

# Anti-diffusive, non-oscillatory central difference scheme (adNOC) suitable for highly nonlinear advection-dominated problems.

Haseeb Zia <sup>\*</sup>      Guy Simpson <sup>†</sup>

February 4, 2022

## Abstract

Explicit non-oscillatory central difference schemes become excessively diffusive when applied to highly nonlinear advection problems where small time steps are necessary to maintain stability. Here, we present a correction to reduce such numerical dissipation for this class of problems. The correction is obtained by selecting the appropriate finite difference approximations for calculating the slopes utilized to reconstruct the solution from the cell averages. The anti-diffusive central scheme does not require any knowledge of the eigenstructure and is fully central. The proposed correction is applied to the widely used Nessyahu-Tadmor scheme to demonstrate the utility of the correction. The stability of the corrected scheme is discussed and the condition for the scheme to become TVD (total variation diminishing) is presented. The corrected scheme is finally tested with a number of test cases and the results are compared with analytical solutions and published results showing the ability of the corrected scheme to effectively resolve sharp discontinuities.

**Key words:** Central schemes, numerical dissipation, hyperbolic conservation laws, shallow water equations.

## 1 Introduction

Advection dominated problems described by hyperbolic conservation laws are of major importance in many areas of science and engineering. Because these problems are often highly nonlinear, for example due to the presence of propagating shock waves, analytical solutions are often complicated or not available.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Dept. of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Univ. of Geneva, 13 Rue des Maraichers, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland. E-mail: Haseeb.Zia@unige.ch

<sup>†</sup>Dept. of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Univ. of Geneva, 13 Rue des Maraichers, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland. E-mail: Guy.Simpson@unige.ch

Therefore, the development of accurate and robust numerical methods to solve hyperbolic conservation laws is a domain of intense ongoing research.

Many of the schemes developed to solve hyperbolic conservation laws have their origin in Godunov’s method Godunov [1959]. These schemes are essentially upwind conservative finite volume methods where numerical fluxes are computed at cell interfaces based on local Riemann problems (e.g., see Toro [2009]; LeVeque and Le Veque [1992] for more details). While these methods can be very accurate, they may suffer from several potential drawbacks. First, for some very nonlinear problems, the wave structure of the governing equations may not be known, which makes it difficult to accurately compute interface fluxes (e.g. see Caleffi et al. [2007]; Balbás et al. [2004]). Second, conservation laws with source terms are often treated with operator splitting, which can in some cases lead to significant numerical errors (e.g. see Engquist and Runborg [1999]; Jiang and Tadmor [1998]; Balbás et al. [2004]).

An alternative to the Godunov approach are central differencing finite volume schemes, due largely to the work of Nessyahu and Tadmor Nessyahu and Tadmor [1990]. Central differencing schemes are based on the Lax-Friedrichs (LxF) scheme that is normally modified to include higher order accuracy Liu and Tadmor [1998]; Huynh [1995]; Bianco et al. [1999]; Qiu and Shu [2002] and several dimensions Arminjon et al. [1995]; Jiang and Tadmor [1998]; Katsaounis and Levy [1999]; Levy et al. [2002]; Balbás and Qian [2009]. These schemes have become known as non-oscillatory central differencing (NOC) methods. These schemes involve no Riemann problems (and therefore require no knowledge of the eigenstructure of the governing equations) and necessitate no operator splitting. Thus, they are relatively simple and especially suitable for the solution of highly nonlinear hyperbolic conservation laws involving stiff source terms (e.g., see application of central schemes in Tai et al. [2002]; Bryson et al. [2005]; Anile et al. [2001]; Kurganov and Pollack [2011]; Chertock et al. [2014]). A major factor limiting the utility of the central differencing schemes has been that they introduce excessive numerical diffusion Kurganov and Tadmor [2000]; Huynh [2003]; Abreu et al. [2009]; Kurganov and Lin [2007]; Siviglia et al. [2013]; Canestrelli and Toro [2012]. In the original central differencing schemes, this diffusivity was shown to be of order  $O((\Delta x)^{2r}/\Delta t)$  Kurganov and Tadmor [2000], where  $r$  is the order of the scheme, showing that the numerical diffusion becomes more important as the time step is reduced. Thus, for very nonlinear systems where small time steps are of paramount importance to ensure stability, the solution may be partially or completely destroyed by artificial diffusion Kurganov and Tadmor [2000]; Kurganov and Lin [2007]; Stecca et al. [2012]. Less diffusive modified schemes utilizing partial knowledge of eigenstructure have been proposed Kurganov and Tadmor [2000]; Kurganov [2002], but excessive diffusivity remains a limitation to central differencing schemes when small time steps are necessary.

In this article we present a simple anti-diffusion correction to the classic NOC scheme Nessyahu and Tadmor [1990] in an effort to reduce numerical dissipation when small time steps must be used. As the original scheme, our method utilizes a staggered grid where the solution is approximated by reconstructing piece-

wise polynomials within the cells from the evolving cell averages. The staggered approach enables the central scheme to have smooth cell interfaces, which makes evaluation of numerical fluxes particularly straight forward. Unlike previously proposed modifications Kurganov and Tadmor [2000]; Kurganov [2002] which require partial knowledge of the eigenstructure, this scheme does not involve the solution of Riemann problems and does not require any knowledge of the eigenstructure of the governing system. Here we demonstrate the ability of the anti-diffusive, non-oscillatory central difference scheme (adNOC) to solve the shallow water equations coupled to substrate erosion and sedimentation.

