A study on CFL conditions for the DG solution of conservation laws on adaptive moving meshes

Min Zhang, Weizhang Huang, and Jianxian Qiu

Abstract

The selection of time step plays a crucial role in improving stability and efficiency in the Discontinuous Galerkin (DG) solution of hyperbolic conservation laws on adaptive moving meshes that typically employs explicit stepping. A commonly used selection of time step has been based on CFL conditions established for fixed and uniform meshes. This work provides a mathematical justification for those time step selection strategies used in practical adaptive DG computations. A stability analysis is presented for a moving mesh DG method for linear scalar conservation laws. Based on the analysis, a new selection strategy of the time step is proposed, which takes into consideration the coupling of the \( \alpha \)-function (that is related to the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of the flux and the mesh movement velocity) and the heights of the mesh elements. The analysis also suggests several stable combinations of the choices of the \( \alpha \)-function in the numerical scheme and in the time step selection. Numerical results obtained with a moving mesh DG method for Burgers’ and Euler equations are presented.
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1 Introduction

We are concerned with the stability of the discontinuous Galerkin (DG) solution of conservation laws on adaptive moving meshes. The DG method is a powerful numerical tool for use in the simulation of hyperbolic problems. It was first used by Reed and Hill [23] for the radiation transport equation and studied theoretically by Lesaint and Raviart [18]. The method was extended to conservation laws by Cockburn and Shu (and their coworkers) in a series of papers [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. The DG method has the advantages of high-order accuracy, geometric flexibility, easy use with mesh adaptivity, local data structure, high parallel efficiency, and a good foundation for theoretical analysis. The DG method has been used widely in scientific and engineering computation. Meanwhile, conservation laws typically exhibit discontinuous structures such as shock waves, rarefactions, and contact discontinuities and are amenable to mesh adaptation in their numerical solution to enhance numerical resolution and computational efficiency. It is natural to combine the DG method with mesh adaptation for the solution of conservation laws.

A large amount of work has been done in this area. For example, Bey and Oden [3] combined the \textit{hp}-method with the DG method for conservation laws and Li and Tang [19] solved two-dimensional conservation laws using a rezoning moving mesh method where the physical variables are interpolated from the old mesh to the new one using conservative interpolation schemes. Mackenzie and Nicola [22] solved the Hamilton-Jacobi equation by the DG method using a moving mesh method based on the moving mesh partial differential equation (MMPDE) strategy [13, 15]. More recently, Uzunca et al. [25] employed a moving mesh symmetric interior penalty Galerkin method (SIPG) to solve PDEs with traveling waves. Luo et al. considered a quasi-Lagrange moving mesh DG method (MMDG) for conservation laws [20] and multi-component flows [21]. Zhang et al. studied the MMDG solution for the radiative transfer equation [26, 27] and shallow water equations [28, 29].

It is worth emphasizing that adaptive DG computations typically employ an explicit time marching scheme due to the high nonlinearity nature of hyperbolic conservation laws and involves non-uniform (and moving) meshes due to mesh adaptation. Thus, the selection of time step plays a crucial role in improving stability and efficiency in these computations.

Consider the conservation laws in the form
\[ U_t + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F}(U, \mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \]  
where \( \Omega \) is a polygonal/polyhedral domain in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) \( (d \geq 1) \), \( U = (u_1, \ldots, u_m)^T \) \( (m \geq 1) \) is the unknown function, and the flux \( \mathbf{F}(U, \mathbf{x}) \) is an \( m \)-by-\( d \) matrix-valued function of \( U \) and \( \mathbf{x} \). A commonly used selection of time step in adaptive DG computations is
\[ \Delta t = \frac{C_{cfl} \sigma_{h,\text{min}}}{\alpha_h}, \]  
where \( \sigma_{h,\text{min}} \) is the minimum height or diameter of the mesh elements, \( C_{cfl} \) is a positive parameter, \( \alpha_h \) is the maximum absolute value of the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of \( (\mathbf{F} - U \dot{X}) \cdot \mathbf{n} \) (with respect to \( U \)) taken over all of the edges, \( \mathbf{n} \) is the unit edge normal, and \( \dot{X} \) is the piecewise linear mesh velocity function. For instance, it was used with the MMDG method in Luo et al. [20] for conservation laws and in Zhang
et al. [28, 29] for shallow water equations. The choice (1.2) is a direct extension of the Courant-Friedrichs-Levy (CFL) conditions studied and used in DG computation for fixed meshes (e.g., see [7, 11]). Some researchers have used a different yet mathematical equivalent form,

\[ \Delta t = C_{cfl} \max_{K \in T_h} \left( \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{e \in \partial K} |\alpha_e| |e| \right), \]  

(1.3)

where \( K \) is an element of the mesh \( T_h \), \( \partial K \) is the boundary of \( K \), \( e \) is an edge of \( K \), and \( |K| \) and \( |e| \) denote the area of \( K \) and the length of \( e \), respectively. This condition has also been established by Zhang et al. [30] for positivity preservation for fixed unstructured triangular meshes. To show the equivalence between (1.2) and (1.3), we notice that, for a simplex \( K \),

\[ \max_{e \in \partial K} |e| \leq \sum_{e \in \partial K} |e| \leq (d + 1) \max_{e \in \partial K} |e|, \]

which implies

\[ \frac{d}{\sigma_{K_{\min}}} \leq \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{e \in \partial K} |e| \leq \frac{d(d + 1)}{\sigma_{K_{\min}}}, \]

where \( \sigma_{K_{\min}} \) denotes the minimum height of \( K \) and we have used a geometric property of simplexes, \( |K| = (1/d) \sigma_{K_{\min}} \max_{e \in \partial K} |e| \). Taking maximum over all elements, we get

\[ \frac{\sigma_{h_{\min}}}{d(d + 1)} \leq \frac{1}{\max_{K} \left( \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{e \in \partial K} |e| \right)} \leq \frac{\sigma_{h_{\min}}}{d}, \]

(1.4)

which gives the equivalence of (1.2) and (1.3).

