoyancy force due to density
Fig. 5.1. Natural convection flow field due to heat transfer between the obstacle and air in the containment at $t = 10.8$ sec
Fig. 5.2. Natural convection flow field due to heat transfer between the obstacle and air in the containment at $t = 62.5$ sec

- $h = 1.8537 \times 10^{-4}$ Btu/ft$^2$F sec
- $(c_p)_{ob} = 1.0$ Btu/lbm $^\circ$F
- $(M)_{ob} = 208.29$ lbm
- $A = 2$ ft$^2$
- $\tau_i = 677.4$ sec
- $\Delta T = 10^\circ$F
- $T_{air} = 68^\circ$F
- $T_{ob} = 58^\circ$F
gradients, temperature and pressure are equally important parameters in determining the flow field. The density change of liquid, however, depends primarily on the temperature, not on the pressure because of a high modulus of elasticity.

The equation of state of an ideal gas is given in the following.

\[
\rho_{\text{new}} = \frac{P_{\text{new}}}{RT_{\text{new}}} \tag{5.1}
\]

\[
P_{\text{new}} = \frac{P_{\text{old}}}{T_{\text{old}}} + \frac{Q_{\text{total}}}{c_v M_f,\text{total}}
\]

\[
T_{\text{new}} = T_{\text{old}} + \frac{Q_{\text{cell}}}{c_v M_f,\text{cell}}
\]

where

- \(\rho_{\text{old}}, \rho_{\text{new}}\): Density of the fluid at old and new time steps.
- \(P_{\text{old}}, P_{\text{new}}\): Pressure of the fluid at old and new time steps.
- \(T_{\text{old}}, T_{\text{new}}\): Temperature of the fluid at old and new time steps.
- \(c_v\): Specific heat of the fluid at constant volume.
\[ M_{f, cell}, \ M_{f, total} : \text{Mass of the fluid in one cell and in the total domain.} \]

\[ Q_{cell}, \ Q_{total} : \text{Heat input to the fluid in one cell and in the total domain.} \]

The VARR calculations [21] have shown that the magnitude of velocity can be affected by a factor two by updating the reference pressure at every time step.

### 5.1.2 Energy Convection

Another difference between liquid and gas is the ratio of the specific heats, \( k = \frac{c_p}{c_v} \). The value of \( k \) is 1.0 for liquid and 1.4 for air. Monatomic, diatomic and polyatomic gases have different values of \( k \). Therefore, the convection energy transfer should be in terms of enthalpy instead of internal energy. The energy convection will be underestimated by a factor of 1.4 when internal energy is used for enthalpy in air flow.

### 5.1.3 Heat Transfer Modelling

The heat transfer to the obstacle is modelled as a natural convection from a vertical surface. The Nusselt and Grashof numbers here are based on the axial length of one computational mesh, but they may also be based on the vertical height of the obstacle. An experimental correlation is given in Eq. 5.2 in terms of the dimensionless numbers.
\[ \text{Nu} = C(\text{Gr} \cdot \text{Pr})^n \quad (5.2) \]

\[ \text{Gr} = \frac{g \beta (\Delta T)L^3 \rho^2}{\mu^2} \quad (5.3) \]

\[ \text{Pr} = 0.708 \text{ (air)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \frac{\text{Gr} \cdot \text{Pr}}{} )</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 10^5 - 10^9 )</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( &gt; 10^9 )</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following data are used to calculate the heat transfer coefficient at the obstacle wall.

\[ L = 2 \text{ ft} \]
\[ \Delta T = 50^\circ \text{F} \]
\[ \rho = 0.0763 \text{ lbm/ft}^3 \]
\[ g = 32.2 \text{ ft/sec}^2 \]
\[ \mu = 1.2179 \times 10^{-5} \text{ lbm/ft \cdot sec} \]
\[ \beta = 1.923 \times 10^{-3} \]

Therefore,
\[ \text{Gr} = 9.7134 \times 10^8 \]
\[ \text{Nu} = 89.876 \]

The heat transfer coefficient is given as,
\[ h = 1.8537 \times 10^{-4} \text{ Btu/ft}^2 \cdot \text{F} \cdot \text{sec} \]

This may be a typical value for the natural convection heat transfer in the containment without any phase change.
The VARR input [21] requires the time constant of the heat transfer instead of the heat transfer coefficient.

\[ C_Q = c_{p,ob} \frac{1}{\tau} (T_f - T_{ob}) \]  

where \(-C_Q\) is the source term in the energy equation of fluid. The time constant, \(\tau\), can be obtained from heat balance between the obstacle and fluid as follows.

\[ \tau = \frac{(M c_p)_{ob} \rho_f}{h A \rho_{ob}} \]  

where

- \(M\) : Mass of one computational mesh.
- \(A\) : Heat transfer area between the obstacle and fluid over one computational mesh.
- \(\rho_f\) : Fluid density.
- \(\rho_{ob}\) : Obstacle density.
- \(c_p\) : Specific heat at constant pressure.
- \(h\) : Heat transfer coefficient between the fluid and obstacle.

Therefore,

\[ \tau = 677.4 \text{ sec.} \]

### 5.1.4 Turbulence Modelling

Laminar flow is assumed in obtaining the results in Fig. 5.1 and Fig. 5.2. If the flow is turbulent, the heat
transfer to the obstacle will be enhanced and the diffusion transport of momentum and energy will also be enhanced in the containment air.

5.2 Numerical Diffusion

The truncation and cross-flow diffusion errors are compared in a simple geometry where an analytical solution can be obtained. The skew differencing and corrective schemes are tested for various problems. Huh's formula is compared with De Vahl Davis and Mallinson's in predicting the magnitude of cross-flow diffusion. The corrective scheme is tested in recirculating flow problems for mesh point and mesh interface implementations.

5.2.1 Truncation Error and Cross-flow Diffusion

The truncation error diffusion is compared with the cross-flow diffusion in a two dimensional, steady-state problem in Fig. 5.3. The flow in Fig. 5.3(A) is parallel with the mesh orientation so that no cross-flow diffusion occurs. The results in Fig. 5.4 and Fig. 5.5 show that the numerical solutions is close to the analytical solution and the truncation error can be neglected. The flow in Fig. 5.3(B) is skewed at 45° to the mesh orientation and both truncation error and cross-flow diffusions are included in the solution error. Figure 5.6 and Fig. 5.7 show that excessive numerical diffusion has occurred due to the
Fig. 5.3. Problem geometry for the two cases, (A) parallel flow and (B) cross flow, for evaluation of numerical diffusion.
Fig. 5.4. Comparison of the analytic solution and numerical solution with donor cell differencing of convection term in 10x10 meshes along the line CD in Fig. 5.3(A)
Analytic solution

Numerical solution with Donor Cell

Fig. 5.5. Comparison of the analytic solution and numerical solution with donor cell differencing of convection term in 6x6 meshes along the line CD in Fig. 5.3(A)
Fig. 5.6. Comparison of the analytic solution, analytic solution with increased diffusion constant and numerical solution with donor cell differencing of convection term in 10x10 meshes along the line CA in Fig. 5.3(B)
Fig. 5.7. Comparison of the analytic solution, analytic solution with increased diffusion constant and numerical solution with donor cell differencing of convection term in 6x6 meshes along the line CA in Fig. 5.3(B)
cross-flow diffusion. Figure 5.4 and Fig. 5.6 are for 10 x 10 meshes and Fig. 5.5 and Fig. 5.7 are for 6 x 6 meshes. It is seen that a finer mesh gives a better solution. Since the cross-flow diffusion constant is proportional to the mesh spacing, more diffusion has occurred in Fig. 5.7 than in Fig. 5.6.

5.2.2 Validation of Huh's Correction Formula

The cross-flow diffusion can be predicted by Huh's formula, Eq. 4.53 and Eq. 4.54. Since the corrective scheme is based on the validity of those correction formulas, it is necessary to test them for various cases.

Figure 5.6 and Fig. 5.7 show that the numerical solution can be reproduced by the analytical solution with increased diffusion constants by the amount given by Huh's formula. De Vahl Davis and Mallinson's and Huh's formulas give the same cross-flow diffusion constants for the case, $\theta = \theta_1 = 45^\circ$. The problem geometry in Fig. 5.8 has the arbitrary angles of $\theta$ and $\theta_1$ such that $\theta = 60^\circ$ and $\theta_1 = 76.81^\circ$. Figure 5.9 is the result by Huh's formula and Fig. 5.10 by De Vahl Davis and Mallinson's for the problem in Fig. 5.8. It can be seen that the former result is much better than the latter.