The article is structured as follows. In section 2, a brief description of Nessyahu-Tadmor central scheme is presented. Section 3 describes how the diffusion can be eliminated by using appropriate finite difference approximations. Section 4 discusses the stability of the corrected scheme and finally, test cases and results are presented in section 5.

## 2 Central schemes

Consider the following scalar hyperbolic conservation law

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial f(u)}{\partial x} = s(u), \quad (1)$$

where  $u$  is the conserved quantity,  $f$  is the flux and  $s$  is the source term, both functions of  $u$ . To explain the centred approach, we will use the Nessyahu-Tadmor scheme Nessyahu and Tadmor [1990], the most widely used second order method as the standard central scheme. The development of this section follows closely that presented by Pudasaini and Hutter [2007]. The method is a high-order extension of the Lax-Friedrichs solver which operates in predictor corrector fashion. The predictor step involves evaluation of first order approximations at half time steps. The second order solution is then realized in the corrector step which utilizes the calculations from the predictor step to evaluate the solution on the staggered cells. Below, we present a description of the procedure involved in evaluation of the solution using the NOC scheme.

We begin by dividing spatial domain into cells. Let  $C_j$  denote the cell that covers the region  $|x - x_j| \leq \frac{\Delta x}{2}$  where  $\Delta x$  is the constant grid spacing. For the development below, we note that the cell  $C_{j+1/2}$  consists of the overlap between the two adjacent cells  $C_j$  and  $C_{j+1}$ . Let  $\bar{u}_j^n$  denote the cell average over the cell at time  $t^n$ . The solution can be reconstructed in space linearly over the cell from the average by:

$$u_j(x, t^n) = \bar{u}_j^n + \sigma_j^x(x - x_j), \quad (x) \in C_j, \quad (2)$$

where  $\sigma^x$  is the discrete spatial slope of the solution  $u$  evaluated at time  $t^n$  (i.e.,  $\sigma^x = \partial u / \partial x$ ). This reconstruction is used to achieve second-order accuracy in space. Second-order temporal accuracy is achieved by using a predictor-corrector procedure in which the solution is first evaluated at the half time step

in the predictor step. Linear reconstruction is also used for reconstruction in time:

$$\bar{u}_j^{n+1/2} = \bar{u}_j^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^n, \quad (3)$$

where  $\left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^n$  is calculated using the conservation law, i.e. Eq. (1):

$$\left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \right)^n = - \left( \frac{\partial f(u)}{\partial x} \right)^n + s(\bar{u}^n). \quad (4)$$

Thus the predictor step is given by:

$$\bar{u}_j^{n+1/2} = \bar{u}_j^n - \frac{\Delta t}{2} (\sigma^f)_j^n + \frac{\Delta t}{2} s(\bar{u}_j^n), \quad (5)$$

where  $\sigma^f$  is the discrete spatial slope of the flux. This first order solution evaluated in the predictor step will be used later for second order evaluation of the solution.

To calculate the second order solution for the conservation law given by Eq. (1), we start by integrating it over the cell  $C_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$  and time period  $[t^n, t^{n+1}]$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} u(x, t^{n+1}) dx &= \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} u(x, t^n) dx - \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} \{f(x_{j+1}, t) - f(x_j, t)\} dt \\ &\quad + \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \int_{t^n}^{t^{n+1}} s(x, t) dt dx. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Notice that the integral is evaluated at the staggered cell. This allows the evaluation of fluxes at the centre of the cells from previous time step where the reconstructions are smooth, see Fig. 1. This is different from upwind schemes where the quadrature is evaluated in the smooth region and the flux is evaluated at the cell interfaces where the piece-wise reconstructions are discontinuous. Note that the slope used for reconstruction in Fig. 1 are standard forward difference approximations. A different finite difference formulation would significantly change the reconstructions. The impact of different choice of finite difference formulation will be discussed in more detail in the next section. Evaluating integrals using the second order accurate midpoint rule gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta x \bar{u}_{j+1/2}^{n+1} &= \frac{\Delta x}{2} (\bar{u}_{j+1/4}^n + \bar{u}_{j+3/4}^n) - \Delta t (f_{j+1}^{n+1/2} - f_j^{n+1/2}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta t \Delta x}{2} (s_{j+1/4}^{n+1/2} + s_{j+3/4}^{n+1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The first integral on right hand side of Eq. (6) consists of two parts i.e. quadrature of two sub-cells with  $j+1/4$  and  $j+3/4$  as cell centres. This is performed with discontinuous piece-wise cell reconstructions, as shown with grey regions




Figure 1: Cell reconstructions and quadrature evaluations.