While the condition (1.2) or (1.3) appears to work well in existing adaptive DG computation for conservation laws, there lacks a theoretical justification of them for non-uniform and moving meshes. One may also wonder if the coupling between physical quantities and mesh elements can be taken into consideration for time step selection. The objective of this work is to study these issues. To be specific, we consider a quasi-Lagrange MMDG method [20, 26] with the Lax-Friedrichs (LF) flux for (1.1). A CFL condition for the \( L^1 \) stability of the MMDG method with \( P^0 \) elements is then established and analyzed for scalar linear equations (cf. Proposition 3.1), which provides a theoretical justification for the stability of the method. Moreover, based on this analysis, for the MMDG method with \( P^k \) elements \((k \geq 1)\) and general conservation laws we propose to choose \( \Delta t \) as

\[ \Delta t = \max_{K \in T_h} \left( \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{e \in \partial K} \alpha_e |e| \right) = \frac{C_{cfl}}{\max_{K \in T_h} \left( \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{e \in \partial K} \alpha_e |e| |K| \right)}, \]

(1.5)

where \( \alpha_e \) is the maximum absolute value of the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of \((F - U \cdot \dot{X}) \cdot n\) (with respect to \( U \)) taken over edge \( e \). This choice is very similar to (1.3). Indeed, it reduces to (1.3) when \( \alpha_e \) is replaced with the global \( \alpha_h \). However, unlike (1.3), the condition (1.5) takes into consideration the spatial variation of \( \alpha \) and its coupling with the element height (i.e., \(|K|/|e|\)). Moreover, it shows that \( \Delta t \) can
be increased if the mesh velocity can be chosen to minimize $\alpha_e$ in regions where the element height is relatively small. On the other hand, if $\alpha_e$ does not change significantly over the domain, then (1.5) is mathematically equivalent to (1.2) and $\Delta t$ is determined essentially by the minimum height of the mesh elements.

An outline of the paper is as follows. The MMDG method is described in Section 2 and the $L^1$ stability analysis of the method with $P_0$ elements is carried out for scalar linear equations in Section 3. Numerical examples are presented in Section 4. In these examples, the MMPDE moving mesh method [13, 15] is used to generate adaptive moving meshes. The section also contains the descriptions of the procedure of the MMDG method and the definition of the metric tensor that is used to control mesh concentration. The conclusions are given in the final section 5.

2 The moving mesh DG method

In this section we describe a quasi-Lagrange MMDG method [20, 26, 29] for solving hyperbolic conservation laws in the form (1.1).

To start with, we assume that a sequence of simplicial meshes, $T^0_h$, $T^1_h$, ..., have been given for $\Omega$ at time instants $t_0$, $t_1$, ... and these meshes have the same number of elements and vertices and the same connectivity. For numerical results presented in this work, we use the MMPDE moving mesh method [13, 15, 16] to generate these meshes (cf. Section 4). For any $n \geq 0$ and $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$, we define $T_h(t)$ as the mesh with the same number of elements ($N$) and vertices ($N_v$) and the same connectivity as $T^0_h$, and having the vertices given by

$$x_i(t) = \frac{t - t_n}{\Delta t_n} x_i^n + \frac{t_{n+1} - t}{\Delta t_n} x_{i+1}^{n+1}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_v, \quad \Delta t_n = t_{n+1} - t_n. \quad (2.1)$$

Define the piecewise linear mesh velocity function as

$$\dot{X}(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_v} \dot{x}_i \phi_i(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_v} \frac{x_{i+1} - x_i}{\Delta t_n} \phi_i(x, t), \quad t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}] \quad (2.2)$$

where $\phi_i(x, t)$ is the linear basis function at $x_i$ and $\dot{x}_i$ is the nodal velocity. For any element $K \in T_h(t)$, let $P^k(K)$ be the set of polynomials of degree at most $k \geq 1$ on $K$. The DG finite element space is defined as

$$V^k_h(t) = \{ u \in L^2(\Omega) : u|_K \in P^k(K), \forall K \in T_h(t) \}. \quad (2.3)$$

We now are ready to describe the DG discretization of (1.1). Multiplying it with an arbitrary test function $\phi \in V^k_h(t)$, integrating the resulting equation over $K$, and using the Reynolds transport theorem, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_K U_h \phi dx - \int_K H(U_h, x) \cdot \nabla \phi dx + \sum_{e \in \partial K} \int_e \phi \hat{H}(U_h, x) ds = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

where $U_h = U_h(x, t)$, $H(U_h, x) = F(U_h, x) - U_h \dot{X}$ is the new flux accounting for the effect of mesh movement, $\hat{H}(U_h, x) \approx H(U_h, x) \cdot n$ is a numerical flux, and $n$ is the unit outward normal to edge $e$. Let $\lambda_m$’s be the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of
$\mathbf{H}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}$ with respect to $U_h$ and $U^\text{int}_h$ and $U^\text{ext}_h$ be the values of $U_h$ in $K$ and $K'$, respectively, where $K'$ is the element sharing $e$ with $K$. Define the $\alpha$-function as