5.2.3 Skew Differencing Scheme

Two skew differencing schemes, Raithby's and Huh's, are tested in Fig. 5.11 and Fig. 5.12 for a simple pure
Fig. 5.8. Problem geometry with arbitrary angles of $\theta$ and $\theta_1$ to compare De Vahl Davis and Mallinson's and Huh's formulas for prediction of cross-flow diffusion constant.

\[\alpha = 1.0\]
\[\Delta x = 0.2406\]
\[\Delta y = 1.0267\]
\[\theta_1 = 76.81^\circ\]
\[u = 5.0\]
\[v = 8.6603\]
\[\theta = 60^\circ\]
\[D_{DM} = 0.7674\]
\[D_{Huh} = 3.335\]
Analytic solution with $D+D_{Cf}$

Numerical solution with Donor Cell

Fig. 5.9. Comparision of the numerical solution with donor cell differencing of convection term and analytic solution with increased diffusion constant, $(D+D_{Cf})$, by Huh's formula along the line BD in Fig. 5.8
Analytic solution with $D+D_{DM}$

Numerical solution with Donor Cell

Fig. 5.10. Comparison of the numerical solution donor cell differencing of convection term and analytic solution with increased diffusion constant, $(D+D_{DM})$, by De Vahl Davis and Mallinson's formula along the line BD in Fig. 5.8
Fig. 5.11. Comparison of the true solution and solutions by donor cell scheme, skew differencing scheme by Raithby and skew differencing scheme by Huh in a pure convection problem with $\theta = 45^\circ$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor cell</th>
<th>Skew differencing by Raithby</th>
<th>Skew differencing by Huh (True solution)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93.75 81.25 65.63 50</td>
<td>100 100 100 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.5 68.75 50 34.38</td>
<td>100 100 50 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 50 31.25 18.75</td>
<td>100 100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 25 12.5 6.25</td>
<td>100 50 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>50 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\theta = 45^\circ$
**Fig. 5.12.** Comparison of the true solution and solutions by donor cell scheme, skew differencing scheme by Raithby and skew differencing scheme by Huh in a pure convection problem with $\theta = 63.43^\circ$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donor cell</th>
<th>Skew differencing by Raithby</th>
<th>Skew differencing by Huh</th>
<th>True solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80.25 53.91 31.96 17.33</td>
<td>96.91 71.43 7.47 -23.15</td>
<td>90.61 59.38 21.88 3.13</td>
<td>100 50 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>70.37 40.74 20.99 10.01</td>
<td>90.74 38.89 -22.83 6.50</td>
<td>81.25 37.50 6.25 0</td>
<td>100 25 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>55.56 25.93 11.11 4.52</td>
<td>72.22 -9.25 -1.86 2.26</td>
<td>62.5 12.5 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.33 11.11 3.70 1.23</td>
<td>16.67 -5.56 1.85 -0.62</td>
<td>25 0 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- To analyze the accuracy of the schemes, compare the values in the table for each scheme with the true solution.
- The true solution is shown in the rightmost column, indicating the expected values for comparison.
- The skew differencing schemes (by Raithby and Huh) are shown in the middle columns, illustrating their performance in approximating the true solution.
- The donor cell scheme is shown in the leftmost column, providing a baseline for comparison.

**Analysis:**
- The skew differencing scheme by Raithby appears to provide a closer approximation to the true solution compared to the donor cell scheme, with smaller discrepancies in the values shown.
- The skew differencing scheme by Huh also shows improved accuracy over the donor cell scheme, with deviations from the true solution being relatively small.
- The true solution column serves as a benchmark for evaluating the accuracy and consistency of the numerical methods used in the schemes.
convection problem. The details of those schemes are given in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. Figure 5.11 has a flow at a 45° angle with respect to the mesh orientation and shows that the donor cell scheme introduces appreciable cross-flow diffusion while Raithby's and Huh's skew differencing schemes give the true solution. Fig. 5.12 has a flow at a 63.43° angle and neither Raithby's nor Huh's scheme can reproduce the true solution. It is indicated that Raithby's scheme may give unphysical results in problems with steep gradients of the quantity under consideration. Some cross-flow diffusion has occurred in Huh's scheme, but less than in the donor cell scheme.

Figure 5.13 and Fig. 5.14 show that the analytical solution can be reproduced by Huh's skew differencing scheme for the case, $\theta = \theta_\perp = 45°$. Raithby's scheme is an Eulerian method while Huh's scheme is Lagrangian. Therefore, the former is conservative while the latter is not. However, both of them are conservative in a uni-directional flow.

5.2.4 Corrective Scheme

The prediction formulas of the cross-flow diffusion constants are validated by showing that the numerical solution can be reproduced by the analytical solution with the appropriately increased diffusion constant. The purpose of the corrective scheme is, however, to obtain the true solution by subtracting the additional cross-flow diffusion
Fig. 5.13. Comparison of the analytic solution and numerical solutions by donor cell scheme and skew differencing scheme by Huh for 10x10 meshes along the line CA in Fig. 5.3(B)
Analytic solution
-----
Numerical solution with Donor Cell
_____ Skew differencing scheme by Huh

Fig. 5.14. Comparison of the analytic solution and numerical solutions by donor cell scheme and skew differencing scheme by Huh for 6x6 meshes along the line CA in Fig. 5.3(B)
constant from the total diffusion constant of the finite difference equation.

In Fig. 5.15 numerical solutions are given for a simple pure convection problem with various diffusion corrections. The flow is at a 45° angle with respect to the mesh orientation. The full correction of the cross-flow diffusion gives the true solution without any numerical diffusion error. Fig. 5.16 has a flow with \( \theta = 63.43^\circ \). The corrective scheme gives a physically reasonable solution, although not identical to the true solution.

The corrective scheme is also tested in the problem geometry of Fig. 5.3(B). Figure 5.17 and Fig. 5.18 show that the cross-flow diffusion can be eliminated by the corrective scheme and that a finer mesh spacing always gives a better solution.

Two implementation strategies of the corrective scheme, mesh point and mesh interface, are introduced in Chapter 4. Both of them are tested in a recirculating flow problem with pure convection. Figure 5.19 is a hypothetical 3 x 3 recirculating flow field where the inlet boundary values are specified on the left and bottom surfaces. Fig. 5.20 shows the diffusion corrections of the mesh point and mesh interface implementations at each interface. Figure 5.21 gives the true solution, donor cell solution and the solutions by mesh point and mesh interface implementations. The mesh point implementation gives an unphysical solution
Fig. 5.15. Donor cell solutions with various diffusion corrections for a pure convection problem with $\theta = 45^\circ$
Fig. 5.16. True solution and donor cell solutions with and without diffusion correction for a pure convection problem with $\theta = 63.43^\circ$
Fig. 5.17. Comparison of the analytic solution, numerical solution by donor cell scheme and numerical solution by corrective scheme for 10x10 meshes along the line CA in Fig. 5.3(B)
Fig. 5.18. Comparison of the analytic solution, numerical solution by donor cell scheme and numerical solution by corrective scheme for 6x6 meshes along the line CA in Fig. 5.3(B)
Fig. 5.19. Simple recirculating flow field for test of the implementation strategies of the corrective scheme
Fig. 5.20. Diffusion constant corrections at each interface for the mesh point and mesh interface implementations of the corrective for the recirculating flow field given in Fig. 5.19
Fig. 5.21. Comparison of the true solution, donor cell solution and solutions by the mesh point and mesh interface implementations of the corrective scheme for the recirculating flow field given in Fig. 5.19
while the mesh interface implementation gives a physically reasonable solution. The true solution cannot be reproduced because some of the information about the flow field has already been lost in Fig. 5.19.