in Fig. 1. Dividing Eq. (7) by  $\Delta x$  leads to

$$\bar{u}_{j+1/2}^{n+1} = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}_{j+1/4}^n + \bar{u}_{j+3/4}^n) - \frac{\Delta t}{\Delta x}(f_{j+1}^{n+1/2} - f_j^{n+1/2}) + \frac{\Delta t}{2}(s_{j+1/4}^{n+1/2} + s_{j+3/4}^{n+1/2}), \quad (8)$$

where  $\bar{u}_{j+1/4}^n$  and  $\bar{u}_{j+3/4}^n$  are approximated by reconstructions

$$\bar{u}_{j+1/4}^n = \bar{u}_j^n + \frac{\Delta x}{4}\sigma_j^n, \quad \bar{u}_{j+3/4}^n = \bar{u}_{j+1}^n - \frac{\Delta x}{4}\sigma_{j+1}^n. \quad (9)$$

The integral of fluxes in Eq. (6) is approximated using the half time step solution evaluated in the predictor step, see Eq. (5).

$$f_j^{n+1/2} = f(\bar{u}_j^{n+1/2}), \quad f_{j+1}^{n+1/2} = f(\bar{u}_{j+1}^{n+1/2}). \quad (10)$$

Similarly, the integral of source terms is approximated by

$$s_{j+1/4}^{n+1/2} = s(\bar{u}_{j+1/4}^{n+1/2}), \quad s_{j+3/4}^{n+1/2} = s(\bar{u}_{j+3/4}^{n+1/2}),$$

where

$$\bar{u}_{j+1/4}^{n+1/2} = \bar{u}_j^{n+1/2} + \frac{\Delta x}{4}\sigma_j^n, \quad \bar{u}_{j+3/4}^{n+1/2} = \bar{u}_{j+1}^{n+1/2} - \frac{\Delta x}{4}\sigma_{j+1}^n.$$

It is important to remember that while the high order nature of the scheme assures that shocks and discontinuities are captured, this comes at the expense of spurious oscillations. To avoid these oscillations, the spatial slopes utilized for reconstructions and the flux slopes should be evaluated with limiters. The use of slope and flux limiters together with the generalized CFL (Courant-Friedrichs-Lewy) condition satisfy the TVD (total variation diminishing) condition, ensuring stability of the scheme. More on stability and robustness of scheme is

discussed in section 4.

### 3 Anti-diffusion slopes

As mentioned in the introduction, classic NOC scheme becomes excessively diffusive when small time steps are used or when flux difference and source terms in Eq. (8) are relatively small. This may occur during near steady-state flow conditions when the flux is same throughout the domain or in passive stages when the flux is zero. To understand this, consider the conservation law (Eq. 1) without the source term. In the case of steady or passive state, the second integral on right hand side of Eq. (6) becomes zero. In this case, Eq. (8) for any cell  $C_j$  can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{u}_j^{n+1} &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}_{j-1/4}^n + \bar{u}_{j+1/4}^n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}_{j-1/2}^n + \bar{u}_{j+1/2}^n) + \frac{\Delta x}{8}(\sigma_{j-1/2}^n - \sigma_{j+1/2}^n).\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

Substituting

$$\bar{u}_{j-1/2}^n = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}_{j-1}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_j^{n-1}) + \frac{\Delta x}{8}(\sigma_{j-1}^{n-1} - \sigma_j^{n-1})$$

and

$$\bar{u}_{j+1/2}^n = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}_j^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{j+1}^{n-1}) + \frac{\Delta x}{8}(\sigma_j^{n-1} - \sigma_{j+1}^{n-1})$$

into Eq. (11) results in

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{u}_j^{n+1} &= \bar{u}_j^{n-1} + \frac{1}{4}(\bar{u}_{j-1}^{n-1} - 2\bar{u}_j^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{j+1}^{n-1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\Delta x}{8}(\sigma_{j-1}^{n-1} - \sigma_{j+1}^{n-1}) + \frac{\Delta x}{8}(\sigma_{j-1/2}^n - \sigma_{j+1/2}^n).\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

The second term on the right hand side of Eq. (12) is the finite difference approximation for a diffusive term (ie.,  $\frac{1}{4}(\bar{u}_{j-1}^{n-1} - 2\bar{u}_j^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{j+1}^{n-1}) \approx \frac{(\Delta x)^2}{4} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}$ ), which shows the origin of numerical dissipation in this scheme.

This dissipation, however, can be mitigated or removed entirely by carefully choosing the finite difference approximations of the slopes present in the equation. Indeed, finite difference approximations with the difference direction towards the cell centre fulfil this requirement. This allows the local slopes to be used in calculation, avoiding the use of slopes evaluated from adjacent cells which are not relevant (see Fig. 2). These slopes are given by:

$$\sigma_{j-1}^{n-1} = \sigma_{j-1/2}^n = \frac{\bar{u}_j^{n-1} - \bar{u}_{j-1}^{n-1}}{\Delta x} \quad (13)$$




Figure 2: Finite difference approximations to be utilized for anti-diffusive scheme.

and

$$\sigma_{j+1}^{n-1} = \sigma_{j+1/2}^n = \frac{\bar{u}_{j+1}^{n-1} - \bar{u}_j^{n-1}}{\Delta x}. \quad (14)$$

Substituting (13) and (14) into Eq. (12) reduces it to

$$\bar{u}_j^{n+1} = \bar{u}_j^{n-1},$$

Thus, the solution is exactly maintained in the case of steady and passive states without any smearing. It has to be noted that the slopes used here are from the previous time step which means that the anti-diffusive scheme has a 3 level deep stencil in time.