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \max_m \left( \max \left( \| \lambda_m(U^\text{int}_h, \mathbf{x}) \|, \| \lambda_m(U^\text{ext}_h, \mathbf{x}) \| \right) \right).$$

(2.5)

In this work we consider the global/local Lax-Friedrichs (LF) numerical flux,

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \left( \mathbf{H}(U^\text{int}_h, \mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{H}(U^\text{ext}_h, \mathbf{x}) \right) \cdot \mathbf{n} - \alpha_{\text{LF}}(\mathbf{x}) (U^\text{ext}_h - U^\text{int}_h) \right), \quad \mathbf{x} \in e \subset \partial K,$n
tewith $\alpha_{\text{LF}}$ denotes a choice of the $\alpha$-function in this numerical flux. In practical computation, the second and third terms in (2.4) are calculated typically by Gaussian quadrature rules. We denote those by

$$\int_K \mathbf{H}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla \phi \, d\mathbf{x} \approx |K| \sum_{x^K_G} w^K_G \left( \mathbf{H}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla \phi \right)_{x^K_G}, \quad \text{with } \sum w^K_G = 1$$

(2.6)

$$\sum_{e \in \partial K} \int_e \phi \hat{\mathbf{H}}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) \, ds \approx \sum_{e \in \partial K} |e| \left( \sum_{x^e_G} w^e_G \left( \phi \hat{\mathbf{H}}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) \right)_{x^e_G} \right), \quad \text{with } \sum w^e_G = 1$$

where $x^K_G$’s and $x^e_G$’s are the Gauss points on $K$ and $e$, respectively. For the analytical analysis in the next section, we assume that the weights $w^K_G$’s and $w^e_G$’s are nonnegative. Combining the above with (2.4) we obtain the semi-discrete MMDG scheme as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_K U_h \phi \, d\mathbf{x} \bigg|_{t=0} = |K| \sum_{x^K_G} w^K_G \left( \mathbf{H}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla \phi \right)_{x^K_G} + \sum_{e \in \partial K} |e| \left( \sum_{x^e_G} w^e_G \left( \phi \hat{\mathbf{H}}(U_h, \mathbf{x}) \right)_{x^e_G} \right) = 0.$$

(2.7)

One choice of $\alpha_{\text{LF}}$ is the point-wise value of $\alpha(\mathbf{x})$, i.e.,

$$\alpha_p = \alpha(x^K_G) = \max_m \left( \max \left( \| \lambda_m(U^\text{int}_h, \mathbf{x}) \|_{x^K_G}, \| \lambda_m(U^\text{ext}_h, \mathbf{x}) \|_{x^K_G} \right) \right).$$

(2.8)

It is worth pointing out that (2.8) is calculated pointwise. We can choose it differently, for example, by taking the maximum value over each edge, all edges on each element, or all edges in the mesh; cf. (3.7) and (3.9).

A fully discrete MMDG scheme can be obtained by discretizing (2.7) in time. A stability analysis is presented in the next section for a simple case with the explicit Euler scheme and numerical results are presented in Section 4 with a third-order strong-stability-preserving (SSP) Runge-Kutta scheme.

3 CFL conditions on adaptive moving meshes

Generally speaking, it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a CFL condition rigorously for a fully discrete version of the MMDG scheme (2.7) for general conservation law (1.1). To gain insight into the stability, we consider a simple situation with the explicit Euler scheme for time integration, and for linear
scalar conservation laws with the flux $F = a(x, t)U$. We also assume that $\Omega$ is cubic, periodic boundary conditions are used, and $a(x, t)$ is periodic in each coordinate direction.

Under these assumptions, we have

$$H(U_h, x) = (a(x, t) - \dot{X})U_h, \quad \lambda(x, t) = (a(x, t) - \dot{X}) \cdot n, \quad \alpha(x, t) = |\lambda(x, t)|.$$  

Moreover,

$$\hat{H}(U_h, x) = \frac{1}{2} \left( (H(U_h^{\text{int}}, x) + H(U_h^{\text{ext}}, x)) \cdot n - \alpha_{LF}(x, t)(U_h^{\text{ext}} - U_h^{\text{int}}) \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left( \lambda(x, t)(U_h^{\text{int}} + U_h^{\text{ext}}) - \alpha_{LF}(x, t)(U_h^{\text{ext}} - U_h^{\text{int}}) \right)$$

$$= \frac{\alpha_{LF}(x, t) + \lambda(x, t)}{2} U_h^{\text{int}} - \frac{\alpha_{LF}(x, t) - \lambda(x, t)}{2} U_h^{\text{ext}}.$$  

Applying the explicit Euler scheme to (2.7) and taking $\phi = 1$, we get

$$|K^{n+1}| \hat{U}_{h, K}^{n+1} = |K^n| \hat{U}_{h, K}^n - \Delta t_n \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G \hat{H}(U_h, x)|x_G^e = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\hat{U}_{h, K}$ is the average of $U_h^n$ on $K^n$, $\hat{U}_{h, K}^{n+1}$ is the average of $U_h^{n+1}$ on $K^{n+1}$, and $K^n$ and $K^{n+1}$ are the corresponding elements in $\mathcal{T}_h^n$ and $\mathcal{T}_h^{n+1}$, respectively.