Another test calculation is done for a two dimensional, rectangular containment with an arbitrary recirculating flow field. There was initially air in the containment and steam is introduced in the source mesh at the rate of 0.2 kg/sec. After a while a flow field is set up in the containment by the input mass and momentum of steam. This flow field is used here to test the mesh point and mesh interface implementations of the corrective scheme. Since the steam concentration distribution and flow field are given at the start of the calculation, the steam concentration for the new time step can be calculated in an explicit way. Figure 5.22 shows the flow field in the containment and more detailed information about the flow field is given in Fig. 5.23. The steam concentration distribution at the beginning is given in Fig. 5.24 in which the source mesh has the highest steam concentration. Figure 5.25 and Fig. 5.26 show the diffusion constant corrections of the mesh point and mesh interface implementations and Fig. 5.27 and Fig. 5.28 show the steam concentration distributions after one time step, 0.3 sec with the corrections in Fig. 5.25 and Fig. 5.26, respectively. The result in Fig. 5.28 is not a reasonable solution while the mesh interface implementation result in Fig. 5.27 is physically reasonable and even better
\[ \Delta x = 0.5 \text{m} \]
\[ \Delta y = 1.0 \text{m} \]

Fig. 5.22. Recirculating flow field for calculation of the steam concentration distribution in the two dimensional containment to test the mesh point and mesh interface implementations of the convective scheme.
velocity [m/sec]

\[ \Delta x = 0.5 \text{ m} \quad \Delta y = 1 \text{ m} \]

Fig. 5.23. Detailed flow field for calculation of the steam concentration distribution in the two dimensional containment to test the mesh point and mesh interface implementations of the corrective scheme.
Ax = 0.5m
Ay = 1m
steam concentration in [kg/m³]

Source: 0.2 kg/sec of steam

Fig. 5.24. Initial steam concentration distribution in the two dimensional containment to test the mesh point and mesh interface implementations of the corrective scheme
Fig. 5.25. Diffusion constant corrections of the mesh point implementation of the corrective scheme for calculation of the steam concentration distribution in the two dimensional containment

Δx = 0.5m
Δy = 1m
Diffusion constant in [m^2/sec]
Fig. 5.26. Diffusion constant corrections of the mesh interface implementation of the corrective scheme for calculation of the steam concentration distribution in the two dimensional containment.
\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
0.0947 & 0.1475 & 0.1733 & 0.1623 & 0.1243 \\
0.0735 & 0.1135 & 0.1711 & 0.1321 & 0.0833 \\
0.0448 & 0.1363 & 0.1706 & 0.0342 & 0.0465 \\
0.0233 & 0.0342 & 0.1847 & 0.0107 & 0.0195 \\
0.0068 & 0.0016 & 0.0003 & 0.0011 & 0.0046 \\
\end{array} \]

\( \Delta x = 0.5 \text{m} \)

\( \Delta y = 1 \text{m} \)

steam concentration in \([\text{kg/m}^3]\)

Source: 0.2 kg/sec of steam

**Fig. 5.27.** Steam concentration distribution after one time step, 0.3 sec, with donor cell differencing of convection term without any diffusion correction
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0.0937 & 0.1493 & 0.1747 & 0.1646 & 0.1240 \\
0.0709 & 0.1797 & 0.1729 & 0.1334 & 0.0815 \\
0.0433 & 0.1247 & 0.1911 & 0.0250 & 0.0465 \\
0.0229 & 0.0287 & 0.2086 & 0.0029 & 0.0355 \\
0.0068 & 0.0005 & -0.0092 & 0.0010 & 0.0042 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\Delta x = 0.5 \text{m}\]

\[\Delta y = 1 \text{m}\]

steam concentration in \([\text{kg/m}^3]\)

Source: 0.2 kg/sec of steam

Fig. 5.28. Steam concentration distribution after one time step, 0.3 sec, with mesh point implementation of the corrective scheme
\[ \Delta x = 0.5 \text{m} \]
\[ \Delta y = 1 \text{m} \]

steam concentration in \([\text{kg/m}^3]\) .

Source: 0.2 kg/sec of steam

Fig. 5.29. Steam concentration distribution after one time step, 0.3 sec, with mesh interface implementation of the corrective scheme
than the donor cell solution. In the meshes at the top of
the source mesh, the steam concentration should decrease
as the flow goes up to the ceiling because most of the
steam introduced in the source mesh goes upward and gets
distributed by convection and diffusion.

5.3 ADI Solution

The ADI scheme is tested to use a time step size
larger than the Courant limit. Although the Von Neumann
analysis shows that the ADI scheme is unconditionally
stable, it has the maximum time step size that can give
a physically reasonable solution. It is found that a wise
use of the ADI scheme can reduce the overall computation
time in comparison with the explicit and implicit schemes.

The results of the ADI and explicit schemes are com-
pared in the problem geometry of Fig. 5.30. In Fig. 5.30
there is an inflow from the bottom surface at the velocity
of \( v = 1.0 \) and the inlet boundary value of \( \phi \) is, \( \phi = 10.0 \).
There is a source of \( \phi \) on the right boundary over two compu-
tational meshes and the profile of \( \phi \) along the dotted line
is affected by that source. Figure 5.31 shows the profiles
of \( \phi \) along the dotted line for the time step size of 0.5 sec,
when the Courant limit is 1 sec. The ADI and explicit
schemes give almost identical results during all the transi-
tent. Figure 5.32 shows the profiles of \( \phi \) at the same loca-
tion for the time step size of 1 sec, which is exactly the
Fig. 5.30. Problem geometry for comparison of the explicit and ADI solution schemes

\[ v = 1.0 \]
\[ \alpha = 1.0 \]
\[ \Delta x = \Delta y = 1.0 \]
Fig. 5.31. Comparison of the explicit and ADI solutions for the profile of \( \phi \) along the line AB in Fig. 5.30 for \( \Delta t = 0.5 \) sec and the Courant limit of 1.0 sec.
Fig. 5.32. Comparison of the explicit and ADI solutions for the profile of $\phi$ along the line AB in Fig. 5.30 for $\Delta t=1.0$ sec and the Courant limit of 1.0 sec.
the Courant limit. Initially, there is some deviation between the two results, but it damps out rapidly and the ADI scheme gives almost identical results with the explicit scheme. No cross-flow diffusion corrections are involved in the results of Fig. 5.31, Fig. 5.32 and Fig. 5.33. Fig. 5.33 shows that the ADI scheme can use a time step size up to five times the Courant limit. The deviation for the time step size of 5 sec is expected to damp out as the calculation goes over to the next time steps because of the unconditional stability.
Fig. 5.33. Comparison of the ADI solutions for the profile of $\phi$ at $t=10.0$ sec along the line AB in Fig. 5.30 with different time step sizes.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Physical Models

(1) The solution scheme presented in Chapter 2 has been adequate for modelling the slow mixing stage in the containment after a loss-of-coolant accident. The continuity/momentum equations are decoupled from the scalar transport equations and solved by the SMAC scheme to obtain the flow field. The mass diffusion, energy, and turbulence equations are solved separately using that flow field. The thermal equilibrium is assumed and the phase change occurs to maintain 100% relative humidity, or superheated steam as may be appropriate.

(2) The models of laminar and turbulent diffusions in Chapter 3 may be adequate for predicting the hydrogen transport in the containment. The total diffusion constant is the sum of the laminar and turbulent diffusion constants.

6.2 Numerical Schemes

(1) There are two numerical diffusion sources, truncation error and cross-flow diffusion, in the finite difference donor cell treatment of convection. Cross-flow diffusion occurs due to the donor cell treatment of the convection term in a multi-dimensional problem. The
effective diffusion constants of the truncation error and cross-flow diffusion are of the same order of magnitude, \( u \Delta x \). The truncation error diffusion occurs in the flow direction while the cross-flow diffusion occurs in the diagonal direction of neighboring mesh points. The gradient of the scalar quantity under consideration is usually small in the flow direction in comparison with that in the direction normal to the flow. Therefore, most of the numerical diffusion error in a multi-dimensional, convection dominant, recirculating flow problem is due to the cross-flow diffusion.

(2) Two types of approaches, skew differencing and corrective schemes, have been tried in order to eliminate the numerical diffusion. The skew differencing scheme gives good results for some problems, but not always. It gives unphysical results for most recirculating flow and coarse mesh problems. The inclusion of corner points complicates the matrix structure and a fully implicit scheme should be used for maintenance of stability. The corrective scheme is based on the fact that the additional cross-flow diffusion can be predicted theoretically for every mesh at every time step. It is conservative and an explicit scheme can be used without affecting the simple solution structure. Therefore, the corrective scheme is generally preferred to the skew differencing scheme.
(3) Two implementation strategies, mesh point and mesh interface, are tried for the corrective scheme. They are identical in a unidirectional flow. The mesh interface implementation is always preferred to the mesh point implementation in a recirculating flow problem. The results of various sample problems show that the mesh interface implementation of the corrective scheme always gives a physically reasonable solution with negligible numerical diffusion error.

(4) The Von Neumann stability analysis is applied to various finite difference forms of a general conservation equation. The graphical method is used to obtain the stability condition in terms of the Courant, diffusion and cell Reynolds numbers, i.e., $C_x$, $d_x$ and $R_x$, using the characteristics of a quadratic equation. The results of numerical experiments are found to be consistent with the Von Neumann analysis.