## 4 Stability

The Nessyahu-Tadmor scheme is a Total-Variation-Diminishing method. The concept of TVD (total variation diminishing), first introduced by Harten [1983] has been utilized by many schemes to avoid spurious oscillations when high resolution schemes are used. The total variation of a conserved quantity,  $\bar{u}^n$  at any time step  $n$  is defined as:

$$TV(\bar{u}^n) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (\bar{u}_{j+1}^n - \bar{u}_j^n).$$

Numerical oscillations increase the *total variation* and may render the scheme unstable. However, if the total variation is ensured not to increase through the time evolution, the scheme is said to be *Total-Variation-Diminishing*. For any

time step  $n$ , the TVD condition is given as:

$$TV(\bar{u}^{n+1}) \leq TV(\bar{u}^n)$$

TVD methods are *monotonicity preserving*, ensuring that spurious oscillations do not arise near propagating discontinuities. Proof of the Nessyahu-Tadmor scheme being TVD can be seen in the paper introducing the scheme Nessyahu and Tadmor [1990]. Next, we will see how the anti-diffusion slopes presented in the previous section affect the stability of the scheme. We will start with the lemma presented in Nessyahu and Tadmor [1990] which states that the scheme is TVD if the following condition is held:

$$\lambda \left| \frac{\Delta F_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (15)$$

where,

$$F_j = f(\bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})) + \frac{1}{8\lambda} \bar{u}', \quad \Delta F_{j+1/2} = F_{j+1} - F_j, \quad (16)$$

and  $\lambda$  is  $\Delta t / \Delta x$ . Substituting (16) into (15) gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \left| \frac{\Delta F_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| &\leq \lambda \left| \frac{f(\bar{u}_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})) - f(\bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}))}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| + \frac{1}{8} \left| \frac{\Delta \bar{u}'_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \\ &\leq \lambda \left| \frac{f(\bar{u}_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})) - f(\bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}))}{\bar{u}_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) - \bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{\bar{u}_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) - \bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| + \frac{1}{8} \left| \frac{\Delta \bar{u}'_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We assume that the product  $\lambda \cdot \max_j |a(\bar{u}_j)| \leq \beta$  where  $a(\bar{u}_j)$  is the velocity at any cell centre  $j$ . This implies that the first term in the inequality (17) is bounded by  $\beta$ :

$$\lambda \left| \frac{f(\bar{u}_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})) - f(\bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}))}{\bar{u}_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) - \bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})} \right| \leq \beta.$$

Using the mid time step value from Eq. (5) without the source term leads to

$$\left| \frac{\bar{u}_{j+1}(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2}) - \bar{u}_j(t + \frac{\Delta t}{2})}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \leq 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left| \frac{\Delta f'_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right|. \quad (18)$$

Slope limiters are a widely used tool to ensure stability of numerical schemes (e.g., see Nessyahu and Tadmor [1990] Sweby [1984]). To get an upper bound on the term  $\left| \frac{\Delta f'_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right|$ , we assume that slopes are limited by the *minmod* limiter given by,

$$\text{minmod}\{r_1, r_2\} = \frac{1}{2} [\text{sgn}(r_1) + \text{sgn}(r_2)] \cdot \text{Min}(|r_1|, |r_2|).$$

Since the *minmod* limiter ensures that the sign of consecutive slopes  $f'_{j+1}$  and  $f'_j$  can not be different,

$$\left| \frac{\Delta f'_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \leq \left| \frac{|f'_{j+1}| - |f'_j|}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \leq \max\left(\left| \frac{f'_{j+1}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right|, \left| \frac{f'_j}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right|\right) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \beta \quad (19)$$

The third term in Eq. (17) can be decomposed into two components,

$$\bar{u}'_j = (1 - \varepsilon) \bar{u}'^{limited}_j + (\varepsilon) \bar{u}'^{nd}_j,$$

where  $\bar{u}'^{limited}_j$  is the limited difference (limited by the *minmod* limiter in this case),  $\bar{u}'^{nd}_j$  is the difference evaluated using the anti-diffusive finite difference approximations described in the previous section and  $\varepsilon$  is a factor signifying the strength of the anti-diffusive slopes used. A value of 1 for  $\varepsilon$  signifies that only anti-diffusive slopes are used in calculation of reconstructions while a value of 0 signifies that the standard NOC scheme is used. The term  $\left| \frac{\Delta \bar{u}'_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right|$  in the case of limited difference is bounded by:

$$\left| \frac{\Delta \bar{u}'_{j+1/2}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \leq \left| \frac{|\bar{u}'_{j+1}| - |\bar{u}'_j|}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right| \leq \max\left(\left| \frac{\bar{u}'_{j+1}}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right|, \left| \frac{\bar{u}'_j}{\Delta \bar{u}_{j+1/2}} \right|\right) \leq 1. \quad (20)$$