**Proposition 3.1** The MM $P^0$-DG scheme (3.1) with $F = a(x, t)U$ is $L^1$-stable under the CFL condition

$$\Delta t_n \leq \frac{1}{\max_{K^n} \left( \frac{1}{|K^n|} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G \alpha_{CFL}^n(x_G^e) \right)}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\alpha_{CFL}^n(x) \geq \alpha_{LF}^n(x)$ and the subscripts $LF$ and $CFL$ stand for the LF numerical flux and CFL condition, respectively.

**Proof.** From the assumption of $P^0$-DG, for any $x \in e$ of $K^n$, we have

$$U_h^{\text{int}, x_G^e} = U_h^{\text{int}} = \hat{U}_{h, K}, \quad U_h^{\text{ext}, x_G^e} = U_h^{\text{ext}} = \hat{U}_{h, K},$$

where $K'$ is the element sharing $e$ with $K$. With this, (3.1) can be rewritten as

$$|K^{n+1}| \hat{U}_{h, K}^{n+1} = |K^n| \hat{U}_{h, K}^n - \Delta t_n \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n + \lambda^n}{2} U_h^{\text{int}, x_G^e} - \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n - \lambda^n}{2} U_h^{\text{ext}, x_G^e} \right) \bigg|_x^e$$

$$= |K^n| \hat{U}_{h, K}^n - \Delta t_n \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \hat{U}_{h, K}^{n+1} \sum_{x_G^e} w_G \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right)$$

$$+ \Delta t_n \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \hat{U}_{h, K}^{n+1} \sum_{x_G^e} w_G \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) - \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right)$$

$$= |K^n| \hat{U}_{h, K}^n \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta t_n}{|K^n|} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right) \right]$$

$$+ \Delta t_n \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \hat{U}_{h, K}^{n+1} \sum_{x_G^e} w_G \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right). \quad (3.3)$$
Notice that, for any $x_G^e \in e \subset \partial K^n$, we have

$$0 \leq \alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e) \leq 2\alpha_{CFL}^n(x_G^e), \quad 0 \leq \alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) - \lambda^n(x_G^e).$$

From the CFL condition (3.2), we have

$$1 - \frac{\Delta t_n}{|K^n|} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right) \geq 0.$$ 

From this, taking the absolute value on both side of (3.3) gives

$$|K^{n+1}| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n+1}|| \leq |K^n| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n}|| \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta t_n}{|K^n|} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right) \right]$$

$$+ \Delta t_n \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n,ext}|| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) - \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right).$$

Summing this over all elements, we get

$$\sum_{K^{n+1}} |K^{n+1}| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n+1}|| \leq \sum_{K^n} |K^n| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n}|| \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta t_n}{|K^n|} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right) \right]$$

$$+ \Delta t_n \sum_{K^n} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n,ext}|| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) - \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right).$$

We notice that $\sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n,ext}||$ (\ldots) goes over all neighboring elements ($K'$) of $K^n$ and each term can be considered to be associated with $K'$ but with $n$ being changed to $-n$ (because the unit outward normal of $e$ in view of $K^n$ is opposite to the unit outward normal of $e$ in view of $K'$). From the periodicity assumption on the boundary conditions and $a(x,t)$, we can rewrite the second term on the right-hand side of the above equation as

$$\Delta t_n \sum_{K^n} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n,ext}|| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) - \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right)$$

$$= \Delta t_n \sum_{K^n} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n}|| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right).$$

Combining these, we have

$$\sum_{K^{n+1}} |K^{n+1}| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n+1}|| \leq \sum_{K^n} |K^n| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n}|| \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta t_n}{|K^n|} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right) \right]$$

$$+ \Delta t_n \sum_{K^n} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n}|| \sum_{x_G^e} w_G^e \left( \frac{\alpha_{LF}^n(x_G^e) + \lambda^n(x_G^e)}{2} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{K} |K^n| ||\tilde{U}_{h,K}^{n}||.$$ 

Hence, the scheme is $L^1$-stable. □
It should be pointed out that the CFL condition (3.2) is only a sufficient condition. Nevertheless, it offers several insights on the maximum time step allowed by stability. We elaborate these in the following remarks.

**Remark 3.2** Condition (3.2) involves an important factor \( \frac{|e|}{|K|} \). It is known that \( \frac{|e|}{|K|} = \frac{d}{\sigma_e} \), \( \forall e \in \partial K \)

where \( \sigma_e \) is an element height defined as the distance between \( e \) and the vertex of \( K \) opposite to \( e \). Using this, we can rewrite (3.2) into

\[
\Delta t \leq \frac{1}{d} \max_K \left( \sum_{e \in \partial K} \frac{1}{\sigma_e} \sum_{x_G} w_G \alpha_{CFL}(x_G) \right).
\]

This indicates that the allowed maximum time step depends on the coupling between \( \sigma_e \) and \( \alpha_{CFL}(x_G) \). Particularly, if we can choose the mesh velocity \( \dot{X} \) to minimize \( \alpha_{CFL}(x_G) \) (or, by the definition of \( \alpha \), the magnitude of \( H(U_h, x) = F(U_h, x) - U_h \dot{X} \)) in regions where \( \sigma_e \) is small, then we can use a larger time step. On the other hand, if \( \alpha_{CFL}(x_G) \) does not change significantly over the domain, then \( \Delta t \) is determined mostly by the minimum height \( \sigma_{h,\text{min}} = \min_{K,e} \sigma_e \) of the mesh elements.