(5) The maximum time step size is limited by the Courant condition in an explicit scheme. The Alternate Direction Implicit (ADI) scheme can be used to increase the time step size and decrease the overall computational effort. Although the Von Neumann analysis shows that the ADI scheme is unconditionally stable, it has its own limitations due to the following factors.

First, the physical constraint in section 4.4.2 imposes a maximum time step size that can give a physically
reasonable solution.

Second, the ADI scheme is a fractional step method. The asymmetry of the given problem may give different results according to the sweeping sequence. For example, a steady-state solution may never be reached due to the fact that one time step is composed of a few fractional steps.
CHAPTER 7
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

7.1 Physical Models

Since both the laminar and turbulent flow regimes are possible in a complicated geometry and flow field, it is necessary to predict the flow regime in order to use appropriate physical models. A criterion for the flow regime should be developed in such a form that it may be implemented into a computer code. The important parameters may be the velocity, geometry (e.g., distance from the wall), velocity gradient, previous time step information, time step size, etc.

The flow regime criterion may be replaced with a model that covers all the turbulent, transitional and laminar flow regimes. The model should show proper limiting behaviors as the Reynolds number goes to infinity (turbulent) and zero (laminar). The modified k-\( \varepsilon \) model in a low Reynolds number flow may be a guide in this approach.

7.2 Numerical Schemes

There have been two approaches, skew-differencing and corrective schemes, to eliminate the cross-flow diffusion. They may still be improved further to get an accurate solution in a transient, multi-dimensional recirculating flow problem.
Corrective scheme

The corrective scheme has been successful by the mesh interface implementation strategy in the scope of this work. More tests and validation calculations are required in recirculating flow problems.

Skew differencing scheme

1. The conservative form of the skew differencing scheme is complicated and time consuming in comparison with the corrective scheme. It may be possible to develop a reasonably simple form that may or may not include the corner points. The solution in Appendix A may be a useful guide in this work.

2. The stability of the skew-differencing scheme is open to question in the explicit, ADI and implicit schemes although only the implicit scheme has been used up to now.
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APPENDIX A

ANALYTICAL SOLUTION FOR THE PROBLEM IN FIGURE 5.3(B)

A steady state two dimensional energy conservation equation without any source is given in the following Eq. A.1.

\[ \rho c_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} = k \left( \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial y^2} \right) \]  

(A.1)

In Eq. A.1 convection occurs in the x direction and diffusion occurs in both x and y directions. The boundary conditions are specified in Fig. 5.3(B) and the constants can be grouped into one constant, c, as follows.

\[ \alpha = \frac{k}{\rho c_p} \]

\[ c = \frac{u}{2\alpha} \]

Therefore, Eq. A.1 is reduced to the following form.

\[ 2c \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial y^2} \]  

(A.2)

Equation A.2 is simplified further by substitution of \( \phi \) for \( T \) as follows.

\[ \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y^2} = c^2 \phi \]  

(A.3)
where

$$\phi = e^{-cX_T}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.4)

The boundary conditions should also be expressed in terms of \( \phi \) as given in Fig. A.1.

Equation A.3 can be solved by the method of separation of variables. The variable \( \phi \) is separated into two variables, \( X \) and \( Y \), which are functions of \( x \) and \( y \) only respectively.

$$\phi(x,y) = X(x)Y(y)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.5)

Then Eq. A.3 is reduced to the following form.

$$\frac{1}{X} \frac{d^2X}{dx^2} + \frac{1}{Y} \frac{d^2Y}{dy^2} = c^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.6)

The two terms on the left hand side of Eq. A.6 should be equal to some constants because they are functions of \( x \) and \( y \) only respectively and the sum of them is equal to a constant, \( c^2 \).

$$\frac{1}{X} \frac{d^2X}{dx^2} = \alpha^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.7)

$$\frac{1}{Y} \frac{d^2Y}{dy^2} = c^2 - \alpha^2 = -\beta^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.8)

where \( \alpha > c > 0 \).
Fig. A.1. Boundary conditions in terms of $\phi$ for the problem in Fig. 5.3(B) where $\phi$ is given by,

$$\phi = e^{-cx} T$$
The solutions to Eq. A.7 and Eq. A.8 can be easily obtained as follows.

\[ X = C_1 e^{ax} + C_2 e^{-ax} \]  
(A.9)

\[ Y = C_3 \sin \beta y + C_4 \cos \beta y \]  
(A.10)

The boundary conditions in Fig. A.1 may be given in terms of the variables X and Y as follows. The boundary condition at \( x=0 \) will be considered later.

\[ \frac{dY}{dy} \bigg|_{y=0} = 0 \]  
(A.11)

\[ \frac{dY}{dy} \bigg|_{y=y_0} = 0 \]  
(A.12)

\[ \frac{dX}{dx} - cX \bigg|_{x=x_0} = 0 \]  
(A.13)

In order to satisfy the boundary conditions given in Eq. A.11, Eq. A.12 and Eq. 13, the constants in Eq. A.9 and Eq. A.10 should satisfy the following relations.

\[ C_3 = 0 \]  
(A.14)

\[ \delta_{n} y_{0} = n \pi \]  
(A.15)

\[ \frac{C_2}{C_1} = \left( \frac{a_n + c}{a_n - c} \right) e^{2a_n x_0} \quad (a_n \neq c) \]  
(A.16)
where
\[ \alpha_n^2 = c^2 + \left( \frac{n\pi}{y_0} \right)^2 \]
\[ = c^2 + \beta_n^2. \]

Therefore, the final solution can be expressed as follows.

\[ \phi = A_0 e^{-\alpha_n x} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \left[ e^{-\alpha_n x} + \frac{\alpha_n + c}{\alpha_n - c} e^{-\frac{2\alpha_n x_0}{\alpha_n - c}} \right] \cos \beta_n y \]

(A.17)

\[ T(x,y) = e^{c x} \phi(x,y) \]

(A.18)

where\[ \beta_n = \frac{n\pi}{y_0} \]
\[ \alpha_n = \sqrt{c^2 + \beta_n^2} \]

Since the boundary condition at \( x=0 \) should also be satisfied, the constants \( A_i \) are determined as follows.

\[ A_0 = \frac{T_h}{2.0} \]

\[ A_n = \frac{-2T_h}{n\pi} \frac{1}{\alpha_n + c} \frac{2\alpha_n x_0}{\alpha_n - c} \sin \frac{n\pi}{2} \quad (n=1,2,3 \ldots) \]

(A.19)
APPENDIX B

ADI SCHEME FOR MOMENTUM EQUATION

The ADI scheme can replace the explicit scheme in the momentum equation in order to eliminate the Courant condition for the time step size. When the tilde phase of the SMAC scheme and other scalar transport equations are solved by the ADI scheme, the computational effort for one time step is greater than that of the explicit scheme. Therefore, the time step size in the ADI should be at least two or three times the Courant limit in order to have a gain in the overall computational efforts required for a problem. The time step size limitation in the ADI scheme comes from the semi-implicit treatment of the non-linear convection term. Since there are two steps involved in solving the momentum equation in each direction, there are six sweeps in a three dimensional problem and four sweeps in a two dimensional problem. The sequence of the sweeps is arbitrary and depends on the problem under consideration. The most important sweep should be given the first priority and most updated information.

The ADI scheme is applied to a two dimensional momentum equation in the following Eq. B.1-Eq. B.4. They are formulated for a natural convection problem where the gravity acts in the z-direction. Equations B.1 and B.3 are the z and x direction sweeps of the x direction momentum
equation. Equations B.2 and B.4 are the x and z direction sweeps of the z-direction momentum equation. The z direction sweep of the z direction momentum equation is treated as the last one in order to be given the most updated information.

\[
\frac{u_{i+k,j}^* - u_{i+k,j}^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{w_{i+k,j+1}^n - w_{i+k,j-1}^*}{\Delta z} = v \frac{u_{i+k,j+1}^* - 2u_{i+k,j}^* + u_{i+k,j-1}^*}{\Delta z^2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial X}{\partial x} w_{i+k,j+1} u_{i+k,j+1} u_{i+k,j} \tag{B.1}
\]

\[
\frac{w_{i,j+k}^* - w_{i,j+k}^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{u_{i+k,j}^* + w_{i,j+k}^* - u_{i-k,j}^* + w_{i-j+k}^*}{\Delta x} = v \frac{w_{i,j+k}^* - 2w_{i,j+k}^* + w_{i-j+k}^*}{\Delta x^2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial Z}{\partial z} w_{i,j+k} w_{i-j+k} \tag{B.2}
\]

\[
\frac{u_{i+1,j}^{n+1} - u_{i+1,j}^*}{\Delta t} + \frac{u_{i+1,j}^* u_{i+1,j}^{n+1} - u_{i,j}^* u_{i+1,j}^{n+1}}{\Delta x} = v \frac{u_{i+1,j}^{n+1} - 2u_{i+1,j}^* + u_{i-1,j}^{n+1}}{\Delta x^2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial X}{\partial x} u_{i+1,j}^* u_{i+1,j} u_{i+1,j} \tag{B.3}
\]
Equations B.1, B.2, B.3, and B.4 have given almost identical results with the explicit scheme for a time step size below the Courant limit.
APPENDIX C
COMPUTER PROGRAMS

The files, 'progl fortran', 'prog2 fortran' and 'prog3 fortran', are the computer programs for calculating the numerical values of the analytical solution in the problem geometries, Fig. 5.3(A), Fig. 5.3(B) and Fig. 5.8.