The upper bound for the anti-diffusive difference is given by  $\gamma$ , where

$$\gamma = \max\left(\left| \frac{\bar{u}_j^n - \bar{u}_{j-1}^n}{\bar{u}_{j+1}^n - \bar{u}_j^n} \right|, \left| \frac{\bar{u}_j^{n-1} - \bar{u}_{j-1}^{n-1}}{\bar{u}_{j+1}^n - \bar{u}_j^n} \right|, \left| \frac{\bar{u}_{j+1}^{n-1} - \bar{u}_j^{n-1}}{\bar{u}_{j+1}^n - \bar{u}_j^n} \right|, 1\right). \quad (21)$$

Using the inequalities (18), (19), (20) and (21), Eq. (17) is reduced to:

$$\beta \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \beta\right) + \frac{1}{8} ((1 - \varepsilon) + (\varepsilon) \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (22)$$

The inequality equation can be solved to get the upper bound  $\beta$ . This bound  $\beta$  is equivalent to the maximum stable courant number ( $Cn$ ) which is used to calculate the stable time step. Fig. 3 shows the maximum stable courant number for different combinations of  $\gamma$  and  $\varepsilon$ . In the case of coupled systems, where the time step is controlled by some other process, the condition (22) can be used to determine the maximum stable ratio  $\varepsilon$  of the anti-diffusive slopes and the limited slopes. In practice, a higher  $\varepsilon$  can be used, depending on the systems being coupled. The NOC scheme corrected with anti-diffusion slopes is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_{j+1/2}^{n+1} = & \frac{1}{2} (\hat{u}_{j+1}^n + \hat{u}_j^n) + \frac{\Delta x}{8} (1 - \varepsilon) (\sigma_j^n - \sigma_{j+1}^n) - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} (\bar{u}_{j+3/2}^{n-1} - 2\bar{u}_{j+1/2}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{j-1/2}^{n-1}) \\ & - \lambda (f_{j+1}^{n+1/2} - f_j^{n+1/2}) + \frac{\Delta t}{2} (s_{j+1/4}^{n+1/2} + s_{j+3/4}^{n+1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$




Figure 3: Maximum stable courant number for different combinations of  $\gamma$  and  $\varepsilon$  evaluated using the inequality (22).

where  $\hat{u}$  is the cell average evaluated without the anti-diffusion correction i.e. the third term in the right hand side of (23). The two dimensional version of the anti-diffusive NOC scheme is presented in appendix A.

## 5 Test cases

We have performed a number of simulations to test the success of the anti-diffusion correction in reducing numerical dissipation in the standard NOC scheme. All of the cases presented here deal with the shallow water equations, either with or without substrate erosion and sedimentation.

### 5.1 Shallow water Equations

The shallow water equations are a depth averaged reformulation of the Navier-Stokes equations that are widely used for modelling of open surface hydraulics. The governing equations are:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(hu)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial(hv)}{\partial y} = 0, \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{\partial(hu)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(hu^2 + \frac{1}{2}gh) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}(huv) = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{\partial(hv)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(huv) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}(hv^2 + \frac{1}{2}gh^2) = 0, \quad (26)$$

where  $h$  is the water depth,  $u$  and  $v$  are the (depth-averaged) velocities in the  $x$  and  $y$  directions, respectively and  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration. In this form, bed slope, bed friction and substrate erosion/sedimentation are neglected. The equations represent a set of hyperbolic conservative laws which can be solved with a variety of numerical methods. In the following test cases, we solve these equations for dam breach problems with the proposed anti-diffusive central scheme.

### 5.1.1 Dam break in one-dimension


The first test case consists of dam breach problem in one dimension, an analytical solution for which is available (see [Toro, 2001]). A 100 meters long domain is initially separated by a dam in the middle separating two regions with water depths of 10 meters and 1 meter. The dam is removed instantaneously at time zero, which results in a sharp shock wave propagating downstream along with a smooth rarefaction wave propagating upstream. The solution is obtained first by the standard NOC scheme with the time steps calculated using courant numbers of 0.5 and 0.05 using:

$$\Delta t = Cn \{ \min(\min_{i,j} \frac{\Delta x}{(|u| + a)_{i,j}}, \min_{i,j} \frac{\Delta y}{(|v| + a)_{i,j}}) \}, \quad (27)$$


where  $a = \sqrt{gh}$  represents the eigenvalues of the shallow water equations, see Stecca et al. [2012]. The domain is discretized with 100 equally spaced cells (i.e.,  $\Delta x = 1m$ ). The results in Fig. 4a and 4b shows the water depth ( $h$ ) and the velocity ( $v$ ) two seconds after the dam breach. The figure shows that the classic NOC scheme is accurate when  $Cn = 0.5$ , while it is excessively diffusive when  $Cn = 0.05$ . Also shown in Fig. 4a and 4b are the results computed using the proposed corrected scheme with  $\varepsilon = 0.85$ . The results show that the proposed correction does a very good job in eliminating the diffusion present when  $Cn = 0.05$ .