**Remark 3.3** From the above proof we can see that the choice of \( \alpha \) in the CFL condition (3.2) can be different from that in the DG scheme (2.8) as long as

\[
\alpha_{CFL}(x) \geq \alpha_{LF}(x).
\]

For example, we can use \( \alpha_{LF} = \alpha_p \) (pointwise, cf. (2.8)) for the scheme (denoted as \( \alpha_{LF,p} \)) and \( \alpha_{CFL} = \alpha_h \) (global) for the CFL condition (denoted as \( \alpha_{CFL,h} \)), where

\[
\alpha_h = \max_{K,e} \alpha(x_G^e) = \max_{K,e,x_G^e,m} \left( \max \left( |\lambda_m(U^\text{int}_h,x)|x_G^e|, |\lambda_m(U^\text{ext}_h,x)|x_G^e| \right) \right),
\]

which has been expressed for the general form (1.1) of conservation laws. This works since (3.6) is satisfied. On the other hand, the proof of Proposition 3.1 will not hold in general for the choice with \( \alpha_{LF} = \alpha_h \) and \( \alpha_{CFL} = \alpha_p \) since it violates (3.6). As a consequence, it is unclear if there is a theoretical guarantee that the scheme is \( L^1 \)-stable for this choice.

**Remark 3.4** For the choice \( \alpha_{CFL} = \alpha_h \) (denoted as \( \alpha_{CFL,h} \)), the CFL condition (3.2) becomes

\[
\Delta t \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_{CFL,h} \max_K \left( \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{e \in \partial K} |e| \right)}.
\]

This corresponds to the CFL condition (1.3) that has been commonly used in existing adaptive DG computation and is a direct extension of CFL conditions used for fixed, uniform meshes.
Remark 3.5 We can use something in between the very local $\alpha_p$ (2.8) and the global one in (3.7). For example, we take the maximum value of $\alpha$ over the Gauss points on edge $e$, i.e.,

$$\alpha_e = \max_{x^e_G} \alpha(x^e_G) = \max_{x^e_G,m} \left( \max \left( |\lambda^m(U^\text{int}_h,x)|_{x^e_G}, |\lambda^m(U^\text{ext}_h,x)|_{x^e_G} \right) \right).$$ (3.9)

For this choice ($\alpha_{\text{CFL}} = \alpha_e$, denoted as $\alpha_{\text{CFL},e}$), the CFL condition (3.2) becomes

$$\Delta t \leq \frac{1}{\max_K \left( \frac{1}{|K|} \sum_{e \in \partial K} |e| \alpha_{\text{CFL},e} \right)}.$$ (3.10)

Remark 3.6 Since an explicit Runge-Kutta scheme can be expressed as a combination of the explicit Euler scheme with different time stepsize, we expect that the above analysis applies to explicit Runge-Kutta schemes as well. Moreover, for general $P^k$-DG ($k \geq 0$) and general systems of conservation laws, based on [5, 7], we suggest to use (1.5), where $\alpha_e$ is defined in (3.9). A choice of $C_{\text{cfl}}$ is $C_{\text{cfl}} \leq 1/(2k + 1)$ [7].

4 Numerical results

In this section we present numerical results obtained with the MMDG method described in the previous sections with the third-order SSP Runge-Kutta scheme [12] for one- and two-dimensional Burgers’ equations and Euler equations. The moving mesh is generated by the MMPDE moving mesh method; e.g., see [26, Section 4] or [27, Section 3] for a brief yet complete description of the method and [13, 14, 15, 16, 17] for a more detailed description and a development history. A key idea of the MMPDE method is to view any nonuniform mesh as a uniform one in some Riemannian metric specified by a tensor $M = M(x)$, a symmetric and uniformly positive definite matrix-valued function that provides the information needed for determining the size, shape, and orientation of the mesh elements throughout the domain.

In this work we use an optimal metric tensor based on the $L^2$-norm of piece linear interpolation error [14, 15]. To be specific, we consider a physical variable $u$ and its finite element approximation $u_h$. Let $H_K$ be a recovered Hessian of $u_h$ on $K \in T_h$ such as one obtained using least squares fitting. Assuming that the eigen-decomposition of $H_K$ is given by

$$H_K = Q \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_d) Q^T,$$

where $Q$ is an orthogonal matrix, we define

$$|H_K| = Q \text{diag}(|\lambda_1|, \cdots, |\lambda_d|) Q^T.$$

The metric tensor is defined as

$$M_K = \det \left( \beta_h \mathbb{I} + |H_K| \right)^{-\frac{1}{d+1}} \left( \beta_h \mathbb{I} + |H_K| \right), \forall K \in T_h$$ (4.1)

where $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity matrix, $\det(\cdot)$ is the determinant of a matrix, and $\beta_h$ is a regularization parameter defined through the algebraic equation

$$\sum_{K \in T_h} |K| \det(\beta_h \mathbb{I} + |H_K|)^{\frac{2}{d+2}} = 2 \sum_{K \in T_h} |K| \det(|H_K|)^{\frac{2}{d+2}}.$$
Roughly speaking, the choice of (4.1) is to concentrate mesh points in regions where the determinant of the Hessian is large. It does not serve the purpose of minimizing $\alpha$ and thus increasing $\Delta t$ (cf. Remark 3.2).