The file, 'difprg fortran', is the program for testing the calculational logic of the mesh interface implementation of the corrective scheme in section 4.3.4.2. There are two different cases treated separately. When there are inflow and outflow, or all inflows in x, y and z direction mesh interfaces, the cross-flow diffusion constants can be calculated in a simple way as in the first part of the program. When there are two outflows in any of the x, y and z directions, a flow split occurs as shown in Fig. 4.8. In the second part of the program the flow split is considered such that every outflow velocity is partitioned into four components in a three dimensional case in proportion to the velocities of the four neighboring surfaces in contact with the surface under consideration. All the inflow velocities are assumed to be zero. The component velocities are used to calculate the cross-flow diffusion constants for eight subspaces in a three dimensional coordinate space. Then four cross-flow diffusion constants at every interface are summed up to give a total cross-flow diffusion constant.
because one axis direction, the positive x direction, has four neighboring subspaces. The total cross-flow diffusion constant can be calculated in the same way for every mesh interface.

The subroutine 'tdm' solves tridiagonal matrix problems by forward and backward sweeps. It is used to solve a one dimensional implicit finite difference equation in the ADI scheme.

A portion of the VARR program is introduced to show how the ADI scheme is implemented in the energy and momentum equations. The ADI scheme for the momentum equation is given in Appendix B.
IMPLICIT REAL*0 (A-H,O-Z)
DIMENSION T(10)

READ(10,11) DX,NX,NY,TH,U,ALP
11 FORMAT(F7.2,215,3F7.2)
PI = 3.1415926536
C = U/(2.0*ALP)
C50 = C*C
X0 = NX+DX
YO = NY+DX
YS0 = PI+PI/(YO*YO)
CCOFF = 2.0+TH/P1
HPI = PI/2.0

DO 10 JJ=1,NY
SUM = 0.0

DO 20 IP=1,26
II = IP - 1
ALN = DSRT(C50+II*II+YS0)
IF (II.EQ.0) GO TO 55
ALNX = (ALN+C)*DEXP(C*XO)/(ALN-C)
COF = CCOFF/II
AAN = -COF*DSIN(II*HPI)/(1.4*ALNX)
ATOT = AAN*2.0+ALN*DEXP(ALN+XO)/(ALN-C)
GO TO 44
55 ATOT = TH*DEXP(-ALN*XO)/2.0
44 YY = II+PI*(JJ-0.5)/NY
ADD = ATOT+DCOS(YY)
SUM = SUM + ADD
CONTINUE

T(JJ) = SUM + DEXP(C*XO)
CONTINUE

WRITE(G,100) (T(I),I=1,NY)
100 FORMAT(IOX,5F11.3)
STOP
END
IMPLICIT REAL*8 (A-H,O-Z)
DIMENSION TH(10), TL(10), GH(10), GL(10), TC(10)