### 5.1.2 Breach of circular dam

The second test case (investigated previously by Stecca et al. [2012]) considers the breach of a cylindrical tank immersed in a frictionless water body



(a) Water depth ( $h$ ) after two seconds of dam breach as calculated by different NOC schemes.



(b) Velocity ( $v$ ) after two seconds of dam breach as calculated by different NOC schemes.

Figure 4: Solution for 1d-dam breach experiment.

initially at rest. The initial conditions are:

$$\begin{cases} h(x, y, 0) = 2.5m & \text{if } x^2 + y^2 \leq r^2 \\ h(x, y, 0) = 0.5m & \text{if } x^2 + y^2 > r^2 \\ u(x, y, 0) = v(x, y, 0) = 0 & \forall x, y \end{cases}$$

where  $r = 2.5m$  is the tank radius. The spatial domain is a 40 m x 40 m square that was discretized with 100 cells in both  $x$  and  $y$  directions. Fig. 5a and 5b shows numerical results after 1.4 seconds, computed with different variants of the NOC scheme. Also shown in Fig. 5b is a high resolution numerical reference solution, calculated using 1000 cells in each direction using the NOC scheme with 1000 cells in each direction and courant number of 0.5. Results show that the standard NOC scheme exhibits varying degrees of numerical dispersion, depending on the time step utilized and scheme-order: although the second order scheme is clearly less diffusive than the first order scheme, both schemes exhibit excessive smearing as the courant number is decreased. This dispersion is markedly reduced by the proposed anti-diffusion correction ( $\varepsilon = 0.75$ ), especially when small courant numbers are used. These results compare favourably with results computed for the same test case by Stecca et al. [2012], illustrated in Fig. 5c.

## 5.2 Flow over mobile bed


This test case illustrates the problem faced by central schemes for coupled systems and it highlights how the anti-diffusive correction presented in this paper largely eliminates this short coming. The test case has been investigated in at least two earlier studies (Črnjarić-Zić et al. [2004]; Caleffi et al. [2007]) using high order ENO and CWENO schemes. The test case considers one dimensional flow of water over a mobile bed, resulting in sediment transport and bed deformation in the direction of flow. This problem is modelled by coupling the shallow water equations to the Exner equation (see Paola and Voller [2005]) for evolution of the bed profile. The complete system in one dimension is given by:

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = S,$$


where the conserved variable vector  $U$ , the flux vector  $F$  and the source vector  $S$  are given by:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} h \\ hv \\ z \end{bmatrix},$$

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} hv \\ hv^2 + \frac{1}{2}gh^2 \\ \frac{1}{1-\phi}qz \end{bmatrix},$$




(a) Water depth after 1.4 seconds of the dam break as calculated by anti-diffusion first order central scheme.



(b) The one dimensional cross section of water depths after 1.4 seconds as calculated by different schemes.

Figure 5: Solution for circular dam breach experiment.



(c) Comparison of numerical solutions calculated for the circular dam break test case, performed by Stecca et al. [2012]. Graph shows water height as a function of distance after 1.4 seconds. The Courant number used was 0.1. The compared schemes are FORCE (a first order central differencing method), UFORCE and KNP (both of which are central-upwind method) and Godunov (using either an exact Riemann solver or the HLL approximate Riemann solver).

Figure 5: Solution for circular dam breach experiment.

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -gh \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In these equations  $h$  is the water depth,  $v$  is the flow velocity,  $g$  is the acceleration due to gravity,  $z$  is the bed elevation,  $\phi$  is the substrate porosity and  $q_z$  is the sediment flux, assumed here to be given by the Grass law Grass [1981]:

$$q_z(v) = Av |v|^{m-1},$$

where  $A$  depends on the type of sediment and signifies the coupling of the sediment with the water flow and  $m$  is the exponent in the range  $1 \leq m \leq 4$ .

The test consists of a 1000 meters long domain with the initial bed profile given by:

$$z(x, 0) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\left(\frac{x-400}{5\pi}\right)}}.$$

The initial hydraulic conditions were computed assuming a constant water level of 10 meters, a water discharge of 10 m/s at both upstream and downstream boundaries and a initially fixed bed, see Fig. 6. Once a steady-state was reached (time=0), the bed and flow conditions were tracked through time.




Figure 6: Initial conditions for the flow over mobile bed test case. The water depth is divided by 10 for better viewing.




Figure 7: The bed-form after 200, 700 and 1400 seconds of sediment transport as calculated by standard NOC, anti-diffusive NOC and fourth order CWENO schemes.

Simulations were performed with the following parameter values:  $A = 1$ ,  $m = 3$ ,  $\phi = 0.2$  and  $\Delta x = 5m$ . The value for  $A$  is notably high, implying strong coupling between the flow and underlying substrate. Values for  $A$  in nature are often ca. 0.001, implying much weaker coupling, which would further aggravate numerical dispersion with numerical methods. Calculations with the anti-diffusive scheme were performed using  $\varepsilon = 1$  for the Exner equation and  $\varepsilon = 0.92$  for the shallow water equations. The courant number used to calculate the time step is 0.45 for standard NOC scheme and 0.2 for anti-diffusive NOC scheme. Fig. 7 shows the computed bed profile after 200, 700 and 1400 seconds. It can be seen that the standard NOC scheme suffers from excessive diffusivity while the anti-diffusive NOC schemes performs on par with the fourth order CWENO scheme presented by Caleffi et al. [2007].