In our numerical results, we use the physical solution $u$ to compute the metric tensor for Burgers’ equation and the density $\rho$ and the entropy $S = \ln(P\rho^{-\gamma})$ for the Euler equations. To explain the latter, we first compute $M^\rho_K$ and $M^S_K$ using (4.1) with $u = \rho$ and $S$, respectively. Then, a new metric tensor is obtained through matrix intersection as

$$\tilde{M}_K = M^S_K \cap |M^\rho_K|, \quad (4.2)$$

where $|||\cdot|||$ denotes the maximum absolute value of the entries of a matrix and "$\cap$" stands for matrix intersection. The reader is referred to [26] for the definition and geometric interpretation of matrix intersection.

We note that it has been shown analytically and demonstrated numerically in [17] that the moving mesh generated by the MMPDE method stays nonsingular (free from tangling) if the metric tensor is bounded and the initial mesh is nonsingular. Moreover, a number of other moving mesh methods have been developed as well; e.g., see the books or review articles [1, 2, 4, 15, 24] and references therein.

The procedure of the MMDG method is presented in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** The MMDG method for hyperbolic conservation laws.

0. **Initialization.** For a given initial mesh $T^0_h$, project the initial physical variables into the DG space $V^{k,0}_h$ to obtain $U^0_h$.

   For $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, do

1. **Mesh adaptation.**
   
   (1.1) Compute the time step $\tilde{\Delta}t_n$ (on the fixed mesh) according to (1.5) based on $T^n_h = \{x^n_i\}$ and $U^n_h$, i.e.,

   $$\tilde{\Delta}t_n = \frac{C_{cfl}}{\max_{K^n}\left(\frac{1}{|K^n|} \sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \tilde{\alpha}^n_{CFL} \right)}, \quad (4.3)$$

   where $\tilde{\alpha}^n_{CFL}$ is chosen based on the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of $F \cdot n$ (with respect to $U$) evaluated on edge $e$.

   (1.2) Compute the metric tensor $M$ based on $T^n_h$ and $U^n_h$.

   (1.3) Generate the new mesh $\tilde{T}^{n+1}_h = \{\tilde{x}^{n+1}_i\}$ using the MMPDE moving mesh method.

   (1.4) Compute the nodal mesh velocity as

   $$\dot{x}^{n+1}_i = \frac{\tilde{x}^{n+1}_i - x^n_i}{\Delta t_n}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_v.$$

   (1.5) Compute the time step $\Delta t_n$ (using (1.5)) based on $T^n_h$, $\tilde{T}^{n+1}_h$ and $U^n_h$ as

   $$\Delta t_n = \frac{C_{cfl}}{\max_{K} \left[ \frac{\sum_{e \in \partial K^n} |e| \alpha_{CFL}}{|K^n|}, \frac{\sum_{e \in \partial \tilde{K}^{n+1}_h} |e| \alpha_{CFL}}{|\tilde{K}^{n+1}_h|} \right]}, \quad (4.4)$$
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where \( \alpha_{CFL} \) is chosen based on the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of 
\((F - UX) \cdot n\) (with respect to \( U \)) evaluated on edge \( e \).

(1.6) Finally, the physical mesh \( T_h^{n+1} \) is defined as

\[
x_i^{n+1} = x_i^n + \Delta t_n \mathbf{x}_i^n, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_v.
\]

2. Solution of the physical equations on the moving mesh. Integrate the 
physical equations from \( t_n \) to \( t_n+1 \) using the MMDG scheme to obtain \( U_h^{n+1} \).

It is remarked that the CFL condition (4.4) has been used in the above algorithm 
to take the old and new meshes \( T_h^n \) and \( T_h^{n+1} \) into consideration. The rationale behind 
this is that the third-order SSP Runge-Kutta scheme we use for the time integration 
has three stages that can be viewed roughly as the Euler explicit scheme from \( t_n \) to 
\( t_{n+1} \), \( t_{n+1} \) to \( t_{n+\frac{1}{2}} \), and \( t_{n+\frac{1}{2}} \) to \( t_{n+1} \), respectively. The computation of the right-hand 
side of (3.1) involves both \( T_h^n \) and \( T_h^{n+1} \) and thus it would be better to take the effects 
of these meshes into consideration more directly in time step even the mesh velocity is 
included in the computation of \( \alpha_e \). In principle, we should also update \( \alpha_e \) during the 
Runge-Kutta stages. However, this can cause changes in the time step size during the 
Runge-Kutta stepping, which requires to re-start the stepping with a new time step 
size. To avoid this complicity, we choose to freeze \( \alpha_e \) at \( t = t_n \).

We also note that \( \alpha_e \) has been used in the algorithm and it can be replaced by \( \alpha_h \). 
In fact, in the following numerical examples, we consider two options \( \alpha_e \) and \( \alpha_h \) for 
each of the LF numerical flux and the CFL condition. For example, \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})\) indicates that \( \alpha_h \) is used in the CFL condition and \( \alpha_e \) used in the LF numerical flux. 
Furthermore, we consider moving mesh \( P^k \)-DG with \( k = 1, 2, \) and \( 3 \). We take the CFL 
number \( C_{cfl} \) as 0.3 for \( P^1 \)-DG, 0.15 for \( P^2 \)-DG, and 0.1 for \( P^3 \)-DG.