C
READ(10,11) DX, NX, NY, THH, U, ALP
11 FORMAT(F7.2,215,3F7.2)
P1 = 3.1415926536
C = U/(2.0*ALP)
CSO = C*C
XO = DX+NX
YD = DX+NY
YSO = P1+PI/(YO+YO)
CCOFF = 2.0*THH/P1
HP1 = P1/2.0
NY2 = NY/2.0
XXX = 2.0
RTO = DSORT(XXX)
C
DO 10 JJ=1,NY2
SUMO = 0.0
SUM1 = 0.0
SUM2 = 0.0
SUM3 = 0.0
SUM4 = 0.0
SUM5 = 0.0
SUM6 = 0.0
SUM7 = 0.0
SUM8 = 0.0
SUM9 = 0.0
SUM10 = 0.0
10 SUMO = SUMO + X
SUM1 = SUM1 + Y
SUM2 = SUM2 + Z
SUM3 = SUM3 + W
SUM4 = SUM4 + V
SUM5 = SUM5 + U
SUM6 = SUM6 + T
SUM7 = SUM7 + S
SUM8 = SUM8 + R
SUM9 = SUM9 + Q
SUM10 = SUM10 + P
C
DO 20 IP=1,21
II = IP - 1
ALN = DSORT(CSO + II*II+YSO)
EXALO = DEXP(ALN*YO+0.5)
XALO = DEXP(-ALN*YO+0.5)
EKAL = DEXP(ALN*X)
XL = DEXP(-ALN)*X
EXALN = DEXP(ALN+XN)
XALN = DEXP(-ALN+XN)
IF(II.F0.0) GO TO 55
ALNX = (ALN+C)*DEXP(2.0*ALN+XO)/(ALN-C)
C0F = CC0FF/11
AAN = -C0F*DSIN(11*HP1)/(1.+ALNX)
BEN = II*PI/YO
YOO = DCOS(BEN+YC)
YII = DCOS(BEN+Y1)
Y22 = DCOS(BEN+Y2)
Y3C = DCOS(BEN+Y3)
Y3S = DSIN(BEN+Y3)
Y4C = DCOS(BEN+Y4)
Y4S = DSIN(BEN+Y4)
ADDO = AAN*(EXALO + ALNX*XAL0)*YO0
ADD1 = AAN*(EXAL+ALNX*XAL)*Y1
ADD2 = AAN*(EXAL+ALNX*XAL)*Y2
ADD3X = AAN*((C+ALN) + EXALN + ALNX*(C-ALN)*XALN)*Y3C
ADD3Y = BEN*AAN*(EXALN + ALNX*XALN)*Y3S
ADD4X = AAN*((C+ALN) + EXALN + ALNX*(C-ALN)*XALN)*Y4C
ADD4Y = -BEN*AAN*(EXALN + ALNX*XALN)*Y4S
GO TO 77
55 ADD1 = TIIH*XAL*0.5
ADD0 = TIIH*XAL*0.5
ADD2 = TIIH*XAL*0.5
ADD3Y = 0.0
ADD4X = 0.0
ADD4Y = 0.0
77 SUM1 = SUM1 + ADD1
SUM0 = SUM0 + ADD0
SUM2 = SUM2 + ADD2
SUM3X = SUM3X + ADD3X
SUM3Y = SUM3Y + ADD3Y
SUM4X = SUM4X + ADD4X
SUM4Y = SUM4Y + ADD4Y
20 CONTINUE
C
TC(JJ) = SUM0*DEXP(C*X0+0.5)
TH(JJ) = SUM1*DEXP(C*X)
TL(JJ) = SUM2*DEXP(C*X)
GH(JJ) = (SUM3X+SUM3Y)*DEXP(C*XN)/RTO
GL(JJ) = (SUM4X+SUM4Y)*DEXP(C*XN)/RTO
10 CONTINUE
C
WRITE(6,100) (TC(I),I=1,NY2)
WRITE(6,100) (TH(I),I=1,NY2)
WRITE(6,100) (TL(I),I=1,NY2)
WRITE(6,100) (GH(I),I=1,NY2)
WRITE(6,100) (GL(I),I=1,NY2)
100 FORMAT(10X,5F11.3)
STOP
END
IMPLICIT REAL*B (A-H,O-Z)
DIMENSION TI(10), TL(10), GI(10), GL(10), TC(10)
C
READ(IO,11) DX, NX, NY, THI, U, ALP
11 FORMAT(F7.2,215,3F7.2)
P1 = 0.1415926536
C = U/(2.0*ALP)
CSO = C*C
XO = DX*NX
YO = DX*NY
YSO = PI*PI/(YO*YO)
CCOFF = 2.0*THI/P1
HI1 = P1/2.0
NY2 = NY/2.0
RT1 = SOHT(2.0)
RT3 = SOHT(3.0)
C
DO 10 JJ=1,NY2
SUMO = 0.0
SUM1 = 0.0
SUM2 = 0.0
SUM3X = 0.0
SUM3Y = 0.0
SUM4X = 0.0
SUM4Y = 0.0
XC=YO/(2.0*RT3)+(JJ-0.5)*(XO-YO/RT3)/NY2
YC=(JJ-0.5)*YO/(2.0+XO/RT3)/NY2
XI=(JJ-0.5)*YO/(2.0+XO/RT3)/NY2
YI=(JJ-0.5)*(XO/RT3-YO/6.0)/NY2
X2=(JJ-0.5)*(XO-YO/(2.0+XO/RT3))/NY2
Y2=(JJ-0.5)*(XO/RT3-YO/6.0)/NY2
X3=YO/(2.0+RT3)+(JJ-0.5)*(XO-YO/(2.0+RT3))/NY2
Y3=(JJ-0.5)*YO/(2.0+XO/RT3)/NY2
X4=YO/(2.0+RT3)+(JJ-0.5)*(XO-YO/(2.0+RT3))/NY2
Y4=(JJ-0.5)*YO/(2.0+XO/RT3)/NY2
C
DO 20 IP=1,22
II = IP - 1
ALN = DSORT(CSO + II+II*YSO)
IF(II.EQ.0) GO TO 55
ALNX = (ALN*CI)*DEXP(2.0*ALN*XO)/(ALN-C)
COF = CCOFF/II
AAN = -COF*DSIN(II+HI1)/(1.+ALNX)
BEN = II+PI/YO
YOQ = DCOS(BEN+YC)
Y11 = DCOS(BEN+Y1)
Y22 = DCOS(BEN+Y2)
Y33 = DCOS(BEN+Y3)
Y3S = DSIN(BEN+Y3)
Y4C = DCOS(BEN+Y4)
Y4S = DSIN(BEN+Y4)
ADD0=AAN+(DEXP(ALN+XC)+ALNX*DEXP(-ALN+XC))*YOO
ADD1=AAN+(DEXP(ALN+X1)+ALNX*DEXP(-ALN+X1))*Y11
ADD2=AAN+(DEXP(ALN+X2)+ALNX*DEXP(-ALN+X2))*Y22
ADD3=AAN+(C+ALN)*DEXP(ALN+X3)+ALNX*(C-ALN)*DEXP(-ALN+X3))*Y3C
...
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ADD3Y = BEN + AAN + DEXP(ALN + X3) + ALNX + DEXP(-ALN + X3) * Y3
ADD4X = AAN + (C + ALN) + DEXP(ALN + X4) + ALN + (C - ALN) + DEXP(-ALN + X4) * Y4
ADD4Y = BEN + AAN + DEXP(ALN + X4) + ALNX + DEXP(-ALN + X4) * Y4
GO TO 77
55 ADDO = THI + DEXP(-ALN + X0) * 0.5
ADD1 = THI + DEXP(-ALN + X1) * 0.5
ADD2 = THI + DEXP(-ALN + X2) * 0.5
ADD3X = 0.0
ADD3Y = 0.0
ADD4X = 0.0
ADD4Y = 0.0
77 SUM1 = SUM1 + ADD1
SUM0 = SUM0 + ADD0
SUM2 = SUM2 + ADD2
SUM3X = SUM3X + ADD3X
SUM3Y = SUM3Y + ADD3Y
SUM4X = SUM4X + ADD4X
SUM4Y = SUM4Y + ADD4Y
20 CONTINUE
C
TC(JJ) = SUM0 + DEXP(C * X0)
TH(JJ) = SUM1 + DEXP(C * X1)
TL(JJ) = SUM2 + DEXP(C * X2)
GL(JJ) = (SUM3X * 0.5 + SUM3Y + 0.5 * RT3) + DEXP(C * X3)
GH(JJ) = (SUM4X * 0.5 + RT3 + SUM4Y * 0.5) + DEXP(C * X4)
10 CONTINUE
C
WRITE(6, 100) (TC(I), I = 1, NY2)
WRITE(6, 100) (TH(I), I = 1, NY2)
WRITE(6, 100) (TL(I), I = 1, NY2)
WRITE(6, 100) (GH(I), I = 1, NY2)
WRITE(6, 100) (GL(I), I = 1, NY2)
100 FORMAT(10X, 5F11.3)
STOP
END
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DIMENSION VELX(0), VELZ(0), VELT(0), DIFRA(0), DIFZA(0), DIFTA(0)
C
READ(10,5) DELR, DELZ, DELTI, UM, UP, VM, VP, WM, WP
C
IS1 = 0
IS2 = 0
IS3 = 0
IS4 = 0
IS5 = 0
IS6 = 0
C
RFGR1 = 0.0
RFGR = 0.0
RFGT1 = 0.0
RFGT = 0.0
QMT = 0.0
C
IF(UM.LT.0.0) IS1 = 1
IF(UP.GT.0.0) IS2 = 1
IF(VM.LT.0.0) IS3 = 1
IF(VP.GT.0.0) IS4 = 1
IF(WM.LT.0.0) IS5 = 1
IF(WP.GT.0.0) IS6 = 1
C
ISA = IS1 + IS2
ISB = IS3 + IS4
ISC = IS5 + IS6
C
UI = -0.5*( UM - ABS(UM) )
U2 = 0.5*( UP + ABS(UP) )
VI = -0.5*( VM - ABS(VM) )
V2 = 0.5*( VP + ABS(VP) )
WI = -0.5*( WM - ABS(WM) )
W2 = 0.5*( WP + ABS(WP) )
C
IF( ISA.EQ.2 OR ISB.EQ.2 OR ISC.EQ.2) GO TO 80
UU = UI + U2
VV = VI + V2
WW = WI + W2
PPX = UU/DELR
PPZ = VV/DELTZ
PPT = WW/DELTII
PSUM = PPX + PPZ + PPT
IF( PSUM.EQ.0.0 ) GO TO 500
C
DIFR = UU+DELR*( PPZ + PPT )/PSUM
DIFZ = VV+DELTZ*( PPX + PPT )/PSUM
DIFT = WW+DELTII*( PPX + PPZ )/PSUM
C
RFGR1 = DIFR*IS1
RFGR = DIFR*IS2
RFGT1 = DIFZ*IS3
RFGT = DIFZ*IS4
RFGT = DIFZ*IS4
FILE: DIFPRG FORTRAN A
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OMT = DIFT ISG
GO TO 999

C

00 PFX = 0.0
PFZ = 0.0
PFT = 0.0
IF((U1+U2).NE.0.0) PFX = U1/(U1+U2)
IF((V1+V2).NE.0.0) PFZ = V1/(V1+V2)
IF((W1+W2).NE.0.0) PFT = W1/(W1+W2)

C

VELX(1) = U1*PFZ*PFT
VELX(2) = U1*(1.0-PFZ)*PFT
VELX(3) = U1*(1.0-PFZ)*PFT
VELX(4) = U1*PFZ*(1.0-PFT)
VELX(5) = U2*PFZ*PFT
VELX(6) = U2*(1.0-PFZ)*PFT
VELX(7) = U2*(1.0-PFZ)*PFT
VELX(8) = U2*PFZ*(1.0-PFT)

C

VELZ(1) = V1*PFX*PFT
VELZ(2) = V2*PFX*PFT
VELZ(3) = V2*PFX*(1.0-PFT)
VELZ(4) = V1*PFX*(1.0-PFT)
VELZ(5) = V1*(1.0-PFX)*PFT
VELZ(6) = V1*(1.0-PFX)*PFT
VELZ(7) = V2*(1.0-PFX)*(1.0-PFT)
VELZ(8) = V1*(1.0-PFX)*(1.0-PFT)

C

VELT(1) = W1*PFX*PFZ
VELT(2) = W1*PFX*(1.0-PFZ)
VELT(3) = W2*PFX*(1.0-PFZ)
VELT(4) = W2*PFX*PFZ
VELT(5) = W1*(1.0-PFX)*PFZ
VELT(6) = W1*(1.0-PFX)*PFZ
VELT(7) = W2*(1.0-PFX)*(1.0-PFZ)
VELT(8) = W2*(1.0-PFX)*(1.0-PFZ)

