Numerical convergence of discrete extensions in a space-time finite element, fictitious domain method for the Navier–Stokes equations
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Abstract

A key ingredient of our fictitious domain, higher order space-time cut finite element (CutFEM) approach for solving the incompressible Navier–Stokes equations on evolving domains (cf. [1]) is the extension of the physical solution from the time-dependent flow domain $\Omega_t^f$ to the entire, time-independent computational domain $\Omega$. The extension is defined implicitly and, simultaneously, aims at stabilizing the discrete solution in the case of unavoidable irregular small cuts. Here, the convergence properties of the scheme are studied numerically for variations of the combined extension and stabilization.

1 Mathematical problem and numerical scheme

For an evolving flow domain $\Omega_t^f$, with $t \in [0,T]$, and $I := (0,T]$ we consider the incompressible Navier–Stokes system (cf. Fig. 1)

$$\partial_t v + (v \cdot \nabla)v - \nu \Delta v + \nabla p = f, \quad \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega_t^f \times I,$$

that is equipped with the initial condition $v(0) = v_0$ in $\Omega_0^f$ and the Dirichlet boundary condition $v = g$ on $\Gamma_t^f \times I$ for the time-dependent boundary $\Gamma_t^f$ of the flow domain $\Omega_t^f$. For flow problems with inflow and outflow boundaries we refer to cf. [1].

Let $T_h = \{K\}$ be a family of regular decompositions of the computational domain $\Omega = \Omega_f^t \cup \Omega_r^t$. By $V_h \times Q_h$ we denote an inf-sup stable pair of time-independent bulk finite element spaces on $\Omega$ for the velocity and pressure. For $u_h, \phi_h \in V_h \times Q_h$, with $u_h = (v_h, p_h)$, $\phi_h = (\psi_h, \xi_h)$, we define $A_h : (V_h \times Q_h) \times (V_h \times Q_h) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $L_h : (V_h \times Q_h) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$A_h(u_h, \phi_h) := \langle (v \cdot \nabla)v, \psi_h \rangle_{\Omega_f^t} + \nu \langle \nabla v, \nabla \psi_h \rangle_{\Omega_f^t} - \langle p, \nabla \cdot \psi_h \rangle_{\Omega_f^t} + \langle \nabla \cdot v, \xi_h \rangle_{\Omega_r^t}$$

$$- \langle \nu \nabla v_h \cdot n - p_h n, \psi_h \rangle_{\Gamma_f^t} + B_{\Gamma_f^t}(v_h, \phi_h) + S_{F_h}(u_h, \phi_h),$$

$$L_h(\phi_h; f, g) := \langle f, \psi_h \rangle_{\Omega_f^t} + B_{\Gamma_f^t}(g, \phi_h).$$
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The bilinearform $B_{Γ_f} : H^{1/2}(Γ_f) \times (V_h \times Q_h) \to \mathbb{R}$ enforces Dirichlet boundary conditions weakly by Nitsche’s method,

$$B_{Γ_f}(w, φ_h) := -⟨ω, ν∇φ_h · n + ξ_h n⟩_{Γ_f \cap Ω} + γ_1 ν \langle h^{-1} w, ψ_h⟩_{Γ_f} + γ_2 \langle h^{-1} w · n, ψ_h · n⟩_{Γ_f \cap Ω},$$

for $w \in H^{1/2}(Γ_f)$ and $φ_h \in V_h \times Q_h$. Here, $γ_1 > 0$ and $γ_2 > 0$ are numerical (tuning) parameters for the penalization. The linear form $S_{F_h}$ is introduced and analyzed for the Stokes problem in [3]. Its impact is twofold. On the one hand it extends the solution $u_h$ from the fluid domain $Ω_f$ to the rigid domain $Ω_r^f$ such that the solution is defined on the whole computational domain $Ω = Ω_f \cup Ω_r$. On the other hand, $S_{F_h}$ stabilizes the solution in the case of small cut cell scenarios. For the definition of $S_{F_h}$, we define a stabilization zone $Ω_r^s \subset Ω$ such that the enclosure $Ω_f \subset Ω_r^s$ is satisfied, and a corresponding submesh $T_h^s \subset T_h$ of all cells that cover $Ω_r^s$ completely. In Sec. 2 we will study numerically the effect of extending the stabilization into the fluid domain, i.e. of widening the domain $Ω_r^s$. The set of all faces that are common to two cells of $T_h^s$ is denoted by $F_h^s$. With numerical parameters $γ_ν = γ_ν ν^{-1} + ν h^{-2} > 0$ and $γ_p = γ_p ν^{-1} > 0$, the form $S_{F_h}$ is defined by

$$S_{F_h}(u_h, φ_h) = \sum_{F \in F_h^s} γ_ν (E v_{h|K_1} - E v_{h|K_2}, E p_{h|K_1} - E p_{h|K_2})_{ω_F} + γ_p (E p_{h|K_1} - E p_{h|K_2}, E ξ_{h|K_1} - E ξ_{h|K_2})_{ω_F}.$$

Here, $E$ denotes the canonical patchwise extension of the discrete functions. We refer to [3] for its definition.