## 6 Conclusion

The excessive diffusion suffered by explicit non-oscillatory central differencing (NOC) schemes when utilizing small time steps is tackled. An anti-diffusive version of the well-known Nessyahu-Tadmor central scheme is presented and tested. The condition for stability is derived and the stable value of courant number with respect to other parameters is shown. The proposed scheme is validated using a number of test cases involving the shallow water equations in one and two dimensions. The corrected scheme is shown to significantly improve the numerical dispersion exhibited by the standard NOC scheme, especially when small time steps are used.

## References

- E Abreu, F Pereira, and S Ribeiro. Central schemes for porous media flows. *Computational & Applied Mathematics*, 28(1):87–110, 2009.
- A Marcello Anile, Nikolaos Nikiforakis, and Rosa M Pidatella. Assessment of a high resolution centered scheme for the solution of hydrodynamical semiconductor equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 22(5):1533–1548, 2001.
- P Arminjon, D Stanescu, and MC Viallon. A two-dimensional finite volume extension of the lax-friedrichs and nessyahu-tadmor schemes for compressible flows. In *Proceedings of the 6th Int. Symposium on Comp. Fluid Dynamics*, pages 7–14, 1995.
- Jorge Balbás and Xin Qian. Non-oscillatory central scheme for 3d hyperbolic conservation laws. In *Proc. Sympos. Appl. Math.*, volume 67, pages 389–398, 2009.
- Jorge Balbás, Eitan Tadmor, and Cheng-Chin Wu. Non-oscillatory central schemes for one-and two-dimensional mhd equations: I. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 201(1):261–285, 2004.
- Franca Bianco, Gabriella Puppo, and Giovanni Russo. High-order central schemes for hyperbolic systems of conservation laws. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 21(1):294–322, 1999.
- Steve Bryson, Alexander Kosovichev, and Doron Levy. High-order shock-capturing methods for modeling dynamics of the solar atmosphere. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 201(1):1–26, 2005.
- Valerio Caleffi, Alessandro Valiani, and Anna Bernini. High-order balanced cwno scheme for movable bed shallow water equations. *Advances in water resources*, 30(4):730–741, 2007.

- Alberto Canestrelli and Eleuterio F Toro. Restoration of the contact surface in force-type centred schemes i: Homogeneous two-dimensional shallow water equations. *Advances in Water Resources*, 47:88–99, 2012.
- Alina Chertock, Alexander Kurganov, and Yu Liu. Central-upwind schemes for the system of shallow water equations with horizontal temperature gradients. *Numerische Mathematik*, 127(4):595–639, 2014.
- Nelida Črnjarić-Žic, Senka Vuković, and Luka Sopta. Extension of eno and weno schemes to one-dimensional sediment transport equations. *Computers & fluids*, 33(1):31–56, 2004.
- Björn Engquist and Olof Runborg. *Multiphase computations in geometrical optics*. Springer, 1999.
- Sergei Konstantinovich Godunov. A difference method for numerical calculation of discontinuous solutions of the equations of hydrodynamics. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 89(3):271–306, 1959.
- AJ Grass. *Sediment transport by waves and currents*. University College, London, Dept. of Civil Engineering, 1981.
- Ami Harten. High resolution schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws. *Journal of computational physics*, 49(3):357–393, 1983.
- HT Huynh. A piecewise-parabolic dual-mesh method for the euler equations. In *12th AIAA Computational Fluid Dynamics Conference*, pages 1054–66, 1995.
- HT Huynh. Analysis and improvement of upwind and centered schemes on quadrilateral and triangular meshes. *AIAA Paper*, 3541:23–26, 2003.
- Guang-Shan Jiang and Eitan Tadmor. Nonoscillatory central schemes for multi-dimensional hyperbolic conservation laws. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 19(6):1892–1917, 1998.
- Theodoros Katsaounis and Doron Levy. A modified structured central scheme for 2d hyperbolic conservation laws. *Applied mathematics letters*, 12(6):89–96, 1999.
- Alexander Kurganov. Central-upwind schemes for balance laws. application to the broadwell model. In *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Finite Volumes for Complex Applications*, 2002.
- Alexander Kurganov and Chi-Tien Lin. On the reduction of numerical dissipation in central-upwind schemes. *Commun. Comput. Phys*, 2(1):141–163, 2007.
- Alexander Kurganov and Michael Pollack. Semi-discrete central-upwind schemes for elasticity in heterogeneous media. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* (Submitted for publication), 2011.