C

DO 38 I=1,8
PPX = VELX(I)/DELR
PPZ = VELZ(I)/DELZ
PPT = VELT(I)/DELT H
PSUM = PPX + PPZ + PPT
IF(PSUM.EQ.0.0) GO TO 600
DIFRA(I) = VELX(I)*DELR*(PPZ + PPT)/PSUM
DIFZA(I) = VELZ(I)*DELTZ*(PPX + PPT)/PSUM
DIFTA(I) = VELT(I)*DELT H*(PPX + PPZ)/PSUM
GO TO 38

600 DIFRA(I) = 0.0
DIFZA(I) = 0.0
DIFTA(I) = 0.0
38 CONTINUE

C

RFGR = DIFRA(1) + DIFRA(2) + DIFRA(3) + DIFRA(4)
RFGT = DIFZA(2) + DIFZA(3) + DIFZA(6) + DIFZA(7)
RFGR = DIFT A(5) + DIFRA(6) + DIFRA(7) + DIFRA(8)

C
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C

RFGT = DIFZA(1) + DIFZA(4) + DIFZA(5) + DIFZA(8)
OMT1 = DIFTA(3) + DIFTA(4) + DIFTA(7) + DIFTA(8)
OMT = DIFTA(1) + DIFTA(2) + DIFTA(5) + DIFTA(6)

999 WRITE(6,6) RFGR1,RFGR,RFGT1,RFGT,OMT1,OMT
   GO TO 200
500 WRITE(6,7)
   5 FORMAT(9F5.2)
   6 FORMAT(3X,2F5.2)
   7 FORMAT(3X,20X,5HSORRY)
200 STOP
END
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SUBROUTINE TD(M(A,B,C,D,X,N)
IMPLICIT REAL*8 (A-H,O-Z)
DIMENSION A(N),B(N),C(N),D(N),X(N),P(400),Q(400)
C
X(1) = D(1)
O(1) = B(1)
NM1 = N - 1
DO 2 I = 1,NM1
P(I+1) = A(I+1)/O(I)
O(I+1) = B(I+1) - P(I+1)*C(I)
2 X(I+1) = O(I+1) - P(I+1)*X(I)
C
X(N) = X(N)/O(N)
DO 3 I = 1,NM1
K = N - I
3 X(K) = (X(K) - X(K+1)*C(K))/O(K)
RETURN
END
NOTE. U AND V TILDE VELOCITY EQUATIONS SECTION

IF(ICAL.EQ.1) GO TO 49998

ADI SOLUTION FOR S.E. ICOLVE.4

1ST SWEET IN X-DIRECTION

IKBR = 1BR*KBR
I1 = 2
I2 = IEP1
K1 = 2
K2 = KEP1

C CROSS-FLOW DIFFUSION CONSTANT CALCULATION

DO 40000 K = 1, KEP2
DO 40000 K = 1, KEP2
IF(K.EQ.1) GO TO 40001
IF(K.EQ.KEP2) GO TO 40002
LUG = ABS(U(IK))
LUG = ABS(V(IK))
GO TO 40005

40001 LUG = ABS(U(IK))
LUG = ABS(V(IK))
GO TO 40005

40002 LUG = ABS(U(IKK))
LUG = ABS(V(IKK))
GO TO 40005

40005 FM = 1.E-10
IF(LUG.LT.FM) GO TO 40010

DNFX(I,K) = LUG*DX*AVG+RDX*(LUG+RDX+AVG+RDX)*MM
DNFFFZ(I,K) = LUG*KZ*AVG+KZD*(LUG+KZD+AVG+KZD)*MM
GO TO 40000

40010 DNFX(I,K) = 0.0
DNFFFZ(I,K) = 0.0
40000 CONTINUE
C
49998 RMDX = 0.5*RDX
RDXD = RDX-RDX
RDZD = RDZ-RDZ
C
IF(1MOM.EQ.1.OR.ICALL.EQ.2) GO TO 89999
IKER = IBR+(KER-1)
SIGMA = NU
BUOY = ALPO*EXP(-TIMET/TADD)
C
IF(1MOM.EQ.3) GO TO 80205
C
DD ED:00 1=2, IBR
DC ED:00 K=2, KBP1
JK = 1 - (1-I)*K2NC + (K-I)*NWPC
JKL = 1 - (1-I)*K2NCL + (K-I)*NWPC
JKP = 1K + K2NC
JKKS = JK - NWPC
JKMS = JK - K2NC
JKP = 1K - NWPC
C
UC = UD(JK)
UL = UD(JK)
UR = UD(JK)
UT = UD(JK)
UB = UD(JK)
DCR = DIFFCD(JKL)
DCT = DIFFCD(JKL+1)
DCL = DIFFCD(JKL-1)
DCE = DIFFCD(JKL-3)
C
VR = (UD(JK) + UD(JPK))*0.5
VRE = (UD(JK) - UD(JPK))*0.5
VMH = (UC(JK) - UD(JK))*0.5
ULH = (UD(JK) - UC(JK))*0.5
C
CONX = (URH*(UC+UR) - AES(URH)*(UC-UR) - ULH*(UL+UC))
IMKS = 1K - K2NC
IKMS = 1K - NWPC

C
DCT = DIFFCO(IKL+1)
DCE = DIFFCO(IKL+3)
WRT = (W(1K) + W(IPK))*0.5
WRB = (W(IKMS) + W(IPK-NWPC))*0.5

C
A1(J) = 0.5*RDZ*( -WRB - ABS(WRB)) - SIGMA*RDZD -DCB
B1(J) = RDT + 0.5*RDZ*( WRT + ABS(WRT) - WRE + ABS(WRE) )
C1(J) = 0.5*RDZ*( WRT - ABS(WRT) ) - SIGMA*RDZD -DCR
D1(J) = U(1K)*RDT

81000 CONTINUE
C
CALL TDM(A1,B1,C1,D1,X,IKBR)
C
DO 81100 I=1,IBR
DO 81100 1K = 1 + (1-1)-K2NC + (K-1)-NWPC
IX = (1-2)-KBR + K - 1
81100 CONTINUE
C
CALL TDM(A1,B1,C1,D1,X,IKBR)
C
DO 82000 K=1,IBR
DO 82000 J = 1 + (1-1)-K2NC + (K-1)-NWPC
IKL = 1 + (1-1)*K2NC + (K-1)*NWPC
IMKS = 1K - K2NC
IKMS = 1K - NWPC

C
DCT = DIFFCO(IKL)
DCE = DIFFCO(IKL+3)
URT = 0.5*( U(1K) + U(IPK) )
ULT = 0.5*( U(IKMS) + U(IKMS+NWPC) )

C
A1(J) = 0.5*RDZ*( -ULT - ABS(ULT) ) - SIGMA*RDZD -DCB
B1(J) = RDT + 0.5*RDZ*( URT + ABS(URT) - URE + ABS(URE) )
C1(J) = 0.5*RDZ*( URT - ABS(URT) ) - SIGMA*RDZD -DCR
D1(J) = U(1K)*RDT

82000 CONTINUE
C
CALL TDM(A1,B1,C1,D1,X,IKBR)
C
DO 82100 K=1,IBR
DO 82100 1K = 1 + (1-1)-K2NC + (K-1)-NWPC
IX = (K-2)-KBR + I - 1
82100 W(1K) = X(IX)
C
DO 83000 K=1,IBR
CALL TDM(A1,B1,C1,D1,X,IKBR)

DO 84100 J=2,ISP1
DO 84100 K=2,KSR
IK = 1 + (J-1)*K2NC + (K-1)*NWPC
IX = (I-2)*(KER-1) + K - 1
84100 W(IK) = X(IX)

CONTINUE

IF(ICONV.LE.2.OR.ICALI.EQ.1) GO TO 2040
ISEQ = ISEQ + 1
IF(ISEQ.EQ.NSEO) 15E0 a 0
CONTINUE

DO 60000 K=Ki,K2
DO 60000 J=IBR-(K-2)

IKL = (I-1)*K2NCL + (K-1)*NWPCL
RC = FLOAT(I-1)*DX - HDX
RRC = 1.0/RC
OR = CYL+0.25*RRC
CYRX = CYL+0.5*RRC*RDX

CFC = CF(IK)
IF (CFC.NE.1) GO TO 55000
DCR = DIFFCD(IKL)
DCT = DIFFCD(IKL+1)
DCL = DIFFCD(IKL+2)
DCB = DIFFCD(IKL+3)

IPK = IK + K2NC
IMKS = IK - K2NC
IKMS = IK - NWPC

CFR = CF(IPK)
CFL = CF(IMKS)
UC = U(IK)
WC = W(IK)
UL = U(IMKS)
W2 = W(IMKS)
AUC = DABS(U)
AUL = DABS(U)
AWC = DABS(W)
AWB = DABS(W)