Putting $A_h^s := A_h + S_{F_h}$ and applying a discontinuous Galerkin time discretization with piece-wise polynomials of order $k$ (cf. [1]) leads to finding, in each subinterval $I_n = (t_{n−1}, t_n)$, functions $(v_{τ,h}, p_{τ,h}) \in P_k(I_n; V_h) \times P_k(I_n; Q_h)$, such that

$$\int_{I_{n−1}} \langle ∂_t v_{τ,h}, ψ_{τ,h}⟩_{Ω_f^s} + A_h^s(u_{τ,h}, φ_{τ,h})dt + ⟨[v_{τ,h}]_{t_{n−1}}, ψ_{τ,h}(t_{n−1})⟩_{Ω_f^s} = \int_{I_{n−1}} L_h(φ_{τ,h}; f, g)dt$$

for all $φ_{τ,h} \in P_k(I_n; V_h) \times P_k(I_n; Q_h)$, with $φ_{τ,h} = (ψ_{τ,h}, ξ_{τ,h})$.

2 Numerical convergence study

For the sake of implementational simplicity, we consider the problem setting of Fig. 2a with a time-independent domain $Ω_f$. Our computational study investigates the impact of the width of the domain of stabilization $Ω_r^s$ on the convergence of the scheme proposed in Sec. 1. Precisely, we aim to investigate if a wider overlapping of the fluid domain $Ω_f^s$ by $Ω_r^f$ is required to ensure
convergence of optimal order. We put $\Omega \times I = (0, 1)^2 \times (0, 1]$. The midpoint of the circular rigid body with radius $r_{\Omega_s} = 0.1$ is located in the center of $\Omega$. We prescribe the initial value $\mathbf{v}_0$ and right-hand side function $\mathbf{f}$ on $\Omega_f \times I$ in such a way, that the solution of the Navier–Stokes system on $\Omega_f$ is given by $\mathbf{v}_s(x, t) = (\cos(x_2 \pi) \cdot \sin(t) \cdot \sin(x_1 \pi)^2 \cdot \sin(x_2 \pi), -\cos(x_1 \pi) \cdot \sin(t) \cdot \sin(x_2 \pi)^2 \cdot \sin(x_1 \pi)^2)$. On the inner fluid boundary we prescribe the condition $\Omega$, where the stabilization $S_{\Omega_s}$ is applied, precisely $r_{\Omega_s} = 1 \cdot r_{\Omega_r}$ (bottom) and $r_{\Omega_s} = 2 \cdot r_{\Omega_r}$ (top).

**Table 1:** Errors and experimental order of convergence for varying radius $r_{\Omega_s}$ of the domain $\Omega_s$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\tau$ $h$</th>
<th>$|e^v|_{L^2(L^2)}$</th>
<th>$|e^p|_{L^2(L^2)}$</th>
<th>$|e^v|_{L^2(L^2)}$</th>
<th>$|e^p|_{L^2(L^2)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0/2^0$ $h_0/2^0$</td>
<td>$1.514e-2$</td>
<td>$3.719e-2$</td>
<td>$1.581e-3$</td>
<td>$8.851e-3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0/2^1$ $h_0/2^1$</td>
<td>$3.764e-3$</td>
<td>$2.01$</td>
<td>$2.234e-4$</td>
<td>$1.174e-3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0/2^2$ $h_0/2^2$</td>
<td>$9.100e-4$</td>
<td>$2.05$</td>
<td>$2.972e-5$</td>
<td>$2.91$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0/2^3$ $h_0/2^3$</td>
<td>$2.340e-4$</td>
<td>$1.96$</td>
<td>$3.527e-6$</td>
<td>$3.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0/2^4$ $h_0/2^4$</td>
<td>$5.792e-5$</td>
<td>$2.01$</td>
<td>$4.666e-7$</td>
<td>$2.98$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0/2^5$ $h_0/2^5$</td>
<td>$1.448e-5$</td>
<td>$2.00$</td>
<td>$5.833e-8$</td>
<td>$3.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the absolute errors are smaller for $r_{\Omega_s} = 2 \cdot r_{\Omega_r}$ (top), our results indicate that the
EOC does not depend on the diameter of the region where the stabilization $S_{F_k}$ is applied. We note that in our experiments cut cells with non-convex boundary segments due to intersections with $\Omega_t^\mathcal{I}$ occur, cf. Fig. 2. The convergence does not suffer from these cells.
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