**Example 4.1 (1D Burgers’ equation)**

We first consider Burgers’ equation in one dimension,

\[
u_t + \left( \frac{u^2}{2} \right)_x = 0, \quad x \in (0, 2)
\]

subject to the initial condition \( u(x, 0) = \frac{1}{2} + \sin(\pi x) \) and periodic boundary conditions. 
The final time is \( T = 1 \).

The mesh trajectories, solution, and time step size obtained with the moving mesh 
\( P^k \)-DG method \((k = 1, 2, \) and \( 3 \)) and \( N = 100 \) are shown in Figs. 1, 2, and 3 
respectively. Three combinations of \( \alpha_e \) and \( \alpha_h \) are used: \((\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e})\), \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})\), and \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,h})\). They all lead to stable computation and almost identical 
solutions and mesh trajectories. A close examination on \( \Delta t \) indicates that \((\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e})\) gives a slightly larger and less oscillatory time step than those with \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})\) and \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,h})\). We may attribute the former to the fact \( \alpha_e \leq \alpha_h \) (cf. (4.4)). 
However, it is unclear to the authors why \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})\) and \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,h})\), which 
appear to be more stable, lead to more oscillatory \( \Delta t \). This feature is also observed in 
other examples presented in this section except the last example (Example 4.5). The 
figures also show that the time step behaves similar qualitatively and quantitatively 
for \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})\) and \((\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,h})\).
Example 4.2 (Sod shock tube problem for 1D Euler equations)

We consider the Sod problem of the Euler equations,

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \rho u \\ E \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \begin{pmatrix} \rho u \\ \rho u^2 + P \\ u(E + P) \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad x \in (-5, 5)
\]

(4.6)

where \( \rho \) is the density, \( u \) is the velocity, \( E \) is the energy density, and \( P \) is the pressure. The equation of the state is \( E = P/(\gamma - 1) + \rho u^2/2 \) with \( \gamma = 1.4 \). The initial conditions are given by

\[
(\rho, u, P) = \begin{cases} 
(1, 0, 1), & x \leq 0 \\
(0.125, 0, 0.1), & x > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

(4.7)

The computation is stopped at \( T = 2 \). The solution of the problem contains a shock wave, a rarefaction, and a contact discontinuity.

The mesh trajectories, density, and time step size obtained with the \( P^k \)-DG (\( k = 1, 2, 3 \)) method and a moving mesh of \( N = 200 \) are shown in Figs. 4, 5, and 6. We can see that the mesh points are concentrated correctly around the shock wave, rarefaction, and contact discontinuity. The computation is stable for all three choices of \( \alpha \). Similar
Figure 3: Example 4.1. The mesh trajectories, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^3$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 100$.

observations can be made for $\Delta t$ as in the previous example except for the case with $P^2$-DG where $(\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})$ leads to larger $\Delta t$ for $0.2 < t < 0.8$ than $(\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e})$. To explain this, we notice that different CFL conditions can lead to different $\Delta t$, which can affect the mesh adaptation and the time integration of the physical equations. These effects do not seem significant in the previous example and in other cases in this example. However, they are slightly more significant in this case. From Fig. 7, we can see that $(\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})$ results in a slightly larger minimum mesh spacing, which in turns gives slightly larger $\Delta t$.

Once again, the results show that $\Delta t$ associated with $(\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})$ and $(\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,h})$ has large oscillations than that associated with $(\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e})$.

It is worth mentioning that we have tried $(\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,h})$, which violates (3.6), in the computation with moving mesh $P^1$-DG. The computation stops at around $t = 0.0011$ when $\Delta t$ becomes machine-precision. Similar unstable computations have also been observed for this choice for other $P^k$ elements.

Figure 4: Example 4.2. The mesh trajectories, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^1$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 200$. 

Example 4.3 (Lax problem for 1D Euler equations)

In this example, we consider the Lax problem of the Euler equations (4.6) with the following initial conditions

\[
(\rho, u, P) = \begin{cases} 
(0.445, 0.698, 3.528), & x \leq 0 \\
(0.5, 0, 0.571), & x > 0.
\end{cases}
\]  

(4.8)
The final time is $T = 1.3$. The mesh trajectories, density, and time step size $\Delta t$ obtained with the $P^k$-DG ($k = 1, 2, 3$) method and a moving mesh of $N = 200$ are shown in Figs. 8, 9, and 10. In this example (and following examples), we show results only for two choices of $\alpha$, ($\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e}$) and ($\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e}$), since ($\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,h}$) and ($\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e}$) produce almost identical results. The results show that the computation is stable and $\Delta t$ associated with ($\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e}$) is slightly larger and has small oscillations than that associated with ($\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e}$).

Figure 8: Example 4.3. The mesh trajectories, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^1$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 200$.

Figure 9: Example 4.3. The mesh trajectories, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^2$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 200$.

Figure 10: Example 4.3. The mesh trajectories, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^3$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 200$. 

Example 4.4 *(2D Burgers’ equation)*

We now consider Burgers’ equation in two dimensions,

\[ u_t + \left( \frac{u^2}{2} \right)_x + \left( \frac{u^2}{2} \right)_y = 0, \quad (x, y) \in (0, 2) \times (0, 2) \]  

subject to the initial condition \( u(x, y, 0) = e^{(-c(x^2+y^2))}, \ c = -\ln(10^{-16}) \) and periodic boundary conditions. The final time is \( T = 2 \).