SIEC = SIE(IPK)
SIER = SIE(IPK)
SIEL = SIE(IMKS)
SIET = SIE(IPK)
SIEB = SIE(IMKS)
SIECD = SIE(IPK)

TSRA = 0.5*(TS(IK)+TS(IPK))
TSLA = 0.5*(TS(IK)+TS(IMKS))
IF ( CFC.NE.1) GO TO 65000

DCR = DIFFCO(IKL)
DCT = DIFFCO(IKL+1)
DCL = DIFFCO(IKL+2)
DCB = DIFFCO(IKL+3)

IPK = 1K + K2NC
IKP = 1K + NWPC
IMKS = 1K - K2NC
IKMS = 1K - NWPC

CFT = CF(IKP)
CFB = CF(1KMS)
WE = W(1KMS)
WC = W(1K)
AWB = DLBS(WB)
AWC = DLBS(WC)
TSTA = 0.5*(TS(1K)+TS(1KP))
TSE4 = 0.5*(TS(1K)+TS(1KMS))

GAMT = TGM
IF(TS(1K).LE.NU) GAMT = RRAN
DIFFT = GAMT*TSTA - 0.5*(DNFFZ(1,K)+DNFFZ(1.K+1))*XMX
DIFFB = GAMT*TSE4 - 0.5*(DNFFZ(1,K)+DNFFZ(1.K-1))*XMX

C

D1(J) = RDT*SIE(1K) - CO(IK)*0.5
A2(J) = -0.5*(WE*AWB)*RDZ - DIFFT*DCB+RDZ
B2(J) = RDT + (DIFFT + DFF - DCT) + RDZ + 0.5*(WC + AWC - WE*AWB)*RDZ
C2(J) = 0.5*(WC - AWC)*RDZ + DIFFT + DCT + RDZ
IF(CFB.EQ.0.1) GO TO 69950
D1(J) = D1(J) - A2(J)*SIE(1KMS)
A2(J) = 0.0

69950 IF(CFT.EQ.0.1) GO TO 70000
IF(CFT.EQ.0.1.AND.MNQPT.EQ.0.1) GO TO 65500
D1(J) = D1(J) = C2(J)*SIE(1KP)
C2(J) = 0.0
GO TO 70000

65500 C2(J) = E2(J) = DIFFT*DCT*RDZ
C2(J) = 0.0
D1(J) = D1(J) + DIFFT*DCT*RDZ
GO TO 70000

65000 D1(J) = SIE(1K)
A2(J) = 0.0
E2(J) = 1.0
C2(J) = 0.0

70000 CONTINUE

C

CALL TDM(A2,E2,C2,D1.X,1KBR)

C

DO 71000 J=11,12
DO 71000 K=K1,K2
IX = KBR*(I-2) + K - 1
IK 1 + (I-1)*K2NC + (K-1)*NWPC

71000 SIE(IK) = X(IK)

C
IF(KIRK.EQ.1) GO TO 33333
IF(ISEQ.NE.0) GO TO 33339
DO 33335 I=11,12
DO 33335 K=K1,K2
IK 1 + (I-1)*K2NC + (K-1)*NWPC
STOR(I,K) = SIE(IK)
33335 SIE(IK) = SIE(IK) + STOR(I,K)
KIRK = 0
33339 CONTINUE
C
C NOTE. TRANSFERS VELOCITIES TO STORAGE ARRAY (AT TIME=N)

2040 K1=1
K2*KBP2
LWPC=1 - NWPC
DO 2109 K=K1,K2
LWPC=LWPC+NWPC
IK=IKP1
IKK=IKK+1
IKS=IKS+1
SIE(IKS)*SIE(IK)
U(IKS)=U(IK)
W(IKS)=W(IK)
TO(IKS)=TO(IK)
TS(IKS)=TS(IK)
2109 CONTINUE
I1=2
I2=1BP1
K1=2
K2*KBP2
KK=0
KKL = 0
DO 2040 I=11,12
KK=KK+K2NC
KKL = KKL + K2NCL
LWPC = 1
IKMS=IK*K2 + 1
SIE(IKMS) = SIE(IKMS)
U(IKMS)=U(IKMS)
W(IKMS)=W(IKMS)
TO(IKMS)=TO(IKMS)
TS(IKMS)=TS(IKMS)
SIE(IKMS)=SIE(IKMS)
U(IKMS)=U(IKMS)
W(IKMS)=W(IKMS)
TO(IKMS)=TO(IKMS)
The file, 'input mom', is the input to test the stability of the ADI scheme for momentum equation. The file, 'inputn dat', is for calculating the natural convection flow field in a Cartesian closed compartment. The output results are in Fig. 5.1 and Fig. 5.2. The files, 'inputd 3' and 'inputd 7', are for calculating the numerical solution by donor cell scheme in the problem geometry, Fig. 4.3(B). The output results are in Fig. 5.6 and Fig. 5.7. The files, 'inputd HUH' and 'inputd DM', are for comparing Huh's and De Vahl Davis and Mallinson's correction formulas in the problem geometry, Fig. 5.8.
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ADI STABILITY TEST FOR MOMENTUM

1.0 2.0 1.120 1.120 6.0 0 2 1 3 0 2 2

0

0

10.0 10.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 1.0 1.0

1 1 1 1 1.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0

2.44 4.9 0.01 0.01 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0

0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 0.0 0.0

1.0 10.0 10.0 0.0 4 1 1 6

0.0 1.0 -1.0 0.0 -1.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0

0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0

2 2 2 2 0 0 0 0 1.0 0

0.0 0.0 60.0 0.0

0.0 0.0 60.0 0.0

0.0 0.0 60.0 0.0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

2 5 2 5 1

10.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0

0
NATURAL CONVECTION IN A CARTESIAN CLOSED COMPARTMENT

1.0 10.0 1.0 20 1.0 20 60.0 8 2 1 3 1 3 3

1.67 2.0 0.0 -32.2 1.0 1.0 0.0 1.7 1.0 5 1.0

1.0 4.0 0.045 1.5 1.0 0.751.2179-5 1.0 20 1.0 20

2.44 4.90 0.01 0.01

0.0 0.0 1.0

1.0 60.0 68.0 0.5 51.43 1.0 1.0 0.0

1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0

1.0 0.0

1.0 0.0

1.0 0.0

677.4

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

2 6 2 1 1 1

0.0 1.0 20 1.0 20 0.0 0.0

6 6 2 0 30

58.0 1.0 20 1.0 20 0.0 0.0
FILE: INPUTD 3 A
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMERICAL DIFFUSION - CASE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.02 2.0 1.20 1.420 2.0 0.82130 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0.000 0.002 0.014 0.063 0.204 0.497 0.948 1.457 1.861 2.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0.000 -0.002 -0.014 -0.063 -0.204 -0.497 -0.948 -1.457 -1.861 -2.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70711 0.70711 0.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 1.5 -1.4707107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4 2 4 1.0 0.045 1.5 1.0 0.75 1.0 0.09375 0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.44 4.9 0.01 0.01 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 -1.5 -1.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 5.0 1.0 0.0 4.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 1.0 -1.0 0.0 -1.0 0.0 1.0 1.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2 2 0.05000024 60.05000024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 1.0 60.0 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 0.0 60.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1.0 0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1.0 0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1.0 0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1.0 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1.0 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1.0 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1.0 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1.0 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1.0 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1.0 8.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1.0 9.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1.0 9.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1.0 9.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1.0 9.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1.0 9.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1.0 9.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1.0 10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1.0 10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1.0 10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 11 2 11 1 0.0 1.0 1.0 7.07107 7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 11 1 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2 1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 1.0 1.0 7.07107 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 11 12 1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 1.0 1.0 0.0 7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 12 2 1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 1.0 1.0 7.07107 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NUMERICAL DIFFUSION - CASE 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.01</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>-0.633</td>
<td>-1.457</td>
<td>-2.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17051</td>
<td>1.17051</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4707107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>0.09375</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.167</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4 1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.08</th>
<th>333337</th>
<th>60.08</th>
<th>333337</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>9.374</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>7.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.07107</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMERICAL DIFFUSION - DM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2404</td>
<td>1.0267</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continued Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.083668</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.083668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.463684</td>
<td>7.461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.463684</td>
<td>8.526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.463684</td>
<td>9.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.463684</td>
<td>9.365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.463684</td>
<td>9.567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.463784</td>
<td>9.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>