- Alexander Kurganov and Eitan Tadmor. New high-resolution central schemes for nonlinear conservation laws and convection–diffusion equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 160(1):241–282, 2000.
- Randall J LeVeque and Randall J Le Veque. *Numerical methods for conservation laws*, volume 132. Springer, 1992.
- Doron Levy, Gabriella Puppo, and Giovanni Russo. A fourth-order central weno scheme for multidimensional hyperbolic systems of conservation laws. *SIAM Journal on scientific computing*, 24(2):480–506, 2002.
- Xu-Dong Liu and Eitan Tadmor. Third order nonoscillatory central scheme for hyperbolic conservation laws. *Numerische Mathematik*, 79(3):397–425, 1998.
- H. Nessyahu and E. Tadmor. Non-oscillatory central differencing schemes for hyperbolic conservation laws. *J. Comp. Phys.*, 1990. doi: 10.1016/0021-9991(90)90260-8.
- C Paola and VR Voller. A generalized exner equation for sediment mass balance. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface (2003–2012)*, 110(F4), 2005.
- Shiva P Pudasaini and Kolumban Hutter. *Avalanche dynamics: dynamics of rapid flows of dense granular avalanches*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- Jianxian Qiu and Chi-Wang Shu. On the construction, comparison, and local characteristic decomposition for high-order central weno schemes. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 183(1):187–209, 2002.
- Annunziato Siviglia, Guglielmo Stecca, Davide Vanzo, Guido Zolezzi, Eleuterio F Toro, and Marco Tubino. Numerical modelling of two-dimensional morphodynamics with applications to river bars and bifurcations. *Advances in Water Resources*, 52:243–260, 2013.
- Guglielmo Stecca, Annunziato Siviglia, and Eleuterio F Toro. A finite volume upwind-biased centred scheme for hyperbolic systems of conservation laws. applications to shallow water equations. *Commun Comput Phys*, 12(4):1183–1214, 2012.
- Peter K Sweby. High resolution schemes using flux limiters for hyperbolic conservation laws. *SIAM journal on numerical analysis*, 21(5):995–1011, 1984.
- Yih-Chin Tai, S Noelle, JMNT Gray, and Kolumban Hutter. Shock-capturing and front-tracking methods for granular avalanches. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 175(1):269–301, 2002.
- Eleuterio F Toro. *Shock-capturing methods for free-surface shallow flows*. Wiley, 2001.
- Eleuterio F Toro. *Riemann solvers and numerical methods for fluid dynamics: a practical introduction*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

## Appendix A Anti-diffusive central scheme in 2-dimensions

A two-dimensional extension of the Nessyahu-Tadmor scheme can be seen in Jiang and Tadmor [1998]; Pudasaini and Hutter [2007]. Following the discussion in section 4 for anti-diffusive central scheme in one dimension (Eq. 23), along with discussion in the above mentioned references, the anti-diffusive central scheme in two dimensions is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{u}_{p+1/2,q+1/2}^{n+1} &= \frac{1}{4} \{ \hat{u}_{p,q}^n + \hat{u}_{p+1,q}^n + \hat{u}_{p,q+1}^n + \hat{u}_{p+1,q+1}^n \} \\
&+ \frac{\Delta x}{16} (1 - \varepsilon) \{ \sigma_{p,q}^x - \sigma_{p+1,q}^x - \sigma_{p+1,q+1}^x + \sigma_{p,q+1}^x \} \\
&+ \frac{\Delta y}{16} (1 - \varepsilon) \{ \sigma_{p,q}^y + \sigma_{p+1,q}^y - \sigma_{p+1,q+1}^y - \sigma_{p,q+1}^y \} - \varepsilon \Psi \\
&- \frac{\Delta t}{2\Delta x} \{ f(\bar{u}_{p+1,q}^{n+1/2}) + f(\bar{u}_{p+1,q+1}^{n+1/2}) - f(\bar{u}_{p,q}^{n+1/2}) - f(\bar{u}_{p,q+1}^{n+1/2}) \} \\
&- \frac{\Delta t}{2\Delta y} \{ g(\bar{u}_{p,q+1}^{n+1/2}) + g(\bar{u}_{p+1,q+1}^{n+1/2}) - g(\bar{u}_{p,q}^{n+1/2}) - g(\bar{u}_{p+1,q}^{n+1/2}) \} \\
&+ \frac{\Delta t}{4} \{ s(\bar{u}_{p+1/4,q+1/4}^{n+1/2}) + s(\bar{u}_{p+3/4,q+1/4}^{n+1/2}) + s(\bar{u}_{p+3/4,q+3/4}^{n+1/2}) + s(\bar{u}_{p+1/4,q+3/4}^{n+1/2}) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Where  $\Psi$  is the 2D anti-diffusive component of the slopes given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi &= -\frac{3}{4} \bar{u}_{p+1/2,q+1/2}^{n-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{8} (\bar{u}_{p+1/2,q-1/2}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{p+1/2,q+3/2}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{p-1/2,q+1/2}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{p+3/2,q+1/2}^{n-1}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{16} (\bar{u}_{p-1/2,q-1/2}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{p+3/2,q-1/2}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{p-1/2,q+3/2}^{n-1} + \bar{u}_{p+3/2,q+3/2}^{n-1}) \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$