The mesh, solution, and time step size obtained with the moving mesh \( P^k\)-DG method \( (k = 1, 2, 3) \) and \( N = 30 \times 30 \times 4 \) are presented in Figs. 11, 12, and 13 respectively. From these figures one can see that the computation is stable and the mesh points are concentrated in regions with sharp jumps in the solution. Moreover, \( \Delta t \) associated with \( \left( \alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e} \right) \) is larger and has smaller oscillations than that associated with \( \left( \alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e} \right) \).

![Figure 11: Example 4.4. The mesh, solution, and time step size are obtained with the \( P^1\)-DG method and a moving mesh of \( N = 30 \times 30 \times 4 \).](image1)

![Figure 12: Example 4.4. The mesh, solution, and time step size are obtained with the \( P^2\)-DG method and a moving mesh of \( N = 30 \times 30 \times 4 \).](image2)
Example 4.4. The mesh, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^3$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 30 \times 30 \times 4$.

Example 4.5 (A 2D Riemann problem for the Euler equations)

We consider a two-dimensional Riemann problem of the Euler equations

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \rho \\ \rho u \\ \rho v \\ E \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \begin{pmatrix} \rho u \\ \rho u^2 + P \\ \rho uv \\ u(E + P) \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \begin{pmatrix} \rho v \\ \rho uv \\ \rho v^2 + P \\ v(E + P) \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (x, y) \in (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \quad (4.10)
$$

subject to periodic boundary conditions and the initial conditions

$$(\rho, u, v, P) = \begin{cases} 
(1.1, 0, 0, 1.1), & x \geq 0.5, \ y \geq 0.5 \\
(0.5065, 0.8939, 0, 0.35), & x < 0.5, \ y \geq 0.5 \\
(1.1, 0.8939, 0.8939, 1.1), & x < 0.5, \ y < 0.5 \\
(0.5065, 0, 0.8939, 0.35), & x \geq 0.5, \ y < 0.5.
\end{cases} \quad (4.11)
$$

The energy density $E$ and the pressure $P$ are related by the equation of the state $E = P/(\gamma - 1) + \rho(u^2 + v^2)/2$ with $\gamma = 1.4$. The problem contains complicated interactions between four initial shocks. This problem has been widely used as a benchmark test for shock capturing methods due to the challenge in resolving the complicated flow features that emerge from those interactions. The final time for the computation is taken as $T = 0.25$.

The mesh and density at the final time, and time step size obtained with the moving mesh $P^k$-DG method ($k = 1, 2, 3$) and $N = 50 \times 50 \times 4$ are shown in Figs. 14, 15, and 16, respectively. Like the previous examples, the computation is stable and the mesh points are concentrated correctly around the shocks. Moreover, $\Delta t$ associated with $(\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e})$ is slightly larger than that associated with $(\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})$. However, unlike the previous examples, $\Delta t$ has large oscillations before $t < 0.1$ for both cases.
Figure 14: Example 4.5. The mesh, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^1$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 50 \times 50 \times 4$.

Figure 15: Example 4.5. The mesh, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^2$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 50 \times 50 \times 4$.

Figure 16: Example 4.5. The mesh, solution, and time step size are obtained with the $P^3$-DG method and a moving mesh of $N = 50 \times 50 \times 4$.

5 Conclusions

In the previous sections we have studied the stability of a DG solution of conservation laws on adaptive moving meshes. Particularly, we have obtained a CFL condition (3.2) for moving mesh $P^0$-DG for linear scalar conservation laws. The condition shows
that the allowed maximum time step depends on the coupling between $\alpha$ on any edge and the element height associated with the edge, where $\alpha$ (cf. 2.8) is the maximum eigenvalue of the Jacobian matrix of the flux $(F - UX) \cdot n$ with respect to $U$ and the element height is the distance between the edge and the vertex opposite to the edge. The condition justifies a known intuition that time step can be increased if the mesh velocity is chosen to minimize $(F - UX)$. On the other hand, if $\alpha$ does not change significantly over the domain, it is expected that the allowed maximum time step is determined mostly by the minimum element height of the mesh.

The stability analysis also shows that different choices of $\alpha$ can be used in the LF numerical flux and the CFL condition but a relation (3.6) should be satisfied for $L^1$ stability. Two common choices for $\alpha$ are $\alpha_e$ defined in (3.9) and $\alpha_h$ defined in (3.7).

Based on (3.2) and CFL conditions for DG method on fixed meshes, we have proposed to choose the time step according to (4.4) (with the same or a different choice of $\alpha$) for moving mesh $P^k$-DG ($k = 1, 2, 3$) for general conservation laws. This condition reduces to the one on fixed meshes when $\alpha$ is taken as $\alpha_h$.

Numerical examples have been presented with mesh adaptation by the MMPDE method for Burgers’ and Euler equations in one and two dimensions. Numerical results show that (4.4) with $\alpha_{CFL} = \alpha_e$ or $\alpha_{CFL} = \alpha_h$ lead to stable computation. Moreover, $(\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e})$ typically gives larger $\Delta t$ than $(\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,e})$ and $(\alpha_{CFL,h}, \alpha_{LF,h})$. All but one example also show that $\Delta t$ with $(\alpha_{CFL,e}, \alpha_{LF,e})$ has smaller oscillations.
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